

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #39; July, 2001 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)-435-2836

## **ISRAEL COVENANT TWO SEEDLINE RACIAL IDENTITY**

### **AN ANGLO-ISAAC-SON CAUCASIAN CULTURE AWARENESS TEACHING LETTER**

#### **A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER**

This is my thirty-ninth monthly teaching letter and continues my fourth year of publication. Since the time I completed my thirty-eighth letter for June, there continues to be more information in the way of archaeology being found concerning Egypt. The latest production on television was entitled *Egypt Beyond The Pyramids* on the History Channel. I found it very interesting when they portrayed Ramesses II The Great with an oversized Hittite hooked nose. This background relationship has been substantiated by information I have presented in past letters. If you have a copy of Howard B. Rand's *Primo-genesis*, you can turn to plate 11 at the end of the book, and it will show that both Ramesses I and Ramesses II (The Great) of the Nineteenth Dynasty were related to Esau through Duke Amalek whose mother was Timna (a wife) to Eliphaz from Adah, one of the Horite-Hittite wives of Esau. I don't know where Rand got his documentation on this, but it sure fits the overall picture. With Ramesses II having that big oversized hooked nose, we don't have to guess as to what Esau's non-Semitic wives looked like. This is what was said concerning Ramesses II The Great by one of the narrators on the recent television program *Egypt Beyond The Pyramids*: **"Anybody who has seen a photograph of the mummy of Ramesses [meaning Ramesses II, The Great], or even in fact a representation of him in Egyptian art, recognizes the fact that he was shown with a very prominent nose. And that might be one of the anatomical features we could look for in trying to determine relationships."** While Rand believes that Merenptah, son Ramesses II, was the Pharaoh at the time of the Exodus, he was probably much too late in history to fit that role. Also, because there was approximately four hundred years between Esau and Ramesses II, there would have to have been several generations in-between. If you have a copy of the book *Mummies Myth And Magic*, by Christine El Mahdy, turn to page 89 and see an X-ray of Ramesses II (The Great) mummy's huge, conspicuous, oversized and unmistakable hooked nose.

#### **NOTE ABOUT SOME OF THE QUOTATIONS I USE**

It has come to my attention that there are some delusory (misleading) premises concerning some of the materials I quote from time to time. I would like to make it clear, I do not agree entirely 100% with every quote I use. Usually there are one or more points in the quotation which I want to zero in upon. If you have been taking every

quotation I use as being infallible truth, this is not the impression I wanted to foster. I am sure, if I could somehow comprehend how my readers are taking each individual thing I am writing, I could adjust for it and make my composing much clearer. I believe the following very helpful letter from one of my proofreaders will serve as an inspiration to everyone concerning this:

“29 May 01, Dear Mr. Emahiser, Hello! I probably should have had a letter concerning the Philistines off to you last week. I did spend quite a bit of time reading what little I could about them then, but still haven’t accomplished all that I would like to on the subject. However the need for me to do this presently is not an urgent one, since several key passages from the Bible, along with one of your recent newsletters, should be all that is needed in order for me to convey the message that I’d like to.

“I am somewhat disadvantaged, not being able to save copies of any of the material that I proofread for you, but I’m certain that I made a short note concerning the Philistines when I saw a quote from a source which used the term ‘Canaanite-Philistines’, on at least one occasion. I felt that this term was quite misleading since, although Canaanites lived among the Philistines, the Philistines surely were not Canaanites.

“In your January Newsletter, #33, on the last page you presented information concerning the Philistines and Caphtor, much of it is from H. Rand and new to me, which I found to be quite enlightening and certainly not disagreeable even though the actual evidence is quite meager. Not much is said in the Bible concerning the origin of the Philistines outside of Gen. 10 (I Chr. 1:12), but this is also true of the other tribes which descended from Adam, although those which we know better in secular history we tend not to question, such as the Medes, the Assyrians, or the Ionians.

