

The Patriarchs, Their Livestock, the LAND

by: Jon Machtemes

**this document, (including accompanying documents: "KNON Growth Chart", "MTsRYM Growth Chart", and the written content of "accompanying maps"), is the intellectual property of the author, Jonathan D Machtemes, including the OBRYbeta3 font used herein. This intellectual property may only be used or reproduced, (in any way: in full or in part), through the express consent of the author.*

Notes to the reader:

1- I will be quoting mainly from the King James Version, and in a few cases, Brenton's LXX. This is not due to preference, but that Strong's, (which I also do not endorse), is geared to the kjv translation and Brenton's is the most widely used and understood LXX translation. When using a King James quote, I will place a (kjb) before or after, and when using Brenton's, I will place (lxx) before or after.

2- All "hebrew" quotes will be presented left to right and in my "OBRYbeta 3" font. This font IS yet in a beta stage, but will suffice for now. All ad hoc OBRY words will be presented with the Strong's "H" code next to it as a subtext. The OBRY, "O¹R²₅₆₈₀" [oh-b~ree] quotes will be character for character from the BHS, (Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia), in the natural with no nikkud, and translated myself. This link: blueletterbible.org is one of many Strong's softwares out there. I am, in no way, supporting or associated with them. Just be sure to enter the "H", "h" before the number. In addition, [qbible.com's hebrew OT](http://qbible.com/hebrew-OT), is very useful in acquainting a novice reader with basic proper nouns within the text.

3- This document is very heavy in OBRY proper nouns. Whenever one appears, it will be presented in the OBRYbeta3 font, with the Strong's as sub text, then followed by brackets with the best pronunciation possible, based on a reasonable phonetic consistency. Within the pronunciation brackets, you'll notice a frequent ~ used between consonants. This is to signal you to go from one consonant to another with the least amount of effort and to not apply any obligatory vowel sound. Simply a breath between m and ts will produce something akin to "mits", or a breath from p to l will likely produce a "pel" sound. Frequently the leading consonant will dictate the sound of the simplest movement from it to the ending consonant, so don't overdue the phonetics...just get from one to the other in a natural breath. True, it would have been easier for the reader, and especially the author, to simply insert the kjv word or well known "hebrew" pronunciation, but that is exactly what we must get past in order to fully understand what is being communicated in the text. For most beginners and casual students, this is the best way to begin breaking the Masoretic notions. For those who will be acquiring and utilizing the tools made available at obryprojekt.info, you will soon find the text becoming less and less confusing once you realize you, if you are an English speaker, are speaking a Shemitic language today.

Introduction

The more I read the Bible, the more I come in contact with a world and people quite foreign to the ones I was taught from the earliest age. Someone who I regard as a friend, one day challenged my paradigms with a simple statement, "I don't believe the events described in the Bible took place in the Middle East... all you see are place names, but no definitive details that describe Palestine." I, honestly, paid little attention to such a claim. Seriously? How incredulous! The "fact" that these events occurred in and around Palestine, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and outlying areas is undisputed: opposition is indefensible, maybe even absurd. The real problem was that I would soon find I couldn't easily dismiss it.

This was about the time I started having to take a serious look at the source language of what is called the "Old Testament". The language, apart from the Masora, I now call O¹R²₅₆₈₀, (obry:

the Bible is not including all the other people with him: handmaids, general servants, keepers of animals, men of action, ect. It seems that, often, in our cursory readings of Genesis, we just don't give a whole lot of attention to chapter 14, verse 14, which reads:

ሂደው ጠዕኖ ለብረጠ ላይ ገደብህ ለይዘኝ ሂደቀ ለህ ይከቅረኝ ጊደጊደጊ ለጊደኝ ሠጠኝ ሰወረ
ሃደው ጠዕኖ ለብረጠ ገደብ ገደብ ገደብ

.....

and hearing ለብረጠ¹⁸⁷ [ab-r~m] of the taking of his brother then selected he spear-men born in his house 8 10 and 300, (318), and he pursued unto ገደብ¹⁸³⁵ [d~n] (Gen 14:14) (kjv)

there are variations that say "trained men, trained soldiers, servants" for ይከቅረኝ²⁵⁹³ [h-nee-qee-yoo]. It only has this single appearance, in this form, but you'll find it's root to be ይከቅረኝ²⁵⁹⁵ [h-neeth]="spear". These were men of action, and they'd need to be, given what they were about to do. The preceding word, ሂደቀ⁷³²⁴ [oo ee-r~q], translated "armed" sometimes, but more often, "draw out, emptied, poured forth", ought to be translated here more consistently, as I did..."selected". So then, he had 318 men to choose from: taking not all, but the most reliable and faithful, "born in his house".

Demographics are not that difficult. They stay mostly the same wherever you go...unless there are aggravating factors: war, disease, infanticide and euthanasia. If a population is allowed to go the natural way, they all stay very similar. Male to female ratio is often very close to 50/50, with female numbers usually tipping the scale slightly in their favor. You can check demographics of Texas, Togo, and Turan and find, besides annual growth rate, conditions remain remarkably similar when any population is allowed to grow unhindered. Age ranges, in relation to entire populations, are also quite ubiquitous.

If I were to select all men 20 and over, up to retirement age, (65), from various countries and American states, that average percentage of men, in that age range is 27.82%. I'll round up to 28%. You'll find every figure herein is geared towards giving the Middle East the advantage: no cooking the numbers here, no close calls. I want the Middle East, and Palestine in particular, to have every advantage. Remember, the text doesn't even imply that these were all the men he had between 20 and 64. It says "he selected of fighters (spear-men) born in his house". We, by all rights, could reduce the percentage of them to the overall number of ለብረጠ⁸⁷ [ab-r~m] house, in many honest and Biblical ways, and end up with a much larger starting figure, but we won't. I am conceding every advantage. The number we end up with, for overall size of ለብረጠ⁸⁷ [ab-r~m] house is 1,135.7.

There were 215 years in ሄኑግ³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan] and 215 years in ጠጥረጠጠ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem] to account for. If you're under the impression that Israel, (ጊወረሃ³⁴⁷⁸ [y~sh-ral]), were in ጠጥረጠጠ⁴⁷¹⁴, ([m~ts-reem], not Egypt), for 400 years, you're not paying attention to genealogies. Even the LXX concurs. ለብረጠ⁸⁷ [ab-r~m] was told by ጊዞሃ³⁰⁶⁸ [ye-oo-eh], in Gen 15:13 (kjv) "And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years". If anyone attempts to argue that they had to be in ጠጥረጠጠ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem] 400 years because of the "they shall serve them...they shall afflict them" part, remember ጊወረሃ³⁴⁷⁸ [y~sh-ral] had it very good until just before Moses, (ጠጠሃ⁴⁸⁷² [m~sh-eh]) was born. Their affliction (in hard bondage and infanticide) was about 80 years. ጊዞሃ³⁰⁶⁸ [ye-oo-eh] was expressing much to ለብረጠ⁸⁷ [ab-r~m] in one statement. No one would win a "400 years of hard bondage" debate, based on Biblical evidence.

