

## Messiah Son of Joseph Part 2: Who Sold Joseph? (Presented on 8/19/2017)

The following text is based on a message from Corner Fringe Ministries that was presented by Daniel Joseph. The original presentation can be viewed at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WcmsPH\\_VWHY&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WcmsPH_VWHY&feature=youtu.be)

**\*Portions of the video message have been edited to present a written document. All the Scripture verses are from the New King James Version unless otherwise noted and are in the red text. Therefore, it is recommended that this document is printed in color. The Hebrew is to be read from right to left.**

We are going to continue on in our series Messiah son of Joseph. We ended part one in the story of Jacob. Jacob commissioned his son Joseph (Yosef) to go to Shechem where his brothers were supposed to be feeding their flocks. So Joseph answers his father by saying *hinnî* or here I am. He is willing to go; he wants to go. So his father sends him on this mission. The only problem is when he get to Shechem his brothers aren't there, and this is where we're going to pick up the story. We're going to circle back to Genesis 37:15-16—**Now a certain man found him, and there he was, wandering in the field. And the man asked him, saying, "What are you seeking?"<sup>16</sup> So he said, "I am seeking my brothers. Please tell me where they are feeding their flocks."**

Now you'll notice that I bolded “a certain man.” In the Hebrew it's just “a man.” It is *ʾiṣh* or the transliterate being *'iysh*. However, this particular scenario is a little peculiar to me in the context of Joseph being sent on a mission, he's all alone, and then he just happens to run into this man who is going to guide or instruct him. Here's why I find this peculiar: because Joseph's father Jacob had an interesting encounter with a man that we read about in Genesis 32. What do we know happened to Jacob? It says in chapter 32 of Genesis that he wrestles with an *'iysh* or man who later we find out was God. At the end of this episode Jacob literally said, “I've seen God face to face and my life is preserved.” It was an awesome encounter, and Jacob even asks this man he was wrestling with what his name was. Jacob is never given a response. All we know is that he was *'iysh* or a man.

Let me take it a step further. Go back to Joseph's great grandfather Abraham. Abraham had a similar encounter where there is a man, and through the story these three angels, as people typically translate this, come to Abraham. Two of them we know were angels; one of them was *ʾĕlōhîm* or *Yēhovah*. He was the living God. However, all three are described as simply being men. Then the two angels go off to destroy Sodom, but *ʾĕlōhîm* stays and talks to Abraham. And again, He's described as a man.

So when we look at this event being described here in Joseph's life, understand that the implications may very well be seriously divine, and the Rabbis teach that. Actually, the Rabbis teach that if you go to Bereshit Rabbah you find that when Joseph got there he was greeted by three angels. It is interesting that through this manifestation of a man they determined this was three Angels. That would parallel what Abraham experienced, but it was a man.

Let me take this a step further because as we get to John 8:39-40 we find Yeshua speaking to a particular group of Jews—**They answered and said to Him, "Abraham is our father." Jesus said**

to them, "If you were Abraham's children, you would do the works of Abraham. <sup>40</sup> But now you seek to kill Me, a Man who has told you the truth which I heard from God. Abraham did not do this. The first thing I want to point out here is what Yeshua said, "Listen, I have spoken to Abraham, and when I spoke to Abraham, he did not respond the way you're responding." In fact, later on Yeshua said—Before Abraham was, I AM (John 8:58).

Did you catch it? Did you catch what Yeshua said in John 8:40—<sup>40</sup> But now you seek to kill Me, a Man? He says—A man. Why didn't Yeshua just say, "You seek to kill me because I told you the truth?" That would have been the natural ebb and flow way to respond. He doesn't say that; Yeshua says—A man. By saying this, Yeshua is describing the events of Joseph, Jacob, and Abraham. Isn't that interesting? So when we read Genesis 37:15-16, we find that Joseph goes there, he is alone, he's looking for his brothers, and all of the sudden this man comes on the scene. This is absolutely divine in nature.

