

Joseph. Adamsdown.. 17 March 2009.

Read : Gen. 37. 2a; 41. 46a; Acts 7. 8b-10.

I concluded last Tuesday by claiming that, apart from revelations which God made by way of dreams, there was a chain of at least ten links stretching from chapter 37 to chapter 41 which brought Joseph all the way from the humble home of his loving father in Canaan to the very highest position open to him in all Egypt.

So let's begin by surveying the territory which I plan to cover over the course of our studies on the life of Joseph.

Our Chain of Ten Links consists of ...

1. **The envy of Joseph's brothers**, 37. 1-11
2. **The anxiety of Joseph's father**, 37. 12-14
3. **The friendly inquiry of a certain man of Shechem**, 37. 15-17
4. **The timely intervention of Reuben and Judah**, 37. 18-24; 26-27
5. **The journeying of certain Arabian traders**, 37. 25, 28
6. **The domestic needs of Potiphar's household**, 37. 36; 39. 1-6
7. **The wickedness of Potiphar's wife**, 39. 7-18
8. **The injustice of Potiphar's decision**, 39. 19-23
9. **The falling from favour of Pharaoh's chief butler and chief baker**, 40. 1-4 – and
10. **The memory of the chief butler**, 40. 20-23; 41. 9-13

So, first ...

1. **The envy of Joseph's brothers**, Gen. 37. 1-11.

We read that Stephen said, 'The patriarchs, moved with envy (better, 'with jealousy'), sold Joseph into Egypt', Acts 7. 9. I say that 'jealousy' is the 'better' translation, because the Greek word used by Stephen – as is true also of the Hebrew word found in Gen. 37. 11 ('his brothers envied him') – means properly 'the desire *to have for yourself what someone else has*' – whereas the Greek word for 'envy'¹ refers rather to 'the desire *to deprive someone else of what he or she has*'.² The word 'jealousy' in both Acts 7 and Genesis 37 is telling us that Joseph's brothers 'resented' him, wanting for themselves what he had – that they 'begrudged' him his special position and privileges.³

The other key word used to describe the brothers' feelings for Joseph is that they 'hated' him – which indeed we are told no less than three times – in verses four, five and eight.

It seems to me that there were at least three contributing factors to their jealousy, resentment and hatred.

First, although the Bible doesn't actually attribute their bad feelings for Joseph to this, the 'evil (the 'bad') report' which he brought home to his father about the activities of Dan, Naphtali, Gad and Asher could not have helped! I suspect that Joseph had been sent to tend Jacob's flock with these particular brothers because they were nearer his own age than were most of his other brothers – than the sons of Leah – and that the bad report which he conveyed to his father would have done nothing to endear him to them.

But, more importantly, there was Joseph's coat (or, tunic – a shirt-like garment) – described in the KJV and NKJV as 'of many colours' – but which was more likely either a richly embroidered tunic or one which reached to his hands and his feet.⁴ The only other passage in the Bible where the particular word occurs is in 2 Samuel 13, where we read of Tamar, (not the Tamar of chapter 38!) the daughter of David, that 'she had on a richly embroidered garment (or, 'long garment with sleeves'), for the king's virgin daughters usually wore such apparel', 2 Sam. 13. 18-19. So, in David's day at least, it was an item of clothing worn by royal princesses. Clearly then this was no ordinary garment and was meant to distinguish the wearer – whether male or female – from all others around.

We read in the opening of 1 Chronicles 5 of how Jacob stripped Reuben of his birthright and transferred it to Joseph's sons. The sin of Reuben which occasioned Jacob's action is recorded for us back in chapter 35 of our book (verse 22), and it may well be that Jacob has already expressed his intentions to his sons and that Joseph's tunic was the mark and symbol of Joseph's special place in Jacob's *plans*.⁵ It certainly seems to have been the evidence and symbol of Joseph's special place in Jacob's *affections*. For we are twice told that 'Israel loved Joseph more' than any of his other sons, vv. 3, 4. Indeed, when we read in verse 4 that 'his brothers saw that their father loved *him* more' than them, the 'him' is emphatic.

The reason for Jacob's special fondness for Joseph was, we are told, that Joseph was 'the son of his old age' – Jacob having been about 91 years old when Rachel gave birth to Joseph.⁶ And in that name 'Rachel' undoubtedly lies the clue to the real and underlying cause of Jacob's special affection for Joseph. For Joseph was the firstborn son of Rachel – who had been by far the greatest love of Jacob's life. And Joseph had even inherited his mother's

good looks. For the very same expression is used to describe both Rachel and Joseph: 'Rachel was beautiful of form and appearance', reads Gen. 29. 17; 'and Joseph was beautiful of form and appearance', reads Gen. 39. 6 (both literal translations).

