



Bible-study: 2020/09/13 (St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, McMinnville) – Exodus 14:19-31

[Ask for a volunteer to read the passage.]

God 'divided' 'the waters': [Ex. 14:21]. He peeled them back like the skin of a giant banana, exposing the seabed – making it available to the fleeing Israelites, so that they might escape from a force of pursuing Egyptian chariotry. This is the climax of a series 'of the most exciting and well-known moments in the Bible as a whole.'¹ The 'focal point of ancient Israelite religion'² still celebrated by Jews today. *But*, two debates rage: Firstly, *where* did they cross? This is bound up with the uncertainty of the "exodus" route in general, and inconclusiveness about how to translate the proper noun used for 'the waters', "yam sūp," in particular. And we'll look at this next week. Secondly, *when* did they cross? And as we've been learning (in the most recent sessions³), this is *frustratingly* hard to say – because 'nowhere in Egypt's vast records is there any documentation of it.'⁴ And this fact cannot be simply "brushed aside."

By-and-large, there are three "camps" (of thought). *One*, it didn't happen. Not really an option for us: Let's move on. *Two*, those who adhere to a "Late Date" hypothesis: that the "exodus" was during the "Ramesside" period, which was in the 1200s B.C.. This is, currently, the prevailing position – including among Evangelicals, despite how it creates a need for a contentiously figurative reading of the 480 years that the author of *1 Kings* matter-of-factly remarks had elapsed between the "exodus" and the building of the Temple (in 967 B.C.)^{[6:1].}⁵

As we've previously acknowledged, the reasoning from the text is straightforward: it's the reference to the Israelites being sent to "build" 'supply cities', including one called 'Rameses, for Pharaoh.'^[1:11] Who goes unnamed in *Exodus*, but, presumably, lent his own to the town. And the "position" has drawn strength from the 'the virtual unanimous conclusion' among archaeologists that this town is none-other-than "Qantir" in the eastern Delta⁶ – that is, in "Goshen," exactly where the Israelites were suffering 'forced

¹ Randall, Benjamin T. (6th of September, 2020), "Back-to-Sunday-School" Bible-study: 2020/09/06 (St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, McMinnville) – *Exodus* 12:1-14', available at http://www.saintmatthewschurch.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Bible-Study-20200906-St.-Matthews-Episcopal-Church-McMinnville-Exodus-12v1-14_BTR-1.pdf.

² Hendel, Ronald (2001), 'The Exodus in Biblical Memory', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Volume 120, No. 4, pp. 601-622, 601.

³ See above, esp. 4-5; and: Randall, Benjamin T. (23rd of August, 2020), "Back-to-Sunday-School" Bible-study: 2020/08/23 (St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, McMinnville) – *Exodus* 1:8-2:10', available at http://www.saintmatthewschurch.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Bible-Study-20200823-St.-Matthews-Episcopal-Church-McMinnville-Exodus-1v8-2v10_BTR.pdf.

⁴ Petrovich, Douglas (2006), 'Amenhotep II and the Historicity of the Exodus-Pharaoh', *The Master's Seminary Journal*, Volume 17, No. 1, pp. 81-110, 101.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁶ Hoffmeier, James K. (1996), *Israel in Egypt: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Exodus Tradition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 117.

labor’[1:11], which underwent ‘huge’ development by Rameses the IInd.⁷

The other “leg” for this “stool” is a mention of “Israel” on the “Merneptah Stela,” a polished slab of granite erected in Thebes by Pharaoh Merneptah to broadcast his victories over various troublesome, petty nations roundabout. It is the oldest use of that name for the “People of God” outside of the Bible itself. And what it does is create a “ballpark” in which the new state came into existence (in Canaan): Merneptah ruled from about 1213 B.C. And the argument goes that if Israel had existed *long* before this, why hadn’t it been talked about previously in Egypt, whose “sphere of influence” always extended over the Levant?⁸

It is possible that this “ballpark,” however, can be dragged – kicking and screaming? – backwards (to an earlier date) thanks to a recent discovery – one yet to receive much attention in the literature: In 2001, Manfred Görg published – in German – a translation of some hieroglyphics from an overlooked item in the archives of the Berlin Museum; from a small piece of a grey statue-pedestal. Some of the words are ‘badly worn’, but it looks *also* to say “Israel.”⁹ And it *may* be ascribed to the reign of Amenhotep (the) IInd. Amenhotep (the) IInd belongs to the Eighteenth Dynasty and the 1400s, which brings us to the third and final “camp” (of opinion) – the one we’ve been taking seriously: that the “exodus” took place about 1446 B.C.

