

# **WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER**

Monthly Letter #119; March, 2008 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)-435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

## **TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS**

### **A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION**

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.  
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

### **A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER**

This is my one hundred and nineteenth monthly teaching letter and continues my tenth year of publication. Once teaching letter #120 has been completed, it will mark ten years of publication. As I have stated before, when one learns the Israel Identity message, one must wipe their mind entirely clean of everything that he thought he knew and start all over again. With this lesson, we'll consider just such a cleansing of the mind, where some fail to comprehend the true context of both Biblical and historical evidence. Really, there is no conflict between the two once certain evidence is reconciled. Some of the people who establish incorrect premises are those who advocate the Septuagint-only for the study of the Old Testament. While the Septuagint is a valuable tool, it isn't perfect in all aspects, as some assert. One proponent of the Septuagint-only (whom will not be named here) took issue with William Finck on several topics. William intends to address several of those misconceptions once he is released from prison. (With this teaching letter, I will also tie-in this subject with the writings of the apostle Paul.) The following is a duplication of Finck's letter, excluding the recipient's name, to this Septuagint-only proponent, which cites only a few of the problems which could be addressed:

\*\*\*\*\*

4th February 08, Dear *Sir*, Greetings. I have your lengthy and critical letter of November 30th [2007] before me. I am not going to respond to the bulk of it at this point, although I am optimistic that if I chose to do so, I may have done so effectively. I only refrain because there seems to be deep fundamental differences in our beliefs, far beyond the use of labels and titles, especially concerning the Aryan peoples of Europe. Without resolving those deeper differences, nearly everything which follows is either irreconcilable, or not worth reconciling.

I knew when I had read your first letter that you were influenced by V.S. Herrell, whom both Clifton and I consider to be a man of many errors. I'm not necessarily referring to errors in translation, but fundamental errors in the interpretation of both history and prophecy. Neither shall I even begin to address these here. Our differences with Herrell are something which I've long hoped to address once I get out, and can get

to a computer. That shall hopefully, be by the end of this year, and can't be much later by any means.

One thing which I am writing to address here is your statement that “[my] ... insisting that Phoenicians were somehow Israelites ... is historically ridiculous and contrary to scripture”. You go on to cite Genesis chapter 10 as proof that Sidon, “the main Phoenician city”, was a Canaanite city, and you say that “since Phoenicia was a geographic term it [the LXX use of the term] poses no problem”. Here I shall discuss these statements.

The term “Phoenician”, and related terms, do not appear in ANY literature, or in any known inscriptions, before the time of Homer. Examining the term in Liddell & Scott, it is also a decidedly Greek term, with a clear etymology. It can be established that Homer wrote circa 690 B.C., and that the main event which he wrote about, the Trojan war, probably occurred about 1185 B.C. Homer being the first writer which we have to mention the Phoenicians, these dates are very important in understanding the context in which the label was applied.

You have cited Genesis chapter 10 to prove that Sidon was a Canaanite city. That is obvious, and indeed it was. So was Jerusalem, originally, and many other of the cities of Palestine later inhabited by Israelites. Homer mentioned Sidon, although he evidently never mentioned Tyre, at least in the works that we have. Other contemporary writers did mention Tyre, albeit in a later historical context than the Trojan war. Tyre is found in ancient Akkadian texts, where the old mainland city is called Ushu. The Genesis 10 account represents the Adamic world as it stood circa 3000 B.C., some time after the flood of Noah, according to the LXX chronology (of course), which puts the flood at circa 3245 B.C. Yet having cited Genesis, do you have faith in the subsequent books of the Bible?

In the LXX, at Joshua 19:28-29, we see that the borders of the land which fell to the tribe of Asher included “the Tyrians” and went “to great Sidon”. At Joshua 19:35, we see that Naphtali also inherited “the walled cities of the Tyrians” and “Tyre”. That Asher surely did occupy the coasts of their allotted territory is evident later, at Judges 5:17: “... and why does Dan remain in ships? Aser sat down on the sea-coasts, and he will tabernacle at his ports.” Here, in the context of “sea-coasts”, it was quite fair of Brenton to render  $\delta\iota\epsilon\zeta\acute{o}\delta\omicron\iota\varsigma$  as “ports”. Elsewhere in Joshua and Judges, where the cities of Palestine from which the Canaanites were not driven out are listed, Tyre is not mentioned among them. Although Canaanite “Sidonians” are mentioned as having remained, at Judges 3:3, that does not mean that they were not displaced from the city Sidon, and it can surely be shown that Israelites did inhabit the city (i.e. 2 Kings [2 Sam. in the A.V.] 24:6, where Sidon is even distinguished from the Canaanite cities).