“Abraham ‘sojourned in the Philistine’s land many days’, and was treated justly by Abimelech (Gen. 21:22-34), who also treated Isaac fairly (Gen. 26:1-18). Samson married a Philistine, whose family was living in Timnath, a city in either Judah (Josh. 15:57) or Dan (Josh. 19:43), there were two cities of this name and I haven’t tried to determine which. The marriage was ‘of YHWH’ (Jdgs. 14:4) who is not the author of error and wouldn’t have Samson marry a kike! Would he? Was Abimelech a kike? [*But parents disapproved.*]

“Although David in his Psalms expresses fear of the Philistines, he refers to them as both Adam (i.e. 56:11) and Enosh, and seems to have been treated fairly by the King of Gath (1 Sam. 22 through 29) and was even given a city by him (1 Sam. 27:1-11). Goliath was probably called a ‘Philistine’ because he was in their army, but Goliath was actually a Rephaim-giant! See not I Sam. 17, where the famous account is given, but II Samuel 21:18-20 and 23:13, which discuss the ‘valley of Rephaim’ and the ‘sons of the giant (Repha.)’ These and other ‘Canaanites’ living among the Philistines are probably the ‘enosh’ of David’s Psalms (Philistines are mentioned in 56: Title, 60:8, 83:7, 87:4. and 108:9). I Chron. 20 confirms II Samuel 21.

“In Isaiah 11:11-13 we see that YHVH, in recovering a remnant of His people, certain of them will ‘fly upon the shoulders (LXX: ‘ships’) of the Philistines toward the west.’ Often in the prophets the Philistines are described as ‘the remnant of.’ One of the most telling verses to me is Zechariah 9:6, which states ‘And a bastard shall dwell

in Ashdod, and I will cut off the pride of the Philistines.’ Which surely indicates to me that there were Philistines around in Zechariah’s time, over four centuries after David, who were not ‘bastards’! Yes, this is the same word ‘mamzer’ used in Deut. 23:2.

“Twice in the LXX ‘Caphtor’ was translated ‘Cappadocia’ (Deut. 2:23, Amos 9:7) and once ‘Caphtorim’ is ‘Cappadocians’ (Deut. 2:23). In Gen. 10:14 ‘Caphtorim’ reads ‘Gaphtoreim’ and I Chr. 1:12 ‘Chaphoreim’ in the Alexandrine MS. (the passage is wanting in the Vaticanus MS.) In Jer. 47:4 where the A.V. has ‘of Caphtor’, the LXX has ‘of the isles’! I only write this here to show you the confusion caused by the LXX on this topic. In many cases which mention the Philistines, the LXX often simply has ‘ἄλλόφυλος’ or ‘other tribes’, rather than ‘φυλιστιεῖμ’ or Philistines.

“This leads me to discuss the connection between the words ‘Philistine’ and ‘Palestine’ which I see mentioned quite often. There is none! Anyone who purports that the Greek word ‘παλαιστίνη’ (our ‘Palestine’) could be derived from ‘Philistine’, a strictly English word for the Hebrew ‘Peleshet’ (6429, 30) is a fool! Yes, the Greek παλαιστίνη and Latin Palaestina existed long before the apparent invention of ‘Philistine’ by English Bible translators. I will not go into all of the supposed sources of the Greek word. It was clearly applied by the Greeks to an area much wider than ‘Philistia.’ I will say this, I believe that it came from two Greek words, ‘παλαι’ meaning ‘old’ and ‘στεῖνος’ meaning ‘confined space.’ The ‘strait’ in Isa. 49:20 is ‘στενός’ in the LXX, ‘στεῖνος’ being Ionic Greek.

“The mainstream think that the Philistines came from the Aegean, or maybe were Greeks. Of course they have it confused, as they do everything else, but this indicates to me that racially the Philistines would be just what I would expect them to be, ‘European’! This further buttresses [supports] the true Biblical account.

“As you know, the Phoenicians are often also called ‘Canaanites.’ In the ‘Persian-Phoenician’ period many of them surely were, and we have discussed this at length. In the *National Geographic* article that you sent me about Ashkelon, there is one very telling statement on page 79. They say ‘we have an idea what the Canaanites looked like ... They had Semitic features ...’ Ha! They know not what they admit to! To them ‘Semitic’ and ‘Jew’ are synonymous! Surely the Phoenicians of Carthage, Spain, etc. and the Philistines, along with the Greeks, had not Semitic, but Aryan features.