Now, what we hear is that ‘The waters returned and covered...the entire army of Pharaoh that had followed the[Israelites] into the sea; not one of them remained.’ To be clear, we’re *not* being told that the force which was destroyed was *everything* in the Egyptian arsenal. Look again, our author seems to be telling us that everyone who had come *with* Pharaoh was swept away and/or drowned. But this is not the same as him saying that the ‘entire’ army in his kingdom was present and smashed that day. After all, only ‘chariots’ and ‘chariot drivers’ are ever mentioned in the episode (under discussion) [Ex. 14:23,26,28], and they were merely the ‘elite’.¹⁰ The ‘bulk’ of New Kingdom war-

⁷ See: Uphill, E. P. (January 1969), ‘Pithom and Raamses: Their Location and Significance’, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Volume 28, No. 1, pp. 15-39. This was, though, only the latest incarnation of the site, which had been long inhabited under different names such as “Avaris”, when it was the Hyksos capital. And pharaohs *before* Rameses had undertaken impressive construction projects on that “spot” too, which might equally fit the biblical “picture” in *Exodus* 1, such as those of Thutmose (the) IIIrd and his son, Amemhotep (the) IInd – co-regents for a period, who, between them, built a palace and a naval-base here. A complex that – and this is surely significant – incorporated ‘significant storage facilities’. – See, e.g.: Bietak, Manfred (2010), ‘Houses, Palaces and Development of Social Structure in Avaris’, in Czerny, Ernst & Forstner-Müller, Irene (Eds.), *Cities and Urbanism, International Workshop in November 2006 at the Austrian Academy of Sciences*, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 11-68. AND: Bietak, Manfred (2017), ‘Harbours and Coastal Military Bases in Egypt in the Second Millennium B.C.: Avaris, Peru-nefer, Pi-Ramesses’, in Willems, Harco & Dahms, Jan-Michael (Eds.), *The Nile: Natural and Cultural Landscape in Egypt*, Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript Verlag, pp. 53-70.

⁸ See: Walton, J. H. (2003), ‘Exodus, Date Of’, in Alexander, T. Desmond & Baker, David W. (Eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch - A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*, Downers Grove, I. L.; Leicester, U. K.: InterVarsity Press, pp. 258-272.

⁹ See: van der Veen, Peter; Theis, Christoffer; and Görg, Manfred (2010), ‘Israel in Canaan (Long) Before Pharaoh Merneptah? A Fresh Look at Berlin Statue Pedestal Relief 21687’, *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections*, Volume 2, No. 4, pp. 15-25.

¹⁰ Spalinger, Anthony J. (2005), *War in Ancient Egypt: The New Kingdom*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 71.

fighting remained with infantry,¹¹ of course, and they aren't spoken of. (Because they hadn't been able to keep up? The existence of other troop-types are implied in the description of who initially set out on the chase – see verse nine.)

Nonetheless, what happens at the “yam suph” would have amounted to a military catastrophe, and as such should have discernible repercussions for ancient Egyptian foreign policy in the subsequent era, no? Well, did it? Did Egypt's power decline after the “yam suph” incident? Well, historian Richard Gabriel observes that: ‘In the 60 years prior to Thutmose's reign, the great warrior kings of Egypt from Ahmose to [his father] Thutmose II fought one foreign campaign every 4.6 years.’¹² ‘[H]e [– Thutmose (the) IIIrd –] fought seventeen campaigns in Canaan and Syria, or an average of one military campaign every 1.2 years.’¹³ But: ‘In the 70 years following Thutmose, from Amenhotep II to Amenhotep III, the kings conducted one foreign campaign every 10.5 years.’¹⁴

Gabriel, of course, thinks that this proves ‘Thutmose III left behind a legacy of greatness.’¹⁵ But what if the opposite is true? What if what this shows is that Egypt *couldn't* fight battles as he had; that the infrequency of campaigning by his successors didn't reflect their strength, *but inability*? More-or-less, this is what the biblical commentator Douglas Petrovich thinks. And he points specifically to the improvement in relations with the Mitanni Empire as proof.¹⁶