Now the Israelite conquest of the land of Canaan took place from approximately 1400 to 1350 B.C., in the main, and sporadically after that, and we know that pockets of Canaanites remained and were never entirely exterminated. Yet with the children of Israel occupying Tyre, Sidon, and the other towns of “Phoenicia” some generations before [the events about which] Homer wrote, just who were the “Phoenicians” that Homer wrote about?

Later, when the prophets forewarned Israel about the coming judgment, Tyre was lamented by Ezekiel. Tyre had supplanted Sidon as the “main Phoenician city” within a short time after the island city was built, which Josephus enables us to date to around 1240 B.C. Speaking to the “house of Israel”, Amos says “Therefore thus saith the Lord God; O Tyre, thy land shall be made desolate round about ...” (Amos 3:1, 11). Likewise, speaking to Israel, Micah says: “And thy cities shall be leveled, and parted among the Assyrians; and thy strong cities shall be parted from Tyre to the river ...” (Micah 7:12).

Tyre, the great “Phoenician” city, was indeed an Israelite city in its most glorious period, which the Greeks wrote of with awe. The “golden age” of Phoenicia corresponded with the very same time when the Bible tells us that Israelites inhabited those cities. Why, *Sir*, do you not believe the Bible? Surely your error is caused – at least in part – by the fact that the LXX translators in many places read “Canaanite” from the Hebrew text, and then errantly wrote “Phoenician” in Greek! **Yet the term “Phoenician” exists nowhere at the time of Joshua or the Judges period, which the LXX translation followed by over a thousand years!** For the LXX translators to have rendered “Canaanite” as “Phoenician” is misleading, at best. It is as if, for example, in translating Mayan texts from a thousand years ago, one should write “Mexican” wherever the name “Mayan” appears. Or, writing a history of the pre-Columbian Mohawk indians, one should call them “New Yorkers”! Surely you may see the false conclusions that this may lead one to believe. Another place where the LXX contains a similar gloss is at Judges 1:27, which contains the interpolation “which is a city of Scythians” in reference to Baethsan (or Beth-shan). Now it is well known, being recorded by the Greeks, that Scythians invaded Palestine in the late 7th century B.C., around the time of the fall of Nineveh, and for some time had a settlement at Beth-shan, which for this reason was called Scythopolis by the Greeks. Yet the LXX gloss would lead one to believe that perhaps Scythians dwelt in Palestine in the time of the Judges period! Such is quite impossible, since at that early time there were NO Scythians!

While “Phoenicia” was later used as a geographical term, and after the Assyrian and Babylonian deportations of Israel many of the inhabitants who remained in “Phoenicia” were indeed Canaanites, **the famous Phoenicians of antiquity certainly were NOT Canaanites but Israelites.** These ancient “Phoenicians” colonized Thessaly, Thebes in Greece, Crete, Cyprus, Cilicia, Caria and the famous city Miletus, Sicily, places in Italy, Sardinia, the coasts and river valleys of France and Spain, Britain, Ireland, and north Africa. Much of this colonization was done incrementally. For example, the Milesians had colonies throughout Europe, notably in Spain and Ireland, along the Danube river, and around the shores of the Black Sea. The Greeks and Romans consistently describe them as fair and blond. Famous Greeks such as Thales and Minos were called Phoenicians, a label which also clung to the Thebans. While it is very likely that the Phoenician colonists of Europe had some Canaanites among them, both slaves and merchants, it is certain that the Phoenicians of the colonizing period were indeed Israelites. If you still disagree with this, I challenge you to write a scholarly paper to refute it! Insisting that the ancient Phoenicians were Canaanites, and not

Israelites, is to follow the Jewish version of history, which allows them to continue masquerading as Israelites.

It may be of interest to note here that the early Greeks, those preceding the Hellenistic period, never used the terms “Israel”, “Judah”, et al. The Levant was called Palestine, or Phoenicia, or Syria, depending on the context. The Greek terms Τύρος (Tyre) and Συρία (Syria) were each derived from the same Hebrew term, TSOR, as even Rawlinson notes in his edition of Herodotus. Herodotus referred to the Judaeans (Judahites and others who had returned from captivity) as the “Syrians of Palestine”, even describing the pre-deportation battle between the Israelites and Egypt (cf. 2 Chron. 35:20 ff.), which he gave an account of in his histories.