“I can consume much paper picking on statements in the *National Geographic* article that you sent me. I would hope that there is no need to. I will say only that the ‘Philistine’ period at Ashkelon (1175 B.C.), according to the article, is not far in time from the presence of the Hebrew Israelites in the area, i.e. Judges 1:18 (was the ‘valley’ in 1:19 that same ‘valley of Rephaim’?) The Canaanites certainly did not have an alphabet before the Hebrew-Israelites came into the area, only cuneiform was found there up to that time, to the best of my knowledge, and we also discussed this last year during our Phoenician discourse.

“Note further that Philistines were not mentioned in either Exod. 34:11-16 or Deut. 7:1-3! And with that, I have probably said all that I can on the subject at this time. I will offer only one more thought: We may never know for certain, but the Philistines were probably merely governed by, or possibly only paid homage to, the Kenites during

the Hyksos period. Certainly they were in Palestine before it began, and then survived it without too much damage. Possibly with none!

“So in closing, I only recommend that your readers not be led to believe that the term ‘Canaanite-Philistines’ appearing in certain quotes in any way implies an endorsement of the idea that somehow the Philistines may have been Canaanites. YHVH Bless ...”

Yes, I agree wholeheartedly with this person, we don't want to get various peoples mixed-up with one another, for there is already too much confusion along these lines as it is. The only point I would take issue with in this letter was the use of the word “Semitic.” We really must qualify this word when we use it. Many use the term to mean “Jew.” Others use it to designate true Israelites as being descendants of Shem. In my mind, pure Semitic and Aryan would be the same thing, and my proofreader informed me this is what he meant. I have to admit this letter has changed some of my thinking and cleared up some things for me. I also hope that it has helped you.

My main point in quoting the Ashkelon article from *National Geographic* was to pull together the Hyksos with the Kenites as the descendants of Cain. I might point out that Eustace Mullins made a very clear distinction between the Phoenicians and the Canaanites in his book *The Curse Of Canaan* page 25 where he writes:

“Another contributing factor is the sudden disappearance of the names ‘Canaan’ and ‘Canaanites’ from all historical records after 1200 B.C. How did this come about? It was very simple. They merely changed their name... Chambers Encyclopedia notes that ‘After 1200 B.C. the name of Canaanites vanished from history. They changed their name to Phoenician.’ Thus the most notorious and most hated people on earth received a new lease on life. The barbaric Canaanites had disappeared. The more civilized Phoenicians, seemingly harmless merchant folk, took their place. Having obtained a monopoly on purple dye, which was highly prized throughout the ancient world, the Canaanites advertised their control over this product by calling themselves Phoenicians, from phoenicia (phoenikiea), the Greek word for purple.”

As we can see from this, apparently the Canaanites assumed the good name of the Phoenicians, which is typical of their hiding under a false appearance, which they are still doing today. Eustace Mullins further describes the confusion of not being able to recognize the difference between a Canaanite and a true member of the Tribe of Judah, page 27:

“There are many people who can agree that the kings and leaders of the Western nations are descended from the tribe of Judah, but they fail to recognize an important fact, which is entirely omitted in the King James version of the Bible, that there were three branches of the tribe of Judah. Those who lump all the descendants of the tribe of Judah together do not realize that there was a tainted branch. There were the families of Pharez and Zarah, Judah's pure bred sons out of Tamar, and there was a third branch, Judah's descendants from a Canaanite mother, Shuah, who were known ever afterwards as ‘the cursed Shelanites.’ Tamar was the daughter of Aram,

the youngest son of Shem. Shuah called Tamar's sons bastards because they had been born out of wedlock, while the twins claimed to be the rightful heirs of Judah because they were of pure-blooded stock, the Adamite strain. From the Shelanites descended thirty-one cursed tribes of Canaanites of Judea and Samaria, including the Sepharvaims, a name which the Canaanites had adopted for deceptive purposes."

It's simply amazing, we have people even in Israel Identity today who try to claim the Canaanites as "God's chosen people." They are the ones who attempt to repudiate the Two Seedline doctrine. Pin them down, and they will proclaim the scribes and Pharisees were true descendants of Jacob-Israel. Ted R. Weiland makes this claim in his book *Eve, Did She Or Didn't She?* page 94 where he says: "The seedliners teach that the Pharisees were *Cainites of the seedline of Satan*, whereas Matthew 3:7-8, 27:6-10, John 7:19, 8:28-37, Acts 4:5-10, 24-35 and 7:2-52 declare that the Pharisees were *Judahites of seed line of Jacob/Israel*."

