

Midian (a defined land and people or a descriptive generalization?)  
by: Jon Machtemes

Is the MDYN "Midian" of the early scriptures, (so called "Old Testament"), as the transliterations have caused us to come to know it as, being a definable geographic nation, and a definable people, or is it, as it's cognates, root families, and context would suggest, a general term for a non defined location and people? To answer this, the forms of MDYN utilized in scripture must be examined carefully. One thing to remember, when examining any given word, is the potential for hiding words in the text under the guise of them being other words. This is the Masoretic mix up. But, as words do have meaning, and OBRY is a language of meaningful, immutable, knowable glyphs, all occurrences of MDYN should bear at least a close resemblance to one another under most circumstances. There are, of course, sensible variations to this. The most common being when one bears a name that is the same as a common word. Then context is king. But we will find this is not the case with MDYN, commonly known as Midian.

MDYN is not only translated "Midian" (as well as "Midianite" with Y suffix, and "Midianitish" with YT suffix, which really ought to be translated "woman of Midian" in the least), but also as "judgment", "strife", and "contentions". If a simple E suffix is added, not uncommon in nouns as a way of softening, generalizing, or dispersing a more rigid specific locative noun, a great many entries occur in which MDYNE is now "province(s)". Still, of further interest, is the number of times MDUN, MDYN, and MDN (H4066, H4079, H4090), are successfully translated in the same basic way: "contentions", "strife", "discord", etc. thus further lending credence to the assertion that all occurrences of MDYN ought to be viewed in common, and that, those occurrences (depending a bit on their part of speech) should be understood as having the same essential meaning. Again, the exception to this, as stated above, is that it would be a proper name and then context and reasons derived from the text would dictate this.

Before I continue, though, the origin of this paper is twofold. The first of which was the very real trouble I had writing a chapter for my forthcoming book "The Bible vs. The Middle East" on the Exodus and Moses' trips to Mt Horeb/Saini. The location of Midian, or pinning it down, rather, kept me going in circles until I finally had to just let the chapter alone for a later time. I now understand the nature of the problems I had. The second issue, (that led me to this study and this paper), was on a point of law I was examining, which in due course, we will see how problematic it was. As I began running searches for variations of MDYN, the problems only increased. What follows is my examination of what we've erroneously come to know as a nation called Midian.

### 1. The Oddities of "Midian"

The first appearances of the word MDYN, translated as "Midian" are to be found in Genesis 25, with complimentary verses in 1 Chronicles 1:

**Gen 25:2** And she bare him Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah.  
**1Ch 1:32** Now the sons of Keturah, Abraham's concubine: she bare Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah. And the sons of Jokshan; Sheba, and Dedan.

Something very important here is that, specifically in Genesis, when a name of any early man is given, it should be noted and, unless evidence demonstrates otherwise, should be directly connected to the occurrences of that name as a nation thereafter. We see this most specifically throughout Genesis 10,

and sparsely throughout the rest of this book. Genesis is foundational. All the people known as guym "nations" are to be found, (or at least their roots are to be found) therein. Abraham's son by Hagar became the Ishmaelites, Abraham's eldest grandson became Edom, and his younger grandson was Jacob/Israel. But, as I stated, in the case of Midian, there is evidence that speaks strongly against the idea that this late-born son became what we read as the Midianites. Just a few verses after MDYN is listed as being born to Abraham, we read:

**Gen 25:5** And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac.

**Gen 25:6** But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward, unto the east country.

He sent them away... back east. He didn't want them near his son whom the promises of YEUE were unto: not the least of which was to inherit all the land of Canaan. He did this same thing with YShMOAL "Ishmael":

**Gen 21:11** And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son.

**Gen 21:12** And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.

**Gen 21:13** And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed.

**Gen 21:14** And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba.

There was, however, a marked difference between Ishmael and Midian:

**Gen 16:12** And he (Ishmael) will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren.

As we witness later in scripture, all the nations proceeding from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob's brethren became enemies to Israel. Did Abraham understand that this would be a very real possibility, and therefore sent his later sons away? It seems entirely plausible that that is the reason he did this, and if that were the case, one would think he would send them far. If one were tempted to think, "but YEUE promised to make Ishmael a nation because he was Abraham's seed, so why not his other children, such as Midian?" The problem with that logic is that Keturah bare him 6 sons, yet we never hear a thing again about the other five, (if indeed the Midian we see later is the Midian, son of Abraham). Furthermore, when Abraham dies, he is buried not by all his sons (such as was the case with Isaac and Jacob), but by his only two two sons living nearby:

**Gen 25:9** "And his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah, in the field of Ephron the son of Zohar the Hittite, which is before Mamre;"

But this is only the start of the oddities of Midian. The next time we see Midian is in Gen 36:35, which is giving a rather long lineage of Esau, the Horites, and Edom, and by the time we see Midian, the timeline has us pretty far into the future from Abraham's day, so let's look at the next chronological reference, which occurs in Genesis 37. Abraham's great grandson Joseph has been

accosted by his brothers, thrown into a pit, and they are deciding what they should do with him. Then we read:

**Gen 37:25** And they sat down to eat bread: and they lifted up their eyes and looked, and, behold, a company of Ishmeelites came from Gilead with their camels bearing spicery and balm and myrrh, going to carry it down to ~~Egypt~~ Mitsrym.

**Gen 37:26** And Judah said unto his brethren, What profit is it if we slay our brother, and conceal his blood?

**Gen 37:27** Come, and let us sell him to the Ishmeelites, and let not our hand be upon him; for he is our brother and our flesh. And his brethren were content.

The outstanding oddity of this passage is... were they Ismaelites or Midianites? It's tempting to try to deal with this question by thinking, "maybe it were Midianites who took him up from the pit and then they (the Midianites) sold him to Ishmaelites". The problem with that is found a few verses later:

**Gen 37:36** And the Midianites sold him into ~~Egypt~~ Mitsrym unto Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the guard.

Rest assured, these Ishmaelites are being referred to also as Midianites. This may be explainable, however. After all, Jacob is called a "Syrian" (more accurately, an Arimy) once in Deu 26:5, "And thou shalt speak and say before YEUE thy God, A ~~Syrian~~ Arimy ready to perish was my father, and he went down into ~~Egypt~~ Mitsrym, and sojourned there with a few, and became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous:". After all, Jacob had lived in Arim for 20 years. Perhaps its the case that the Ismaelites lived in Midian or vise versa. This could explain these strange passages. Except that, for one, we never see Ishmael having a defined geographical expression named Ishmael, and for another, how old would one expect Midian, Abraham's son, to be by now? Old enough and with enough sons to already have formed a nation bearing his name?

Midian had to be about Jacob's age, if not younger, and by this time, (and with two wives and two concubines), Jacob only has 12 sons and one daughter, and the eldest can't be much over 30. Is it believable that in that time Midian would have reproduced and grown enough to have either a geographical expression or a noteworthy tribe? Israel's sons weren't even solidified into a nation until after spending some time in Mitsrym. Ishmael, by this time, would have grown a great deal. He had 12 sons, for starters; was 14 years older than Isaac; Isaac didn't begin having any children until his 40s; his younger son Jacob also didn't start having sons until around the same age, and by Genesis 37, his eldest is only just in his 30s.

These Ishmaelites would have been Ishmael's grand and great grandchildren. He's had plenty of time to multiply and we have every reason to understand why his descendants would be nearby and blessed with many children. We have no reason to believe this about Midian, who besides for only having 5 sons (who we never hear of except for one once in Isaiah... maybe) was maybe around Jacob's age. I would have to say if I'm to believe the MDYN "Midian" here is the same as Abraham's late coming son, this passage doesn't make a whole lot of sense. But, as with Jacob being referred to as an "Arimy" in Deuteronomy (maybe), we could probably just shrug it off and tell ourselves, "there must be a reasonable explanation for this". And that would suffice... until we come to the life of Moses.

Moses, as most know, was raised in Mitsrym, in the house of PROE (Pharaoh), but always knew he was an OBRYM "Hebrew". So, according to Exo 2:11-14, one day he goes out to visit his brethren and sees a Mitsry beating an Obry, so he kills the Mitsry and hides the body, but finds out afterward that he was seen, so he runs from Proe who is now bent on killing him. And we read:

**Exo 2:15** Now when Pharaoh heard this thing, he sought to slay Moses. But Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian: and he sat down by a well.