And now that Rachel was dead and buried, Jacob's love and attention transferred to her firstborn son. And so, just as we read in chapter 29 that Jacob 'loved Rachel more than Leah', v. 30, we now read in chapter 37 that he 'loved Joseph more than all his sons', v. 3 literally – the very same expression being used in both passages.

And Joseph's tunic was clearly meant by Jacob to distinguish Joseph from his half-brothers and indeed to mark him out as pre-eminent over them. Apart from anything else, a richly embroidered garment or a long garment with sleeves was totally unsuitable for manual work – tunics worn for such activity were plain, had no sleeves and reached only to the knees. In one sense, the tunic which Jacob had made for Joseph, v. 3, said it all : Joseph was the apple of Jacob's eye.

But I can't help feeling that Jacob was less than wise in this, and that he, of all men, should have known better. For Jacob had been brought up in a family and home where his own father, Isaac, had made *one* of his sons, Esau, his obvious favourite. Oh yes, Jacob knew well how it felt to be loved less than his brother. And he had experienced at first hand how his father's selective affection had bred hatred and threats of violence in the home. And yet now we see Jacob himself sowing the seeds of hatred and violence in his own family.

I said that there were at least three contributing factors to the brothers' jealousy, resentment and hatred. There was Joseph's bad report of verse 2, and Joseph's distinctive tunic of verses 3 and 4. But matters really came to a head over Joseph's dreams of verses 5 to 11.

Scripture doesn't actually say that these dreams came from God, but ... given that they received such accurate fulfilment later – and given the explicit God-given nature of the two other pairs of dreams in the story (the one pair of dreams granted to Pharaoh's officers in chapter 40, and the other pair granted to Pharaoh himself in chapter 41 ... it is clear that they did just that – that Joseph's dreams actually came from God, that is.

And we now find that Joseph's brothers came to 'hate' him 'even more' on account of God's manifest favour towards him than they did on account of his father's – for, as verse 8 says, 'they hated him *even more* for his dreams'. And it is lovely to note from later chapters that Joseph never bore *any grudge* against these men – these men who *begrudged* him his special place both in his father's affection and in God's revealed purpose.

For what it is worth, although I know the dreams undoubtedly threw fuel on the raging fire of his brother's envy, I don't see Joseph's telling of his dreams as a matter of proud boasting on his part. I suspect he related them to his brothers and his father in all innocence. Given what we learn of Joseph's character later, I find it difficult to believe that Joseph had particularly high thoughts of himself – or for himself.

But, for whatever reason he told them, the report of *his dreams to his brothers* did more to inflame their hatred than had his report of *their misdeeds to his father*, v. 2.

Joseph had two dreams. And, if I understand them correctly, the first dream, which concerned the sheaves, pointed in an unmistakable way to his destined supremacy over his brothers, and the second dream, which concerned the heavenly bodies, pointed to his destined supremacy over the whole house of Israel – including even Jacob himself.⁷

The fact that Joseph had two dreams with more or less the same meaning and interpretation is itself significant. Unless I am mistaken, the key to this lies in chapter 41. For, when Joseph came to interpret Pharaoh's two dreams – which also both carried much the same meaning – he explained to Pharaoh, 'the dream was repeated to Pharaoh twice because the thing is established by God', Gen. 41. 32. I suspect that in Joseph's case also, repetition indicated certainty of fulfilment.

And was there also a hint, I wonder, of future events in the very imagery of the first dream – in which his brothers' sheaves 'stood round about, and made obeisance' – bowed down – to Joseph's own sheaf – a very suitable symbol perhaps of his brothers later coming to Egypt for grain, and bowing to him, when, so to speak, their sheaves were empty, and his sheaf was full?

But Joseph's recounting of his dreams proved – if you will excuse the pun – the last straw for his brothers – and 'they were jealous of him', v. 11.⁸ 'Who', the proverb asks, 'can stand before jealousy?', Prov. 27. 4. And many indeed are the ugly weeds which have grown on this particular stalk! It was, we remember, jealousy which motivated Korah to speak against Moses and Aaron⁹ ... it was envy which motivated King Saul to hound and seek the life of young David ... it was jealousy which motivated the presidents and princes of Persia to accuse Daniel to Darius ... and, above all else, it was, as Pilate perceived, envy which motivated the chief priests and elders of our Lord's day to deliver Him up to Pilate that He should be crucified, Matt. 27. 18.