For all this time, and especially in ሄኑግ³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan], we will need to figure them for herders specifically. They would have to keep livestock as their main source of food and income. They were rarely able to stay in an area long enough for crops, and even when they are able to plant crops they'd need to dedicate a good deal of grains to feeding their livestock while wintering, unless we

figure them for year round grazing. Either way, as you'll see, a defense of Palestine becomes quite unattainable.

Now that we've established that we are not looking at a little rag-tag band of Abrem, (ላብረጣ₈₇ [ab-r~m]), Lot, (ሊዮ₃₈₇₆ [loot]), and Sara, (ወረደ₈₂₉₇ [sh-ree]), Before we draw out the years and consider the necessary charts, spreadsheets, maps, Bible verses, and aggravating vs mitigating factors, we need to establish what we are talking about.

.....

Defining the animals, people, demographics, and tabular data

We'll need to start by breaking a few stereotypes and educating ourselves on what we are looking at and the needs of various livestock and people. Let's begin by establishing facts.

...(የጊዛጊ ሊሃ) ጉህጎ₆₆₂₉ የሊቀገ₁₂₄₁ የይጣረጊጣ₁₂₅₄₃ የዐረገገ₅₆₅₀ የወገይጵ₈₁₉₈ የህጻንጵ₈₆₀
የገጣረጊጣ₁₅₈₁
(and was to him)... <the rest explained below>

this passage is from Gen 12:16. What we want to establish is the continually reoccurring terms for livestock: ጉህጎ₆₆₂₉ [tsahn] and ሊቀገ₁₂₄₁ [b-q~r]. The other words present are important words, but for the purposes of this paper, and for reasons of their dubious etymology, we aren't concentrating on them now. It will suffice to say that ዐረገገ₅₆₅₀ [oh-b~d] and የወገይጵ₈₁₉₈ [oo sh~p-hey] have enough cross-reference evidence to easily settle on "male and female servants", but ይጣረጊጣ₂₅₄₃ [h-mar], የህጻንጵ₈₆₀ [oo ath-nay], and ገጣረጊጣ₁₅₈₁ [g-m~l] will need left alone until another paper.

(የላብረጣ ላረገገ ጣህጻን) ለጣቀጣጣ₄₇₃₅ ለህቆገ₃₇₀₁ የረገገ₂₀₉₁
(and ላብረጣ₈₇ [ab-r~m] extremely weighted)

this is Gen 13:2. The ህቆገ₃₇₀₁ [k-s~p] and ገገ₂₀₉₁ [zeb], translated "silver and gold", will be regarded, for now, as tertiary, like the other pack, draft, work, and saddle animals we may encounter. Again, these words are important, but will not have a weighted bearing on the words we need to understand. We will, however, establish ጣቀጣጣ₄₇₃₅ [m~q-nay].

ጣቀጣጣ₄₇₃₅ [m~q-nay]: the broadest of these three. Related roots are ቀገ₇₀₆₄ [q~n] and ቀጣጣ₇₀₆₉ [q-nay]. There are, in fact, many 3 character roots utilizing ቀገ [q~n]; however, not all are appropriate, as it would be flippant to refuse to recognize the existence of homonym, antonym, and synonym in ዐረገገ₅₆₈₀ [oh-b~ree]. A cross-reference check of the three reveals a similarity of root intent, and ጣቀጣጣ₄₇₃₅ [m~q-nay], by all accounts, is the broadest "domestic farm and herd" animal term.

ጉህጎ₆₆₂₉ [tsan]: Besides many other variations, (mostly the "appears w/" kind), its most often translated "flock, sheep, or cattle". These are not synonyms. Based on the elemental ideograms ጉ [ts]- movement, ህ [ah]- augmentation, ጎ [oon]- suffix used as denoting "less than, but characterized by", the ጎ [oo] is frequently dropped when this suffix is a permanent attachment to another root. With the ጎ alone, it still signifies division, less than, but similar. All ጉህጎ [tsa] root words have to do with movement. ጉህጎ₆₆₂₉ [tsan] is then a descriptive of a thing or body characterized by movement: grazing livestock. All evidence suggests it is both sheep and goat. It appears that ጉህጎ₆₆₂₉ [tsan] encompasses many of the animal word entries: ወህ [sheh], ዐህ [ohz], ህህገ [k-sh~b], ወይገ [r-h~l], ect.

𐤀𐤓𐤓₁₂₄₁ [b-q~r]: occurs 182x as listed by Strong's. 𐤀𐤓𐤓₁₂₄₁, [b-q~r], like 𐤏𐤔₆₆₂₉ [tsan], doesn't appear in the plural, (neither does livestock or cattle). Considering all verses, in which it is used, and the associated terms, (𐤓𐤓 [p~r] and 𐤔𐤓 [sure]), plus the fact that both milk and butter are directly associated with it, "Cattle" is the preferred translation. Cow will not be used due to verses that directly cite both male "𐤏𐤔𐤓" [z-k~r] and female "𐤓𐤓𐤀" [n~q-bay]. The surety of this author as to 𐤀𐤓𐤓₁₂₄₁ [b-q~r] being "Cattle" is 100%. Cattle are in the family "Bovidae" and subfamily "Bovinae". These are man's terms; however, they all have a reason for being classified as they are.

We need to now understand that what we are looking at is a community. A community needs to eat, needs shelter, needs protection, and what we will factor in will have to account for much, while still giving Palestine every advantage.

At this point, we really don't know the materials their tents and clothes were made of, (quite possibly cannabis...canna, canaan?), but it's safe to assume they would be utilizing wool, goat's hair, cow skin, (all skins for leather), the milk of the three for milk, cheeses, (and in the cow's case), butter. They were moving frequently and had not the advantage until 𐤔𐤌₄₃₆ 𐤓𐤓𐤓₄₄₇₁ [al-nee m~m-ray] to grow anything, (and the text doesn't say he does...even at 𐤀𐤔𐤓 𐤔𐤓₈₈₄ [bar sh-bow] it only reads "he planted a grove": "grove"= 𐤔𐤔₈₁₅ [a-sh~l]- unproven and highly dubious, (Gen 21:23). Its not until 𐤏𐤔𐤓₃₃₂₇ [y~ts-h~q] at Gen 26:12 that we know planting is being done. One must understand, you cannot use the same ground for planting and grazing, plus they couldn't mine their precious metals, so we must assume their various grains, spices, smithing metals (iron, bronze, ect), were being bought with the produce of their flocks and herds, (𐤏𐤔₆₆₂₉ [tsan] and 𐤀𐤓𐤓₁₂₄₁ [b-q~r]). So, maybe the over 1,000 with 𐤔𐤓𐤓₈₇ [ab-r~m] weren't eating a mostly meat diet, (which it sounds like they were: meat and grains), but even if not, they'd need to buy their grains, fruits, vegetables, and spices.