We continue on in Genesis 37:17—And the man said, "They have departed from here, for I heard them say, 'Let us go to Dothan.'" So Joseph went after his brothers and found them in Dothan. Isn't that interesting? He guided Joseph with perfect accuracy. Joseph found exactly what he was looking for because of this man. And notice— I heard them say. This man mentions that he heard them say—Let us go to Dothan. That's a little peculiar because when I read this I think about Numbers 12 when Miriam and Aaron are having a discourse and they are saying that the LORD hasn't just spoken through Moses. They say that the LORD had spoken through them also. The very next thing it says is the LORD heard it. He heard it; He eavesdrops on us. Make no mistake; His eyes go to and fro throughout the earth. Amen. It's such a peculiar thing to look at this verse where He says— I heard them say, 'Let us go to Dothan.' So He is guiding Joseph in this process.

Continuing in Genesis 37:18—<sup>18</sup> Now when they saw him afar off, even before he came near them, they conspired against him to kill him. The imagery here, is exactly what happened to Yeshua. The chief priests, the leaders of the Jews, conspired against Yeshua to kill Him.

Moving on to Genesis 37:19-22—Then they said to one another, "Look, this dreamer is coming! <sup>20</sup> Come therefore, let us now kill him and cast him into some pit; and we shall say, 'Some wild beast has devoured him.' We shall see what will become of his dreams!" <sup>21</sup> But Reuben heard it, and he delivered him out of their hands, and said, "Let us not kill him." <sup>22</sup> And Reuben said to them, "Shed no blood, but cast him into this pit which is in the wilderness, and do not lay a hand on him" that he might deliver him out of their hands, and bring him back to his father.

For those of you who have kids, you have your firstborn. What we see happening here with Reuben is that he is moved in the order of a firstborn by doing something that would come naturally to a first born. The firstborn would protect and be his brother's keeper. Much more is expected when mom and dad are away. The firstborn is expected to rise up and to care for the home. This is the reality; this is exactly what we see in Reuben. He's acting naturally by doing what comes instinctively to him as a firstborn son.

Now continuing on in Genesis 37:32—So it came to pass, when Joseph had come to his brothers, that they stripped Joseph of his tunic, the tunic of many colors that was on him. So the very

thing that was the expression of Jacob's love for him, the very thing that separated him from his brothers, because none of his brothers were clothed in this garment, only Joseph, the very thing by which he was highly exalted in the eyes of his brothers, was taken from him. He was stripped of this garment. And just incidentally, as you look at Yeshua the very same thing happened to Him by His own brothers. In fact, as you get into His crucifixion, He was literally stripped of His garments. Scripture says the guards cast lots for His garments.

Moving on to Genesis 37:24-25—**Then they took him and cast him into a pit. And the pit was empty; there was no water in it.** <sup>25</sup> **And they sat down to eat a meal.** How ironic is that? They cast their brother, who is beloved, who is highly exalted, and who is adorned for beauty and for splendor in this coat, and they throw him in the pit with no food or water. Then they themselves go and have a meal. That's a little ironic considering the fact it would be Joseph who would go before them later on and provide the very thing that he's been deprived of.

We can take this a step further by getting into the prophetic level. We see that Joseph has been betrayed, and then his brothers sit down and eat a meal. Can you think of any special meal around the time Yeshua was betrayed that His brothers collectively sat down to eat? The Passover.

Continuing in Genesis 37:25-27—**Then they lifted their eyes and looked, and there was a company of Ishmaelites, coming from Gilead with their camels, bearing spices, balm, and myrrh, on their way to carry them down to Egypt.** <sup>26</sup> **So Judah said to his brothers, "What profit is there if we kill our brother and conceal his blood?"** <sup>27</sup> **Come and let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let not our hand be upon him, for he is our brother and our flesh." And his brothers listened.**

Now isn't this interesting because there's this subtle, prophetic implication being revealed here. What do I mean by that? Go to 1 Chronicles 5:1. There you will notice it says that Reuben was the firstborn. However, because he went up to his father's couch and defiled it with his father's wife Bilhah, Joseph received the firstborn status. Yet the very next statement says Judah prevailed above his brothers for out of him came a ruler (See 1 Chronicles 5:2).

