

The Ethnicity of the Sea Peoples

THE ETHNICITY OF THE SEA PEOPLES

DE ETNICITEIT VAN DE ZEEVOLKEN

Proefschrift
ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de
Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
op gezag van de
rector magnificus

Prof.dr. S.W.J. Lamberts

en volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties.
De openbare verdediging zal plaatsvinden op
vrijdag 28 april 2006 om 13.30 uur

door

Frederik Christiaan Woudhuizen

geboren te Zutphen

Promotiecommissie

Promotor:

Prof.dr. W.M.J. van Binsbergen

Overige leden:

Prof.dr. R.F. Docter

Prof.dr. J. de Mul

Prof.dr. J. de Roos

To my parents

“Dieser Befund legt somit die Auffassung nahe, daß zumindest für den Kern der ‘Seevölker’-Bewegung des 14.-12. Jh. v. Chr. mit Krieger-Stammesgruppen von ausgeprägter ethnischer Identität – und nicht lediglich mit einem diffus fluktuierenden Piratentum – zu rechnen ist.” (Lehmann 1985: 58)



CONTENTS

Preface	9
Note on the Transcription, especially of Proper Names.....	11
List of Figures.....	12
List of Tables	13
1. Defining Ethnicity.....	15
2. Ethnicity and Protohistory	21
3. Historical Setting	29
4. An Historiographic Outline.....	35
5. Contemporary Sources.....	43
6. Lukka and the Lukka Lands.....	57
7. Ethnogenesis of the Greeks.....	59
8. The Rise and Fall of the Mycenaean Greeks.....	69
9. From Danaoi to Dan.....	77
10. Etruscan Origins.....	79
11. The Aeneas' Saga: Etruscan Origins <i>in parvo</i>	89
12. Philistines and Pelasgians	95
13. Teukroi, Akamas, and Trojan Grey Ware.....	107
14. The Central Mediterranean Contribution	111
15. Concluding Remarks.....	117
Appendix I. On the Decipherment of Cretan Hieroglyphic	123
Appendix II. On the Position of Etruscan	135
Appendix III. A Luwian Trifunctional Divine Triad Recorded for Crete	141
Appendix IV. Pelasgian Demeter and Zeus	143
Bibliography	147
Nederlandse Samenvatting: De Etniciteit van de Zeevolken	163
Curriculum Vitae Frederik Christiaan Woudhuizen.....	167

PREFACE

Significance of the topic

Bringing down the Hittite empire and dealing Egypt a blow from which it never recovered, the Sea Peoples' episode at the end of the Bronze Age was crucial for a shift of the economic and political centre of gravity of the Mediterranean world away from the Levant and towards Greece, Africa Minor, and Italy. Soon this shift was to give rise to the splendors of archaic and classical Greece developing into Hellenism, Carthage, Etruscan civilization, Rome, the Roman empire, early Christianity, and, in the long run, the emergence the modern western European civilization, dominated by speakers of Indo-European languages, but greatly influenced by a Levantine religion (Judaism). For better or worse, the Sea Peoples' episode was one of the few major turning points in world history, comparable to the period of the great migrations which led to the collapse of the Roman empire, or the rise and early spread of Islam.

The present book's argument

With the help of modern anthropological theories about ethnicity, I seek, in the present study, to determine whether the enigmatic Sea Peoples were merely a bunch of pirates or whether they constituted a set of coherent ethnic entities, temporarily making common cause in pursuit of the riches of, and hence a better life in, the Near East.

Of vital importance to this endeavour is the question of the homelands of the various groups which make up the Sea Peoples. In order to tackle this problem, an interdisciplinary proto-historical method has been applied, which makes full use of the available archaeological, historical, and linguistic data as provided by Egyptian, Levantine, Anatolian, Aegean, and central Mediterranean sources.

As such, the work aspires at an *historical synthesis*, in which the Masperonian thesis of a homeland for the Sea Peoples in Asia Minor and the Aegean is balanced with the opinion of others who rather attribute such a role to the islands of Sardinia and Sicily and the Italian peninsula in the central Mediterranean. It will be shown that both the "Anatolian thesis" and the "central Mediterranean antithesis" are partly valid, and that some of the groups of the Sea Peoples originated from Anatolia and the Aegean, whereas others rather came from the central Mediterranean region.

It will further be argued that the "prime mover", which set into motion the whole process leading to the upheavals of the Sea peoples, is formed by the truly massive migration of bearers of the central European Urnfield culture into the Italian peninsula *c.* 1200 BC.

Building upon over a century of scholarly Sea Peoples' research, and offering a combination of various specialist (and therefore often relatively inaccessible) approaches from a variety of disciplines, this study will offer the reader synthetic perspectives onto a crucial period of human history.

Acknowledgments

The work I have been engaged with let us say about the last eight years could not have been accomplished without the help of good friends and colleagues. First of all, my sincere feelings of gratitude are due to my supervisor Wim van Binsbergen, who initiated the project, arranged a stipendium to work it out granted by the Erasmus University, and, in addition to stimulating supervision, provided a theoretical framework on ethnicity suitable for the analysis of the Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age. Next, the Indo-Europeanist Frits Waanders was so kind to proofread an early draft of the entire manuscript and save me from many errors in spelling and judgment – needless to say that remaining ones are my sole responsibility. Furthermore, I am greatly indebted to the specialist in Linear A, Jan Best, who so to say raised me in the interdisciplinary field of protohistory and kindly proofread an early draft of the sections on the Greeks and the Pelasgians. For the systematization of the transliteration of the Ugaritic texts, I am much obliged to the Assyriologist Frans Wiggermans, whereas in matters of Egyptian hieroglyphic I was guided by the Egyptologists J.F. Borghouts and Willem van Haarlem. Also of much help was the letter (d.d. 11 January 2002) by the archaeologist Manfred Bietak on the sensational find of Minoan tephra at Tell el-Dab'a/Avaris. Unfailing support came from the members of the editorial board of *Talanta*, consisting of Jan de Boer, Ton Bruijns, Roald Docter, Jorrit Kelder, Vladimir Stissi, Jan Stronk, Reinier Telling, and Maarten de Weerd, which not only generously facilitated a prepublication of the section on the Etruscans, but also brought to my attention relevant literature and, where necessary, severe criticism. My work also

profited from the collaboration with Winfried Achterberg, Kees Enzler, and Lia Rietveld, as duly acknowledged in the bibliography. Further, my thanks are due to the Etruscologist Bauke van der Meer, the Classical archeologist Eric Moorman, and the Mediterranean archeologist Jacques Vanschoonwinkel, for kindly bringing relevant literature to my attention.

Finally, I am indebted to Ulrich Seeger (cf. 2002) and Peter Broers for allowing me to use their fonts Bock and Kefas2, respectively, as sources of special characters.

NOTE ON THE TRANSCRIPTION, ESPECIALLY OF PROPER NAMES

In the transcription of proper names, I have in most instances preferred one closest to the Greek original: thus Akhaians, Herakles, Herodotos, Homeros, Korinthos, etc. Encouraged by the German saying that “Jeder Konzequenz führt zum Teufel”, however, I have not aimed at being entirely systematic in this respect, since I found it hard to transform the current English forms of Cilicia, Crete, Crimea, Cyclades, Mycenae, Thucydides, Tiryns, Troy, Tyre, etc. into less familiar ones closer to the Greek original. The same license has been adopted with respect to the ending of the ethnonyms, now using the Greek one, as with Danaoi and Teukroi, then using the English one,

as with Pelasgians. When originating from a Latin source, the Latin forms of the proper names are preferred, as in the section on the Aeneas’ saga. As far as possible, I have preferred to use (in general discussions outside the context of my presentation of original texts) the simple *s* instead of the cumbersome *sh* for the transcription of the sibilant *š* in Hittite personal names and Philistine place names, thus Ḫattusilis, Suppiuliumas and Askalon, Asdod. However, for the sake of clarity *sh* is maintained for Eshtaol, Kadesh, and Laish as well as for the ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples from the Egyptian sources, hence Ek-wesh, Teresh, etc.