You also follow the Jews – as all mainstream academia does – by distinguishing “Indo-European” and “Semitic” languages. The Jews have gone to great lengths to ensure that this distinction is maintained. Yet, aside from having suffered much distortion at the hands of the early Talmudists, the Hebrew language has all of the features which would enable it to be classified as Indo-European. There are also hundreds of Greek and Latin words, many of them quite rudimentary, which clearly have their origin in Hebrew. Off the top of my head I can supply ἀγορά, βῆμα, ἀγρός, ἥλιος, ταῦρος, ὄμηρος, χώρα, χόλη, and χάραξ; avarus, adorea, cavus, cupa, erectus, plaga, manere, massa, moneta, mutare, negare, terminus, and tumere. All of these, and many more, have counterpart Hebrew words, similar in sound and related in meaning. This is not a coincidence, and these are not “loan words”. I have also found cognates of some Greek words in Akkadian, another “Semitic” language (i.e. ἀνά, ἄνω, σιγή, σιγάω), and hope one day to be able to examine an Akkadian lexicon, in pursuit of other such words.

While there certainly were White men in Europe, other branches of the Adamic race who migrated out of the Near East – even beyond the points recorded in Genesis chapter 10 – long before Abraham’s time, that doesn’t mean that those early emigrants are the ancestors of the tribes we later know as Kelts, Germans, Scandinavians, or others who dwell in Europe now, although in part some of them may be. Just as the ancient gravesites of the Mohawk valley don’t really belong to “New Yorkers”, old graves found in Britain – such as the “Amesbury Archer” – don’t necessarily belong to the Kelts! For my part, I am quite certain that the primary ancestors of today’s Keltic and Germanic Europeans, along with those of the formerly White southern Europeans of Greece, Italy and Spain, were indeed the Hebrew Israelites of the Bible, whether Danaan Greeks, Phoenicians, Trojan Dardans, Dorian Greeks, or the Kimmerians or Scythians who emerged from the Assyrian deportations of Israel and Judah. I can debate the fact of these White migrations with anyone, including V.S. Herrell, using the Bible, the Classical poets and historians, and archaeological findings as my foundation. Generally, I stay away from modern history books, because they have all been unduly influenced by the thinking and assertions of the Jews, and so their vision of the past is clouded.

Anyone looking for the origins of our Aryan race outside of the pages of the Old Testament, and outside of the ancient Near East, is deceived. The original Hebrews – our ancestors – along with their Persian, Aramaean, and Assyrian cousins – all Semites

– were all wholly just as “Aryan” as we are. The so-called “Semites” of today are all truly Canaanites, each with various admixtures of several other races. Hence the term “arab”, a Hebrew word which means “mixed”.

Anyone claiming to be a Christian, who cannot find his ancestors in the Israelites of the Old Testament, is also deceived. The New Testament is a matter of prophecy (Jer. 31) and is a covenant of God made only with Israel. Christ came not for “Aryan man”, but for the descendants of the Old Testament Israelites – **ONLY!** But of course, the Israelites are indeed Aryan.

Unless we can agree on these basic precepts, *Sir*, we can agree on nothing which follows. While this situation may be unfortunate, unless you have read and can cite the Classics which I have read and do cite, and the books of ancient inscriptions, and see what they say firsthand, I do not understand how you could venture to either condemn or refute me. Simply reading Homer, Aeschylus and Virgil, and then the ancient Akkadian and Sumerian myths which are extant, should lead one to discover that all four cultures: Babylonian and Assyrian (both “Semitic”) and Greek and Roman (both “Indo-European”), have religious beliefs quite consistent with the Hebrew, with the addition of the pantheons of false gods, as the Hebrew Scriptures said that they had! On this note, I will leave this discussion until you choose to respond. I will make a few short remarks concerning some of the other points in your letter before closing.

I prefer to use the Hebrew word Y-H-V-H, Yahweh, the word which the LXX translators usually rendered Κύριος, rather than “Lord” – not because it is a proper personal name – I never said it was – but because it is formed from an ancient verb which in essence means ἐγώ εἰμί, or “I AM”. I thought that I made this clear in my first letter. When Josephus wrote that the word Yahweh could be spelled with four vowels (although he did not provide the word himself), he was writing in Greek, and he meant Greek vowels! So even though I know that you do not accept as much, we are closer than you think on this issue. It amazes me that you so wantonly slander Josephus, who was a full-blooded Levite and no Canaanite, as a “Judaizing kike”. While he had the misfortune of being born in Judaea (Galilee, actually) which had already rejected and crucified Christ, and having been educated as a Pharisee, many good men had been Pharisees. That doesn’t make any of them “kikes”. Your condemnation is far too harsh and without merit.