What would they buy them with? They'd use either livestock, (produce of livestock), or precious metals, (most likely acquired by selling livestock). The people are of greatest importance here and the animals are their food, clothing, and supplies. In order to figure the animals they would need to keep, we need to figure on the people's needs, then translate that to animals kept, and finally to AUs, AUMs, and the like. To figure the sustenance one can get from a Bovidae animal, each kind needs to be considered in what it produces (on average) and the value this brings back to the individual, which can then be applied to a unit. These units will then be averaged as far as how many a human needs per annum.

This point is where some necessary tables come into play. We know 𐤔𐤓𐤓₈₇ [ab-r~m] had a large company and we know they were continually on the move, (what comes more clear, in textual examination, is that they establish an alley not unlike American cattle herders: north to south.), so even when they establish places to settle and work out from, they are still moving their livestock.

Table 1 is based on natural averages: no special breeds, no modern technology.

No considerations are made here for modern herding worldviews, (based solely on profit). These averages are for basics in every animal: common sense values to people.

The term Personal Food Unit (PFU) will be used as a way to translate many products into their usefulness to one average person per day. PFUs will be better explained in the next table. Average lifespans are long, in these animals; however, if they were culled far earlier, (based on the needs of the community), more would be bred to satisfy, which would put the numbers we'll ultimately see back up to the same basic amounts.

Hide/final products PFUs are a one time value placed on the hide and products of the carcass. We kept that quite low as well.

Product (per annum)	<u>Cow</u> avg#(weight in pounds) 1,000	<u>Bull</u> (1/25 ratio) avg# 1,200	<u>Ewe</u> avg# 150	<u>Ram</u> (1/50 ratio) avg# 250	<u>Doe Goat</u> avg# 120	<u>Buck Goat</u> (1/25 ratio) avg# 150
milk	4,800#	-	720#	-	1000#	-
offspring	1	25	1	50	2	50
meat	400#	500#	70#	115#	50#	70#
hide/ final products	7 PFU	7 PFU	25# wool/yr 3 PFU	35# wool/yr 4 PFU	3 PFU	3 PFU
avg lifespan	8	8	8	8	8	8
-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 2 represents the 3 main livestock animals and the amount of weight of produce (depending) that it would take to feed the average adult, based on a 2000 cal/day diet, for one day. The wool and hide rows are based on the standard market price of those things in 2018 and the average cost to put 2000 cal/day into an average adult. (given that much of this is costly in today's market, we will average between products to determine a cost of \$10.00/day to feed an average adult on 2000 calories). Children of differing ages do eat less, (sometimes), as do the elderly, but a grown man who works all day can consume twice to three times the calories of an infant without a second thought. The addition of PFUs, instead of calories alone, is to provide an expression of mostly non consumable, but valuable, products the animal may have, i.e. hide or wool.

The way in which the calculations were performed was based on calories per oz of any given product and dividing that into the 2000 number, multiplying the quotient by portion weight, and dividing that by 16, (for oz). So, if there are 100 cal. in 2 oz of product, 100 goes into 2000 20x, then 20 must be multiplied by the weight- 2oz, and the product must be divided by 16oz. $2000/100 = 20$. $20 \times 2 = 40$. $40/16 = 2.5$. And 2.5 would be the pounds of the product needed to satisfy a PFU or "Personal Food Unit" in one day.

Some of these numbers are averaged based on the multitude of cuts of meat, in a given animal, with varying fat content. Also, cheeses can fluctuate wildly, depending on process, breed, additives (even just natural), aging, and so forth. All these figures are a median average, and all of them, (like all other figures), are lending the advantage to the "Palestine IS the Promised Land"- (PIPL), argument.

Pounds (#) of product needed for one day (PFU)

Product	Cattle	Sheep	Goat
meat	1.862	1.6	2.5
milk	5.88	4.09	5.95
cheese	1	1	1
butter	.817		
wool		6.67	
hide/final products	7 PFU	3.5 PFU	3 PFU

Table 3 illustrates what it will take, per animal to feed the average adult for 1 year. To do this, we need to calculate a lifetime product for these individual animals, based not on modern commercial concerns, but on their uses in a simple agrarian, non-fluctuating market situation. Given the lossy nature of dairy products, (butter, cheeses, yogurts,ect), an average must be made to satisfy a logical PFU. The total amount of milk will be considered with half being assumed for products at a 50% loss, (which is normally made up for in calories), thus 3/4 of expected lifetime milk production will be considered. For ease of further PFU calculations, all finals will be rounded.

Animal	Avg lifespan	Total Products	PFU per product	total PFUs
Cow	8	18,000# dairy 400# meat 7 PFU (1 time)	2,447.98 214.82 7	2,670
Bull (or steer)	8	500# meat 7 PFU (1 time)	268.53 7	276
Ewe	8	3,780# dairy 70# meat 175# wool 3 PFU (1 time)	924.21 43.75 26.24 3	997
Ram	8	115# meat 245# wool 4 PFU (1 time)	71.88 36.73 4	113
Doe goat	8	9,450# dairy 50# meat 3 PFU (1 time)	735.29 20 3	758
Buck goat	8	70# meat 3 PFU (1 time)	28 3	31

With the preceding tables presented, we will need to discuss some very important factors that blend this information with an understanding of cattle, sheep, and goat breeding, various extensive considerations of a livestock centered community, and an understanding of the requirements for the livestock needed.

The first thing to be noted is that although many of these animals are culled before reaching 8 years, that age given is relatively arbitrary, as we'll see. The more important information is average breeding capabilities and cycles. Whether the herdsmen wish to cull most animals at a younger age or not, the fact is that a certain amount of these beasts must be kept, at any given time, to satisfy the community's needs without exceeding them so much as to be a drain on the community, (not to mention the land!). This would happen if they needed to supply too much feed vs what they are taking back in animal product, whether that food source be the sheer amounts of acreage of forage needed or dry grains, (which most natural herdsmen would try keeping to a minimum for ruminants), or if too many men and materials were required to control the herds/flocks. So, a reasonable number must be established.

I, also, need to stress, now, that various people could take all the information provided in the preceding tables and use it to apply all kinds of various formulas. One could argue that the sheep count would be up far far higher than the cattle or goat for any particular reason, or the other way around and on and on. Besides this author inviting all to put on their thinking caps and work these

things out yourselves, I am inviting all comers to thoughtfully take the work herein and show the fallacies of logic...if they exist...to which I will give sober consideration.