LIST OF FIGURES

<p>Frontispiece. Rowers depicted on a Late Helladic IIIc sherd from Seraglio on Kos (from Sandars 1980: 131, afb. 92)..... 5</p> <p>Fig. 1a. Diagram of the extremities in the spectrum of possibilities of the relation between ethnic groups and the indicia language, religion, and material culture..... 16</p> <p>Fig. 1b. Diagram of the partial relationship between ethnicity and its indicia, kinship, material culture, language, and religion..... 21</p> <p>Fig. 2. Distribution of the Greek dialects (from Hall 1997: 154, Fig. 25)..... 23</p> <p>Fig. 3. The ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples in Egyptian writing, transliteration, and standardized transcription (from Kitchen 1982: IV, 4 and Kitchen 1983: V, 40).... 36</p> <p>Fig. 4. Plan of Ramesses III's temple at Medinet Habu, Thebes (after Cifola 1991: 12) 51</p> <p>Fig. 5. Land battle scene of Medinet Habu (from Oren 2000: 96, Fig. 5.5)..... 53</p> <p>Fig. 6. Sea battle scene of Medinet Habu (from Oren 2000: 98, Fig. 5.6)..... 53</p> <p>Fig. 7. Prisoners of war: (a) Hittite, (b) Amorite, (c) Tjeker, (d) Sherden, (e) Shasu, and (f) Teresh (from Nibbi 1975: Pl. I)..... 53</p> <p>Fig. 8. Map of Lycia (from Mellink 1995)..... 58</p> <p>Fig. 9. Distribution of centres of radiation of Late Helladic I material. (a) Pottery in combination with architectural remains (Pylos, Kirrha, Thebes, Eleusis, and Athens); (b) pottery in shaft graves, tholos- and chamber tombs (Koryphasion, Peristeria, Epidauros Limera, Lerna, Mycenae, Prosymna, and Thorikos). Sources: van Royen & Isaac 1979 and Hope Simpson 1981 63</p> <p>Fig. 10. Reconstruction of the split between Greek and Thracio-Phrygian on the basis of the development of the mediae aspiratae (after Haas 1966: 209)..... 66</p> <p>Fig. 11. Sites in southern and central Greece destroyed and/or abandoned at the end of Late Helladic IIIB. 1. Teikhos Dymaion, 2. Pylos, 3. Nikhoria, 4. Mene-laion, 5. Ayios Stephanos, 6. Krisa, 7. Tsoungiza, 8. Mycenae, 9. Zygouries, 10. Berbati, 11. Prosymna, 12. Midea/Dendra, 13. Tiryns, 14. Orkhomenos, 15. Iria, 16. Gla, 17. Eutresis, 18. Thebes, 19. Brauron. Source: Hope Simpson & Dickinson 1979 72</p>	<p>Fig. 12. Sites and cemeteries (a) in Late Helladic IIIB and (b) in Late Helladic IIIc (from Popham 2001: 282-3) 75</p> <p>Fig. 13. Distribution of biconical urns in the Urnfield world (from Hencken 1968: 441, fig. 452) 81</p> <p>Fig. 14. Distribution of house urns (from Bouzek 1997: fig. 49) 82</p> <p>Fig. 15. Distribution of (a) proto-Villanovan and (b) Villanovan sites (after Hencken 1968: fig. 466)..... 83</p> <p>Fig. 16. The Heroon of Aeneas at Lavinium (from Somella 1974: Taf. VII)..... 90</p> <p>Fig. 17. Settlement of the Sea Peoples in the Levant and the remains of the Egyptian sphere of influence (from Bietak 1993: 295, Fig. 4) 96</p> <p>Fig. 18. Figurines from (a) Asdod, (b) Cyprus, and (c) Mycenae (from Sandars 1980: 165, afb. 116) 97</p> <p>Fig. 19. Comparison of (a) Philistine chamber tombs from Tell Fara with (b) Mycenaean prototypes (from Waldbaum 1966: 332, Ill. 1; 336, Ills. 11-14)..... 97</p> <p>Fig. 20. Late Helladic IIIc1b ware with “antithetic horns” and “bird looking backwards”: (a) Crete, (b) Cyprus, and (c) Philistia (after Schachermeyr 1979: 160, Abb. 41a; Noort 1994: 122, Abb. 36; 115, Abb. 38) 98</p> <p>Fig. 21. Distribution of Trojan grey ware (from Heuck Allen 1994)..... 110</p> <p>Fig. 22. Sherden in the Egyptian reliefs from the reigns of Ramesses II and Ramesses III with (a) long slashing swords and round shields, and (b) javelins (from Sandars 1980: 29, afb. 12 and 32, afb. 14) 111</p> <p>Fig. 23. Statue-menhirs from Corsica: (a) Cauria (with horns reconstructed on the helmets), (b) Scalsa Murta (from Grosjean 1966b, Fig. 5; Sandars 1980: 99, afb. 60)..... 113</p> <p>Fig. 24. Distribution of Urnfield culture and the route of the Sea Peoples; (a) c. 1180 BC; (b) 12th-10th century BC (after Kimmig 1964: 269-70, Abb. 17-8) 116</p> <p>Fig. 25. Origins of the Cretan hieroglyphic script. (a) Luwian hieroglyphic (56 signs); (b) Egyptian hieroglyphic (14 signs) 128</p> <p>Fig. 26. Cretan hieroglyphic seals with the categories “man’s name”, “title”, and “place or country name” (drawings of the original publications, except in the case of # 309) 130-133</p>
--	--

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Overview of the mention of the Sea Peoples in the various Egyptian sources from the Late Bronze Age	56
Table 2. Literary traditions with a bearing on the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I, c. 1600 BC.	63
Table 3. Developments in the innovative group of Indo-European languages related to the progressive use of the horse	67
Table 4. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Luwian hieroglyphic (values in square brackets attested for Cretan hieroglyphic only).....	124-125
Table 5. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Egyptian hieroglyphic (values as attested for Cretan hieroglyphic).....	125
Table 6. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Cretan Linear	127
Table 7. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Cypro-Minoan.....	127
Table 8. Seals with the categories “man’s name”, “title”, and “place or country name”.....	130
Table 9. Trifunctional divine triads among various Indo-European speaking groups.	142

1. DEFINING ETHNICITY

In a work which deals with the ethnicity of the Mediterranean population groups which attacked Egypt at the end of the Bronze Age, commonly referred to as the Sea Peoples, it should first of all be specified what “ethnicity” actually means and how we will put this concept into practice. To this aim, it is interesting to note that the word is derived from Greek *ethnos* (plural *ethnē*), “number of people living together, body of men; nation, people; foreign, barbarous nations; class of men, caste, tribe”.¹ According to Werner Sollors in his *Theories of Ethnicity, A Classical Reader* of 1996, the modern formation *ethnicity* came into use during the Second World War (1940-1945), being first attested in a publication by W. Lloyd Warner (p. vii). As a definition of this term, the same author presents the one formulated by R.A. Schermerhorn in 1970, which runs as follows (*ibid.*, p. xii):

“An ethnic group is ... a collectivity within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood. Examples of such symbolic elements are: kinship patterns, physical contiguity (as in localism or sectionalism), religious affiliation, language or dialect forms, tribal affiliation, nationality, phenotypal features, or any combination of these. A necessary accompaniment is some consciousness of kind among members of the group.”

Not explicitly mentioned in this definition, but of vital importance to our subject, is the fact that ethnic groups are in most of the cases referred to by a name, coined either by themselves or by outsiders, which we call an *ethnonym*.