And the apostle Paul is careful, I note, to include 'jealousy', along with 'envy', in his catalogue of 'the works of the flesh' in Galatians 5 (verses 19-21). Well might we say, in the words which, in his play 'Othello', William Shakespeare put into the mouth of Iago, 'Beware ... of jealousy; it is the green-eyed monster ...'!

And so, in His own wonderful and mysterious way, our God caught up Joseph's telling of his dreams into the fulfilment of His own gracious purpose – for, in part at least, it was Joseph's telling of his dreams – together, of course, with his brothers' reaction to them – which led to their ultimate fulfilment! But of this, Joseph, of course, knew nothing – then!

The animosity of his brothers toward Joseph had built up until the situation had become highly explosive. It only needed a match. It was only a matter of time and of opportunity. And that time and that opportunity finally arrived when Jacob sent Joseph to Shechem. Which brings us to the second link in the chain.

But, before we leave the first link, let us file away just how critically important the brothers' jealousy and hatred were – for, apart from these, Joseph would never have been sold into Egypt – and, as we saw last Tuesday, the history of the world would have been radically different!

And so ...

2. **The anxiety of Joseph's father**, Gen. 37. 12-14.

Joseph's brothers – now all ten of them – not only four, as in verse 2 – were feeding their father's flocks in Shechem. In one way this was not surprising – but in another it most certainly was.

First, it was *not* surprising, because we learn from chapter 33 that Jacob had bought the portion of the field at Shechem where he had once pitched his tent, Gen. 33. 19 – and presumably that parcel of ground still offered Jacob and his sons good pasture land for their flocks.

What makes the brothers' presence at Shechem to be *surprising* is the incident recorded, not in chapter 33, but in chapter 34. For it was there that Jacob's daughter Dinah had been assaulted and 'defiled' by the prince of the city, and it was there that Jacob's sons – Simeon and Levi especially – had responded by slaughtering all the males of the city. Jacob's later commentary on the action of Simeon and Levi is recorded in chapter 49 for us: 'Simeon and Levi are brothers; instruments of cruelty are in their dwelling place ... cursed be their anger, for it is fierce; and their wrath, for it is cruel!', Gen. 49. 5-7.

At the time, Jacob had been appalled at their violent actions, saying to Simeon and Levi, 'You have troubled me to make me to stink among the inhabitants of the land ... and I, being few in number, they shall gather themselves together against me, and slay me; and I shall be destroyed, I and my house', Gen. 34. 30.

Scripture makes it clear that, at the time, God had specially preserved Jacob and his family when they left Shechem far behind them : 'they journeyed', we read, 'and the terror of God was upon the cities that were all around them, and they did not pursue the sons of Jacob', Gen. 35. 5.

But now, whether at Jacob's bidding or on their own initiative I know not, Joseph's brothers had ventured back to the scene of the massacre. I can well understand therefore their father's anxiety – his sense of apprehension over the welfare of both his sons and his flocks, v. 14. His sons were well known – even notorious – in the area, and it was not beyond the realms of possibility that some angry relatives or friends of the Shechemites who had been killed might be looking for revenge.

I take it that Jacob would not have sent Joseph on such a potentially dangerous mission unless he saw this as absolutely essential. And I note that Joseph was not sent by his father to take food and other provisions to his brothers – as was David to his brothers in the Valley of Elah about 900 years later. But Jacob has no real choice – he must know whether all is well with his sons.

I take it also that Jacob entertained no suspicion that Joseph's brothers nursed such bitter hatred for Joseph that they would consider killing him themselves. Which is why, of course, at the end of the chapter, when confronted with Joseph's blood-stained tunic, Jacob is ready to believe that he had been attacked and killed by some wild beast – not imagining for one moment that the hands of his other sons might have been running red with Joseph's blood. Little did Jacob suspect that Joseph had far more to fear from his own relatives than ever his other sons had to fear from the relatives of the dead men at Shechem!

But I am less sure what Joseph thought. It is difficult to believe that he had failed to register the strength of his brothers' feelings. But, if he had sensed this, he didn't allow it to hold him back from obeying his father's instruction. Quite possibly, he couldn't believe that his brothers would ever do more to him than shout at him, vv. 4, 8 – or perhaps he simply trusted his dreams. I don't know. What matters is, that, to ease his father's mind, he went.