Evidently, Ted R. Weiland never read *Josephus Wars*, 2:8:2 where it says: "For there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essenes. These last are Jews by birth, and seem to have a greater affection for one another than the other sects have."

From this, it would appear that essentially of these three sects mentioned, only the Essenes could claim to be pureblooded Israelites. Why didn't Josephus mention the Pharisees and Sadducees as being Jews by birth? By making such a statement, Ted R. Weiland is also claiming the half-breed sons of Shuah and Judah, the Shelanites are true-blooded Israelites, and charges a fee for his misinformation.

This is not the only erroneously information Ted R. Weiland advances. Weiland has very little to say of the Sephardic Jews, and what he does say is mostly in error. In his book "*God's Covenant People, Yesterday, Today And Forever*", Weiland quotes (page 68) a Jewish source, James Gaffe from his book "*The American Jews*" which says this:

"... the early Sephardic settlers for example, left practically no descendants who are still Jewish.... they disappeared not because they intermarried but because they refused to intermarry - and so, without sufficient choice among their own, they remained unmarried and died out. ...choosing extinction rather than assimilation."

Now, I will back up to a note by Weiland: "**Note that he (Gaffe) considers the Sephardic Jew extinct.**" At this point, one must understand Weiland's motive for quoting this "Jew." Weiland is attempting to prove that the "Jews" of today are only "Jews" by religion. By doing this, he tries to avoid any connection whatsoever with a genetic Satanic seedline. But, in so-doing, he backs himself into a corner. Weiland also tries to trace the "Jew's" lineage back to Esau in order to discredit any idea that they are descendants of Cain. By Weiland's endeavor to prove the Sephardic extinct, he is also implying the Esau-Edomite-Jews are extinct. If the Sephardic-Esau-Edomite-Jews are extinct, why does Ted R. Weiland even make an issue out of it? I will now present

evidence that the Sephardic “Jews” still exist. The following is a review of what I have written before concerning this:

**THE SEPHARDIM ARE STILL AROUND!** In the book *OUR CROWD*, ‘The Great Jewish Families of New York’, pages 29-30, and I will have to paraphrase the story: Sometime in the 1650s a ship (“bark”, 3 masted sailing ship, *St. Charles*) dubbed the “*Jewish Mayflower*” brought twenty-three Sephardic Jews from the culture of medieval Spain and some of the great Sephardic families of New York descended from the “*St. Charles*” arrivals which included the Hendrickses, Cardozos, Baruchs, Lazaruses, Nathans, Solises, Gomezes, Lopezes, Lindos, Lombrosos & Seixases. Check these names and you can know, without any reservations, the Sephardic “Jews” are still around. On page 31, it tells how the Sephardic and German (Ashkenazi) Jews of New York began to “intermarry.” It was the Sephardic that were the old Canaanite-Jews that came from Palestine, as Eustace Mullins in his book *The Curse Of Canaan* so ably describes. They had the blood of Cain, Esau and the race of Rephaim (fallen angels). **If the Sephardic Jews are extinct, as Ted R. Weiland implies, there is no longer an Esau-Edom! Why, then, even make an issue of Esau-Edom if this is the case?** This is just one example of the many spurious statements people such as Weiland, Jones, Bruggeman and Weisman make in their presentations to mislead and confuse the issues. Anything but anything to destroy the ministries of Bertrand L. Comparet and Wesley A. Swift! I further said the following:

I could make long quotes from the 7 volume *History of the Jews* by Graetz; *The Story of the Jew* by Levinger; the 2 volume *History of the Jews* by Henry H. Milman; *History and Destiny of the Jews* by Josef Kastein and *A History of the Jews* by Abram Leon Sachar that the Sephardic “Jews” still exist. As I have now quoted from the book *Our Crowd* by Stephen Birmingham, let’s review what we need to know about the Khazar kingdom that accepted the religion of Judaism under king Bulan in 740 A.D. Upon doing so, they brought in Sephardic Rabbis from Babylon and the race-mixing began between the Cain-Satanic-Jews and the Khazars infusing them with the Satanic bloodline, which they probably already previously had. In 960 A.D. the Khazar Jews made contact with the Sephardic Jews in Spain and more race-mixing between the two branches of Jewry ensued, further spreading the Satanic bloodline. From 720 A.D. until today has given the “Jews” of Ashkenazim and Sephardim 1,278 years to completely mix the Cain Satanic blood among them.