In the study of ethnicity, various approaches can be encountered. In the first place, the ethnic group under consideration can be studied from the perspective of the members of this group themselves. This approach is called *emic*. Alternatively, the ethnic group under consideration can be studied from the perspective of outsiders. The latter approach is called *etic*. As explained by Wim van Binsbergen, these terms are rooted in the field of linguistics, where *phonetics* furnishes a purely external description of a language (hence *-etic*), and *phonemics* deals with the smallest

units of speech sound distinguished by the language users themselves (hence *-emic*).² Another pair of concepts is formed by primordialism and instrumentalism. According to the *primordial* approach, the ethnic features of a specific group are immutable qualities, inherited from father to son and mother to daughter, and thus a historically “given”. As opposed to this, the *instrumentalist* approach, initiated by Frederik Barth in his classic *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* of 1969, holds that ethnic features can be manipulated for certain causes by the members of a specific group and that hence the ethnic boundaries are permeable. Accordingly, instrumentalists will stress the dynamic and negotiable nature of ethnicity, whereas primordialists will do the opposite. In reality, the truth lies somewhere in between these opposites, some ethnic boundaries being difficult to cross or even impermeable in a certain period of time, especially when there is a high ethnic conscience (= *ethnization*), and others, or the same but in a period of time when there is a low ethnic conscience, being easy to cross. Furthermore, dynamism also needs to be called into play in order to account for the fact that an *ethnos* can die out (= *ethnothanasia*) or be newly created (= *ethnogenesis*).

The determination of an ethnic identity is in essence an historical process. As we will be working in the protohistory, which lacks contemporary works of history, the definition of ethnicity needs to be translated into protohistorical categories of evidence. In addition, these categories of evidence should be workable in the context of the eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age, which with societies ranging from highly developed multiethnic empires through individual kingdoms and city leagues to merely tribal forms of organization³ is far more complex than, for example, the modern African one where the various ethnic groups are all of a similar degree of organization – in the words of van Binsbergen: like cookies shaped with different cookie moulds from one and the same large rolled out slab of dough.⁴ Hence, following in the tracks of

¹ LSJ, s.v.; in modern literature, one also finds the plural *ethnoi* or *ethnēs* (from singular *ethnē*) or the originally French form *ethnie* used for both singular and plural.

² Van Binsbergen 1999: 43.

³ For the definition of *tribe* as “an ethnic group within the global space but outside the politically dominant civilization”, see van Binsbergen, *forthc.* 10.

⁴ Van Binsbergen 1999: 69; the same observation to some extent

Jonathan Hall in his *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* of 1997, we might – apart from ethnonyms – suitably adopt the following indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups: 1. kinship or “race”, 2. language or dialect, 3. religion, and 4. material culture (= the materialisation of shared cultural traits).⁵ As we will see in the next section, these indicia for ethnic groups are very close to the categories of evidence distinguished by the ancients themselves to this aim.

Of the given indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups, the first one, kinship or “race” is a tricky one, as one has to steer carefully between the Scylla of “Blut und Boden” theory of indigenous development and the Charybdis of an invading “Herrenvolk”. In effect, however, although Egyptian artists do distinguish phenotypal features in their reliefs, the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age appears to be not particularly preoccupied with the “race” issue.⁶ To all probability, this results from the fact that the eastern Mediterranean population is thoroughly mixed: even the Ionians, who were so proud of their pure blood, had killed the male Carians and taken the female ones as their wives at the time of their colonization of western Asia Minor, as Herodotus slyly remarks (*Histories* I, 146). In the course of our investigations, we will experience that in all cases of a migration some measure of mixing between the invaders and the indigenous population took place, so that the category of “race” will not figure prominently in our treatment – not in the least also because we lack the sources whether the population groups under discussion considered themselves of pure descent (= emic point of view).

A complicating factor in our work with the remaining three indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups is the fact that, as duly stressed by Hall, the boundaries of speech communities, religious entities, and material cultures are not always coterminous. Thus, to stipulate the extremities of the entire spectrum of possibilities, a language can be shared by two or more ethnic groups, like in the case of the English and the Americans or the formerly west- and east-Germans, or a single ethnic group can be characterized by

also holds good for Europe during the Bronze Age.

⁵ Hall 1997: 19 ff. I consulted Jones 1997, but did not grasp her coming up with a protohistorical method. For a definition of culture as “everything one acquires as a member of society”, see van Binsbergen, *forthc.* 11.

⁶ Cf. Snowden’s (1997: 121) characterization of the Graeco-Roman world as a “society which (...) never made color the basis for judging a man.” But see now Isaac 2004.

two or more languages, like the Franks on the east (Germanic) and the west (Romance) side of the Rhine or the Swiss (German, French, and Italian). Similarly, a religion can be shared by two or more ethnic groups, like in the case of the Orthodox religion adhered to by the Greeks and numerous Slavic population groups, or a single ethnic group can be characterized by two or more religions, like the Dutch by Protestantism and Catholicism. In certain cases, the differences of religion may cause a once united people to break up into different ethnic groups, like in the case of the former Yugoslavia, now being split up into Serbia (Orthodox), Croatia (Catholic), and Bosnia (partly Muslim). And finally, a material culture can be shared by two or more ethnic groups, like in the case of the Flemings and the Walloons in Belgium, or a single ethnic group can be characterized by two or more material cultures, like in the case of the Phrygians using grey ware in the west and so-called mattpainted ware in the east (see Fig. 1a).⁷




Fig. 1a. Diagram of the extremities in the spectrum of possibilities of the relation between ethnic groups and the indicia language, religion, and material culture.⁸

Given this complicating factor, it cannot be denied, however, that the different indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups often overlap and that precisely here we may find a nucleus of an ethnic group (see Fig. 1b, below): if we would assume otherwise we would throw away the child with the bathwater (for an elaboration of this point of view, see section 2)! The latter observation should not be mixed up with Gustav Kosinna’s adage that “cultural provinces clearly outlined archaeologically coincide in all periods with precise peoples or tribes”,⁹ which simplifies the actual state of affairs in an irresponsible manner. In

⁷ Haas 1966: 17.

⁸ I am indebted to Wim van Binsbergen for drawing this diagram.

⁹ Demoule 1999: 194.

similar vein, to accuse Georges Dumézil of racialism, as Tim Cornell does,¹⁰ because he discovered the remnants of a tripartite Indo-European religious ideology among various peoples speaking an Indo-European tongue, means an irresponsible mixing up between the categories of kinship or “race” and religion, elements of the latter of which namely can also be inherited by genetically mixed descendants. On the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that in the overlap of our protohistoric indicia for ethnic groups lurks yet another ethnic group, which, notwithstanding the fact that it shares in with the same phenotype, language, religion, and material culture of a particular ethnic group, simply considers itself distinct, like some of the Dryopes in Greece¹¹ or the Asturians – who, while speaking Spanish, being Catholic, and sharing the Spanish material culture, consider themselves Celtiberians – in Spain.¹² As we will also see in the next section, here our protohistoric method by its mere definition simply fails to help us out.

As cogently argued by van Binsbergen, the shortcomings of our protohistorical method can be partly compensated by working within a theoretical framework, based on experience with ethnic studies from the historical period. In the following, then, I will present a summary of van Binsbergen’s attempt at such a framework in his *Ethnicity in eastern Mediterranean protohistory, Reflections on theory and method* (forthc.), sections 1-3.

Starting point is the realization that ethnicity is not just a classification of human individuals in terms of an ethnic label, but a way of creating a wide-ranging, supra-local socially structured space as a context for social, economic, political, military, and ritual interaction over a relatively vast area. To underline this, there can be distinguished three constituent aspects to make clear what ethnicity is about:

1. a system of classification into a finite number of specific ethnic names;
2. a socio-political structure, notably the device to turn the overall, neutral geographical space into an ethnically structured space, accommodating a number of

concrete named groups in interaction; and

3. a process, involving both the interaction of these ethnic groups over time, and the dynamics (emergence, maturation, change, decline, replacement, etc.) of the overall ethnic space they constitute together; of this process, we distinguish at least three important movements:
 - a. *ethnogenesis*, as the redefinition (through changes in the classification system) of the overall ethnic space so as to accommodate a new ethnic group (often with repercussions for the other groups already recognized within that space);
 - b. *ethnicization*, as the internal process of “taking consciousness” through which members of an essentially non-ethnic category in the socio-economic-political space redefine their identity increasingly in ethnic terms (usually under the influence of a local elite);
 - c. *ethnothanasia*, the decline and eventually loss of ethnic consciousness by an ethnic group, which merges with another ethnic group already existing in the same geographic space or having newly arrived there.