(technically, the text read that he dwealt at "the Bar", which may well be a proper name), but either way, he meets there the daughters of a man called Reuel/Rageuel H7467 and Jethro H3503 "the priest of Midian" (Exo 2:16). So, here we see "land of Midian" and "priest of Midian", so, certainly, Midian is either a geographical expression based on the only Midian we are aware of, with a definite people... except...

**Jdg 4:11** Now Heber the Kenite, which was of the children of Hobab the father in law of Moses, had severed himself from the Kenites, and pitched his tent unto the plain of Zaanaim, which is by Kedesh.

("father in law" should be translated simply as "in law"... Hobab was Moses' brother in law).

So, we see Hobab, the son of Reuel/Jethro is called a Kenite, not a Midianite. This is confirmed in 1 Sa 15:6, "And Saul said unto the Kenites, Go, depart, get you down from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them: for ye shewed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt Mitsrym. So the Kenites departed from among the Amalekites.". This is true. The Kenites, being Hobab and Reuel's kin, were the one people who dealt kindly towards Israel in the wilderness. If this ethnic oddity weren't strange enough, there's also this:

**Num 12:1** And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian KShYT (Cushy woman) whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian KShYT (Cushy woman).

Now this is just bizarre. Which is it: Midianite, Kenite, Cushite? Upon reading this I was tempted to consider whether Moses had taken another wife, but after reflecting, the question would be when and under what circumstances would Moses, appointed by YEUE to lead his millions of Israel from Mitsrym: the calling, the plagues, the exodus, the parting of the SUP sea, the complaints of the people, the battles, the Commandments, the Law... when did he sneak in a new wife? No, this regarded TsPRE "Zipporah", as her father had just brought her back to Moses at SYNY "Sinai" and they were not far out from journeying from Sinai to QDSh "Kadesh".

Now, if Zipporah was a Cushite, how could she have both a Kenite brother and be a Midianite? Is there any sensible answer? Yes, there is. The Kenites were a people that had no nation. They lived among other peoples, and Cush bordered Mitsrym (Eze 29:10. I cover Cush's location extensively in my forthcoming book). How likely is it, if Midian was where we are forced to believe it was (being somewhere east of the Dead Sea on a Palestinian landscape), that Moses would be leading a flock all the way into the Sinai Peninsula, and for what? Was he a fool? Even per the actual geography of Canaan and surrounding lands, if Midian was a geographical expression, it would have to be near Moab and likely northeast of it. It still doesn't make sense that he would be in that area and lead Jethro's flock where he did.

The logical answer here is that Reuel/Jethro and his daughters and son Hobab were Kenites who lived in a MDYN of Cush. "A MDYN of Cush?"... as in? As in a "province; territory; midlands" H4082 and H4083(AR) used 55 times, in total, as "province(s). But these two points, thus far, may not be yet convincing enough, so we will examine Midian in the context of Moab.

Beginning in Numbers 22, Israel has traveled from Kadesh (BRNO-"Barnea"), skirted Edom and Moab, and are camping in a region oft referred to as ARTs MUAB "land of Moab", though it isn't Moab proper. We know that because in Deu 2:9-25 Israel is forbidden by YEUE to infringe upon the land of Moab and Ammon because YEUE had given those lands to the children of LUTh "Lot". Notice, YEUE never commands them to not infringe on Midian (a son of Abraham), nor does the text in either Numbers or Deuteronomy tell us Israel was near to the borders of Midian, yet Midian had to be near. It was the Midianite women who drew the Israelites away after their "gods".

If Midian were a geographical expression of a particular nation they would absolutely have to be right up next to Moab. In Gen 36:35 and 1 Ch 1:46 we read:

**Gen 36:35** And Husham died, and Hadad the son of Bedad, who smote Midian in the field of Moab, reigned in his stead: and the name of his city was Avith.

**1Ch 1:46** And when Husham was dead, Hadad the son of Bedad, which smote Midian in the field of Moab, reigned in his stead: and the name of his city was Avith.

It would be odd to smite Midian in the field of Moab if Midian were not near or at least in the direction of Moab, but these are only supporting verses of the bigger picture of Midian's relationship to Moab found in Numbers and Deuteronomy.

