

Dr. Robert Vannoy, Genesis, Session 30, Podcast Audio

Biblicalelearning.org by Ted Hildebrandt

All right, so get ready, folks; put on those historian hats, everybody, because today we're diving deep straight into ancient Egypt. A period, well, let's be honest, a period just shrouded in mystery and intrigue, right? Well absolutely. We're tackling a question that has puzzled scholars forever.

Did the biblical figure Joseph arrive in Egypt, get this, before or during the rule of the Hyksos? And by the way, just a reminder, the Hyksos were those mysterious foreign rulers. So whether you are, I don't know, maybe prepping for a presentation or you're brushing up on some biblical history, or maybe you're just curious- whatever the reason- I think you're going to love this. We are going deep into a lecture transcript from an Old Testament history course.

And let me tell you, the fact that there are no easy answers here just makes it so much more fascinating, wouldn't you say? Oh, 100%. One of the things that makes this so interesting is how we answer this question, because it really has this ripple effect. It impacts how we understand when the Exodus occurred, which is a whole other can of worms we could get into later.

But let's stick with Joseph for now. Okay, so like a domino effect, basically. Yeah.

Joseph's timeline impacts the Exodus timeline and so on and so on. But before we go too far down that road, can you give us just like a little background on the Hyksos? Like who are these foreign rulers everybody keeps mentioning? Yeah, so even the term Hyksos is kind of a head scratcher, honestly. Traditionally it's been interpreted as, you know, shepherd kings.

And that possibly points to like these nomadic rulers from the Levant. Now that's the area that includes like modern-day Syria, Lebanon, and Israel. But some scholars think that Hyksos might just mean foreign rulers, you know, without that specific shepherding connection.

And that distinction is actually really important when we're trying to like pinpoint when exactly Joseph arrived. Right. Because if these Hyksos guys were actually shepherd kings, that makes that whole thing from Genesis 46:34 about Egyptians like hating shepherds.

Well, that gets a little tricky, doesn't it? You know, like would the Egyptians have had a problem with shepherds if their own rulers were shepherds themselves? It's a good question. So does that maybe mean that Joseph arrived before the Hyksos came to power? Yeah. So that is actually one of the main arguments for a pre-Hyksos arrival.

But you hit the nail on the head. If Hyksos just means any foreign ruler, then that whole shepherd king argument kind of falls apart. And it's not as relevant to Joseph's timeline anymore.

So we've got to keep both interpretations in mind as we go through the evidence. So it's almost like we're starting this investigation with like a blurry picture of the suspect. We don't even know what the Hyksos really look like, much less when they showed up.

But the lecture transcript does mention a really important figure: this new king who knew not Joseph, right, from Exodus 1:8. He's the one who starts the whole enslavement of the Israelites, right? Yeah, exactly. Yeah. This new king, he's like a pivotal character in the story.

But trying to figure out who he actually was, it's just another piece of this whole puzzle. One interpretation says that he was like a native Egyptian who overthrew the Hyksos. And this led to a new period of Egyptian rule.

So this would put Joseph arriving during the time of Hyksos control. And that leads up to the Exodus later on. Okay, so in this version of events, we've got the Hyksos in power.

Joseph shows up during their reign. And this new pharaoh, he boots them out and starts oppressing the Israelites. But the lecture mentions another interpretation too, right? One that flips this whole timeline around.

It does, yeah. And this other interpretation is saying that the new king was actually himself a Hyksos ruler who overthrew a previous Hyksos dynasty, basically a coup. And now this puts Joseph in Egypt before the Hyksos even got there.

Oh, okay. Hold on. So in this scenario, the Israelites are already in Egypt when the Hyksos show up.

That raises so many questions, like so many. Would they have welcomed these new guys or would they have seen them as a threat? Yeah, that's what makes it so interesting.

Proponents of this view say that, well, if the Israelites and the Hyksos were all buddy-buddy, then why weren't they all kicked out together when the Egyptians took back control? The fact that the Israelites stayed kind of suggests a more antagonistic relationship.