Much of the structure and dynamics of ethnicity depends on the framing of communities into wider organizational settings, be they states, regional cultic networks, or commercial networks. In themselves, these latter forms of organization are alternative, and hence competing, ways of structuring wider socio-political space.

The ethnic name may be either geographically based or referring to some quality of the designated group as perceived by others or the group itself. The process of naming is contrastive: by calling the other category “A”, one’s own category in any case is identified as “not-A”. The latter is usually also given a name, “B”, by those which it has called “A”, and third parties within the social space can either adopt this nomenclature or replace it by one of their own invention. With the naming, a classification system is imposed. Obviously, it is impossible for an ethnic system to comprise only one ethnic group (in that case the group usually identifies itself simply as “humans”) – the plurality of subsets is a precondition for ethnicity. The distinction between ethnic groups, side by side in the same social space, tends to involve an element of subordination and hierarchy, at least from the perspective of the historical actors themselves.

We would call a named set of people an “ethnic

¹⁰ Cornell 1997: 14, note 18.

¹¹ Hall 1997: 74-7.

¹² Fernandez 2000.

group” only if certain additional characteristics are present, namely:

- when individual membership is primarily derived from a birth right (*ascription*);
- when the set of people consciously and explicitly distinguishes itself from other such sets by reference to specific cultural differences; and
- when the members of such a set identify with one another on the basis of a shared historical experience.

The social process creates boundaries, but also in order to cut across them. Thus, most ethnic groups include a minority of members who have gained their membership not at birth but only later in life, in a context of marriage, migration, language acquisition, adoption, the assumption of a new identity and new life style, religious conversion, etc.

Boundary markers include:

- a distinct ethnic name;
- a distinct home territory (although many members of any ethnic group may have taken up residence, temporarily or permanently, outside that territory);
- associated with the home territory, a distinct language or dialect (although many if not most adults will be at least bilingual);
- distinct traditional authorities (kings, chiefs, headmen);
- distinct details of custom, especially in the sphere of expressive, ceremonial, and ritual production (music, dance, puberty rites, other life crisis ritual, patterns of sacrifice, hairstyle and clothing, royal ritual) which may be taken as distinguishing ethnic markers between adjacent ethnic groups even though in fact the spatial distribution of the custom in question may be much more widespread.

In general, ethnicity is conceived as holistic and bundled, involving language, cultural customs, somatic features, territory, and political leadership, which integrated package is claimed to determine the total mode of being of that person. In reality, however, ethnic groups often differ from each other only with respect to a very limited selection of cultural features functioning as boundary markers. Now, ethnicization displays a remarkable dialectics which one might consider its engine: on the one hand, the binary

opposition through nomenclature offers a logical structure, which is further ossified through ascription (i.e. being made into a birth right) and which presents itself as *unconditioned, bounded, inescapable, and timeless* (= primordial); on the other hand, the actual processual realization (through the construction of a culture coinciding with the group boundary, through distinctive cultural symbols, through a shared historical consciousness, through that part of membership which is non-ascriptive but acquired) means *flexibility, choice, constructedness, and recent change* (= instrumental). Both, entirely contradictory, aspects of ethnicization belong to ethnicity. As a result, ethnicity is often of a highly kaleidoscopic nature, constantly changing in shape and difficult to pin down to specific, general analytical formulae. Above all, it should be realized that for every set of historical actors involved their particular vision on ethnic relations and ethnic history is per definition that of partisans, and therefore must be subjected to severe historical criticism before it can be used as an historical source.

The given

- (1) model of *nominal ethnicity within a continuous cultural space*

is only one of several very distinct shapes that the ethnic space can take in different periods and in different regions. Several major alternative models are:

- (2) The *immigrant* model, found in all continents throughout history, where a set of immigrants (not necessarily less numerous than the original population) have managed to insert themselves into the local geographic space, and while retaining a selection of linguistic and cultural specific traits (often as a result of continued contacts with these immigrants’ original home, which may be quite distant, and both culturally and linguistically very distinct from their new host society), have begun to function as an integral part of that host society’s ethnic space.
- (3) The *conquest* model, found in all continents throughout history as a variant of the immigrant model, in situations where an immigrant dominant minority (of pastoralists, metal-workers, warriors with superior skills and weapons, etc.) has imposed itself as a distinct ethnic minority

upon a pre-existing local population, retaining its distinct identity and thus its prerogatives of inequality through a package that, in addition to military, technological superiority, may include a language and customs different from the local majority, special ritual functions, and a strategy of endogamy.

- (4) The *millet system* that was the standard form of ethnic space under the Ottoman empire in the Middle East and eastern Europe from the late Middle Ages to the early 20th century AD (although in fact this may be traced back to the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Achaemenid empires of the second and first millennium BC, as mediated through Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and early Islamic empires): the state's overall political and military space encompasses a number of distinct ethnic groups (Turks, Jews, Greeks, Circassians, etc.) each of which are largely self-contained in cultural, linguistic, marital, judicial, and religious matters, and each of which displays – both in life-style and in physical appearance – a distinct identity (perpetuated over time because these ethnic groups are endogamous), although they share the overall public economic space production, exchange and state appropriation, often against the background of a *lingua franca*.
- (5) The *colonial plural societies* of Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the 19th and 20th centuries AD, which *mutatis mutandis* are rather similar to the *millet* system, but whose top-ranking ethnic groups in terms of political power (the European civil servants, agricultural settlers, and industrialists, with their secondary entourage from the distant metropolitan colonizing country) in fact function as an example of the conquest model (3).
- (6) The *melting-pot* model of the urban society of North America in the late 19th and 20th centuries AD, where very heterogenous sets of numerous first-generation immigrants rapidly shed much of the cultural specificity of their society of origin, although it is true to say that the descendants of many of these immigrant groups, rather than disappearing in the great melting pot of Americanness, continue to stand out with a

distinct ethnic identity, to inform especially the more private, intimate aspects of life (family, reproduction, recreation, religion) and maintained by a selection of language and custom and a tendency to endogamy.

- (7) Very common and widespread (e.g. in south Central Africa, Central Asia, the Ottoman empire, medieval Europe, the Bronze Age Mediterranean, etc.) is the *specialization* model where, within an extended ethnic space, each ethnic group is associated with a specific specialization in the field of production, circulation or services, so that the ethnic system is largely also a system of social, economic, and political interdependence, exchange, and appropriation. Agriculture, animal husbandry, fishing, hunting, trading, banking, military, judicial, royal, religious, recreational, performative, artistic functions may each be associated (in actual practice, or merely in ideology) with specific ethnic groups. Often such a specialization model is combined with, or is a particular application of, some of the other systems listed above.

More models could easily be added to this list. Each of these models displays a different mix, a different package of cultural, linguistic, and ritual elements, with differing degrees of explicit ethnic consciousness at the level of the social actors involved. It is therefore important to repeat that the specific composition of the distinct package in a concrete ethnic situation in space and time, can never be taken for granted and needs to be established by empirical research in each individual case.