In Numbers 22, the Israelites have just conquered SYHUN "Sihon" king of the AMRY "Amorites" and the children of Israel are camping in the plains of Moab. But, they haven't disobeyed YEUE's command to not infringe upon the land of Moab. How is this? It is because outlying lands would typically be called "of" the nearest place that had any influence thereon. We often see the MDBR "wilderness of" then the place name (MDBR KDSH, MDBR YEUDE). That doesn't mean that if one sets foot there they've infringed upon them. These are the outlying lands, or when other nations with definite borders are nearby, they would be the midlands. These lands would likely be frequently disputed, which we see even in our own day. This is how borders often change on our maps. Midlands-Midian... that's interesting.

So, while Israel is encamping in the ORBT "plains" of Moab, the king of Moab conspires with the elders of Midian to hire BLOM "Balaam" to curse Israel. When this action fails, Num 31:16, as well as Rev 2:14 tells us Balaam had advised BLQ "Balak" king of Moab to cast a stumbling block before Israel: to eat things sacrificed to idols and engage in illicit sex with the women of Moab... or is it the women of Midian? That is the question, isn't it.

The first verse of Numbers 25 reads:

**Num 25:1** And Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab.

but within a few short verses, there is this:

**Num 25:6** And, behold, one of the children of Israel came and brought unto his brethren a Midianitish woman in the sight of Moses, and in the sight of all the congregation of the children of Israel, who were weeping before the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

and thereafter, we read of nothing but the Midianites and Midianitish women. Where did Moab go? Even after the affair is over and YEUE tells Moses his last duty is to exact vengeance upon them who led Israel astray, they go after... Midian, but not Moab. And here I thought Moab was the one behind all this. To further complicate the matter, in Deu 23:1-8, when YEUE is instructing Israel, via Moses, on who may or may not enter into his QEL "Special Assembly", I was expecting to find Midian, but Midian isn't to be found. No, YEUE says:

**Deu 23:3** An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of YEUE; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of YEUE for ever:

**Deu 23:4** Because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt Mitsrym; and because they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor of Pethor of Mesopotamia Arim of Rivers, to curse thee.

**Deu 23:5** Nevertheless YEUE thy God would not hearken unto Balaam; but YEUE thy God turned the curse into a blessing unto thee, because YEUE thy God loved thee.

**Deu 23:6** Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever.

Imagine my shagrin to not only not see Midian in there, but to also see OMUN "Ammon"! What, after all, did Ammon have to do with this? Is there any way to make sense of this? How unjust this seems!

But YEUE is NOT unjust. What, then, is the truthful and reasonable solution? It is, most certainly, as we just read, that Moab and Ammon were the perpetrators of the malevolence against Israel in the matter of BOL POUR "Ba'al Peor". And it is, most certainly, as we read in Numbers, that Israel was carousing with Midianite women. And we see further evidence of this in the matter undertaken by Jephthah in Judges 11.

Therein, the Israelites of GLOD "Gilead" the region, (also those of the sub-tribe GLOD "Gilead" of the tribe Manasseh. Be careful not to confuse the two as the "Gileadites of Manasseh lived in the Gilead region which took it's name from Jacob's pact with Laban in Genesis 31.), asked their brother Jephthah to intercede with Ammon (Ammon!!!) concerning the matter of the land Israel took from Sihon king of the Amorites, as Ammon claimed it was theirs.

Now, if Ammon claimed the region called Gilead was theirs and Numbers 21 tells us Sihon took it from Moab, and again, there's no word from Midian on the matter, and Jephthah doesn't tell Ammon they never had any stake in Gilead, then it's fair to believe Ammon, as well as Moab, occupied the region of Gilead before Sihon. These were obviously contested lands. Strong's H4066 MDUN, H4079 MDYN, and H4090 MDN are all translated as "strife; contention; discord; brawling". And since we now know Gilead was a contended land, does this now help us understand how Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, in Genesis 37, would be called "Midianites"? As that region was contended land, and YEUE instructed that both Ammon and Moab were barred from His Special Assembly for all time over the matter of Ba'al Peor; although from Numbers 25-31 all we read about, in the matter, is "Midian", is it not fair to now say that the "Midianites" were, in fact, Moabites and Ammonites who lived in the "provinces" (H4082 and H4083 MDYNE) or "contended" over lands (H4066 MDUN, H4079 MDYN, and H4090 MDN)? Is this not the proper understanding of why and how, "Hadad the son of Bedad smote Midian in the field of Moab", as ShDE "field" is also a common "of" term which pertains often to outlying lands: field of Moab (Gen 36:35), field of Ai (Jos 8:24), field of Edom (Jdg 5:4)?