And this new king, this Hyksos usurper, let's call him, might've seen this growing Israelite population as a potential threat. And that's why he decided to oppress them. So instead of allies, we might be talking about an Israelite-Hyksos conflict.

This is giving me some serious Game of Thrones vibes, shifting alliances, power struggles. Man, ancient Egypt was wild. Oh, you can say that again, but it doesn't stop there.

So Exodus 1:10 describes Pharaoh being afraid, afraid that there were getting to be too many Israelites. Now, if he was talking about all the Egyptians, this would be a major exaggeration, right? But the lecture suggests that maybe he was only worried about the Hyksos ruling class. Ah, okay.

I think it's, you were going with this. So if the Israelites were already a decent-sized group before the Hyksos took over, then they could have outnumbered those Hyksos elites, especially their warriors. Exactly.

The lecture even quotes Gleason Archer, and he posited this as a real possibility. Just imagine the Israelites, like a demographic threat to the Hyksos. But we've got to remember, we're just talking about interpretations here.

We're not dealing with, you know, like hard facts, unfortunately. Right. It's easy to get lost in the what ifs and all the drama.

Okay. So let's step back for a sec. So out of all these arguments, are any of them like slam dunks? Like, does any of this definitively tell us if Joseph was there before or during the Hyksos rule? Sadly, no.

You know, there's no smoking gun. There's no ancient inscription out there that says Joseph arrived on this date before or during the Hyksos. You know, we're kind of stuck piecing together the clues that we have.

And you know, sometimes you just got to accept that some mysteries are going to stay mysteries. Man, I was really hoping for a clean-cut answer. But I guess you're right.

The mystery is part of the fun. That's like a big historical jigsaw puzzle. But we're missing a few pieces.

Oh, speaking of missing pieces, though, the lecture does bring up one more detail, something really interesting. It's an assumption, basically, made by people who support a really early date for the Exodus, which would mean, of course, that Joseph got there before the Hyksos. Yeah, they propose this potential gap, this missing chunk of time in Exodus chapter one, specifically between verses 14 and 15.

They say that this gap, this missing time, allows for a smooth transition from Hyksos rule to the 18th dynasty. Now, that's the period with those powerful pharaohs, guys like Thutmose. And this gap lets all that happen without interrupting the continuous oppression of the Israelites.

Oh, OK. So they're saying that even though the Hyksos were eventually driven out, the oppression of the Israelites, it just continued. But now it's under those new Egyptian pharaohs.

That's quite a gap to fill in. It is. And that's the problem, really.

This gap, it's an assumption. It's not something that's clearly stated in the text itself. It's just a way to make that early date for the Exodus.

And by extension, Joseph arriving pre-Hyksos fits into the chronology. It's like we're rebuilding a, I don't know, a broken vase or something. We've got most of the pieces, but we're filling those gaps with, you know, plaster, hoping it looks right.

But it's still just an educated guess in the end. Yeah, that's history for you. We're always working with incomplete information, and we're just trying to make sense of whatever fragments we can find.

Sometimes we have to make those educated guesses to bridge the gaps. But it's important to always be up front about those assumptions and remember that they might not be, you know, set in stone. Right.

Good point. OK, so much to think about already. And we are just getting started.

Stay tuned, everybody, because this is a deep dive you won't want to miss. We're just getting warmed up, folks. So much more to come.

So don't go anywhere. Exactly. Yeah, it's super important to be aware of those assumptions when we're putting together this whole historical puzzle.

But we can't forget, even with those gaps, we can pretty confidently say that Joseph arrived in Egypt somewhere between like nineteen hundred and seventeen hundred B.C. That's based on, you know, both the Bible and what we know about Egyptian history. OK, so we're working with like a 200-year window, basically not super precise, but hey, it's a start right now. You mentioned before figuring out when the Exodus happened.