2. ETHNICITY AND PROTOHISTORY

The study of the Sea Peoples, whose attack on Egypt and the Levant marks the watershed between palace-bound Late Bronze Age empires and more or less polis-oriented Early Iron Age societies, leads us into the field of Mediterranean protohistory as there are not yet any contemporary works of history to inform us about the course of events. As a result of this, we have to content ourselves with piecemeal preserved epigraphical records, often of a propagandistic nature, or bits of information from literary sources of a later date, which can be supplemented by relevant archaeological data. However, as the title of this monograph suggests, our aim is not merely to study the protohistorical Sea Peoples as such, but in particular to focus on their ethnicity, thus stimulating us to combine the methods of ethnic studies with that of protohistory.

The factors which play a role in the definition of ethnicity are neatly summed up by Herodotos when he makes the Athenians answer to the Spartan envoys, who feared that Athens might come to terms with Persia:

“There is not enough gold in the world, nor any land so beautiful, that we would accept it in return for colluding with the Persians and bringing Hellas into slavery. There are many important reasons to prevent us from doing so, even if we wished to ... there is a Greek nation – our shared blood and language, our common temples and rituals, our similar way of life.”¹³

In similar vein, Jonathan Hall distinguishes “race”, language, religion, and shared culture as factors in the self-expression of ethnic groups. Rightly, he stresses in this connection that these factors are not defining criteria of ethnicity, but *indicia*, as he goes to great length to show that, for example, a language may have a more restricted distribution than the ethnic group or, vice versa, may have a wider distribution than the ethnic group, or that the ethnic group may be bilingual or multilingual, or change from one language to another altogether (cf. section 1).¹⁴

Another point rightly emphasized by Hall is that the determination of ethnic identity is in essence an historical process. Thus it can happen that individuals consider themselves as members of an ethnic group without distinguishing themselves from other ethnic groups by any of

the ethnic *indicia*: “Someone is a Lue [= ethnic group in Thailand] by virtue of believing and calling himself a Lue”.¹⁵ It is clear that we are at a loss to trace this type of ethnic group with a protohistorical method, as the contemporary epigraphical records or literary sources of a later period we will be working with often fall short in presenting the so-called *emic* point of view.¹⁶ The best thing we can do is to reconstruct distribution patterns of language groups and archaeological cultures, and assume that where these two overlap the nucleus of an ethnic entity will to all probability be lurking at the background (cf. Fig. 1b).




Fig. 1b. Diagram of the partial relationship between ethnicity and its *indicia*, kinship, material culture, language, and religion.¹⁷

According to Hall, this latter approach is fallacious, because linguistic and cultural boundaries are seldom co-terminous.¹⁸ However, in my view that is overstating the evidence: there are numerous instances in which archaeological cultures overlap with language groups, especially in contrastive situations like, for example, the colonization by the Greeks of culturally different regions in the Early Iron Age.

As far as the Black Sea area is concerned, there is un-

¹³ *Histories* VIII, 144; cf. Hall 1989: 165.

¹⁴ Hall 1997: 19-26.

¹⁵ Hall 1997: 24.

¹⁶ Cf. Lomas 1997: 2.

¹⁷ I am indebted to Wim van Binsbergen for drawing this diagram.

¹⁸ Hall 1997: 23.

certainty about the 8th century BC colonization of Sinope and Trapezus on the northern Anatolian coast, because this cannot be backed up by archaeological evidence. But the refoundation of Sinope by the Milesians Kretinos and Koos after the period of the Kimmerian invasion coincides with late 7th century BC east-Greek and a little Corinthian pottery from graves. Similarly, the Milesian colonization of Histria in present-day Romania, which is variously dated to 656/5 (Eusebios) or the late 7th century BC (pseudo-Skymnos), is archaeologically matched by Middle Wild Goat (= east-Greek) style pottery dating from *c.* 630 BC onwards. Furthermore, the likewise Milesian colony at Borysthene or Berezan, an emporion near the mouth of the river Bug, the foundation of which is dated to 646/5 BC by Eusebios, produced a wide variety of east-Greek (besides some Attic and Corinthian) pottery from occupation deposits dating from the second quarter of the 7th century BC onwards. Here were also found Milesian coins (late 7th century BC) and a Greek inscription on a bone plaque (late 6th or early 5th century BC). As a final example from the Black Sea region, we may point to Khersonesos in the Crimea, which was founded by Dorians from Herakleia Pontica (the latter being a Megarian colony) in 422/1 BC, but used already before this date as a trading station. Next to burials in amphorae from Samos and Thasos dated to the beginning of the 5th century BC, “ostraka” from about the same time were found here inscribed first in the Megarian alphabet and later in the Milesian one with Dorian personal names.¹⁹

If we turn to Egypt, it so happens that pharaoh Psammetichos I (664-610 BC) granted Greeks, who had served him as mercenaries, the right to settle in a trading colony called Naukratis – a site 3 km from present day el-Niqrâš along the western branch of the Nile delta. The validity of this historical information is underlined by the fact that Greek pottery is attested for the earliest layer of the site dating from *c.* 630 BC onwards. The privileged position of the Greeks at Naukratis is subsequently reinforced by Amasis (570-526 BC), under whose rule the Greeks built a joint sanctuary, the Hellenion. In this sanctuary pottery has been found inscribed with the Greek text “to the gods of the Greeks”. Next, there have been excavated temples of individual states, like that of Aphrodite (Chian), Hera (Samian), Apollo (Milesian), and the Dioskouroi (unspeci-

¹⁹ Tsatskheladze 1994: 115-23; for the Berezan inscription on a bone plaque, see Onyshkevych 2002.

fied), whereas pottery finds range from Rhodian, Chian (one inscribed with a dedication by Sostratos [= Aeginetan trader who also dedicated an inscription at Graviscae in Etruria] to Aphrodite), Samian, Clazomenian, Lesbian (bucchero) from the Aegean islands to Spartan, Corinthian, and Attic from the Greek mainland. Interesting also is a faience factory producing scarabs and other Aegyptiaca for the Greek market.²⁰

Finally, the Greeks also expanded into the western Mediterranean. The earliest site in this area is Pithecussae on the island of Ischia before the coast of present-day Naples. This emporion produced Euboian and Corinthian ware next to Greek inscriptions (among which the famous Nestor cup) dating from *c.* 770-675 BC, which coincides nicely with the fact that according to literary evidence Euboians from Khalkis and Eretria were once stationed here. Of these two Greek population groups, the Khalkidians went over to the Italian mainland and settled at Cumae – “the oldest of all the Sicilian and Italiotic cities”²¹ –, an event reflected in the archaeological record by Greek inhumation graves dating from *c.* 725 BC onwards.²² But as Naxos in Sicily is the earliest *Greek* colonial foundation in the west, we should refrain from considering Pithecussae and Cumae as purely Greek enterprises. In Pithecussae, next to Greek inscriptions, Aramaic and proto-Etruscan ones came to light, indicating the presence of Aramaean and Tyrrhenian merchants and/or resident aliens from North Syria and the Aegean, respectively, whereas Cumae is named after Kume in Aiolia on the coast of western Anatolia, and, next to Greek graves, produced a very rich Etruscan cremation burial, the so-called fondo Artiaco, and an Etruscan inscription in the earliest period of its existence.²³ The story of the subsequent colonization of Naxos (by the Khalkidians, 734 BC), Syracuse (by the Corinthians, 733 BC) and the other sites in Sicily, and their importance for the absolute chronology of Greek (especially Corinthian) pottery, may be considered familiar by now.²⁴ Still interesting to adduce is that the historical tradition of the Phokaians from Aiolia in western Anatolia sailing all

²⁰ Boardman 1994; cf. Boardman 1999: 118-33.

²¹ Strabo, *Geography* V, 4, 4.

²² Boardman 1999: 165-9.

²³ Buchner 1982: 293; Woudhuizen 1992a: 154-64; Woudhuizen 1998-9: 176-8 (cf. section 10, esp. notes 298 and 303-5 below).