What we will now determine is, based on necessary PFUs and caloric intake, the mean average of pounds of livestock needed for an individual, which can then be applied to overall population numbers. If we were to be so shortsighted as to say, "A milk cow has a high enough PFU to provide for one person one year.", this, of course doesn't account for many factors, not the least of which is you'd need to spread the final products like all the meat and hide (say you sold it) over the year, and then wonder where is the next year's PFUs going to come from. So, we must also think of the effects of the animals culled on the remaining animal population: we do, after all, want them to breed, and incidentally...if anyone on the "Palestine IS the Promised Land" side, would like...I can just figure the non siring males as meat with the occasional female once through with all her birthing; however, this would swell the numbers needed far above what they will already end up being. As I've said, and will repeat ad nauseum, "I am giving the land of Palestine every advantage".

In order for every man, woman, and child to be provided for, (and continue to be provided for), there needs to be a certain amount of animals exceeding, (by a good margin), the culling being done. This amount, which we will express per person and accounting for residual production (milks, cheeses, ect), will then be applied to the growth chart formula respectively. We will also consider the fact that it's not just people and livestock: its people, livestock, riding animals, (herds this size will not be kept on foot...if the PIPL people insist that the shepherds weren't mounted, then they can add more needed PFUs...MORE LIVESTOCK...to satisfy the needs of far more shepherds and dogs, or whatever beings they must imagine are needed when we take away the most common, efficient, and age-old ways of herding large numbers), pack, draft, and work animals, living accommodations, medicines, clothing, animal accessories, ect. I think the point is made. This all adds to PFUs, (and AUMs...we'll get to this), as their cattle, not their gold and silver, were their stock in trade. People with sense enough to survive and thrive would, and do, regard precious metals as only valuable for trade in an established market economy: cattle and flocks are worth their output no matter where you go or whom you ask. The cattle and flocks are $\text{Y}^{\text{L}}\text{R}^{\text{U}}\text{Y}^{\text{M}}$ ₈₅, $\text{Z}^{\text{r}}\text{E}^{\text{P}}$ ₃₃₂₇ [y~ts-h~q], and $\text{Z}^{\text{O}}\text{P}^{\text{L}}$ ₃₂₉₀ [yoh-q~b] stock in trade.

When all the respective breeding cycles and projected breeding lifetimes, respective siring, suckling times, averages of male to female ratios, (in relation to specifically meat animals and breeding animals), percentages of younger animals slaughtered, loss of volume in milks, (when processed), loss of weight in butchering, and on and on...are all taken into account, (and all these components are important), a modest number of 500 pounds of livestock animal must be present at all times to continue an even provision for every man, woman, and child, (including all aforementioned aggravating and mitigating factors). In addition to the tables I've provided, there exists many sources for consideration of all these components online and in periodicals and publications. For expedience' sake, I have not included all of these complex calculations, but it is not beyond anyone's reach to prove these things themselves. I will, however, quickly show the thought process behind such a figure.

If the average person requires 365 PFUs in a year. Let's say they can live off a cow's milk/cheese/butter, (while giving suck), for 150 days, then the other 215 days they use all useable meat/product, (and I hope most of it is treated for preservation). On new year's day they have to start this all over again. To do so, you'll need a cow that's reached a 2 to 3 year maturity...that's a cow. If it's a steer, you'll need more. You'll need one cow at 2-3 years ready to go, one at 1-2 years, (for next year), and the calf that the mother is giving suck to at the time. Plus you'll need the bull for siring. How much weight is that? That's far more than we are figuring...I promise. And this does not get easier or different with a sheep or goat. Their milk products are similar in caloric providence, and based on their respective weights and potential breeding production, you are right back up to the needed pounds, (or AUs) at any given time.

When considered, in this way, (or any logical way), it will, again, need to be conceded that I've given the land of Palestine the advantage by not going up even further on the AUs, (or total pounds of ruminant, based on PFUs, required to be kept, per person, at any given time).

Before we can get to the central table of this document, I do need to explain AUs: what they are, how they are figured, and the accompanying considerations.

AU: Animal Unit. This is expressed as 1 AU = 1,000# (pounds) of grazing animal.

Stocking Rate: expressed as how many animals, or how many pounds (based on % of body weight consumption of forage) we put on an acre. The Foraging and Grazing Terminology Committee defines it as: The relationship between the number of animals and the grazing management unit utilized over a specified time period

Utilization Rate: how much forage 1 AU consumes per month.

Growth Rate: how much forage (in pounds) an acre can produce per month

Keeping these terms in mind, we need to also take a quick look at growth rates. The growth rate of any population is typically expressed as a percentage and can be derived from a simple equation. The equation goes as such, (let's say we are looking at one year...which we will be showing these per year, but this equation can work on any time span): $\frac{\text{new population} - \text{initial population}}{\text{initial population}} \times 100 / \text{number of years passed}$. or:

$$\text{Population growth rate} = \frac{\text{new pop.} - \text{initial pop.}}{\text{initial pop.}} \times 100 = \frac{\text{product}}{\text{\# years passed}}$$

Some may, rightly, say, "How can anyone really know the growth rate of the company of people with the Patriarchs?". The answer is woven into a number of factors, and as much as I would love to make this section shorter and simpler and present the next table, it's impossible without confirming what growth rate I applied and why.

Besides the "selected men of action" being 318, we saw earlier, we have every reason to apply a good and steady growth rate to יִצְחָק ¹⁸⁵, יִשְׂרָאֵל ³³²⁷ [y~ts-h~q], and יְהוֹאָחָז ³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b] the entire time they are in כְּנָעַן ³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]. The following passages serve to illustrate this. I have listed them sequentially and by respective Patriarch:

יִצְחָק ¹⁸⁵

Genesis 13:2 And Abram was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold.

Genesis 13:6 And the land was not able to bear them, that they might dwell together: for their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together.

Gen 17:2 And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.

Genesis 24:1 And Abraham was old, and well stricken in age: and the LORD had blessed Abraham in all things.

Genesis 24:35 And the LORD hath blessed my master greatly; and he is become great: and he hath given him flocks, and herds, and silver, and gold, and menservants, and maidservants, and camels, and asses.

יִשְׂרָאֵל ³³²⁷ [y~ts-h~q]

Genesis 25:11 And it came to pass after the death of Abraham, that God blessed his son Isaac; and Isaac dwelt by the well Lahairoi.

Genesis 26:12 Then Isaac sowed in that land, and received in the same year an hundredfold: and the LORD blessed him.

Gen 26:13 And the man waxed great, and went forward, and grew until he became very great:

Gen 26:14 For he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants: and the Philistines envied him.

יֹֹפִיִּא³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b]

Genesis 30:43 And the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maidservants, and menservants, and camels, and asses.

Genesis 31:9 Thus God hath taken away the (cattle)- מִֹפִיִּא⁴⁷³⁵ [m~q-nay] of your father, and given them to me.

Genesis 32:5 And I have oxen, and asses, flocks, and menservants, and womenservants: and I have sent to tell my lord, that I may find grace in thy sight.

Genesis 32:6 And the messengers returned to Jacob, saying, We came to thy brother Esau, and also he cometh to meet thee, and four hundred men with him.