Well, that's also connected to this whole Joseph and Hyksos debate. Can you explain that a bit more, like for me and for anyone listening who maybe needs a refresher on their biblical timeline? Sure. So remember, the Bible says that the Israelites were in Egypt for four hundred thirty years.

Right. So if we can figure out when they left, when the Exodus happened, then we can work backward and kind of estimate when they first got there, which would include Joseph, of course. But get this, just like everything else we've been talking about.

Well, figuring out when the Exodus happened, that's a whole other scholarly brawl. OK, let me guess. There are different groups, each with their own timeline, and each of those timelines changes how we see Joseph's arrival.

You got it. You're catching on quick. So we've got this group, the early date camp.

They say the Exodus happened around the 15th century B.C. And then there's the late date camp. They put it closer to the 13th century B.C. Now, a two-hundred-year difference. That's massive when you're talking about ancient history.

Right. So if we go with that early Exodus date, that would support the idea that Joseph was in Egypt before the Hyksos, because then the Israelites would have been in Egypt for much longer. Right.

And they would live through this oppression under multiple different pharaohs. But if we go with a late Exodus date, well, that pushes Joseph's arrival much closer to or even during the Hyksos rule. Right.

Exactly. Yeah, that's the whole point. This isn't just about like dates on a timeline.

It changes how we understand, like, the whole Israelite experience in Egypt, their relationship with whoever was in charge, the reasons why they were enslaved, and everything about how their exodus went down. If Joseph got there during the Hyksos rule,

their relationship to the Egyptian power structure, well, it might have been completely different. OK, so let's play this out for a second.

Let's say Joseph arrived before the Hyksos were around. What kind of relationship do you think there would have been between the Israelites and the Egyptian authorities? OK, well, think about it. They would have been settled in Egypt when native Egyptians were running the show.

And this could explain why they were treated pretty well at first. Like, remember how Joseph became so powerful and his family was invited to live in Goshen. That doesn't really fit if the Hyksos, those, you know, foreign rulers, were already calling the shots.

Right. That makes sense. And that change, that shift from, you know, being favored to then being oppressed, that we see in exodus, all that anxiety about, you know, there being too many Israelites.

That could have happened gradually over generations under different pharaohs. And that would all lead up to the exodus. But what if Joseph arrived during Hyksos rule? Doesn't that kind of mess things up? Yeah, it adds a whole bunch more layers, that's for sure.

So imagine this. Joseph rises to power. He's got all these incredible administrative skills.

Remember, he saved Egypt from that famine. What if those skills what if they're exactly what made him so valuable to the Hyksos? Because they were trying to, you know, solidify their power. OK, so instead of seeing him as like a threat, the Hyksos might have seen Joseph as a useful ally, maybe even like a key player in their government, which could explain, you know, why he moved up in Egyptian society so quickly.

But wait a minute. Haven't we already talked about this? If the Israelites and the Hyksos were on the same side, why weren't the Israelites kicked out with them when the Egyptians took over again? Oh, that's a great point. You're absolutely right.

It suggests that their relationship wasn't just a simple alliance. Maybe there were times when they cooperated, but then other times when there was like tension, maybe even conflict, you know, as different Hyksos rulers came to power. Just imagine the Israelites stuck in the middle of all that political back and forth.

And we got to remember, we only have like a limited historical record. The Bible gives us one side of the story, but there was probably so much more going on that we'll never know about. It's like we're watching this historical drama, but we only get to see a few random scenes.

We can try to fill in the blanks, but we'll never have the full picture. It's frustrating, but also super intriguing. Yeah, exactly.

And that's what keeps, you know, historians and archaeologists going. They keep digging literally and figuratively. But let's not get too bogged down in all the speculation.

You mentioned earlier that the lecture brought up the dating of Abraham and how that impacts our understanding of Joseph. Can you remind us of that connection again? Oh, right. The lecture pointed out that figuring out when Abraham lived is, well, kind of messy.