²⁴ Boardman 1999: 169 ff; cf. Dunbabin 1999 (esp. 435-8).

the way to Tartessos just outside the pillars of Herakles in southern Iberia is reflected in the archaeological record of Huelva by north-Ionian bird bowls and Aiolian bucchero dating from *c.* 630-580 BC.²⁵ Apparently to accommodate this long-distance trade the Phokaians founded colonies along the route at Marseilles (= Massalia, *c.* 600 BC) and Ampurias (= Emporion, also *c.* 600 BC).²⁶

With a view to linguistics, it deserves our attention that there can be distinguished four types of names for the Greek colonies in general: (1) after or derived from geographic names in the motherland, like Cumae, Megara Hyblaia, and Naxos; (2) based on Greek divine names, like Apollonia, Herakleia, and Posidonia; (3) based on Greek vocabulary words, like Emporion, Naukratis, Olbia, and Khersonesos; or (4) derived from local geographic (especially river) names, like Borysthene, Gela, Histria, and Sybaris.




Fig. 2. Distribution of the Greek dialects (from Hall 1997: 154, Fig. 25).

Thus far our interdisciplinary method to detect proto-historical ethnic groups, notwithstanding its shortcomings, seems to work fairly well. But what about less contrastive situations, when a population shift takes place from one point to another within a cultural continuum? The best example of such a case is the migration of the Dorians from various regions in Phokis and Thessaly to the Peloponnese under the leadership of Heraklid kings, who, as the

myth goes, return to their ancestral lands some time after the Trojan war. In fact, the evaluation of the historicity of this event is a central theme in Hall's study of ethnicity in antiquity.

The problem of the coming of the Dorians and the return of the Heraklids involves three categories of evidence: linguistic, historical (or mythical),²⁷ and archaeological. The linguistic thesis is presented by the map of the distribution of the Greek dialects (see Fig. 2). What strikes us about this distribution is that speakers of Arkado-Cypriot – which is the dialect closest to the Mycenaean Greek language as attested for Linear B tablets from the Late Bronze Age – besides their extension to Cyprus (not on the map), are locked up in the Arkadian upland plain in the centre of the Peloponnese and entirely surrounded by speakers of the West Greek or Doric dialect. From this distribution pattern it may be extrapolated that Arkado-Cypriot was once spoken in a wider area including the coastal regions of the Peloponnese in order to explain the maritime connection with Cyprus, and that West Greek or Doric is a latecomer in the region, having been introduced in the Peloponnese and spread to Crete, the Dodekanesos, southwest Asia Minor, and Rhodes after the downfall of the Mycenaean civilization.

The historical antithesis consists of mythical traditions that the Dorians once lived in various regions of Thessaly (first Phthia in the south and later Histiaiotis either at the foot of the Pindos mountain in the midwest or between mounts Ossa and Olympos in the northeast) and Phokis (Dryopis, later called Doris). In Thessaly, the Dorians became associated with a royal house descended from Herakles, who during his labors visited the region of Histiaiotis and helped the Dorians to defeat their enemies, the Lapiths, in return of which he received a third share of the land and the kingship from them. Now, Herakles is, like Eurystheus, who through the wiles of Hera became king in his place, a member of the Perseid dynasty of Mycenae. This latter dynasty was subsequently replaced by the house of Pelops, to which Agamemnon, the king of Mycenae at the time of the Trojan war, belongs. After a futile attempt of the Heraklids to regain their throne under Herakles' son Hyllos, the great-grandson of the latter, Temenos, together

²⁵ Cabrera & Olmos 1985; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 150.

²⁶ Shefton 1994: 61-3 (east-Greek and Korinthian wares reported for the earliest layer); 70-1

²⁷ In general, concerning the category the historical or mythical evidence as presented by the literary sources, Forsdyke's (1957: 162) adage that "Plausible fiction can only be distinguished from fact by external evidence (...)" should be applied whenever possible.

with the Heraklids Kresphontes and Aristodemos, led an army of Dorians to the Pelopponesos, drove out the last representative of the Pelopids, Teisamenos, the son of Orestes, and divided the Pelopponesos in three parts, Temenos himself taking Argos, the sons of Aristodemos (whose father had been killed by a thunderbolt) receiving Sparta, and Kresphontes being allotted Messenia.

Apparently, the literary traditions tally very well with the linguistic evidence, but the missing link to solve the riddle of the Dorian invasion once and for all is formed by the archaeological side of the story. Like others before him, Hall is not able to find archaeological evidence for a migration from the region of Thessaly to the Pelopponesos and gets so frustrated that he altogether denounces the mythical stories as inventions of later date (whether, and if so, *how* he reevaluates the evidence of the dialects is not clear).²⁸ The solution of this problem, however, has been presented by Birgitta Eder in a thorough study of the archaeological evidence from the Argolid, Lakonia, and Messenia from the end of the Late Bronze Age to the Protogeometric period. As Eder convincingly shows, all three regions of the Pelopponesos suffer from heavy depopulation during the Submycenaean period (= dearth of material evidence) and receive new population impulses at the end of the Submycenaean and beginning of the Protogeometric period (= reappearance of material evidence). In the course of this latter process, there are some traces of discontinuity in material culture with that of the previous Mycenaean one in the form of graves for individual burials dug in former habitation areas (Mycenae and Tiryns), the introduction of handmade ware with affinities to pottery of middle Greece (Tiryns and Asine), and the (re)introduction of apsidal houses.²⁹ As after the low ebb in material finds from the Submycenaean period the archaeological culture in the regions of the Pelopponesos under discussion develops without a break from the Protogeometric period to the Classical one and beyond, Eder rightly concludes that this is the time that the ancestors of the historical Dorians have arrived – and, we would like to add to this conclusion, that the ancestors of the historical Dryopes, a distinct ethnic group inhabiting Asine in the Argolid until the end of the 8th century BC, might be among them!³⁰

²⁸ Hall 1997: 56-65; 184-5; Hall 2002: 73-89.

²⁹ Eder 1998: esp. 57 (Mycenae); 58-62 (Tiryns); 67-8 (Asine).

³⁰ On the Dryopes, see Strid 1999.

Instead of addressing Eder's archaeological results, however, Hall energetically persists in his disqualification of the literary traditions on the return of the Heraklids and the coming of the Dorians as mere inventions – a very unsatisfactory point of view for an adherent of what he calls the “historically positivist” school like myself.³¹ And he puts some venom in this, when he associates the interdisciplinary method propagated here – in his words the “culture-historical” approach – with its nationalistically colored application by Gustav Kossinna and the subsequent abuse of the latter's views for the “Blut und Boden” propaganda of the German Nazi's.³² In section 1 above we have seen how Kossinna's adagium that “cultural provinces clearly outlined archaeologically coincide in all periods with precise peoples or tribes” falls short of explaining the complexities of reality and that the different categories of evidence need to be tackled individually.

If, for the sake of argument, we would join Hall in his rejection of the interdisciplinary method propagated here notwithstanding its noted shortcomings and deficiencies, the immediate consequence would be that the phenomenon of ethnic groups detectable for the historical period did not exist in protohistorical and prehistorical times – a basically improbable assumption. The more so, because already in this early period we are confronted with ethnonyms – those of the Sea Peoples being at the heart and core of the investigation we are presently embarking on – , which Hall himself considered “a vital component of ethnic consciousness”.³³

Homeros and History

An important literary source for the reconstruction of the early history of the region of Greece and the Aegean is formed by Homeros' epics the Iliad and the Odyssey. As related forms of six from the total of nine ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples figure in them, the Homeric poems also have a direct bearing on our topic.³⁴ The fundamental question is, however, which period do the Iliad and the Odyssey reflect, the Late Bronze Age or the Early Iron Age, or both,

³¹ Hall 2002: 73-89; Hall 1997: 41.

³² Hall 1997: 129; Hall 2002: 38.

³³ Hall 2002: 55.

³⁴ *Akhaioi*-Ekwesh, *Danaoi*-Denye(n), *Lukioi*-Lukka, *Pelasgoi*-Peleset, *Sikeloi*-Shekelesh, and *Teukros*-Tjeker.

or none at all?