Yet another situation that requires strong consideration is that of Judges 6-8: Gideon and Midian. The two very odd things about this narrative are one, Midian's numbers and two, Midian's

retreat. Their numbers are a problem since in the book of Numbers, chapter 31, Israel absolutely decimated the "Midianites". They slew all their men (vs. 7), killed their kings (vs. 8), burnt all their cities and castles (vs. 10)(in a desert? really?), and took all their cattle, beasts, possessions, and women (9, 11, and 12). They were then commanded to kill all the women who had known a man, but to keep the virgins for themselves. If this were a specific people and specific geographical nation, they weren't anymore, unless "all" is unclear here. This is not among the verses in which KL H3605 "all" needs further qualification. Israel decimated the people who were responsible for the matter of Ba'al Peor... the "Midianites". But, as Jdg 7:12 attests, "And the Midianites and the Amalekites and all the children of the east lay along in the valley like grasshoppers for multitude; and their camels were without number, as the sand by the sea side for multitude."

As the narrative from chapters 6-8 tells us, the "Midianites" were among the chief offenders, (as far as numbers and leadership), but yet Israel utterly decimated "Midian" only about a century before. Did they forget someone? Did they only destroy a portion of this "Midianite" kingdom that, apparently, must have been quite vast. Vast enough that their borders are not once mentioned... no telling of Israel going from Kadesh to Shittim mentions them having to go around Midian or being near the borders of Midian. Strange. And here is Midian: like grasshoppers or sand on the seashore... without number. Now, don't think I've forgotten about the Amalekites or the BNY QDM "children of the east"... I haven't. They certainly could account for the vast numbers of men recorded in Jdg 7:12... but not for the direction they flee towards.

In Jdg 8:3-8, GDOUN "Gideon" is pursuing two kings of Midian and in the opposite direction than where other earlier verses seem to indicate Midian would be as a geographic expression. When enemies retreat, they tend to retreat to their own land, but if Midian is near Moab, as other texts would suggest, it's inexplicable as to why these kings would head in the opposite direction. They had no foes ahead of them to cut them off, and no other reason given in the text as to why they would do something so counter intuitive. Unless they headed towards their home after all, being MDYN "a province or contended territory". On this point, some may be tempted to say, "Perhaps Midian is north, in Gilead, and I've misinterpreted all the other texts.", but that cannot be. The first reason is that Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh occupied all Gilead (as per Deuteronomy 4 and Joshua 13), besides all the former evidence to this point, and the following passage.

**1Ki 11:14** And YEUE stirred up an adversary unto Solomon, Hadad the Edomite: he was of the king's seed in Edom.

**1Ki 11:15** For it came to pass, when David was in Edom, and Joab the captain of the host was gone up to bury the slain, after he had smitten every male in Edom;

**1Ki 11:16** (For six months did Joab remain there with all Israel, until he had cut off every male in Edom:)

**1Ki 11:17** That Hadad fled, he and certain Edomites of his father's servants with him, to go into ~~Egypt~~ Mitsrym; Hadad being yet a little child.

**1Ki 11:18** And they arose out of Midian, and came to Paran: and they took men with them out of Paran, and they came to ~~Egypt~~ Mitsrym, unto Pharaoh king of ~~Egypt~~ Mitsrym; which gave him an house, and appointed him victuals, and gave him land.

Based on this passage, there's no chance Hadad would go to Midian on his way to Mitsrym... not a Midian in Gilead, nor one by Moab. It does, however, fit perfectly if he was in a province of Edom and left from there to Paran then to Mitsrym. There is no other way. At this point, some again may be tempted to think, "Maybe Midian is like the Canaanite, in the sense of various 'cities of' in various

numerous places", but this thought cannot answer the Moabite and Ba'al Peor issue, which is so conclusive as to leave little doubt as to whether "Midian" was, in fact, Moab and Ammon, and that being the case, that thought quickly loses its weight.

## 2. The Provinces

As already stated, there are really three ways in which variations of MDYN are used in scripture: as "Midian" (a perceived nation), as "strife/contention/etc.", and as "province(s)". "Province" could just as well have been translated "district, territory, colony, or domain". Concerning the understanding of MDYNE "province", 1 Kings 20 proves this is not necessarily a land held by an ethnically foreign ruler.