(‘[W]e know little about Mitanni. Its capital city, Washukani...remain[s] as yet unidentified... It is clear, however, that after 1470 [B.C.], Mitanni...extended its sway over all of northern Syria to the Mediterranean, as well as eastward through Assyria [that is, *northern Mesopotamia*].’¹⁷ [\[Show on map.\]](#) They spoke “Hurrian,” an extinct language;¹⁸ and theirs was a fierce, ‘warrior’,¹⁹ “horse-daft”²⁰ culture. Much else ‘is still a mystery’.²¹)

In principle, author Amanda Podany maybe contradicts Petrovich, arguing about the “thaw” between Egypt and the Mitanni under Thutmose's immediate descendants that – I quote: ‘It seems likely that it was Shaushtatar II

¹¹ Heagren, Brett H. (2010), ‘The Art of War in Pharaonic Egypt: An Analysis of the Tactical, Logistic, and Operational Capabilities of the Egyptian Army (Dynasties XVII-XX)’, PhD Thesis, The University of Auckland, 57.

¹² Gabriel, Richard A. (2009), *Thutmose III: The Military Biography of Egypt's Greatest Warrior King*, Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, Inc., 3.

¹³ *Supra*.

¹⁴ *Supra*.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 204.

¹⁶ Petrovich, Douglas (2006), ‘Amenhotep II and the Historicity of the Exodus-Pharaoh’, *The Master's Seminary Journal*, Volume 17, No. 1, pp. 81-110, 100.

¹⁷ Pitard, Wayne T. (2001), ‘Before Israel: Syria-Palestine in the Bronze Age’, in Coogan, Michael D. (Ed.), *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 25-57, 43.

¹⁸ Novák, Mirko (2013), ‘Upper Mesopotamia in the Mittani Period’, in Orthmann, Winfried; Matthiae, Paolo; & al-Maqdissi, Michel (Eds.), *Archéologie et Histoire de la Syrie*, Wiesbaden (Germany): Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 345-356, 347.

¹⁹ Gabriel (2009), 66.

²⁰ Keller, Werner and Rehork, Joachim (1995), *The Bible as History – Second Revised Edition*, translated by William Neil & B. H. Rasmussen, New York, N. Y.: Barnes & Noble Books, 111.

²¹ See: Novák, Mirko (2013), ‘Upper Mesopotamia in the Mittani Period’, in Orthmann, Winfried; Matthiae, Paolo; & al-Maqdissi, Michel (Eds.), *Archéologie et Histoire de la Syrie*, Wiesbaden (Germany): Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 345-356.

who made the first gesture of friendship towards Amenhotep II, rather than vice versa. The diplomatic alliance that ended up flourishing between the two lands was entirely Syro-Mesopotamian in its conception. It was something that only a king of Mitanni, or perhaps Babylonia, could have brought to the table. He clearly proposed to the pharaoh the system that was so familiar to him: ambassadors would travel between the courts of the great kings carrying letters; the kings would refer to one another as “brother;” they would write on clay tablets in Akkadian cuneiform; they would send one another lavish gifts of equal value; they would agree to regard one another as equals; their families would intermarry; and they would abide by treaties to which they both agreed. ... Over a thousand years of tradition lay behind these ideas in Syria – in the very lands where Shaushtatar ruled – whereas almost none of this had any history in Egypt.’²²

Furthermore: ‘Shaushtatar was in a tough position... ..Egypt wasn’t the only threat. Hatti, to the northwest[, in what is Turkey], was also becoming aggressive towards Mittani. [Thus,] Shaushtatar II was in the position of possibly having to fight enemies on two fronts. ...the two kingdoms had reached a crisis point...[and] Shaushtatar might have reasoned, it would be better to be on the same side as Egypt than to have Egypt and Hatti join forces against him.’²³

Whatever the truth about who initiated the truce and why, Egypt’s aggressions appear to be ‘more subdued’ under those who followed Thutmose as we *might* expect taking the text of *Exodus literally*.²⁴ However, though we may wish to seize upon this seeming decline of Egyptian power-projection into the Fertile Crescent as corroborative evidence, if we look even *closer* at the historical record we find Thutmose himself actually launched a campaign in 1445 – the *very* next year after the “exodus.”²⁵ And although: ‘The details are not clear.’²⁶ Enough can be reconstructed from the boastful tomb memoirs of an officer who served with Thutmose,²⁷ to establish that it was an extraordinary feat:

It was launched to suppress some sort of ‘anti-Egyptian coalition’ that has sprung up among some Syrian princes, who certainly had been provoked by the Mitanni. And rather than fighting his way slowly through them – those “princes,” like wading in treacle, Thutmose attacked from the sea, capturing a number of ports that were then used ‘to effectively “fire” the Egyptian army

²² *Brotherhood of Kings: How International Relations Shaped the Ancient Near East* (2010), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 169.