And since he's like the patriarch, you know, the Og of the whole family line, knowing when he lived is super important for figuring out when Joseph was doing his thing in Egypt. Yeah, it's like trying to solve a math problem. But you don't know one of the key variables.

Everything else depends on it. So let's talk variables. And what are the main theories about when Abraham lived? Did the lecture give us any clues? Yeah.

So it highlights that scholars don't really agree on this. Some put Abraham way back in the 21st century BC. Others say it was closer to the 19th century BC.

Now, a two-century difference has a huge impact on Joseph's timeline. If we go with an early date for Abraham, that pushes Joseph further back, which makes it more likely that he was around before the Hyksos. But a later date for Abraham.

Well, that puts Joseph closer to the Hyksos period. So then it's more likely that he arrived during their rule. So we're basically adding another layer of uncertainty to this whole thing, trying to figure out when Abraham lived, then impacts when we think Joseph lived.

Yeah. Which then affects how we date the Exodus. It's like a historical chain reaction.

Exactly. It just shows you how connected all these historical events are. Even what seem like small differences in the timing, they can have a huge impact on how we see the big picture.

OK, I think my brain is starting to hurt a little bit. Can we take a break from all these timeline gymnastics for a second? Let's talk about something a bit more. Well, a bit more concrete.

We've been talking a lot about the biblical story, but is there any? You know, archaeological evidence or anything from outside the Bible, anything that can support any of these theories- like, what does the physical evidence actually tell us? That is the million-dollar question, and unfortunately, the evidence we have, while it's fragmentary and open to interpretation, like always, let's let the biblical texts themselves. The Book of Genesis gives us a pretty detailed account of Joseph's life, right? His rise to power, his family coming to Egypt, and all the events that led up to the Israelites being enslaved.

But like we've been saying, the Hyksos are never mentioned directly. We kind of have to read between the lines and try to make those connections to other historical sources. Right.

So it's like we've got one piece of a jigsaw puzzle, but we're not even sure where it fits in the whole picture. So let's go hunting for more pieces then. What kind of archaeological evidence or evidence from outside the Bible? What could help us understand this period better? What should we be looking for? Well, ideally, we would find some Egyptian inscription that mentions the Israelites by name during this time period.

That would be amazing. Talk about a historical mic drop, right? But I have a feeling those kind of discoveries are, well, they're pretty rare. Yeah, you're not wrong.

Finding an inscription that specifically names the Israelites from way back then. It's like finding a needle in a haystack. But there are some pretty interesting hints and possibilities, things that have really caught the attention of scholars.

So remember how the Hyksos ruled during a time called the Second Intermediate Period? That was a time of a lot of political upheaval and change in Egypt. And during this time, we find some Egyptian texts that describe these groups. They're described as like Asiatics or foreigners.

And they were living in Egypt. Hold on, hold on. Before we go any further, can you explain what the Second Intermediate Period is? I know you mentioned it before, but just, you know, to clarify for our listeners who maybe aren't as familiar with Egyptian history? Oh, sure.

Yeah, no problem. It's a bit confusing. I know.

Basically, Egyptian history is divided into these periods called kingdoms. These were times when Egypt was, you know, strong and unified. Now, the Second Intermediate Period, it lasted roughly from like 1750 to 1570 BC.

And it was this time of instability and division. It happened between two of those kingdoms. And it's during this chaotic time that the Hyksos came to power.

Okay, got it. Thanks for the clarification. So back to those Asiatics mentioned in the text, were they described as like pastoralists? Yeah.

Or shepherds? Because if they were, then that could link them to the Israelites, right? Yeah. You're thinking along the right lines. And yes, these texts do describe those groups as having a pastoral lifestyle, which, you know, that lines up with how the Bible describes the Israelites.

It's not definitive proof, but it's a pretty interesting clue. It suggests that there might've been groups like the Israelites in Egypt during this time. Okay.