Genesis 32:7 Then Jacob was greatly afraid and distressed: and he divided the people that was with him, and the flocks, and herds, and the camels, into two bands;

Genesis 33:9 And Esau said, I have enough, my brother; keep that thou hast unto thyself.

Genesis 33:11 Take, I pray thee, my blessing that is brought to thee; because God hath dealt graciously with me, and because I have enough. And he urged him, and he took it.

Genesis 36:6 And Esau took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and all the persons of his house, and his cattle, and all his beasts, and all his substance, which he had got in the land of Canaan; and went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob.

Genesis 36:7 For their riches were more than that they might dwell together; and the land wherein they were strangers could not bear them because of their cattle.

(kjv)

When we read a passage like Gen 30:43, we should always keep in mind that whenever the Bible says "whomever" increased greatly, (whether with or without those specifics), you can count on them being there. And there isn't any gross speculation here, either: **וְיָֹפִיִּא**⁶²¹⁵ [oh-shoo] is coming to meet his brother **יֹֹפִיִּא**³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b] with 400 men in Gen 32:6. Their father is still alive and therefore hasn't given them their inheritance, and yet **וְיָֹפִיִּא**⁶²¹⁵ [oh-shoo] alone has 400 men of action with him. In the preceding verses, **יֹֹפִיִּא**³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b] divides his various herds into groups of distinct animals and sends them ahead separately. This alone would take many men to accomplish, but he also has much more substance left. You must take into consideration, the large gift he gives to **וְיָֹפִיִּא**⁶²¹⁵ [oh-shoo] could not exceed his company's needs or he would have big problems until they caught back up. Be assured, the population of the people with the Patriarchs was great and we can expect nothing but a good birth rate to match.

So that we can comprehend what a reasonable birth rate looks like, I've consulted many demographic sources. Quoting worldatlas.com, from their article "[Countries with the Highest Population Growth](#)", it reads, "...where the African nations of South Sudan and Niger experienced a growth rate of 4.09 and 4.00, respectively", and, "Oman has experienced a growth rate of 8.45% in recent years". It can, and should be, concluded that countries with the more "natural" environments today are often experiencing a growth rate of between 4.0% and 8.45%. Also, these figures often have included fluctuations in and out, due to migration, which will always be the case; however, later we'll take a look at the official world population growth rate, and you'll find that the numbers applied here are right on. Currently, White Western countries are experiencing far lower growth rates due to so many internal and external factors, by design, that it is its own separate, and grievous subject.

According to countrymeters.info, the current live population of Oman is at 5,850,779. Based on their proven growth rate, we can take the percentage, turn it into a decimal, and figure, at current rates, next year it will be at 6,345,170. This sort of simple application of percentage growth rate to a population will allow our projection of total population during the years in **כְֹּפִיִּא**³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan] to be accurate, and here is the key to it's accuracy: common demographics. Like before, when we applied an

understanding of common demographics to our knowledge of ህገገገገ⁸⁵ having 318 "selected men of action" and extrapolating the conservative overall number of 1,135.7, we will perform a comparison between the 215 years in ህገገገገ³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan] and the 215 years in ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴, [m~ts-reem]. And, yes, it's only 215 years in ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴, [m~ts-reem] and NO, ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem] is not, nor ever was Egypt.

I understand we've all been taught 400 years in "Egypt". Both factors are absolutely wrong. This isn't a paper about ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴, [m~ts-reem] and ህገገገገ³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan], per se, but besides the Bible attesting to the fact that the slavery and persecution of ህገገገገ³⁴⁷⁸ [y~sh-ral], (not "the Jews"), only began a bit before ማገገገገ⁴⁸⁷², ([m~sh-eh]...aka "Moses"), birth and the exodus commencing when he was 80, if you'll check Gen 46:11 and 1 Ch 6:1-3, you'll see that 400 years in ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem] would only be feasible if each of the only 2 generations from ህገገገገ³⁸⁷⁸, ([loo-ee]...aka "Levi") son ዋገገገ⁶⁹⁵⁵, [q-hath] to ማገገገገ⁴⁸⁷² [m~sh-eh] would need to vastly outlive their fathers and sons, but also sire children at an age far older than ህገገገገ⁸⁵ [ab-rem]. Don't believe me...believe the Bible. It's right in there.

Now, according to the BHS, (Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, or Lenongrad Codex, or just "masoretic"), ህገገገገ³⁴⁷⁸ [y~sh-ral]... that is the genetic seed of ህገገገገ³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b], was 70 men going in to ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem], (Gen 46:27 & Exo 1:5). According to the Brenton English translation of the Septuagint, (LXX), there were 75. This isn't an age range demographic, but specifically the males of the house of ህገገገገ³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b]. Upon leaving ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴, [m~ts-reem], (Exo 12:37), we read, "about 600,000 men on foot" (kjv). The numbering system of Exodus will now be quickly and Biblically established.

Numbers 1:3 From twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel: thou and Aaron shall number them by their armies. (kjv)

This is straight forward. There's no ambiguity within the text to argue, and we see this sort of numbering scheme throughout Scripture, unless explicitly stated otherwise, like in (Gen 46:26) "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, all the souls were threescore and six;" (kjv). That means old and crusty to young and pink...all the males of the house of ህገገገገ³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b]. Most numbering, in the Bible, is 20 years and up to the age when a man couldn't walk and fight well. Incidentally, unless specifically included and noted, ህገገገገ³⁸⁷⁸ [loo-ee] numbers aren't recorded, as they weren't to be warring and doing common work. So, figure another hefty percent ought to be added onto these population numbers...but again...Palestine (and the Mid-East) will get every advantage.

Demographically, the percentage of men from 20 to 65, in virtually every natural population, (as shown earlier), is 28%. At that common demographic percentage of total population, we can figure the total at about 2,142,857, (or just over 2 million, since the Biblical quote is "about 600,000"... men on foot...excluding Levi), people of the direct genetic lineage of ህገገገገ³²⁹⁰/ህገገገገ³⁴⁷⁸ [yoh-q~b/y~sh-ral]. Earlier, when the total males is given, we can take the high number of 75 and add over 50% for wives and daughters, (giving the Mid-East the advantage), and start at year one in ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem] with a population of 160. Again, this is just direct family...genetic family...no mention of all the peoples with them, which were not direct family, coming into, or going out of ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem]. To reach just over 2 million, in the allotted 215 years, a growth rate of 4.5% annually was applied.

Table 4, (attached as a PDF of a spreadsheet entitled, "MTsRYM Growth Chart") shows the growth rate over the 215 years at 4.5% annually. Remembering the "Levites", we could easily argue that it ought to be higher than 4.5%, but we won't. And how is it that ህገገገገ³⁴⁷⁸ [y~sh-ral] grew nicely while ማገገገገ⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem] did not? That's the subject for another paper, but the answer is in Gen 47. Suffice to say, that is a fair, even low, growth rate. This same growth rate, (due to all the verses

supplied about the Patriarch's growth and blessings), would be entirely fair, but, of course, we want Palestine to have the upper hand, so in **Table 5**, I've applied only a 3% growth rate per annum.