And for now we note how essential it was that, under God, Jacob's concern for his other sons and his flocks led him to send Joseph to Shechem. But that, in itself, raises an interesting point. Because it means that, had it not been for the tragic events of chapter 34, including the cruelty of his sons Simeon and Levi, Jacob would have had no reason to be anxious about his sons welfare now – and would therefore have had no reason to send Joseph to far-off Shechem – and, if Joseph hadn't gone to Shechem – our chain of providence would have snapped – and we haven't even reached the third link yet! But I guess that it is about time that we did. And so ...

3. The friendly inquiry of a certain man of Shechem, Gen. 37. 15-17.

Verse 14 closed by telling us that Jacob 'sent him (Joseph) out of the Vale of Hebron, and he came to Shechem' – a distance of just over 50 miles as the crow flies – a good 60 miles if you don't happen to be a crow! Such a journey would have taken Joseph at least two days.

But in verse 15 we find him '*wandering* in the field' at Shechem – and, rather fittingly, given that Joseph was in quest of his father's flocks, the word translated 'wandering' is that translated 'astray' in the very familiar text from Isaiah 53 – 'All we like sheep have gone astray', Isa. 53. 6.

And, if the field in question was that which his father Jacob had purchased some time before, Joseph would therefore have had every reason to *expect* to find his brothers there. But he didn't.

But I guess that Joseph would *never have expected* that, over 500 years later, according to Joshua 24, his own bones would be buried in that very field – having been brought there all the way from Egypt in a coffin by the children of Israel, Josh. 24. 32.

But, if his brothers were nowhere to be found – Joseph was! For it was there, in that field, we are told, that some unnamed individual 'found' him – 'unnamed', I mean, by scripture, not by his parents!

And it just so 'happened' that the man who came across Joseph 'straying' in the field – had just 'happened' to see Joseph's brothers there some time before – and had just 'happened' to overhear them say they were moving on to Dothan – for reasons not given in the text. I understand that, although the area to the east of Shechem offered excellent pasture land, that at Dothan was even better.¹⁰ But, for whatever reason, Joseph's brothers had gone – and it just so 'happened' that the unnamed individual who discovered Joseph was able to tell him *where* they had gone!

And, at this point, the whole story of Joseph – and the outworking of God's great purpose and plan – rests foursquare on an utterly casual and unscheduled meeting – 'unscheduled' by man, I mean. Just a 'chance' meeting! What an incredible coincidence! And, if you believe that, you will believe anything! Indeed, I don't think you will find the word 'coincidence' in God's dictionary. Talk about large doors swinging on very small hinges! 'Chance' meeting indeed!

But, speaking of 'chance' ...here surely was Joseph's 'chance' to return to his father at Hebron, if his heart was not in his mission. He has already travelled some 60 miles – and it has all been hills – through what we know as 'the hill country of Judea' – and for him now to go to Dothan will mean at least a further 15 miles – and again it will all be hills – this time through what we know as 'the hill country of Ephraim' – and you can guess from whom they later got that name!

But no – Joseph has no intention of turning back and going home until he has completed his allotted task. And we will discover this conscientious trait time after time in Joseph's life – whether in Potiphar's house, the King's prison or Pharaoh's palace. Clearly, Joseph had come straight out of the Ecclesiastes 9. 10 mould – 'Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might'.

And so to Dothan.

Interestingly, we will find another Bible character at Dothan many centuries later – and he, as Joseph, found his life endangered, because he also had received direct revelations from God. But Elisha – for that is who it was – had the advantage of horses and chariots of fire to surround him and protect him from his assailants. Apart from which, God gave him the power to inflict blindness on those who attacked him.

Joseph enjoyed no such luxuries. And yet ... and yet at Dothan Joseph was as safe as was Elisha – for he too was in God's hands – and God can use a Reuben and a Judah *to deliver Joseph from death* with the same ease that He could have used His fiery angelic host! (For those interested, the full story of Elisha's encounter with the Syrian army is told in 2 Kings 6.)

And so, as I say, to Dothan – where we witness ...

4. The timely intervention of Reuben and Judah, occupying Gen. 37. 18-24, 26-27.

But before we consider the role played in the story by these two men, we need to fill in the gap between the time when Joseph set out for Dothan in verse 17, and the time when we first meet Reuben in verse 21. The brothers greeted the sight of Joseph's approach with a smile – with a *grim* smile – not that they were in any way pleased at the prospect of having his company, thank you – but because his coming to them so far away from home and father presented them with a golden opportunity to be rid of him – rid of his fancy tunic – rid of his insufferable dreams – and that for ever!