N.T. passages at Matt. 2:18 (Jer. 31[38]:15) and Matt. 8:17 (Isa. 53:4) are but two examples of quotes of the O.T. where the N.T. text is very similar to the Masoretic, and not the Septuagint. There are others, and not because of some chance occurrence in paraphrasing – the differences in the passages provided here are obviously due to reasons other than that. There are – like the Hebrew – many differences among various LXX manuscripts, enough that no LXX manuscript can possibly be selected and anointed as being representative of “the” inspired O.T. Furthermore, it is quite obnoxious of you to assert that any translation by men – no matter how learned – could be as perfect as the original words of the original language. While the Hebrew texts are indeed corrupted, and even before the LXX was translated, they still cannot be easily discarded, and there are many clear instances where their value is fully demonstrated. While the early Christian leaders naturally favored the LXX, since the apostles

obviously used versions of it often, and since their whole world, for the most part, already spoke Greek, aside from the jews' being generally and rightfully despised, it is nevertheless quite foolish to toss out all O.T. versions besides the LXX. The LXX certainly has its flaws, in areas not only of translation, but in the prophets, where much room is open to interpretation while translating, and where certain Hebrew idioms appear, which don't translate so readily into the Greek and which the LXX renders poorly in places. It is a silly thing to hate all things Hebrew because of hatred for the jews. The jews are not Hebrew – they are Canaanite usurpers who have absconded all things Hebrew! In the same manner, they have taken grasp of and perverted all things “American” today.

Neither are the Dead Sea Scrolls “Jewish”, in spite of what the jews claim. Rather, they are Judaeans, and there is a difference. If you would read Josephus, and reconcile the history of Judaea with certain N.T. passages, such as are found in John 8 and Romans 9, you may realize as much. The jews descended primarily from the Edomite-Canaanite converts to Judaism, which is a corruption of the O.T. religion of the Israelites, which I prefer to label as Hebrewism. White Judaeans, true Judahites, Levites, etc., who accepted Christ had for the most part left Judaea by 70 A.D., and subsequently lost their identity as Judaeans. There is truly no telling whether the Qumran sect had any Canaanites among their numbers, or whether they were indeed Essenes, who seem to have been White separatists and also among the first Christians, or, if not, who else they actually may have been. Yet the Qumran sect seems to fit the description of the “fourth sect” among the Judaeans, as described by Josephus at *Antiquities* 18.1.1, 6 (or 18:1-25).

Your statements on the organization of the Christian community and the term ἐκκλησία do not disagree in substance – so far as I can perceive – with the things detailed in my essay “Misconceptions Concerning Paul and the ‘Church’”, found in Clifton’s Watchman’s Teaching Letters #’s 107 and 108, for March and April of 2007. With this I will close ... *William Finck*

\*\*\*\*\*

As I stated above, I will now tie-in this subject of the errant position of the Septuagint-only proponents with the writings of Paul. You are already probably wondering how I am going to do this. It should be apparent here that if one relies upon only the Septuagint for one’s study of the Old Testament, one will ultimately become confused with the question of who are the true full-blooded Israelites, and who are the usurping Edomite-Canaanites pretending to be Israelites. Surely this is a dangerous position! We have the same problem today with people who don’t understand the difference. Paul knew the difference, and so should we! In fact, most of the preachers in churchianity today are doing their damndest to give our Israelite heritage to the Canaanite variety of bad-fig-jews. This is not to say that one should shun the Septuagint though, for it is also a valuable witness for arriving at the truth concerning many things.