Now, with all of that laid out before us, and before we look at **Table 5**, we must revisit the science of Animal Units, Forage Growth, and Grazing.

Penning up ruminants, and feeding them nothing but grains is not a traditional nor a healthy practice. It's one of greed or absolute necessity. The Patriarchs grazed their livestock, unlike the livestock industry today, owned by "Jews", in Palestine, which relies on imported feeds and constantly caged animals. To stop there would be very fair, but would not give Palestine the advantage, so let's assume Palestine for the same kind of growth rate for, say, the American Southeast. I don't know how familiar all readers are with the American SE, but it is good, rich land, with many areas relatively near the gulf enjoying year round grazing.

Most countries that have shepherds have some equivalence to the US' NRCS, (National Resources Conservation Service). They provide reports for areas of land: their forage growth rates and what species of forage. The NRCS produces resources that explain how one may determine forage rates themselves. Going by all average forage rates, for a good productive land like the American SE, a year round average of ac/mo, (how many pounds of good forage will grow on an acre in a month), is 1000#, and again...this is slightly liberal. Plus, the herder will need to make adjustments per the season, due to heavy fluctuation, but it's an average.

The NRCS advises, (as does everyone expert in grazing, supply rates, and the real dangers of over grazing), that 50% of the land's Forage Rate be used and then letting it grow back. A ruminant, in general will consume 3-4% its body weight, per day, in forage, and the simplest equation for its consumption for a month is "body weight" x 1.2#. If an AU is 1,000#, we can figure an AU for eating 1,200# forage per month. This will require 2 acres, (at the average forage growth rate), per AU, (1,000 pounds of ruminant animal), per month. Now, it is quite true that many good areas of growth can produce 2,000+ # forage in the middle of summer; however, this does swing hard in the winter, even in more tropical areas, and the more tropical an area, (like say the Eastern Mediterranean), the more concerns there are about heat stress on the ruminants. An average Texas rancher, for example, will figure a 1,000 steer, (1 AU), for 20 acres, for the year, plus supplements.

The Patriarchs clearly did not over graze, as they remained in the same areas throughout their initial time in $\aleph\iota\omicron\aleph_{3667}$ [k-noan]. From the movements described by them, in the Bible, they were conscious about keeping their ruminants on good forage land for the appropriate time. Now view **Table 5**, "KNON Growth Chart".

The % growth rate is 1.5% lower than their time in $\aleph\iota\omicron\aleph_{4714}$ [m~ts-reem]. The pounds of livestock needed were carefully calculated with earlier tables. The pounds of livestock is then reduced to AUs and in the last column the amount of acreage needed per month is represented in square miles. Note that the end number, (of sq/mi needed), after 215 years in $\aleph\iota\omicron\aleph_{3667}$ [k-noan], is 907.3, and that's for one month!

I've taken the liberty of also providing maps of Palestine and Egypt and applying circles of the appropriate sq/mi. I've also shown that same amount in a country like America. You need to stay with this train of thought and sound reason, so to help you understand the reality of these kinds of numbers and their probability, (especially when you have so many people to perform all the tasks of herding, care-taking, culling, building, ect.), I'll note the largest private ranch in America. This is, of course, now that the unlawful acquisition of so much land by the Federal Government has restricted what was once free range grazing land. The squeeze that these evil practices of the Fed, (in conjunction with UNESCO), have put on is what makes it necessary for places like the King Ranch, and most herdsmen, to have one place to graze all their cattle. Located outside Kingsville, Texas, (near Corpus Cristi), the King Ranch sits on 825,000 acres. That's 1,289 square miles of one location grazing.

I know that even pointing this out, and alerting the reader to the fact that there are many other enormous ranches like this one, in the US, may not stop a degree of immediate cognitive

dissonance, (the Waggoner Ranch, for instance, boasts over 8,000,000 pounds of just cattle and horses and over 800 continuous sq/mi land). You must also remember that **ሂሂሂሂ**³⁰⁶⁸ [ye-oo-eh] is building a nation from the seed of **ሂሂሂሂ**⁸⁵, [ab-rem] and the amount of non Israelite people's that came out with them, from **ሙረረ**⁴⁷¹⁴ [m~ts-reem], would be staggering. These would have been the non **ሂሂሂሂ**³⁴⁷⁸ [y~sh-ral] peoples...(many of whom would have been with them from the start). Others would even become part of a tribe...like Caleb son of Jephunneh the Kenizzite, (which is an unacceptable transliteration, but I digress). The models we've been programmed with must be abandoned if we are to see what the Bible is, in fact, telling us.

Adding it up and considering all perspectives

There will, most certainly, be radical nay-sayers right out of the gate. I expect that. Remember, that model that's been engrained in our minds is there deliberately. I would recommend, for starters, that everyone read Ashraf Ezzat's "Egypt Knew no Pharaohs nor Israelites", to begin gaining an idea of how it could be that the lands we've been conditioned to believe ARE the "Promised Land" and surrounding areas cannot be. I also don't expect this paper to be the only source utilized for rethinking it all, but my hopes are it will be a positive building block in the ultimate case to prove not only where the events of the Bible transpired, but also who the Israelites were and are. (incidentally, Dr. Ezzat and I have presently come to different conclusions on the actual locale of Bible events; however, that may someday change. We ARE, though, in total agreement on the reality that the events described in the Bible could not possibly have taken place where most people currently *believe* they did.)

Many can also point out how a land can dictate the growth of a herd based on available forage, water, weather, ect., but as I've stated, we are given no indication that these things were limiting factors. **ሂሂ**³⁸⁷⁶ [loot] and **ሂሂሂ**¹⁸⁷ [ab-r~m] had to separate...true, but that the, "land was unable to bear them" (Gen 13:6), is not to imply there was any defect to the land. Note that in the next verse we read that the **ካካ**³⁶⁶⁹ [k-no-nee] and **ሂሂ**⁶⁵²² [p-r~z-ee] were also in the land. My response to that information is to take it as, "besides the issues they are already dealing with, (the conflicts of their herdsman), those other peoples were in close proximity to them, as well.". The terrain, (not forage supply rate), is also a likely issue, as anyone can study the area between **ሂሂ**¹⁰⁰⁸ [beeth al] and **ካካ**⁵⁸⁵⁷ [oy] and see that they would be on the slopes of at least one mountain, which is not highly advantageous for grazing. The exact reason for going back there, (if any exists other than **ሂሂሂ**⁸⁵ [ab-rem] having an altar built there), is not known.