'Behold, this dreamer comes', they said sarcastically – literally, 'this master ('this possessor') of dreams'.¹¹ Clearly, they hadn't forgotten his dreams – indeed they deeply resented them. And there and then they resolved to put this 'master of dreams' to death.

'Come now therefore, and *let us kill him*', they said among themselves – words which may well find an echo in those which our Lord put into the mouths of the husbandmen in His parable of the vineyard in Mark 12, who 'said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him', Mark 12. 7.¹²

And so Joseph's brothers planned first to *put Joseph to death* and then to *put out the story* that some wild beast had killed and devoured him – which would in itself have been plausible enough. For we gather from Jacob's blessing of his sons in chapter 49 that he was familiar at least with lions and wolves, Gen. 49. 9, 27.¹³

'We shall see what will become of his dreams', they said, v. 20. And, in one sense at least, those very words 'what will become of his dreams' seem to resound as a question through the next few chapters!

Yet Joseph's brothers would never have guessed that the very plans they were at that moment formulating between themselves would ultimately lead to the fulfillment of those very dreams!¹⁴ But they have yet to learn – as many since – that you cannot fight against God – and win!

Yes, the very plans they were at that moment devising between them would ultimately lead to the fulfillment of Joseph's dreams. But for that to happen, everything now rested – humanly speaking – on the contribution about to be made by Reuben and Judah.

And so the next few verses focus our attention on Joseph's two brothers.

First, Reuben.

Reuben never forgot his unsuccessful attempt this day to rescue Joseph from his brothers' clutches and to restore him unharmed to his father. He refers back to this very moment in chapter 42, when speaking to his other brothers – although there claiming that he had said rather more than he really had – namely, that his brothers should do *nothing at all* to Joseph – and then claiming that they had simply refused to listen to him. 'Reuben answered them, saying, Did I not speak to you, saying, Do not sin against the boy; and you would not listen?', Gen. 42. 22.

But even allowing for some exaggeration – or perhaps faulty memory – on Reuben's part, he certainly did attempt to save – and indeed, played a key part in saving – Joseph from being murdered by his other brothers. And though Reuben was the oldest of the brothers – and knew that his father would therefore likely hold him responsible for anything which happened to his (Jacob's) favourite son – it was in many ways very commendable that Reuben chose to intervene as he did – for, as we have noted earlier, his firstborn rights were to be transferred to Joseph. And Reuben would therefore have had more reason than any to have resented his 17-year old brother.

I spoke of Reuben's noble attempt to restore Joseph unharmed to his father as being 'unsuccessful'. And so, of course, it was. But then, if Reuben meant well – God meant better. And yet, God's 'better' for Joseph – and for countless others through him – now called for a crucial proposal to be made by Judah.

But before we get to that, Joseph has arrived! And I note that his brothers' very first action was to strip him of his tunic – the tunic which they so deeply resented. He was now *at their mercy* and he would not shortly be going home to the father who had given the distinctive tunic to him – and so would have no further need of it! And I enjoy the thought that, when, many years later, the tables were turned – and Joseph had his brothers *at his mercy*, such was his forgiving spirit that he gave 'to all of them', we are told, 'to each man changes of clothing' when sending them home safely to their father, Gen. 45. 22.

His brothers' next action was to throw Joseph into a pit – into a water cistern, that is – which at the time was empty, v. 24. In all likelihood, the cistern was shaped something like a bottle with a narrow mouth, so that anybody imprisoned there would be unable to escape without assistance.¹⁵

I gather from something which the brothers later let out in chapter 42 that, at this time, Joseph had pleaded with them for mercy – but that they had been totally unresponsive, and had refused to listen : ‘They said to one another’, we read, ‘We are truly guilty concerning our brother, for we saw the anguish (the trouble – the distress) of his soul when he pleaded with us, and we would not hear’, Gen. 42. 21. That was over 20 years later, and Joseph’s cries still haunted them.

We don’t actually read of Joseph shedding any tears when he was stripped and flung into the cistern – but I would find it hard to believe that he didn’t. And, if Joseph did, then that would make at least nine times in all that he shed tears – for, between chapters 42 and 50, we read of him ‘weeping’ on no less than eight occasions¹⁶ – and mostly over these very men.