²³ *Supra.* & 171.

²⁴ Heagren, Brett H. (2010), ‘The Art of War in Pharaonic Egypt: An Analysis of the Tactical, Logistic, and Operational Capabilities of the Egyptian Army (Dynasties XVII-XX)’, PhD Thesis, The University of Auckland, 9.

²⁵ And again two years after that – see: ahn, Dan’el (2011), ‘One Step Forward Two Steps Backward: The Relations between Amenhotep III, King of Egypt and Tushratta, King of Mitanni’, in Bar, S.; Kahn, D.; & Shirley, J. J. (Eds.), *Egypt, Canaan and Israel: History, Imperialism, Ideology and Literature: Proceedings of a Conference at the University of Haifa, 3-7 May 2009*, Leiden, The Netherlands, Boston, M. A.: Koninklijke Brill NV, pp. 136-154.

²⁶ Cook, Stanley A. (1924), ‘Syria and Palestine in the Light of External Evidence’, in Bury, J. B.; Cook, S. A.; & Adcock, F. E.(Eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History: Volume II – The Egyptian and Hittite Empires to c.1000 B.C.*, New York, N. Y.: The MacMillan Company, pp. 296-351, 310.

²⁷ Gabriel (2009), 165.

[inland] at ‘targets’ [further from the] shore’.²⁸ Having captured the coast, he then built small river-boats, ‘rafts’ really, then made his way into the interior, dragging them with bulls, 270 miles, to the Euphrates, where these craft were strung together, side-by-side, to form a bridge; which he crossed, to attack the Mitanni instigators in their homes (on the far bank).²⁹

The question is, does the claims of our text *demand* that this – the aforementioned – should have been impossible? And the answer is: *no*. If Moses told us that *all* of the military assets available to Thutmose – or even the majority – were destroyed in the “yam suph” – and Thutmose too, then, without a doubt, we should find that Egypt lost ground against her regional competitors in the subsequent decade or so, *which she doesn’t*. But I refer you back to what I said about the fact that only ‘chariots and chariot drivers’ were mentioned. These were valuable, painful weapons-platforms to lose; *but replaceable* – by training and investment. Their destruction would not have constituted a major loss of soldiery for the state. Truthfully, a loss of prestige more than anything else.

Of course, the contentious question of whether the loss of Thutmose’s chariot squadron at the “yam suph” would have hampered his warring or not “evaporates” if he’s not the ‘Pharaoh’ of the narrative. I said moments ago that counting back the stated 480 years from the fourth of Solomon’s reign (in *1 Kings*) requires that he be so – a detail that *unequivocally* rules out *any* of the Rameses-es as candidates; but this is the case *only* according to what’s called the *Low* chronology.

There are, you see, at least *two* versions of when things happened in Ancient Egypt; that is to say, two *sets* of dates – ‘two main configurations’.³⁰ Why? Because: ‘The ancient Egyptians did not number the years of their calendars from a fixed point in time; rather, a new counting of years began typically with the ascension of a new king’.³¹ In others, nearly every single time a new pharaoh came to the throne, the “clock” was re-set to “Year One.” This gave rise to a great number of ‘floating chronologies’, *hundreds* of them.³² To determine when something occurred vis-à-vis our own calendar, therefore, scholars need to “string” these “floating chronologies” together in the right sequence and in the right way. *But*: ‘Undocumented years at the ends of some reigns and overlap between successive monarchs create uncertainties’.³³ ‘– the

²⁸ See: Anonymous (August 2006), ‘Ancient Egyptian Joint Operations in the Lebanon Under Thutmose III (1451-1438 BCE)’, *Semaphore: Newsletter of the Sea Power Centre – Australia*, No. 16, available at <https://www.navy.gov.au/media-room/publications/semaphore-ancient-egyptian-joint-operations-lebanon-under-thutmose-iii-1451>, (accessed September 8, 2020).