**TED R. WEILAND GOOFS IN HIS BOOK.** Ted R. Weiland, Stephen E. Jones, James Bruggeman and Charles Weisman are doing their best (or maybe their worst) to make Esau-Edom the only enemy of Israel, and prove that the Ashkenazim-Jews are just converts to the Jewish religion, and therefore not of the Satanic race of Cain. They, in doing this, make our present day problems seem like a quarrel between two brothers, Jacob and Esau. Weiland does this when he speaks of Esau-Edom on pages 309-311 in his book *God’s Covenant People, Yesterday, Today And Forever*, as I said before. Weiland speaks of the Ashkenazi Khazar Jews on pages 59-74; 93-94; 126; 140 and 327 making it appear like a race of people who just happened to accept the Jewish

religion. By doing this, Weiland and others attempt to completely avoid the “Satanic Seedline” doctrine.

By this time, it should be becoming obvious why I quoted my proofreader’s letter to you. I would highly suggest that each one of you find the *National Geographic* for January, 2001, and read and appraise the article on “Ancient Ashkelon” for your self. The origin of the city seems to antedate the time of Abraham, so my feeling is that the city may have been built by a descendant of Shem, and later occupied by the Canaanite-Hyksos. With the evidence I presented in letters #37 and #38, I believe we are safe by using such a term.

There is one more thing which should be addressed here. In ancient times the main mode of transportation was by water. It doesn’t take a lot of reckoning to understand that from northern Egypt and lower Palestine all the east-west trade had to use this geographic area as a land-bridge between India and the western Mediterranean. There were land routes, but water was much easier and less costly. There is evidence in Egypt of huge cedar trees being transported from the Lebanon area. You simply do not ship such cargo with camels overland. But, smaller cargo could make its way to this land-bridge by water and then be taken overland to a port on the other side and then continue on its way by water again. Once one can put all of this together in one’s mind, one can begin to realize that this geographic area was one of the most valuable pieces of real-estate in the entire ancient world at that period. Once we begin to see this, we can understand why the Hyksos and other groups wanted so badly to control this particular critical land area. To such a world environment was born our Patriarchs and their descendants. No doubt, in this vitally important area, there were caravans containing camels by the hundreds. Not only that, but there must have been watering, food and rest stations every few miles along the way. In such surroundings, Joseph was sold into Egypt. It should also be pointed out, people in those days didn’t usually venture out and travel by themselves. For safety, they stayed on the established routes and traveled with the caravans. It was either do it this way or take a small army along for protection. With this in mind, we can see it was no small venture for Joseph’s brothers to go to Egypt to buy grain during the seven years of famine.

### **LANGUAGES USED AT THAT TIME**

Not only do we have to understand the commercial interaction between the ancient peoples of that time, but we must comprehend the various languages spoken by them. For instance, we know that Moses was raised in the House of Pharaoh and trained as a scribe. From this knowledge, we can see it would have been necessary for Moses to not only write and speak in Egyptian, but also all the other languages the Egyptians had commercial intercourse with during his time. You can see then, becoming a scribe during that period was no small task. Moses, Being trained as a scribe would have required Moses to both write and speak in several of the ancient languages. Once we understand this, we can begin to comprehend that Moses, because of these skills, was a very important person to become Yahweh’s man to lead Israel. We can also see why Moses was highly qualified to write the first five books of

what we know today as the Bible. To give you some idea of what was demanded of a scribe in Moses' day, I will now quote some excerpts from the book *Civilization Before Greece And Rome* by H. W. F. Saggs, chapter five, pages 98-104:

"... In both Babylonia and Egypt literacy was held in honour, and from both regions the scribes have left us self-admiring descriptions of the importance and dignity of the scribal office. Literary proficiency was so highly regarded that even kings claimed it, or had it attributed to them. Shulgi, for example, a notable Sumerian king of just after 2100 BC, spoke proudly of his literacy: '*As a youth, I studied the scribal art in the Tablet-House, from the tablets of Sumer and Akkad; No one of noble birth could write a tablet as I could ...*'

"Literacy was a claim equally made in Egypt, both for high officials and for kings, even before the middle of the third millennium. The chief executive of the Third Dynasty king Zoser, the man responsible for building the Step Pyramid, called himself 'Chief of the King's Scribes.' Sneferu, the first king of the Fourth Dynasty soon after 2600 BC, was also literate, for a text speaks of him writing on papyrus ... From over a millennium latter, a temple scene at Abydos shows a prince holding a papyrus scroll, and describes him as 'reading out praises'; the prince in question later became the great pharaoh Ramesses II (1290-1224 [BC]). Scribal equipment figured among the contents of the tomb of Tutankhamun (c. 1340 BC), and Ramesses IV made a special boast of having studied all the texts of the House of Life (*pir-ankh*, academy of the scribes).