**1Ki 20:19** So these young men of the princes of the provinces came out of the city, and the army which followed them.

**1Ki 20:20** And they slew every one his man: and the Syrians Army fled; and Israel pursued them: and Benhadad the king of Syria Arim escaped on an horse with the horsemen.

The provinces (MDYNUT), in this case, would have been all the cities and governates around ShMRUN "Samaria" which Samaria had direct control over and offered protection for in a time of war. They had a great deal, obviously, and this would be why such a large area of the kingdom of the House of Israel became known simply as ShMRUN "Samaria". In this case, the MDYNUT, the plural of MDYNE, would be cities/lands under the direct dominion of Samaria, likely with special privileges and special duties. The MDYNE, with the generalized E ending, would be places that, for whatever reason, were either currently under another authority or that had traditionally been places that changed hands. The reason that early in scriptures, we see mostly MDYN, and later we see mostly MDYNE is that as these various nations grew, lands that were once territories of contestation became more permanently absorbed into nations that now had more stable boundaries, and places that gained a reputation for fluctuating between outside governments, for whatever reason, would become generally known as MDYNE or MDYNUT in plural.

But what about the difference in form: MDYN as opposed to MDYNE? Isn't that significant? I would ask what the difference is between MDBR and MDBRE H4057, as both are translated "wilderness" (or "desert" when the text just has to sound more Middle East like). How is H6790 TsN different from TsNE: both are translated "Zin"? It's the same place, same thing, simply with an E ending which has a softening or generalizing effect, as in "the general area of", "the general idea of"... TsN = "Zin proper" as opposed to TsNE = "the whereabouts of Zin". How about H2022 ER or ERE: both are translated "mount/mountain"?

**Gen 14:6** And the Horites in their mount (ER) Seir, unto Elparan, which is by the wilderness. and...

**Gen 14:10** And the vale of Siddim was full of slimepits; and the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, and fell there; and they that remained fled to the mountain (ERE).

In the preceding verses, 14:10 should have read "the area of the mountain" or similar. Even more appropriate would be a comparison with a word like TsDQ "righteousness; a state of being right; just". As H6664 TsDQ it is used far more as the specific "just weights; just judgment; the just law", but as H6666 TsDQE (with the E ending) it is "righteous/righteousness" as in "a state of", or "just in general":



"And he believed in YEUE; and he counted it to him for righteousness ( TsDQE)". (Gen 15:6). This is the case with an innumerable amount of so called "nouns". The difference being only in how specific the author intends to be concerning that noun. Was a law TsDQ "just"? This is specific. Was a man TsDQE "just"? This is in general.

How then would it apply to MDYN? MDYN would be a place, with accompanying people, which would be considered a place of contestation, due to geography or any other important factor. A MDYNE would be a place, with accompanying people, that very well could be under contestation, but is instead being ruled over in at least relative peace. The E at the end doesn't change the meaning but the intensity: it's not currently under contestation, but is a place or thing contested over. This is why Jeremiah, in Lamentations 1:1 groups YRUSHLM "Jerusalem" in with other provinces... because she was, by then, and for some time now, a contended over place. Solomon ruled over various provinces (Ecc 2:8 and 5:8). These were lands contended for by him, his father David, and his successors. There is very little difference in the minds of the writers of scripture between MDYN and MDYNE other than it's current state of being. The biggest difference is whether a Jewish Masorete or translator (with either good or bad intentions) wishes it to be "contention/strife", "province", or "Midian".

### 3. Root Family and Cognates

A relatively quick look at the possible roots and likely etymology of MDYN to MDYNE will help to solidify what is being expressed when we see MDYN, though it appears to us in most translations as "Midian". The only two possibilities for roots are MD or DN. The MD root can be positively identified in 3 simple words:

- H4055 MD n. translated as, "garment (4x), armour (2x), measure (2x), raiment (1x), judgment (1x), variant (1x), clothes (1x)"
- H4058 MDD v. translated as, "measure (47x), mete out (2x), mete (1x), stretched (1x)."
- H4060 MDE n. translated as, "measure (37x), piece (7x), stature (4x), size (3x), meteyard (1x), garments (1x), tribute (1x), wide (1x)."