A lot of ink has been spilled on this question, and I am not aiming to present an exhaustive treatment of the relevant literature, but only to briefly adstruct my own position in this matter. One work needs to be mentioned here, however, and that is Martin Persson Nilsson's *Homer and Mycenae* (1933), which, in my opinion, offers the best introduction to the Homeric question.³⁵ As the latter author goes at great length to explain, the Homeric poems are the result of a long lasting epic tradition, in which bards constantly rehandled their material for instant public performances and old and new elements are mixed together like currants and raisins in a well-kneaded dough. Consequently, the efforts made by many a scholar to distinguish early and late passages are altogether futile: there can, with the help of archaeological, historical, and linguistic data, only be distinguished early and late elements!

Among the late elements, the first that comes to mind is iron. This metal is mentioned 23x in the *Iliad* and 25x in the *Odyssey*.³⁶ Now, it is clear that in the Homeric poems a conscious attempt is made at archaizing by having the weapons made of bronze. Only in two instances, *Iliad* IV, 123 and *Odyssey* XIX, 13, the poet (= poetic tradition epitomized in Homeros) makes a slip of the tongue and speaks of weapons of iron. In this respect, then, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* may be assumed to have reached their final form in about the same period and not the one earlier than the other as is often assumed. Note further in this connection that the iron club of Areithoös (*Iliad* VII, 141-4) is a special case: it may have been made of meteoric iron, which was already known in the Bronze Age, or it may be one of those rare objects of mined iron on the production of which the Hittites had a monopoly during the Late Bronze Age.

Another definite Early Iron Age element is formed by the close association of the Phoenicians with the Sidonians – the latter being mentioned 4x in the *Iliad* and 13x in the *Odyssey*. Although George Bass makes a strong case for Canaanite shipping to Greece and the central Mediterranean already in the Late Bronze Age on the basis of the shipwrecks found by him off the coast of Lycia at Uluburun near Kaş (c. 1300 BC) and at cape Gelidonya near

³⁵ Other pertinent literature: Page 1959, Webster 1960, and Latacz 2003.

³⁶ Gehring 1901, s.v. *sidēreios*, *sidēreos*, *sidēros*.

Finike (c. 1200 BC),³⁷ Jacob Katzenstein convincingly demonstrates that the prominent position of the Sidonians among the Phoenicians dates from the refoundation of Tyre by the Sidonians in 1197 BC to the Assyrian conquest of the city at the end of the reign of Eloulaios, 694 BC: in this period the kings of Tyre were addressed as “king of the Sidonians”.³⁸

Next, it so happens that the standard burial rite in the Homeric poems is cremation. The latter rite is already known in the Late Bronze Age for Hittite royal burials,³⁹ and there are more than 200 cinerary urns reported for the cemetery of Troy VIh.⁴⁰ But for Greece, one is especially reminded of the burial of the hero of Lefkandi in the 10th century BC and the burials at the west gate of Eretria from the 8th century BC.⁴¹ In general, it may be stated that the popularity of the rite of cremation in Greece is an Early Iron Age feature.

A further Early Iron Age feature is the use of the term *basileus* as a mere substitute for *anaks* “king”. Both these titles are already found in Linear B, where they occur as *qa-si-re-u* and *wa-na-ka*, respectively, but only the latter renders the meaning “king” here, whereas the former denotes a functionary of lower rank in, so far specified, the bronze industry.⁴² It is interesting to observe in this connection that the titular expression *anaks andrōn*, with only one exception in which it is associated with Eumelos of Iolkos (*Iliad* XXIII, 288), is reserved for the supreme commander of the Greeks, Agamemnon.

Also in the field of armory and fighting methods Early Iron Age elements have slipped in. Thus the warriors are often equipped with a round shield, two spears, and greaves – the latter in one instance from tin (*Iliad* XVIII, 613). As Robert Drews cogently argues, the innovative round shield is introduced into the eastern Mediterranean by Sherden mercenaries from Sardinia fighting in the Egyptian army from the beginning of the 13th century BC onwards. Its earliest attestation in Greece is on the warrior vase from Mycenae, dated to Late Helladic IIIC, i.e. just

³⁷ Bass 1997.

³⁸ Katzenstein 1973: 58-63; 130-2.

³⁹ Haas 2000 (esp. 66-7).

⁴⁰ Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 195.

⁴¹ Popham, Touloupa & Sackett 1982; Bérard 1970 (cf. section 10, esp. note 288 below).

⁴² Ventris & Chadwick 1973: glossary, s.v.

after the end of the Bronze Age.⁴³ Drews further shows that the round shield is used together with a slashing sword, two spears or javelins, and metal greaves in hand-to-hand fighting by skirmishers.⁴⁴ In an earlier period, Greek infanterists were used to the towershield, which covered the entire body. The latter shield also turns up in the *Iliad* particularly in association with the Salaminian hero Aias. But sometimes the poet (= poetic tradition epitomized in Homeros) gets confused and calls the towershield (*sakos*) “small” (*Iliad* XIV, 376) and wrongly associates it with greaves (*Iliad* III, 330-5), whereas the round shield (*aspis*) is stated to “reach the feet” (*Iliad* XV, 645-6).⁴⁵ Another striking Late Bronze Age reminiscent besides the towershield is the boar’s tusk helmet (*Iliad* X, 261-5). An important factor, however, in Late Bronze Age fighting is formed by the chariot. In Egyptian reliefs it is shown that the chariot was used as a mobile platform to shoot arrows with the composite bow.⁴⁶ In the *Iliad* the chariots are sometimes used for fighting with a long lance or spear, just as it is depicted on a Late Helladic IIA seal from Vapheio in the Argolid.⁴⁷ But in general the original use of the chariot as a mobile platform from which the warrior actually fights seems no longer clear to the poet and he stages it, in line with pictorial evidence from Late Helladic IIIC,⁴⁸ as a taxi for elite warriors to move to the front, where they get out and fight on foot as infanterists (note, however, that in some instances, as at the beginning of *Iliad* XII, this tactic is merely determined by the terrain, because the chariots cannot possibly cross the ditch in front of the wall near the ships of the Greek camp).

⁴³ Drews 1993a: 177-9.

⁴⁴ Drews 1993a: 176-208.

⁴⁵ For the erroneous coalescence of these data into a very “big round shield” which can only be carried by fairy tale heroes, see van Wees 1992: 17-22.

⁴⁶ Drews 1993a: 104-34; Drews 1988: 84 ff.

⁴⁷ Crouwel 1981: Pl. 11; cf. Wiesner 1968: F 27; F 95.

⁴⁸ E.g. Crouwel 1981: Pl. 59; note that Crouwel’s (1981: 119 ff.) downplaying of the early evidence for Mycenaean warriors actually fighting from the chariot, reducing it to the scene of the seal from Vapheio just mentioned to the neglect of, for example, the scenes on the stelae from the shaft graves (Crouwel 1981: Pls. 35-7), is induced by his preoccupation with the most common Homeric use of the chariot as a taxi, so that his conclusion (Crouwel 1981: 151) that the iconographic evidence agrees with this particular Homeric use is not only a simplification of the state of affairs but in effect rests on circular reasoning.

The palace-bound civilization of Late Bronze Age Greece was characterized by an intricate system of administration on clay tablets inscribed in Linear B. Homeros, on the other hand, is totally unaware of this script – his only reference to a regular script, the *sēmata lugra* “baneful signs” in the Bellerophon story (*Iliad* VI, 168), defines this as an exotic phenomenon.