²⁹ Gabriel (2009), 165f. See also: Breasted, J. H. (1924), ‘The Reign of Thutmose III’, in Bury, J. B.; Cook, S. A.; & Adcock, F. E. (Eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History: Volume II – The Egyptian and Hittite Empires to c. 1000 B.C.*, New York, N. Y.: The MacMillan Company, pp. 67-87, 76-78.

³⁰ Dee, M. W. (2013), ‘A Radiocarbon-based Chronology for the New Kingdom’, in Ramsey, C. Bronk & Shortland, Andrew J. (Eds.), *Radiocarbon and the Chronologies of Ancient Egypt*, Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 150-172, 151. (Kindle)

³¹ Creasman, Pearce Paul (2014), ‘Tree Rings and the Chronology of Ancient Egypt’, *Radiocarbon*, Volume 56, No. 4, pp. 85-92, 85.

³² Ramsey, Christopher Bronk; Dee, Michael W.; Rowland, Joanne M.; Highman, Thomas F. G.; Harris, Stephen A.; Brock, Fiona; Quiles, Anita; Wild, Eva M.; Marcus, Ezra S.; & Shortland, Andrew J. (18th of June, 2010), ‘Radiocarbon-Based Chronology for Dynastic Egypt’, *Science*, Volume 328, pp. 1554-1557, 1554.

³³ *Supra*.

existence, for example, of several ephemeral pharaohs and a plethora of theories concerning co-regencies during the Middle Kingdom...'³⁴ The difference between the two versions – or “configurations” – is eighteen years.³⁵ Which may not seem like a great deal, but has significant ramifications for our discussion.

The “Low” chronology – the one that I have following so far; the one reflected in the timeline I created for you; *and* the one used on Wikipedia – has Thutmose (the) IIIrd taking the crown in 1479 B.C. and dying in 1425. And the “exodus” falls somewhere in the middle of this period – about his thirty-third year. And until almost yesterday, experts were saying this about the “Low Chronology:” “it is absolutely clear for Egypt that for the N.K. [The New Kingdom], this is the only chronology with which we can live.”³⁶ This confidence has suddenly been punctured thanks to the new science of radiocarbon dating:

“The method was developed in the late 1940s at the University of Chicago by Willard Libby, who received the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for his work in 1960. It is based on the fact that [the element] radiocarbon (¹⁴C) is constantly being created in the atmosphere by the interaction of cosmic rays with atmospheric nitrogen. The resulting ¹⁴C combines with atmospheric oxygen to form radioactive carbon-dioxide, which is incorporated into plants by photosynthesis; animals then acquire ¹⁴C by eating the plants. When the animal or plant dies, it stops exchanging carbon with its environment, and thereafter the amount of ¹⁴C it contains begins to decrease as the ¹⁴C undergoes [a rigid, predictable rate of slow] radioactive decay. Measuring the amount of ¹⁴C in a sample from a dead plant or animal, [then,] such as a piece of wood or a fragment of bone, provides information that can be used to calculate when the animal or plant died.”³⁷ And, so far, ‘all of the radiocarbon measurements [for ancient Egypt] supported a much earlier date’ than according to the “Low Chronology.”³⁸ *All*. Thus, as Alan B. Lloyd says, in a recent textbook: ‘It now seems that the low chronology must be abandoned’.³⁹

The “*High Chronology*,” which embraces radiocarbon data, “pushes” Thutmose and his campaigning – in its entirety – *before* the exodus, making his son Amenhotep (the) IInd the pharaoh of the moment. Which brings us (back) to Douglas Petrovich’s argument, and the link he suggests between what happened at the “yam suh” and the ‘virtual hibernation’ of Egypt’s ambitions in Syria under that king and those immediately after him.⁴⁰ And though I said I don’t think what is depicted in *Exodus requires* “hibernation,” it would offer a tidy explanation for it.

So, *if* Amenhotep *was* Moses’ adopted brother – the Pharaoh with the “hardened heart” [see: [Ex. 7:13,14,22, 8:15,19,32, 9:7,12,34, etc.](#)] at the heart of the tale, there must *surely* be evidence to confirm *other* aspects of the

³⁴ Romer, John (2017), *A History Of Ancient Egypt - Volume 2: From The Great Pyramid to the Fall of the Middle Kingdom*, New York, N. Y.: Thomas Dunne Books (St. Martin's Press), 526.