Not only did Paul know the difference between a Canaanite and an Israelite, but Daniel also was aware of that fact, *History Of Susanna* vv. 55-57: ““ You have told a fine lie against your own life, for already the angel of God has received the sentence from

God, and he will cut you in two.’ And he (Daniel) had him removed and ordered them to bring in the other [Canaanite]. And he (Daniel) said to him, ‘ You descendant of Canaan and not of Judah, beauty has beguiled you, and desire has corrupted your heart! This is how you have been treating the daughters of [the house of] Israel, and they yielded to you through fear, but a daughter of [the house of] Judah would not endure your wickedness’ ...” (Smith & Goodspeed). [Items in brackets mine]

Surely also, Jeremiah understood the difference between Canaanites and those of pure blood of the tribe of Judah at ch. 24! Speaking of the nation of Judaea, which by the time of Christ was mostly populated (but not all) by half-breed Canaanite-Judahites, Jeremiah prophesied at 19:11: “ **And shalt say unto them, Thus saith Yahweh of hosts; Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter’s vessel, that cannot be made whole again: and they shall bury them in Tophet, till there be no place to bury.**” What is there about “cannot be made whole again” that we don’t understand? All of this happened in 70 A.D. when Titus fought against Judaea and laid siege to Jerusalem, destroying many of the seed of the serpent (half-breed Canaanites) of Genesis 3:15. Paul makes the connection and also predicted this at Romans 16:20 where he said: “ **And the God of peace shall crush Satan under your feet shortly ...**” Paul was predicting that the Romans would shortly besiege and destroy Jerusalem, along with Herod’s temple, a fulfillment of Jer. 19:11. This prophecy by Paul foresaw a fulfillment of the prophecy at Genesis 3:15; that the seed of the woman would bruise the head of the serpent. This could only mean that the Romans were of the seed of the woman, and the bad-fig-jews at Jerusalem the seed of the serpent (John 8:44).

You will notice that this is a prophecy to “Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem”. Yet further explanation is needed for the reader to thoroughly comprehend the importance of this passage. Jeremiah was not addressing all the twelve tribes of Israel, nor was he speaking of all of the original nation of Judah! We must not overlook the fact that the bulk of Judah had also been taken into the Assyrian captivity, never to return, and after Assyria left off with Judah, all that was left was the city of Jerusalem. It was, rather, addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, some of whom had mingled their blood with the Canaanites. Later, when the nation of Judah was taken captive into Babylon, most of pureblooded Judah would never return again, but follow in the footsteps of the ten northern tribes. After a remnant of the nation of Judah returned to Jerusalem from the Babylonian captivity, even more admixture of the Canaanites was added to Judah. Nevertheless, many stayed racially pure. This race-mixing process continued more and more until, at the time of Christ, there remained only a remnant in the nation of Judah with the pure blood of Judah, Benjamin and a smattering of Levites. We must also fathom that the prophecy at Jeremiah 19:1-11 of the broken-bottle nation is just the opposite in nature to the prophecy given at Jeremiah 18:1-6 of the potter and the clay, which indicates that the house of Israel would be restored, unlike the remnant nation of Judah with its inhabitants of Jerusalem, condemned never to be revived. Yahshua Christ Himself reinforced Jeremiah 19: 11 by stating at Matthew 21:19, “ **Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever.**” What is there about “ **Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever**” that we don’t understand? So both Christ and

Paul are in agreement about the Canaanite-jew seed of the serpent falsely proclaimed today by nearly all of churchianity as being God's chosen! Yes, they are chosen all right – chosen by their god, and father, Satan!

Time and time again, Paul came into contact with the Canaanite-jews, and time and time again they refused to believe that Christ was the Messiah. You may not be aware of it, but Paul launched his early ministry among the synagogues of the Judaeans. When Paul entered a new synagogue, he would always find several unbelieving Canaanite-jews with which he had to contend, but Paul also found a few believing Judahites of pure blood who gave him aid and comfort. It was only after Paul had gathered a nucleus of true-blooded Judahites that he finally took the Gospel to the lost *ethnê* (nations) of Israel. And in this process, Paul was whipped nearly to death several times, having been stoned and left for dead, beaten with rods, and suffering other adversities for the sake of the Gospel. The term "synagogue" can be found 34 times in the book of Acts, and not again until one comes to the book of Revelation, except for James 2:2 where the same Greek word translated as "assembly" in the A.V. Had Paul tried to enter the pagan temples with his Gospel message, he wouldn't have been treated any better. So Paul depended upon those few scattered true-blooded Judahites which he usually found attending the synagogues. And once he had gathered a small nucleus around him, he established an ekklesia. Actually what Paul was doing was separating the Israel-sheep from among the Canaanite-jewish-wolves. So from city to city, Paul continued on his way doing exactly this, and all the while fighting a group of devils of the likes that run organized-crime in our Israel lands today. Paul could have gone from house to house knocking on doors to organize his several ekklesias, but by entering the various synagogues, he had a ready-made nucleus of a few pureblooded Judahites willing to help spread his message. It was just a matter of culling out the good figs from among the bad figs. Have you ever noticed how, when someone finds a new product he likes so well that he decides to start selling it? Have you also noticed how that person then goes first to his relations and friends to sell that product to them? Well, that is exactly what Paul was doing, and though few, he found his relations and friends in the synagogues in those days, and he needed to get them out, away from the proselyted-Canaanites.