You will notice the parallel here: Reuben being the firstborn, doing what comes naturally to the firstborn, comes in and gives advice. Then Judah comes later and gives advice, and his advice prevails. This is the exact same structure we see in 1 Chronicles 5 that is being played out here. So the brothers all agreed they were going to do this; they were going to sell Joseph to the Ishmaelites.

Now, looking at the prophetic implications: this plan to not kill him with their own hands but rather to sell Joseph to the Ishmaelites is something that is worthy of note. Here you have the children of Israel, and then you have the Ishmaelites. In other words, we have Gentiles. So you have Joseph's brothers not killing him themselves and instead passing him off to Gentiles. Does that sound familiar? That is exactly what happens in Matthew 27:1-2—**When morning came, all the chief priests and elders of the people plotted against Jesus to put Him to death.** <sup>2</sup> **And when they had bound Him** [What did Joseph's brothers do? They bound him], **they led Him away and delivered Him to Pontius Pilate the governor.**

Now you can't make this stuff up! Joseph's brothers don't lay a hand on him; they did not kill him. No! They gave him to the Gentiles, "We'll give him to the Ishmaelites and his fate rests in their hands." That is exactly what happened to Yeshua. He is the Mashiach ben Yoseph.

Continuing on in Genesis 37:28—**Then Midianite traders passed by; so the brothers pulled Joseph up and lifted him out of the pit, and sold him to the Ishmaelites for twenty shekels of silver. And they took Joseph to Egypt.** I'm going to tell you something: this particular passage is fraught with controversy. You have no idea how many debates have erupted over this particular passage. Outside of Christendom and inside of Christendom. Many scholars have debated what's actually going on here, and when I thought about this I kind of had a Titus moment. Do you remember when we went through the series in Titus and I debated whether or not to get into the particular teaching of the Granville Sharp construction? I debated because it's so much work to go through it, and it doesn't affect your doctrine at all. I had another moment like that right here in this passage.

I had to make a decision as to whether we're going to deal with this head on, in regard to all the controversy that swirls about this, or are we just going to continue on because most of you have no idea there's any controversy here whatsoever. That would have been easy for me to do; you would not have known. But the conviction got the better of me because the agnostics, atheists, and our Muslim neighbors will utilize this passage as proof that the Bible is corrupted and cannot be trusted. They use this passage to try to prove the Bible is filled with contradictions. This is just one of many passages they will use.

Now you're confronted, when you know the integrity of Scriptures is being attacked, because we are called to defend the faith. We are called to understand these things. Right? You even have scholars, like Bart Ehrman, who believe the Bible is inerrant; he does not believe it is infallible. He believes it's filled with contradictions, and this passage is a perfect example of that idea.

So in light of that, I've actually decided we're going to dig into this, and forgive me if it gets tedious. You know this is not typically invigorating stuff, but it is necessary. With that said, what is the debate about? The debate really comes down to who really pulled Joseph up out of the pit, and who sold Joseph to whom. That is it in a nut shell.

I would take it a step further: Who are the Midianites, and who are the Ishmaelites. Are they one in the same? Are they two different entities entirely? What's actually being described here?

I want to begin digging into this by addressing the question as to who pulled Joseph out of the pit. We read this right at the front in Genesis 37:18—**Then Midianite traders passed by; so the brothers pulled Joseph up and lifted him out of the pit.** Well, I think that is pretty clear. There's no ambiguity. Right? However, here is where the controversy begins. "The brothers" is not in the Hebrew—**Then Midianite traders passed by; so ~~the brothers~~ pulled Joseph up and lifted him out of the pit.** This is the English that was added. You will not find it anywhere in the Tanakh. How it should read is like this—Then the Midianite traders passed by and "they pulled Joseph up"