"To be a scribe in Egypt was to hold a position of respect. High officials, such as a chief magistrate, might be content simply to use the title 'scribe.' A Nineteenth Dynasty text recommends the profession of the scribe, and tells how a man of that kind goes out looking sleek, dressed in white, and finds himself greeted by men of standing.

"The original creative impulses of the civilizations of Egypt and Mesopotamia did not depend upon writing, but writing quickly followed as one of the consequences of those impulses, and the consolidation and extension of those emerging civilizations rested heavily upon scribal activity. This was not only a matter of recording literature and historical records for posterity; many aspects of those societies could not have operated at all without the services of scribes. Public works and taxation required census lists and other records; the army could not function efficiently without trained personnel to work out its ration requirements; building operations needed scribes to calculate such things as the quantity of earth to be removed, or the amount of stone required and the sizes and shapes to which it was to be cut, or the manpower necessary to move an obelisk: these necessitated instruction in arithmetic and geometry. Communication between the king and his officials, upon which the administration of the state depended, was mainly by letters dictated to scribes; business contracts and court decisions had to be recorded in writing; and international diplomacy required written treaties. An Egyptian scribe might find himself sent on a mission to Syria, and to cope with this he would require a detailed knowledge of the geography of the country ...

"In Egypt the scribal craft was predominately a profession for men, but there are occasional references to female scribes. We also know that princesses learnt to write. We have no precise information about the age at which scribal education began but

boys were already attending 'the teaching room' (i.e. school) while they were still heavily dependent upon their mothers. We deduce this from a text called *The Maxims of Ani*, which exhorts a man to be good to his mother because, after suckling him as a baby for three years and clearing up his messes, she then put him to 'the teaching room' where he was taught to write. This suggests an age of perhaps as young as four and certainly not more than six ... The elementary scribal training lasted for four years, after which the trainee scribe went on to more advanced work. Teachers kept their pupils to their tasks by the sanction of corporal punishment; it was said that 'a lad's ear is on his back and he listens when he is beaten.'

"Once settled in their schools, students had to cope with two main tasks: one was to learn certain ancient literary works by heart, and the other was to become competent in writing to a degree at which they could compose letters and official documents. Learning by heart was achieved by the class members reciting aloud in chorus ... The other type of practice material consisted of passages from literary works which had their origin in the Middle Kingdom (beginning of the second millennium), and were in a form of Egyptian which by the time of the New Kingdom was no longer the living tongue. To help the trainee scribe master these, there was instruction in ancient grammar, of which relics remain on hieratic ostraca bearing lists of verbal paradigms. Some of these literary texts were manifestly designed to heighten the motivation and increase the self-esteem and group solidarity of the trainee scribes ...

"Major states needed communication with other countries, and this required interpreters. Some Egyptian scribes must certainly have been trained for this; there is little direct evidence from earlier periods, but for the first millennium we know that Egyptian king Psammetichus sent boys to live with Greek settlers in the Delta to train them as interpreters. We also find mention of the teaching of Egyptian to Nubians, Syrians, and other foreigners. Interpreters accompanied the army, and from the Eighteenth Dynasty, there were Greek interpreters at the Pharaoh's court.

"In the second millennium, the language of international communication was Akkadian cuneiform, used far beyond the region in which it was a language of everyday speech. It was, for example, used in correspondence between Egypt and the Hittites. Either both countries had scribes highly competent in Akkadian cuneiform, or (less probably) both courts employed bilingual Babylonian scribes. One letter to the Pharaoh, exceptionally written in Hittite, addressed the recipient scribe directly and requests a reply in the same language, indicating that some Egyptian scribes could both read and write Hittite. A literary composition of the thirteenth century attests the knowledge of foreign languages amongst Egyptian scribes ..."