That's pretty cool. So we don't have like a name tag that says, hello, we're the Israelites. But we do have these descriptions of people who seem to fit the bill.

And they were living in Egypt at the right time. What other clues should we be looking for? I'm feeling like a historical detective here. All right.

So since we're talking about Asiatics, remember that Semitic refers to a whole family of languages, and that includes Hebrew, which is what the Israelites spoke. So if we can find archaeological evidence of settlements in Egypt from the right time period, and those settlements show signs of Semitic culture or language, well, that could be another piece of the puzzle. That makes sense.

Have archaeologists found any settlements like that? They have. And some of them are pretty fascinating. One example is the site of Avaris.

It was the Hyksos capital in Egypt. It was this bustling city with all these different layers. And excavations have shown a mix of Egyptian and foreign influences.

But here's the key. We found remains of houses, tombs, and artifacts, and they show clear signs of Semitic culture. Wait, well, hold on.

So we're talking about the Hyksos capital, like the center of their power. And within that city, archaeologists are finding evidence of Semitic people. That's a pretty strong connection, wouldn't you say? Could the Israelites have actually lived in Avaris? It's definitely a possibility.

And it's one that has sparked a lot of debate among scholars. The evidence from Avaris suggests that there was a significant Semitic presence there. And it's tempting to link that directly to the Bible's account of the Israelites living in Egypt.

But we got to remember, just because two things happened at the same time doesn't mean one causes the other. Just because there were Semitic people in Avaris doesn't automatically mean they were the Israelites. There could have been other Semitic groups living in Egypt at the time.

Right. Good point. We can't jump to conclusions, but it's hard not to get excited when those pieces seem to fit together so well.

But Avaris is a major clue for sure. What other archaeological sites might give us some insight into all this? Another one worth mentioning is Tel El Amarna. It's thought to be the site of the biblical city of Ramesses, one of the cities that the Israelites built when they were enslaved.

This site dates back to the Second Intermediate Period. Remember, that's the time of the Hyksos. And excavations there have revealed a large planned city.

Ramesses, like the city from the Exodus story. Okay, I'm definitely paying attention now. What did they find at Tel El Amarna? Anything that points to the Israelites being there? Well, there aren't any inscriptions that specifically mention Israelites, unfortunately.

But the way the city is laid out, it's pretty interesting. It's got this grid pattern and these standardized houses. And some scholars think that style, that way of building, well, it resembles what you might expect from a Semitic settlement.

Wow. Fascinating. So even though we don't have names or labels, the way this city is structured, it hints at a possible Semitic influence.

Exactly. And remember, we're looking for patterns and connections here. Each piece of evidence on its own might not be conclusive.

But when we start to see those pieces fitting together, it strengthens the overall picture. It's like we're following this trail of historical breadcrumbs. And each breadcrumb gets us a little closer to the truth.

Evvaris, Tel El Amarna, these are key locations in our investigation. They are, yeah. And they highlight how important it is to combine textual analysis with archaeological evidence.

We need both to get a more complete picture of this time period. You know, you're absolutely right. We can't just rely on the Bible, but we can't ignore it either.

Yeah. We need to bring everything to the table and see where the pieces land. Exactly.

And speaking of bringing more to the table, are there any other sources of information we could use? We've talked about the Bible and archaeology, but is there anything else that could shed some light on this whole puzzle? You're reading my mind. I was just thinking the same thing. We've been focusing a lot on the Egyptian side of things.

But what about sources from other cultures? Are there any ancient writings besides the Bible that might mention events or people connected to the Israelites? You're thinking like a true historian. And yes, there are. We can look for clues in what we call extra-biblical texts.

These are ancient writings from other cultures, writings that might overlap with the biblical story. In the case of ancient Egypt, we've got a ton of written records besides the Bible, from inscriptions on monuments to papyri, which are basically like ancient scrolls. So it's like we're getting a glimpse into the Egyptian perspective, right? We can see how they recorded events and how they interacted with different groups.