This is where the controversy erupts. There is no "brothers" in the text at all. In fact, there are several translations that read like this. This version is the New King James translation, and of

course there's conspiracies on top of that that the New King James version is proof Satan's trying to corrupt and destroy you. The New Living Translation translates it this way, and there are others. But there are other translations that don't translate it this way. For example, the New American Standard translates it this way—**Then some Midianite traders passed by, so they pulled him up and lifted Joseph out of the pit.** This is very different than reading what I just read in the New King James. Let's look at the King James—**Then there passed by Midianites merchantmen; and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit.**

So here's the thing. When just reading this at face value, you can see why someone can come to the conclusion, “Well wait a second. Joseph's brothers did not pull him out of the pit. It was the Midianites.” Let me tell you, identifying who pulled him out of the pit is critical. Whoever pulled Joseph out of the pit is the one who sold him. As we continue this is going to be extremely valuable.

Let me take it even a step further. If we can determine who sold Joseph, we can also identify who pulled him out of the pit. They are one in the same. Whoever pulled him out of the pit sold him. So, was it Joseph's brothers, or was it the Midianites?

I'm going to just cut to the chase: it was not the Midianites. They did not pull him out of the pit or sell him to the Ishmaelites. It was Joseph's brothers. They are the ones who sold him.

Now you might say, “Daniel, that doesn't really seem to jive; we don't necessarily see that.” Hear me out for a second because we're going to go to great lengths to establish this. It is important to look at internal evidence, and it's important to look at external evidence. Internal evidence would be the context of what we find within the story itself.

Let's look at some internal evidence. Going to Genesis 45:4—**And Joseph said to his brothers, "Please come near to me." So they came near. Then he said: "I am Joseph your brother, whom you sold into Egypt.** This verse is the recordation of the firsthand account of Joseph, and he's under the impression that it wasn't the Midianites who sold him. He states that it was his brothers who sold him. Since Joseph was there, I'm going to say this is very important information.

So the controversy is our Muslim neighbors will come up and say, “Well, here it says this, but if you go back to Genesis 37 it clearly says the Midianites sold him. Therefore, the Bible is corrupted. There are too many authors who are contributing to it. It can't be trusted.”

But just hold on. Here we have a firsthand account. It was Joseph's brothers who pulled him out of the pit. Let me give you a first-century Jewish perspective. This is a supernatural one meaning in the New Testament. It is inspired. Stephen, in his last discourse on earth, goes back to the history of his people as he is speaking to his Jewish brother, and he recalls the story of Joseph, and this is what he says—**And the patriarchs, becoming envious, sold Joseph into Egypt. But God was with him (Acts 7:9).**

So as we can see right within the text the internal evidence clearly suggests that Joseph himself testified that his brothers sold him. Here you have a first-century Jewish believer, Stephen, who is anointed with the Ruach Hakodesh (Holy Spirit, See Acts 6:3-5,8,10), and his account of the matter is the same: Joseph's brothers sold him.

Let me take it a step further. I'm going to take you to another first-century document found among the Dead Sea Scrolls in the caves of Qumran. This document is known as the Book of Enoch. You will find it quoted in the New Testament in the book of Jude. I'm taking you to this resource because it takes up the story of Joseph, and it's really fun. You are going to see why it's so fun—**And they began to bite one another; but that white bull which was born amongst them begat a wild donkey and a white bull with it, and the wild donkeys multiplied (Enoch 89:11).** This makes perfect sense, doesn't it?

I'm going to cut to the chase and decode this for you. Once you see this you will see that it is really powerful. Enoch reads like the book of Revelation; it's highly prophetic and profound.

So, the verse talks about a white bull. That white bull is Abraham. A bull is a clean animal, and especially when you have a white bull, it is pure. This white bull is a clean, pure animal. But here's what's interesting: he begot two children. The first was a wild donkey. That's unusual because a donkey is an unclean animal. He is a wild donkey; he's not like a white bull. You see, when bulls have offspring, they have bulls. This bull, however, has a wild donkey. This wild donkey is Ishmael.

This bull had another son who is just like him. This is Isaac. He's exactly like his father. Then we go back to the verse—**with it and the wild donkeys multiplied** meaning that the Ishmaelites multiplied.