³⁵ Dee (2013), 151. (Kindle)

³⁶ Hornung, Erik (2006), ‘Introduction’, in Hornung, Erik; Krauss, Rolf; & Warburton, David A. (Eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, Leiden, The Netherlands; Boston, M. A.: Koninklijke Brill NV, pp. 1-17, 8.

³⁷ See: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radiocarbon_dating.

³⁸ Dee (2013), 153. (Kindle)

³⁹ *A Companion to Ancient Egypt* (2010), Malden, M. A.; Oxford, U. K.: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 81.

⁴⁰ Petrovich (2006), 100.

Scriptures for *his* reign. What about the death of the firstborn for example? We're told in the Bible that: 'At midnight the Lord struck down all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the firstborn of Pharaoh who sat on his throne to the firstborn of the prisoner who was in the dungeon': [Ex. 12:29]. Well, did He? Did Amenhotep (the) IInd's oldest boy die? *That* seems like something we might know; like something that would have been recorded. *Yes*. Or at least: 'The seniority of Thutmose IV^[th] at his accession, [Amenhotep's son] ...cannot be supported.'⁴¹ – by the surviving archaeology, that is. And, interestingly, Amenhotep was also not *his* father's eldest either: Indeed, Donald Redford writes: 'There can be little doubt that there was an older (half-) brother of Amen[hotep] II who died early.'⁴²

Don't forget either that we said last week that the biographer Arielle Kozloff mentions – in her intriguing presentation of evidence for divine-scale plague and devastation during an eight-year 'gap' in Amenhotep (the) IIIrd's reign, that there was 'a similar one' during his father, Amenhotep (the) IInd's rule.⁴³ Sadly, she didn't go into detail; nor does she offer a citation to pursue. Her focus is on the latter man rather than the former. (I have reached out to her directly for a source, but haven't as yet had a reply.)

Whenever it happened, we might still ask: "What happened, exactly?" As with the plagues, sceptics have reached for explanations of the described phenomena that would exclude the Lord's involvement. For such commentators, 'the pillar of cloud'[Ex. 14:19], for instance, that we just heard about in our reading, becomes 'some majestic cumulus cloud sailing slowly through the heavens'.⁴⁴ And for the scientist Barbara Sivertsen, and many others too, the "yam suph" 'parted' as a consequence of the Santorini eruption – a rare and massive volcanic event that sent an '...atmospheric shock wave', which drove the waters back.⁴⁵ But such offerings flounder and crash upon the sharp "rocks" of the claims of the text itself. And I refer you to the wording I employed at the beginning of this session – about the "banana." (Also, the Santorini event was in 1628 B.C. or thereabouts;⁴⁶ *far* too early!) What we *are* told defies something that "Mother Nature" could produce (by herself), which is that 'the waters form[ed] a wall for the[Israelites] on their right and on their left.'^[v.22] This was *a miracle* in the most genuine sense of that word – 'a corridor of air cut through the sea',⁴⁷ which is precisely why: 'It has great theological significance as the Old Testament example *par excellence* of God's [love]'.⁴⁸ One that deserved memorializing. What do you think?

⁴¹ See: Bryan, Betsy (1991), *The Reign of Thutmose IV*, Baltimore, M. D.: The John Hopkins University Press, 42.

⁴² Redford, Donald B. (December 1965), 'The Coregency of Tuthmosis III and Amenophis II', *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Volume 51, pp. 107-122, 108.

⁴³ Kozloff, Arielle P. (2012), *Amenhotep III: Egypt's Radiant Pharaoh*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 110.

⁴⁴ Meyer, Frederick Brotherton (1894), *Moses: The Servant of God*, New York, N. Y.; Chicago, I. L.; Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company, 76.

⁴⁵ *The Parting of the Sea: How Volcanoes, Earthquakes, and Plagues Shaped the Story of Exodus* (2009), Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 39.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁴⁷ Beynon, Nigel and Sach, Andrew (2010), *Dig Deeper: Tools for Understanding God's Word*, Wheaton, I. L.: Crossway, 106.

⁴⁸ *Supra*. (Author's italics.)