Now Paul, when entering a new synagogue, couldn't go in throwing his weight around like a bull in a china shop, but he had to be wise as a serpent and as gentle as a dove. And since he had been in the service of the devils at Jerusalem, he knew exactly what to expect from them – as he knew their every move and countermove. Had Paul not had this experience with these devils, they would have long since ground him up like hamburger. They almost did anyway. Now Paul could have gone into those synagogues and shouted out to them that some of the people are part Edomite and that Yahweh had an everlasting hatred for them, and he would have been telling them the truth, but Paul would deal with the Edomite question later at a proper place and time. And remember that Esau took wives of the Canaanites of the Hittite tribe. I simply don't know what it is going to take to make our people understand that when Christ told the unbelieving-jews that they were not His sheep, that they were not genetic Israelites! When Paul said "Lest there *be* any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one



morsel of meat sold his birthright” at Hebrews 12:16, he made it clear that Yahweh was not pleased with Canaanites of any genetic mixture. There are some people who can read Hebrews 12:16 and never see the Canaanite connection! Paul wasn't looking for halfbreed Edomites in those synagogues, but pureblooded Israelites! Most people, when reading Acts, put all of those people in the synagogues into one basket, both the bad-fig-jews and the good-fig-Judahites of Jeremiah 24. Jeremiah had the good sense to place them into two different baskets, so why don't we? And everyone knows that if one were to place a rotten apple into a basket of good apples, it isn't very long until they are all rotten, and I do mean genetically! And all of Esau's descendants were rotten apples, and Paul knew it.

Our purpose here is to compare how Paul discriminated Israelites from the Canaanites, and how the errors of the Septuagint confuse, by mistranslation, making Israelites to be Canaanites. This is the kind of damage that V.S. Herrell and company are spreading all around Israel Identity today. And it isn't the least bit funny! There is much, much more to be brought forward concerning the Septuagint-only advocacy, but space does not allow it. Likewise, there is much, much more to bring forward on how Paul handled the topic of the Canaanites. The problem is, Paul didn't call them Canaanites, but “dogs”, the Old Testament term for them. It is the same term that Christ used for the Canaanite woman who wanted her daughter healed. A female dog is a bitch, so the Canaanite woman's daughter was a daughter-of-a-bitch. And had the Canaanite woman had a son, you know what he would have been called! And that is exactly what all Canaanites are. I have talked to some people who believe the term “canine” is derived from Canaanite, which might be a Hebrew idiom. My *Junior Classic Latin Dictionary* has “cānis” meaning *dog; hound; parasite; dog-star*. It is interesting that in the *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon To The Old Testament* under #3611, it indicated that fierce and cruel men are sometimes called *dogs* (Ps 22:17, 23). It also takes note that in the East, at the present day, Christians are called dogs by the Mohammedans. I am sure with many the feeling is mutual! Strong's at H#3611 indicates: “(by euphemism) a male prostitute ...” Sodomites were also considered dogs, so we can see there are many shades of meaning for the term. One must remember that at Sodom they were committing both homosexual acts as well as going after “strange flesh”, which would be the mixing of races. Homosexuality, while repugnant, does not produce bastards such as Esau's descendants, but going after “strange flesh” does! In the case of homosexuality, even a White person (both male and female) can become classified as a dog. What difference is there between the events we see going on in our day and what was going on in Sodom in Lot's day? In Lot's day it was localized to a couple of cities, but today it is prevalent worldwide! And who's promoting it? Of course, the Canaanites! And they still measure up to be comparable with dogs. And churchianity continues to claim that the Canaanite-bastard-dogs are “God's chosen people”!

In the next issue of the *Watchman's Teaching Letter*, #120, we will look further into some of the tragic errors which the LXX translators brought about. Tragic, for even today they haven't been corrected, and time and again several misleading conclusions are unwittingly repeated and passed along as fact. But don't let this deter you from

purchasing a LXX, for in other places it clears up much confusion. Just be very careful to avoid the misleading errors it contains! I am simply amazed at some of the conclusions arrived at by those who advocate a single Bible, and ignore all other evidence.