Now continuing on into Enoch 89:12—**But that bull [Isaac] which was born from him begat a black wild boar [Isaac had a firstborn son who was Esau. He is described as a pig which is an unclean animal.] and a white sheep [Isaac had another son, Jacob. Jacob is described as a sheep which is a clean animal] and the former [Esau] begat many boars [This would be the Edomites] but that sheep [Jacob] begat twelve sheep [The 12 sons of Jacob].**

So here we have Jacob and Esau, the white sheep and the wild boar. Now, here's where we get to the story; I had to cover that so that you would understand what's being said. Verse 13—**And when those twelve sheep had grown, they [The Israelites] gave up one of them to the donkeys [The Ishmaelites], and those donkeys [The Ishmaelites] again gave up that sheep [An Israelite: Joseph] to the wolves, and that sheep grew up among the wolves.** Who are the wolves? The Egyptians.

So here you have this first-century document found in the caves of Qumran actually going through this story exactly how we have it in Scriptures with deadly accuracy. And the testimony we find in this document is that the brothers sold Joseph into Egypt, and the Ishmaelites brought him to the Egyptians.

Let me take it a step further. I want to take you to Josephus who is a first-century Jewish historian. Let me show you his understanding of the story—**But Judas [meaning Judah], being one of Jacob's sons also, seeing some Arabians, of the posterity of Ismael, carrying spices and Syrian wares out of the land of Gilead to the Egyptians, after Reubel [Reuben] was gone, advised his brethren to draw Joseph out of the pit.** So Josephus is giving us a little backdrop to the story. What he is saying is, Reuben gave his testimony, and then he left. Then Judah gave his plan, and we know the brothers agreed to that plan and followed it. Continuing on—**and sell him to the Arabians; for if he should die among strangers a great way off, they should be freed from this barbarous action.** Now here's where we come to the gist of it—**This, therefore, was resolved on;**

so they drew Joseph up out of the pit, and sold him to the merchants for twenty pounds (Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews Bk2). Josephus' testimony is that Joseph's own brothers are involved in selling him.

So it doesn't matter where we look. We can go to the internal evidence; we can look at the story itself and the context. We can go to the New Testament; we can go to other external sources in the first century, Josephus and Enoch, and they are all saying the exact same thing. This is what you call hermeneutics; this is what you call consistency.

So, when we read this passage with understanding, whether or not this term "brother" is in the text is irrelevant. It doesn't matter because it would still make sense under this context. For example, if you take it back to the King James Version. Genesis 37:28—**Then there passed by Midianites merchantmen; and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit, and sold Joseph to the Ishmeelites.** So break this verse down according to what we just learned— **Then there passed by Midianites merchantmen; and they** [The brothers] **drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit, and sold Joseph to the Ishmeelites.** It makes perfect sense. That's why when we go to Genesis 37:28 in the New King James version—**Then Midianite traders passed by; so the brothers pulled Joseph up**—there's no conspiracy here. It's the difference between formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. These are two terms the scholars use to describe how you translate moving from a host language to a receptive language.

Formal equivalence will take word for word. A good example of this is the New American Standard. It's very hyper-literal. I could go much deeper in describing what a formal equivalence is, but in a nutshell, this is what it is. It is very formal word for word.

Dynamic equivalence is taking the concept or the idea of what's being conveyed and conveying that identical idea in its receptor language. We can look at the Targum. The Targum was written in Aramaic; the Tanakh is written in Hebrew with only a few parts written in Aramaic, such as in the Book of Daniel, but it is all in Hebrew. You will notice the Targum is the renderings of the Tanakh but in Aramaic, and it is not word for word. It's a good example of hyper-dynamic equivalence. They take the concept, the reality, and they translated it.

Look at the Greek Septuagint. It is Greek; it's not Hebrew. When the Jews translated it, you will notice some interesting things. There are times where there is a dynamic equivalence that is performed. What happens in this dynamic equivalence? You end up getting a greater understanding of what initially was being conveyed. It is very powerful!

In regard to these verses: essentially that's what is happening here. There's no conspiracy or corruption. This is the context. And the New King James is just ensuring you are not misreading it or getting confused because when I say "they" whether I say "they" who are brothers, or I literally say *ākhim*, it's the same thing.