Yet they certainly shed no tears over him here in chapter 37. Far from it! For their third and final action before Judah mounts the stage to say his all-important lines was that ‘they sat down to eat bread’.

Apparently, the appetites of the brothers were unaffected by Joseph’s pitiable cries. And so they calmly sit down to enjoy their meal.

It is hard to credit just how callous and cruel these men had become. And remember, please, that they started on their downward path when they allowed the green-eyed monster in! And their heartlessness is so monstrous and grotesque that it later became proverbial in Israel: ‘Woe to you’, Amos wrote in chapter six of his prophecy – as he denounced those who indulged and gratified themselves, but were unmindful of the desperate needs of those around – ‘Woe to you’, he wrote, ‘who drink wine by the bowlful, and anoint yourselves with the best ointments, but are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph’ ... ‘are not grieved for the bruising – the breaking in pieces – of Joseph’, Amos 6. 6. Yes, that’s a good word to describe Joseph’s ordeal. Thank you, Amos.

And so Joseph’s brothers feasted while Joseph hungered. But it was just as well for them that Joseph wasn’t left to die of hunger in that cistern – or they would all likely have died of hunger some 20 years later – and a whole lot more people with them!

And so ... enter Judah. But Judah will have to keep his contribution until next week!

Endnotes

¹ Distinguished from 'jealousy' in Gal. 5. 20-21.

² For the Greek word, see W. E. Vine's *Expository Dictionary*, under 'Envy, envying', and Trench's *Synonyms*, number xxvi. For the Hebrew word see NIDOTTE, number 7861.

³ NIDOTTE, number 7861, paragraph 1.

⁴ See NIDOTTE, number 4189 – 'a distinctive tunic, possibly richly embroidered or with long sleeves'. Also : <http://www.kolel.org/pages/5765/vayeshev.html>.

⁵ 'The presentation of the special garment may have been an act of investiture, analogous to the special apparel that Aaron and his descendants don in connection with their ordination to the priesthood (Exod. 28. 40-41) or to the mantle that Elijah threw over Elisha when he designated him his successor (I Kings 19. 19). If these analogies hold, then the presentation of the ornamental tunic to Joseph was more than a doting father's innocent (if catastrophically insensitive) demonstration of affection; it was, instead, Jacob's designation of his primary beneficiary. If this be the case, then it is readily understandable why Joseph's brothers "hated him so that they could not speak a friendly word to him" (Gen. 37. 4). With that one act of investiture, Jacob's biological eleventh son became his legal first-born, leapfrogging over Leah's first-born son as well as over those of the two slaves, Bilhah and Zilpah', Jon Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son*, pages 57-58. (Quoted at ... <http://www.kolel.org/blog/2007/11/parashat-vayeishev-genesis-371-4023.html>)

⁶ Jacob was 130 years old when he appeared before Pharaoh, Gen. 47. 9. At that time there had been two years of famine, Gen. 45. 6. That is, because of the intervening seven years of plenty, it was some nine years since Joseph had first appeared before Joseph – at which time Joseph was 30 years of age, Gen. 41. 46. In summary, Joseph would have been about 39 years old when Jacob was 130 – a difference of 91 years.

⁷ Compare Rev. 12. 1.

⁸ Jacob didn't dismiss the dream. He simply put it on the back burner and let it simmer.

⁹ Psa. 106. 16

¹⁰ *Genesis*, by Driver, page 323.

¹¹ A Hebrew idiom for ownership and possession; for example, 'archers', Gen. 49. 23, is literally, 'masters/owners of arrows'; 'hairy', 2 Kings 1. 8, is literally 'master/owner of hair'; 'wrathful man', Prov. 29. 22, is 'master/owner of wrath'.

¹² Indeed the words of Mark 12. 7 are identical to those in the Greek Old Testament of Gen. 37. 20.

¹³ Compare also Judg. 14. 5; 1 Sam. 17. 15; 1 Kings 13. 24 and 2 Kings 2. 24.

¹⁴ The dreams spoke of Joseph's brothers 'bowing' before him – see the fulfillment in Gen. 42. 6; 43. 26, 28 (the same word, Strongs 7812) and 44. 14; 50. 18 ('fall before', Strongs 5307).

¹⁵ The cistern was probably shaped like an upside-down light bulb.

¹⁶ Gen. 42. 24; 43. 30; 45. 2, 14, 15; 46. 29; 50. 1, 17.