Exactly. And while these texts don't usually mention the Israelites specifically by name, some scholars think that some events or descriptions might indirectly be related to what the Bible says. It's all about connecting the dots.

Okay. You've definitely piqued my curiosity. What kind of indirect connections are we talking about? Give me an example.

All right. So consider this. The Bible tells us that Joseph came to power in Egypt because there was this terrible famine, right? Now, some scholars have pointed to Egyptian texts that describe famines or times when the economy was really bad.

And these were during the Second Intermediate Period. It's possible that these events line up with what the Bible says, even if the Egyptians didn't specifically mention Joseph or the Israelites. That makes a lot of sense.

If Joseph really did save Egypt from starvation, it's totally plausible that there would be some record of it in Egyptian sources, even if it doesn't match up perfectly with the biblical story. It's like finding a fingerprint at a crime scene, you know? It doesn't tell you the whole story, but it's an important clue. I love that analogy.

You're getting really good at this historical detective work, and it shows how important it is to be open to those indirect connections, those echoes of the biblical story that we find in other sources. So instead of just focusing on the Bible, we're looking at everything, right? Archaeology, Egyptian texts, maybe even stuff from other cultures. It's like we're putting together this giant historical jigsaw puzzle, and we're using every piece we can find to get a clearer picture.

That's a fantastic way to put it. And just like with a jigsaw puzzle, we might not have all the pieces. We might never have the complete picture, but that doesn't mean we should stop searching.

Definitely not. The search is half the fun, you know? But after all this digging, all this piecing things together, have we actually found any definite answers? Can we say for sure when Joseph arrived in Egypt? Unfortunately, no. And this is where we need to be honest about the limitations of studying history.

We found some really interesting clues, some really cool connections, but there's no single piece of evidence that proves without a doubt whether Joseph got there before or during the Hyksos rule. It's still a big topic of debate among scholars. So both possibilities are still on the table: Joseph arriving before the Hyksos or Joseph arriving during their reign.

We went through all this evidence, and we're basically back to where we started. In a way, yeah, that's true. But that's not necessarily a bad thing.

Remember, the journey, the process of exploration, it's just as important as reaching a destination. You know what? You're right. Honestly, if we had a definite answer, it would kind of take the fun out of it, wouldn't it? The mystery keeps us engaged, makes us think critically, think outside the box.

Exactly. It's that element of the unknown. That's what keeps historians and archaeologists coming back for more.

We're driven by this desire to understand the past, even if we know we might never have all the answers. Okay, so no definite answers. Yeah.

But we do have some key takeaways from all this, right? What are the most important things we've learned about this period, about Joseph's story, and about the challenges of trying to understand history in general? That's a great question. I think the biggest thing we've learned is that we need to be humble when we're dealing with ancient history. We have to acknowledge that the evidence is limited.

There might be multiple interpretations, and what we understand about the past, well, it's always changing. New discoveries can change everything. It's like we're constantly refining our understanding, adding new details, adjusting our perspective as we gather more evidence.

Exactly. History isn't like a fixed thing. It's alive, it's dynamic, and it changes as we learn more.

Okay, so humility is key. What else? I think we've also learned that it's important to be open to different viewpoints and interpretations. We have the biblical account, which is super important, of course, but we can't ignore the things we learn from archaeology, from Egyptian texts, and from other sources.

By bringing all those perspectives together, we create a richer, more nuanced understanding of the past. It's like we're weaving a tapestry, you know, using threads from

all these different sources, and that's how we create a more complete and vibrant picture. I love that analogy.

It really highlights the beauty and the complexity of trying to understand history. It's not always about finding the right answer. It's about exploring the possibilities, asking questions, and constantly trying to get a deeper understanding.

Okay, so humility, open-mindedness, and a good dose of curiosity. I think those are great principles to guide us in our historical explorations. But before we wrap up this deep dive, I want to throw out one final thought-provoking question to our listeners.