Unfortunately, we're not done. There's more controversy. You can see why I went down this path. We've got to take this a step further. I want to deal with these terms Midianite traders and Ishmaelites in Genesis 37:28— **Then Midianite traders passed by; so the brothers pulled Joseph up and lifted him out of the pit, and sold him to the Ishmaelites for twenty shekels of silver. And they took Joseph to Egypt.** The controversy over this is are these two groups one? Are they transposable terms, or are these two distinctly different groups entirely?

The first thing I want to establish is it's the Ishmaelites who took Joseph into Egypt. There is no debate with this; we need to focus on this fact. It's the Ishmaelites who took Joseph into Egypt. Again, it's so critical you understand this because then all of this drama starts to squelch and simmer down.

I'm going to show you why there is so much drama. Let's drop down a couple verses to Genesis 37:36; this is what we read—**Now the Midianites had sold him in Egypt to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh and captain of the guard.** This is why our Muslim neighbors contend this is a total contradiction. Genesis 37:28 made it clear it was the Ishmaelites who brought Joseph down to Egypt. Now in 37:36 it is saying the Midianites are the ones who brought him down to Egypt.

Let me take it a step further. When we go to Genesis 39:1, this is what we read—**Now Joseph had been taken down to Egypt. and Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, an Egyptian, bought him from the Ishmaelites who had taken him down there.**

So in Genesis 37:28 we have the Ishmaelites doing it. Later on in Genesis 37:36 we have the Midianites as the ones. Then we come to Genesis 39:1, and we find it is the Ishmaelites again. So I ask you again: are these two different groups, or are these one in the same? I'll just tell you they're one in the same, and that's where a lot of this controversy is coming from. People are not identifying them as one in the same.

There is precedent for identifying them as transposable terms, and I'll give it to you right within the Word itself. In Judges 8:22, we read this—**Then the men of Israel said to Gideon, "Rule over us, both you and your son, and your grandson also; for you have delivered us from the hand of Midian."** Go back and read the story in Judges. It's one of the greatest battles in history. Gideon routes over 120,000 men of Midian. These are Midianites. The LORD gave Gideon supernatural victory through the power of the LORD to totally devastate the two kings, and the Midianites fell.

After this victory, his own brothers tell him he needs to rule over them. They recognized he had just given them a great victory, and there was clearly an anointing. However, Gideon said he would not rule over them because the LORD should rule over them. Now, listen to what he said next—**Then Gideon said to them, "I would like to make a request of you, that each of you would give me the earrings from his plunder."** For they had gold earrings, because they were **Ishmaelites (Judges 28:24).** These Midianites are literally called Ishmaelites. These are transposable terms!

Now, let's go back to that first-century Jewish historian Josephus. What did he say—**But Judas, being one of Jacob's sons also, seeing some Arabians [in other words, Midianites], of the posterity of Ishmael (Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews).** He said he saw some Midianites of the posterity of Ishmael! In other words, there were physical descendants of Ishmael dwelling in Midian. They were part of the Midianite Kingdom.

It's real simple. I had a Jewish friend who moved from Israel to Minnesota. One of the first things he said to me once he arrived here was, "I'm a Minnesotan. That's one of the first things he said. He then said, "It's good to be a Minnesotan," but he's still a Jew. So, I could have said, "I'm going to meet my Jewish friend," or I could have said, "I am going to meet a fellow Minnesotan." That is exactly what's being described here in these verses. It is the same group of people.

So when we look at this passage in Genesis 37:28—**Then Midianite traders passed by; so the brothers** [here we have that dynamic equivalence] **pulled Joseph up and lifted him out of the pit, and sold him to the Ishmaelites for twenty shekel of silver**—we find the story is very clear, and all the rest of the text falls in perfect harmony. There are no contradictions at all. I brought this up because if we ever get in a situation where we're talking to a wonderful Muslim and the topic comes up, now you have the answer.