For any who would persistently argue that, "Although it's true, there must have been a thousand or so people, on the move and therefore living off the produce of their livestock, or selling it and consuming various other foods procured from the sale or trade, there's no hard evidence that they grew in the way you're presenting it." My answer would be, "I've already shown verses stating that every Patriarch, (and the 12), were continually growing in size and wealth, but yes, there is much more to prove such a growth rate.", "here are a few":

1) **ሂሂ**⁸²⁸³ [sh-reh] dies in **ሂሂሂ**²²⁷⁵, [h-b~r-oon] (Gen 23:1-2). About this time, **ሂሂሂ**⁸⁵ [ab-rem] is staying at **ሂሂሂ**⁸⁸⁴, [bar sh-bow] or at least not at **ሂሂሂ**²²⁷⁵ [h-b~r-oon]. In verse 4, he asks to purchase the cavern of **ሂሂሂ**⁴³⁷⁵ [m~k-p~l-eh] from a **ሂሂ**²⁸⁵⁰ [h~th-ee], so he may bury her, "out of his sight". In just 3 years, **ሂሂ**³³²⁷ [y~ts-h~q] is dwelling at **ሂሂሂ**²⁴⁶², [bar l-hee ray], while **ሂሂሂ**⁸⁵ [ab-rem] is elsewhere. In Gen 35, **ሂሂ**³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b] journeys from **ሂሂ**⁷⁹²⁸, [sh-k~m], (where he had bought land after he built a house and stables elsewhere: **ሂሂ**⁵⁵²³, [s-k~th]), **ሂሂሂ**¹⁶⁸³, [d-boo-reh], **ሂሂሂ**⁷²⁵⁹ [r~b-qeh] nurse dies at **ሂሂ**¹⁰⁰⁸ [beeth al]. Later, in 35, we see **ሂሂ**³³²⁷ [y~ts-h~q] dwelling near **ሂሂሂ**²²⁷⁵ [h-b~r-oon] in his old age. Later, **ሂሂ**³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b] is dwelling near **ሂሂሂ**²²⁷⁵ [h-b~r-oon], thinking his sons to be grazing in

WY⁷⁹²⁸ [sh-k~m], he sends ZY³¹³⁰ [yoo-s~p], but he finds they are grazing in a place called AX¹⁸⁸⁶.

What does all this mean? It shows a clear progression of land acquisition and greater division by the Patriarchs, attempting to keep their ever increasing numbers, (of people and livestock), spread out enough to accommodate them all.

2) In Gen 26, it is said that the JLWX⁶⁴³⁰ [p~l-sh~th-eem], envied ZY³³²⁷ [y~ts-h~q]. YLR¹⁸⁵ [ab-rem] ZY³³²⁷ [y~ts-h~q], and ZO³²⁹⁰ [yoh-q~b] all dwelt, at many times, near other peoples. It's clear those peoples were often not overly friendly towards them, but not once did any try killing them and taking what was theirs, (which was envied by others). Why? They were a formidable company of people amidst all these YO³⁶⁶⁹ [k-no-nee]. And what of the incidents where both YLR¹⁸⁷ [ab-r~m] and ZY³³²⁷ [y~ts-h~q] tell their wives to say "he is my brother" to the MR⁴⁷¹³ [m~ts-ree] or to the JLWX⁶⁴³⁰ [p~l-sh~th-ee]? In the case of the MR⁴⁷¹³ [m~ts-ree], WR⁸²⁹⁷ [sh-ree] is taken by RO⁶⁵⁴⁷, ([p-roh]...a title of their king). In the case of the JLWX⁶⁴³⁰ [p~l-sh~th-ee], she is taken by YL⁴⁰, ([ah-bee-m-l~k]...a title of their king).

They are noticed by the kings of these two countries. A small band will not attract the attention of the king. We don't know what customs these two nations had that dictated their actions, which were obviously common knowledge to YLR¹⁸⁵ [ab-rem], but it's reasonable to think YLR¹⁸⁵ [ab-rem] feared they would kill him subtly, (perhaps poisoning or assassin). They were in the territory of those kings...those people...all they need do is kill them all and take what was theirs. Why didn't they? Not out of ethics. And who says it's unethical, amongst nations, to defeat an invader and take what's theirs? No...they were a large company of people and these were very broad places.

Incidentally, there was no shortage of other peoples living in and around YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]. All of these peoples, being strangers to the Patriarchs, were a potential threat. So, how many various peoples were there in this land of YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]?

QZ⁷⁰¹⁷ ([qee-nee], tr. Kenite. Descendants of "Cain")

QZ⁷⁰⁷⁴ ([q-n~z-ee], tr. Kenezite or Kenizzites. No lineage given.)

QD⁶⁹³⁵ ([q~d-m~n-ee], tr. Kadmonites. No lineage given. Same as 6931. An Ancient tribe(s))

EX²⁸⁵⁰ ([h~th-ee], tr. Hittite. 2nd son of YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]. No proof of relationship to Turkish Hittite)

JRZ⁶⁵²² ([p-r~z-ee], tr. Perizzite. No lineage given. Poss. related to 6518-21.)

RJY⁷⁴⁹⁷ ([r~p-ah-eem], tr. giants, Rephaim. No lineage given. Poss. related to 7495-root, and 7496)

YMR⁵⁶⁷ ([am-r-ee], tr. Amorite. Son (or tribe from) YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]. Listed fourth of descendents.)

YO³⁶⁶⁹ ([k-no-nee], tr. Canaanite. E²⁵²⁶ [h~m] 4th son or resident of YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]: broad spectrum)

GRW¹⁶²² ([g~r-g~sh-ee], tr. Girgashite or Girgasite. Son (or tribe from) YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]. Listed fifth of descendents.)

ZLY²⁹⁸³ ([yeb-oo-see], tr. Jebusite. Son (or tribe from) YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]. Listed third of descendents.)

JLWX⁶⁴³⁰ ([p~l-sh~th-eem]. tr. Philistine. Defined as people from Caphtor, (Crete). Baseless claim)

YD⁶⁷²² (tsee-d~n-eem], tr. Sidonian. 1st born of YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan]. Occupied very large area.)

OML⁶⁰⁰³ (ohm-l~q-ee], tr. Amalekite. This one is not the son of OW⁶²¹⁵ [oh-shoo]. No lineage given. Old nation.)

WYR¹⁶⁵¹ ([g~sh-ur-ee], tr. Geshuri or Geshurites. No lineage given. Old nation near YO³⁶⁶⁷ [k-noan].)

ZR¹⁵¹¹ ([g~z-ree], tr. Gezrites. No lineage given. Not the same as 1507. Old nation.)

ZYZ²¹⁰⁴ ([zoo-zeem], tr. Zuzim. No lineage given. Some lived in Y¹⁹⁹⁰ [em].)

𐤅𐤌𐤌𐤌₃₆₈ ([ah-meem], tr. Emims. No lineage given. Called 𐤓𐤓₇₄₉₆ [r-pah] like 𐤐𐤓𐤌𐤌₆₀₆₂ [oh-n~q-eem])

𐤐𐤓𐤌𐤌₆₀₆₂ ([oh-n~q-eem], tr. Anakims. No lineage given. Said to be 𐤓𐤌₇₃₁₁ [r~m]=lofty, great and broad.)