Okay, let's hear it. So imagine you're an archaeologist, and you're working in Egypt. You're excavating a site, and bam, you find something amazing, like an inscription, an artifact, something that proves definitively whether Joseph arrived before or during the Hyksos' rule.

What would that discovery look like? What kind of evidence would convince you, like, without a shadow of a doubt? Ooh, that's a fantastic question. What do you think? What kind of discovery would settle this debate once and for all? Hmm. Well, I think I'd be totally blown away if we, like, stumbled across a royal decree, you know, from a Hyksos king.

Maybe it would say that they were granting land to Joseph, or acknowledging, like, how he helped them during that famine, or what about this? Imagine we found a tomb, right? And it's obvious that it belonged to, like, someone super important, but it has both Egyptian and Semitic burial practices. Like, that kind of mixing of cultures, that would be a huge clue, right? Oh yeah, those are really good ideas. You know, you're thinking like a real archaeologist now, and I really like that you're thinking about those subtle ways that cultures interact.

We shouldn't expect there to be, like, a clear dividing line between, you know, Egyptians and foreigners, especially not in a place like Avaris, which was this big cosmopolitan center. Right, exactly. It wouldn't be just, you know, us versus them.

There has been all this, like, exchange and blending of different cultures going on. But okay, let's say we did find an inscription, and it mentions Joseph by name, maybe even alongside a Hyksos ruler. Wouldn't that basically settle the debate? Oh yeah, it would definitely be a huge discovery, especially if that inscription was backed up by other evidence, too.

You know, like, the archaeological context, the style of the writing, all those little details that help us figure out if an artifact is authentic and how old it is. So it's not just about, like, finding a name scribbled on a piece of pottery, right? We need, like, the whole picture of the historical context and all that supporting evidence. That's how you build a really strong case.

Exactly, yeah. And even then, you know, there would probably still be some debate and discussion among scholars. That's just how it goes with historical research, you know? It's an ongoing conversation.

We're always reevaluating and reinterpreting things. You know what? After this whole deep dive, I'm starting to think that maybe those unanswered questions and all that debate, that

back and forth, maybe that's actually part of what makes history so fascinating. It's not just about memorizing a bunch of dates and names.

It's about, like, wrestling with these mysteries and trying to understand the past on its own terms. I totally agree. It's about embracing the complexity, the ambiguity, and accepting that we might never have all the answers, but that doesn't mean we stop searching.

Right, exactly. We keep digging. We keep asking those questions.

Because those questions, they connect us to the past, to the people who came before us. They make us realize that history isn't just something in a textbook. It's a story that's still being written, and we're all part of it.

That's a beautiful way to put it. Who knows? Maybe one of our listeners will be the one to make that amazing discovery. Maybe they'll be the one to unearth that missing piece of the puzzle and finally solve this whole Joseph and Hyksos mystery.

That would be incredible. But even if we never find that one definitive answer, I think this deep dive has shown us that the journey itself, the process of exploration, well, it's just as rewarding as reaching the final destination. Oh, absolutely.

It's about that process of discovery, the thrill of uncovering those clues and the joy of putting together those fragments of the past. So to all our listeners out there, we encourage you to keep exploring, to keep asking those questions, and to keep diving deep into the amazing world of ancient history. You never know what you might find.

And remember, even without all the answers, we can still learn, we can still grow, and we can still be amazed by all the incredible things that happened in the past. Well said. All right, folks, on that note, I think it's time to wrap up our deep dive into the world of Joseph and the Hyksos.

We've covered a lot of ground today, from the Bible to archaeology to all those intriguing extra-biblical sources. It's been quite a journey. We've explored different interpretations, we've weighed the evidence, and hopefully we've inspired our listeners to keep thinking about history.

To all our fellow history buffs out there, thank you so much for joining us on the Deep Dive. Until next time, keep those minds curious, keep asking those questions, and let your imaginations be sparked by the wonders of the past. Take care, everyone.

Bye.