We want to defend the faith. We care for them, and we want them to have the truth. Whether they're atheist, agnostic, or Muslims, we want them to have the truth. We want them to have salvation.

Now, we're not done with this passage. There's something else here that is absolutely worth looking at—**and sold him to the Ishmaelites for twenty shekels of silver (Genesis 37:28)**. So Joseph was sold for silver, and it was for the price of a slave. This is no great revelation because now what is he going to be? He's going to be a servant of Egypt. He became a slave of Potiphar.

What is fascinating to me is how this parallels the life of Yeshua. Joseph is a slave. When Yeshua came enshrouded in this title of the Mashiach ben Yosef, what was He? He was a slave. How do I know this? Because this is the testimony found in Scripture.

Let's look at this in Philippians 2:5-7—<sup>5</sup> **Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus,** <sup>6</sup> **who, being in the form of God, did not consider it robbery to be equal with God,** <sup>7</sup> **but made Himself of no reputation, taking the form of a bondservant** [In the Greek it is δούλος *doulos*. That is literally a slave], **and coming in the likeness of men.** That is powerful!

Do you remember Yeshua's words in Matthew 20:28? Yeshua said—**just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve.** This is what happens with Kings: everybody falls and serves him; however, Yeshua came to serve. That's what a slave does; that's what a servant does; and that's what the Mashiach ben Yosef did. He came and served.

When we look at John 13, we're supposed to pick up on who is our King. We are to emulate Him. He served His brethren in order to leave them an example that as He has done so we ought to do to our neighbor. Amen?

Taking this a step further, what else do we know about Yeshua that parallels the Genesis 37 verses in regard to the life of Joseph? They were both sold for silver. Yeshua was sold for thirty pieces of silver. Joseph was sold for twenty pieces of silver.

Some would look at this and say, “Well, Daniel, this is not really an apples to apples comparison. One was sold for twenty while one was sold for thirty.” To find the answer for this, we need to go to the Torah. Do you know there is a valuation on slaves? We find that in Leviticus 27:1-5—<sup>1</sup> **Now the LORD spoke to Moses, saying,** <sup>2</sup> **“Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them: ‘When a man consecrates by a vow certain persons to the LORD, according to your valuation** [In other words, they are going to be a slave of the LORD. They are being dedicated to Him to serve], **if your valuation is of a male from twenty years old up to sixty years old, then your valuation shall be fifty shekels of silver, according to the shekel of the sanctuary.** <sup>4</sup> **If it is a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekels;** <sup>5</sup> **and if from five years old up to twenty years**

old [How old is Joseph? Seventeen. He fits this criteria; he is seventeen years old], **then your valuation for a male shall be twenty shekels.** This is how much Joseph was sold for.

Now keep in mind, this was for a living slave. There is another valuation of a dead slave, one who would die. Exodus 21:32—**If the ox gores a male or female servant, he shall give to their master thirty shekels of silver, and the ox shall be stoned.** The difference between Joseph and Yeshua is that Joseph's life foreshadowed the Mashiach ben Yosef. Joseph did not literally die, but Yeshua did in this whole process. So you have one being sold for twenty shekels, and the other one for thirty.

Then we go to Zachariah the prophet in Zachariah 11:13—**Then the LORD said to me, "Throw it to the potter, that magnificent price at which I was valued by them." So I took the thirty shekels of silver and threw them to the potter in the house of the LORD.** This is the prophecy, and it is interesting that the LORD says— **that magnificent price at which I was valued.** This is interesting because the first person who is speaking here is Yeshua, and He is talking about the price that they set on Him.

Then, as you get into the Gospels and go into Matthew 26-27 you find out that Judas the Iscariot sold Yeshua for the same amount. There was such guilt riddling Judas that he literally throws the thirty pieces of silver into the temple. The chief priests went and collected the silver. They knew they could not put the money in the treasury because it was the money of blood. So what do they do? They go buy a field called Potter's Field. This is the testimony; this is the prophecy.

This is what I love about the Word of God. No matter where I go, no matter what I'm reading, over and over and over again it testifies of One? He really is the Author and Finisher of our faith. Amen?