𐤁𐤓₂₇₅₂ ([h-ree]. tr. Horite. No lineage given. Called "cave dwellers". 𐤁𐤓₂₇₁₅ [h~r]=nobles.)

𐤁𐤏₂₃₄₀ ([hoo-ee], tr. Hivite. Son (or tribe from) 𐤅𐤓𐤓₃₆₆₇ [k-noan]. Listed sixth of descendents.)

𐤏𐤏₅₅₁₃ ([see-nee], tr. Sinite. Son (or tribe from) 𐤅𐤓𐤓₃₆₆₇ [k-noan]. Listed eighth of descendents. Probably related to 5512, 5514, 5515.)

𐤁𐤌𐤏₂₅₇₇ ([h-m~th-ee], tr. Hamathite. Son (or tribe from) 𐤅𐤓𐤓₃₆₆₇ [k-noan]. Listed eleventh of descendents. From 2574. Probably also related to 2575-6.)

𐤏𐤓₆₈₇₆ ([ts~r-ee]. tr. Tyrian. No lineage given. Close nation and city in 𐤓𐤏𐤌₅₃₂₁ [n~p-th~l-ee]. Related, at least, to 6865)

I'm sure I am forgetting a few. All these peoples were formidable. All were "strangers" to the Patriarchs. Any could have just taken what was theirs and killed all the men and no 𐤅𐤓𐤓₃₆₆₉ [k-no-nee] would bat an eye at it. Maybe we can trust that since only 5 years in the land 𐤅𐤓𐤓₁₈₇ [ab-r~m] had enough fighting men to take on the 4 kings of Gen 14:1, (who were beating everyone else they came against), that as they grew and grew, (and there's ample textual proof they did just that), that all the surrounding peoples would not be too quick to attack them.

Aha! But what about Gen 34:30, "And Jacob said to Simeon and Levi, Ye have troubled me to make me to stink among the inhabitants of the land, among the Canaanites and the Perizzites: and I being few in number, they shall gather themselves together against me, and slay me; and I shall be destroyed, I and my house."? (kjv) Yes, "Jacob" does say "I, being few in number", but if he was so few in number, why would these peoples have to gather themselves against him? And, does anyone think "Levi" and "Simeon" killed all those men by themselves? Remember, the Bible is talking about a certain family of people... most times, all the other peoples with them will not be mentioned. Also, 𐤏𐤓₃₂₉₀ [yoh-q~b] had not yet come into his inheritance.

3) According to [wikipedia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_population), and various other mainstream census and demographics entities, the world population was 1 billion in 1804, and 7.6 billion as of May 1, 2018. If we plug the numbers into our population growth rate equation, (from above), that number turns out to be at an average 3% growth rate, and even though the 𐤏𐤓𐤓₃₄₈₁ [y~sh-ral] enjoyed a far higher growth rate during their 215 years in 𐤌𐤏𐤓₄₇₁₄ [m~ts-reem], in the spirit of giving Palestine every advantage, (actually the PIPL people are getting the advantage...I've got a feeling that Palestine, Egypt, and every land and people remotely near the State of "Israel" would forfeit all these "advantages" for a little freedom from terror), we used the same 3% growth rate on **Table 5** spreadsheet, "KNON growth chart". Keep in mind, in the last 215 years of world history, there have been many of the aforementioned aggravating factors to quell the population which were NOT present in the Patriarch's camp. So...how much fooling around, against common averages and multiple verses telling us plainly that they were growing and increasing abundantly, does anyone expect we do to make a land that cannot fit this narrative fit?

4) Look at a map of Egypt and Palestine. Now read Exo 3:8, "And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites.". The 𐤐𐤓₅₆₈₀ [oh-b~ree] for "a good land and a large", is 𐤏𐤓₂₈₉₆ [too-beh] 𐤏𐤓₇₃₄₂ [oo r-h~b-eh], or, "goodly and wide". There is a comparison being drawn here from the land they are in, (which we are all told is Egypt), to the land where they are going, (which we are all told is Palestine). Look back at your map of Egypt and Palestine. Maybe 𐤏𐤓₃₀₆₈ [ye-oo-eh] was confused?

In conclusion

The preceding information was based mainly on an angle of demographics and livestock management. The very same book of Genesis can be, and should be, examined from a geographical, topographical, economical, cultural, linguistic, zoological, anthropological, and, of course, a Theological/Spiritual angle... or, at least, these angles for starters. Most self-professed "Christians" have a very superficial and myopic approach to Bible study. The, "Me Me Me", approach will never search out the deliberate, age-old secrets stored in scripture. The days of Simple Simon criticizing those who go deep as being "Gnostic", (as if "to know" should ever be a pejorative), must come to an end.

Our world is slipping into a very dark time. I place a great deal of blame on the "feel good Daily Devotional" Christian. Whomever convinced us that the more ignorant we become the more righteousness we've attained, was not teaching from the Bible. The one who teaches, "my people perish for a lack of knowledge", is a true shepherd indeed. We ALL must end our phobias concerning examination of the Bible and the world around us. We must consider many perspectives and peruse dissenting arguments. All of us have work to do in the days ahead.

I have examined the Patriarchs as I see them truly described. At this point I still feel that I am lacking. The richness of the text throughout Genesis alone is enough to gain untold wealth in wisdom and knowledge. There are still a myriad of answers to historical questions waiting in the pages of Scripture. Someone has decided to present the Bible to us as a "dead book". This is, of course, by design, and will not last. I invite all to examine my research for its strengths and flaws and to join the few of us laboring at understanding, in some way. The layers of distortion and deception aimed at our understanding of the Bible go deep: very deep and span centuries.

Concerning my conclusions stated above... the fact is, there are many elements one can point out, (even without doing any $\text{O}^{\text{L}}\text{R}^{\text{Z}}_{5680}$ [oh-b~ree] word studies), that illustrate plainly that the land of the Bible is not, and never was, the land of Palestine, Egypt, or the Middle East. This is precisely what we at the OBRY projekt will demonstrate. The Bible is a book written to a different people than today's "Jews", focusing on a different land than today's Palestine, Egypt, and the Middle East, with an obviously different eschatology. And what's the positive side of this revelation? Who are the people, what is the land, what does it all mean? It will all be revealed in time.

Additional information links:

Various articles on heat stress concerning ruminants around the Mediterranean:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41393970_Effect_of_heat_stress_on_production_in_Mediterranean_dairy_sheep

<https://www.dairyschool.co.il/the-sheep-and-goat-industry-in-israel/>

Livestock, Stocking Rates, Forage Growth Rates:

https://texnat.tamu.edu/files/2010/09/managing_livestock_stocking_rates_on_rangeland.pdf

https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb1097070.pdf

https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/ne/range_and_pasture_technical_note_11.pdf

Demographic References:

<https://www.worldatlas.com/>

<http://www.worldometers.info/>