It isn't likely, though that MDYN takes it's root from this family, as the majority of words listed with an apparent YN suffix have a very close meaning to the simple root made up of the glyph immediately preceding and succeeding the Y, such as AN/ayN, EN/eYN, ShTN/ShTYN. These pairs of words all having similar or the same translation or meaning. In addition, many words listed with an apparent YN suffix will often appear in the text either with or without the Y before the N and translated successfully in the same or virtually the same way. What this indicates is that the root is likely contained in those two glyphs immediately preceding and succeeding that Y. In this case, it occurs in the latter part of MDYN... DN.

- DN H1777 v. translated as, "judge (18x), plead the cause (2x), contend (1x), execute (1x), plead (1x), strife (1x)."

This root has many cognates, all with similar meanings and uses. It will appear as DN, DYN, DUN, DNE, and only change meaning slightly. M is an extremely common prefix that tends to change the usage of the root it's added onto from an action, attribute, or noun into a more precise thing: ARB v. "to ambush" - MARB n. "ambushment"; BUA v. "to enter" - MBUA n. "entrance"; BHR v. "to choose" - MBHR n. "a choice", etc, etc.

DYN "judge; contend; strife" becomes MDYN "a thing contended; a thing judged; a thing striven over". This, of course, fits the idea of a province or outlying lands: borderlands. MDYNE "province" doesn't appear until 1 Ki 20:14. MDYNE was the logical progression from the earlier MDYN as the once more constantly contended borderlands, or outlying property achieved a more steady state, as opposed to being in flux. Locations that were once in greater states of contention, but had become more stable, though still typically ruled over by another people or city would simply go from being considered MDYN "contested thing" to MDYNE "stable province".

## Summery

In the end, it is always a worthwhile endeavor to look into why anyone was named as they were, and MDYN "Midian" as it's transiterated by Masoretic dictate, (being one of Abraham's late in life children), is no exception. But at least now, having an understanding of what MDN, MDYN, MDUN, MDYNE denote and connotate, it will make considering the circumstances of that son of Abraham become at least a little bit more understandable. The great take away here is the lack, now, of confusion about who and what a number of people are who are labeled "Midianites" as though they were a distinct nation with a distinct geographical expression. They are various people, sometimes Moabites or Ammonites, sometimes Cushites or Edomites, and living in contested territories, borderlands, and in sometimes homogeneous governates, such as Samaria and it's MDYNU "provinces".

Does this have strong implications on the text as it currently stands? Of course it does. It effects geography, ethnology, and the Law, among other things, but to properly understand this is to have REAL knowledge, which is great power: a power that bad translations (deliberate or accidental) have taken away from us. Often, revelations like this one are difficult to cope with, especially if one has built theological systems around the old faulty way, but those who truly love the truth will find a way to incorporate this newly found understanding into their Biblical and World views, as no truth is really new, but has just gone unknown for some time. I'm not Pioneering, after all, but merely rediscovering. This is restoration.

Yes, the enormous gain to this is the greater understanding one will now possess in all matters: matters of geography; matters of Law; matters of politics and social dynamics. And all understanding gained about scripture is empowering. This new knowledge will give us great power against critics, against false assumptions and erroneous teachings, and against contrived histories, phony "discoveries", and questionable deuterocanonical texts. Is there, yet, any translation that is aware of this problem? Not that I'm aware of, but we can hope that responsible translators will consider this new information and work to generate better, more accurate translations. All who read or hear this can rest assured that an OBRY Projekt translation is certainly on the horizon and will not falter on this and so very many other vital points.

For now, keep in mind that context is ever critical, and arm yourself with the knowledge that H4066&68 MDUN, H4079-81 MDYN, H4081-83 MDYNE, H4084 MDYNY, H4090 MDN, and H4092 MDNY are all very similar in form and, therefore, usage. We've seen ample evidence that speaks against the idea that we are looking at a defined people from the later sons of Abraham, as well as abundant evidence that MDYN is a contended territory and MDYNY "Midianites" are simply the peoples identified with those territories... "provincials" or "colonists" or "settlers".

In all things stay vigilant and wary of most translations brought to us, in large part, by Conversos and Shabbas Goy Pharisees. None of this is easy on the reader or this researcher, but it's the due diligence we must exerceise for the sake of those who come after us; those who are counting

on us to turn a world of lies and darkness into a world of light and truth. I'm relying as much on all of you as you are on me, so I expect you to look into this matter for yourself. Don't simply believe me, or anyone, but prove all things.

For the OBRY Projekt, I'm Jon Machtemes bidding you kind regards and Godspeed.