It also seems reasonable to suggest that the use of clothing pins or fibulae, as referred to in both the *Iliad* (X, 133; XIV, 180 [both verbal forms]) and the *Odyssey* (XIX, 226; 256), constitutes an Early Iron Age feature, because these objects only turn up in graves from the latter period. Note in this connection that the *peronē* according to Herodotos is a characteristic feature of Doric dress.⁴⁹

Finally, there are some names paralleled only for Early Iron Age texts. This has a bearing on the *Arimoi* in the territory where Typhoeus is situated, which probably refers to the volcanic island of Pithecussae off the coast of present-day Naples in Italy, and hence we are likely to be dealing here with *Aramaeans* (*Iliad* II, 781-3),⁵⁰ the *Kimmerians*, who invaded Anatolia and northern Mesopotamia from the Russian Crimea at the end of the 8th century BC and therefore are thoroughly out of place in the context of Odysseus’ visit to the underworld somewhere in the central Mediterranean (*Odyssey* XI, 14); lake *Gygaia* in Maeonia, likely to be named after the Lydian tyrant *Gyges*, who ruled from 685 to 657 BC (*Iliad* XX, 390-1; cf. II, 865),⁵¹ and the *Dorians* on Crete, who, as we have shown above, can only be surmised to have colonized the island at the end of the Submycenaean or beginning of the Proto-geometric period (*Odyssey* XIX, 177).

Notwithstanding these Early Iron Age features, which have filtered in during the hundreds of years of improvised epic performances by the bards and which no doubt can be multiplied by closer study, the heart and core of the Homeric poems reflects a Late Bronze Age politico-historical setting. One of the strongest arguments to underline this statement is formed by the fact that Heinrich Schliemann on the basis of the geographical information in Homeros’ epics excavated the citadels of Troy (1870), Mycenae (1876), and Tiryns (1884) – an empirical approach in the

⁴⁹ Lorimer 1950: 337; cf. also *porpē* mentioned in *Iliad* XVIII, 401. For the Dark Ages in general, see Desborough 1972 and Snodgrass 2000.

⁵⁰ Bernal 1991: 192.

⁵¹ Kullmann 1999: 192.

humaniora which comes closest to experiment in the natural sciences. To these epoch-making finds, Carl Blegen supplemented the discovery of the Mycenaean palace of Pylos (1939), which was destroyed at the end of the Late Bronze Age and therefore cannot possibly be accommodated in an Early Iron Age environment. To this comes that the king of Mycenae, Agamemnon, is endowed with the power to call all the other Greek kings from both the mainland and the Aegean islands to service in war – which presumes a political unity reflected in the archaeological record by the so-called Mycenaean *koinē* of Late Helladic IIIB, but never reached again until the unification of Greece by Alexander the Great at the start of the Hellenistic period.

The historical validity of the supreme power of the king of Mycenae is further emphasized by the recognition of the king of Ahḫiyawa (= Greek Akhaians) as a great king in correspondence with the Hittites, namely in the so-called Tawagalawas-letter from presumably the reign of the Hittite great king Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC). The latter source of evidence further affirms the historicity of Agamemnon's father and predecessor, *Atreus*, who appears in the so-called Indictment of Madduwattas from the reigns of Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC) as *Attarissiyas*, the man of Ahḫiyā (= a short-hand variant of Ahḫiyawa). Moreover, in a treaty also from the reign of Muwatallis II the kingdom of Troy is referred to as *Wilusa*, the Hittite equivalent of Greek *Ilios* (< **Wilios*), and turns out to be headed by a king named *Alaksandus*, the Hittite equivalent of Greek *Aleksandros*. As a matter of fact, in the aforesaid Tawagalawas-letter, a conflict between the Hittite king and his Ahḫiyawan colleague over Wilusa is explicitly mentioned – an incident which inflated in Greek memory to the famous Trojan war (see further section 8 below)!

In alignment with the Hittite evidence, it is of no little consequence for the historicity of the Trojan war that the Hittites, as first realized by Thomas Webster, are staged in Homeros' account of it as allies of Troy in two capacities: first in the enumeration of the Trojan allies at the end of book II of the *Iliad* as *Halyzones* from far away Alybe – a city, like the Hittite capital Ḫattusa, associated with silver – (*Iliad* II, 856); and second as *Kēteioi*, whose leader Eurypylos, the son of the Mysian king Telephos, is killed by Akhilleus' son Neoptolemos (*Odyssey* XI, 521).⁵² To this

⁵² Webster 1960: 67; Meyer 1968: 12 identifies Alybe with the

may also be added⁵³ the mythical *Amazones*, an enemy whom the Phrygians run up against when trying to carve out a territorium for themselves along the Sangarios river in Anatolia at the time when Priamos still fought himself (*Iliad* III, 184) and whom Bellerophon stumbles upon during his adventures inland from Lycia (*Iliad* VI, 186).

Furthermore, another strong argument in favor of the Late Bronze Age politico-historical setting of the Homeric poems is provided by the catalogue of the ships. As far as the Greek mainland is concerned, it stands out that Aitolia and Thessaly are represented, but northwest Greece is not. This coincides with the distribution of Late Helladic IIIB ware in connection with settlements and chamber tombs with multiple burials, from which northwest Greece is excluded: apparently the latter region is not Hellenized before the Early Iron Age.⁵⁴ Similarly, as duly stressed by Joachim Latacz, the Cyclades and the west coast of Asia Minor are also not represented, which, as far as the last mentioned area is concerned, is historically correct since the Aiolian, Ionian, and Doric migrations to western Anatolia date from the Submycenaean period onwards. A problem is posed, however, by the position of Miletos (= Hittite Millawanda), which according to Homeros is inhabited by Carians and sides with the Trojans (*Iliad* II, 686), whereas it definitely belonged to the Mycenaean (archaeologically) or Akhaian (historically) sphere of influence at the time of the Trojan war (c. 1280 BC). As Millawanda is in the Hittite records reported to have changed sides during the reign of Tudḫaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC), the Homeric position of

Khalybes from the Black Sea coast, which is linguistically possible, but chronologically inadequate as these latter are only attested for the Early Iron Age. Note in this connection that Hittite involvement in Mysia is assured by their foundation of Sarawa there, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 138.

⁵³ Smit 1988-9: 54, with reference to Garstang 1929: 86 f. for the Amazones and 172 for the Keteioi; see further Leonhard 1911: 15-6. Note with Gindin 1999: 225-6 that the relation between Keteioi and Amazones is enhanced by the fact that the name of the leader of the former, *Eurypylos*, is a masculine variant of that of the queen of the latter, *Eurypyle*. The same author also rightly stressed the relation of the name *Telephos* with the Hittite royal name *Telepinus* (p. 248-9), and that of his second son *Tarkhōn* with the Luwian divine name *Tarḫunt* (p. 225). The close knit fabric of mythical associations is further elaborated by the fact that the wife of Telephos is recorded to fight from the chariot like an *Amazone* (Gindin 1999: 248-9). On top of this, the leader of the Keteioi is called a *meḡas basileus* "great king" by Quintus of Smyrna, see Gindin 1999: 231.

⁵⁴ Smit 1989: esp. 180 (map); cf. Latacz 2003: 266, Abb. 22, and section 8, Fig. 12a below.

Miletos may be due to an historical hypercorrection.⁵⁵

Finally, the close contacts of the Mycenaean Akhaians with the Hittites as attested for Hittite correspondence can be further illustrated by the fact that Homeros in two instances has applied a standard expression from Hittite texts in annalistic tradition according to which the chief deity, in the case of the Hittites the stormgod, runs before the king and his army in battle to secure victory.⁵⁶ Thus, in one passage Apollo, the chief god of the Trojans, mentioned in form of Appaliunas as one of the local oathgods in the Alaksandus-treaty,⁵⁷ precedes the Trojans with the aegis in their attempt to storm the Greek wall (*Iliad* XV, 307-11), and in another Athena, one of the deities on the Greek side, precedes Akhilleus when he conquers Lyrnessos and Pedasos to the south of mount Ida (*Iliad* XX, 94-6)!

⁵⁵ Latacz 2003: 278 ff.; 339 f. See further section 8 below.

⁵⁶ For the earliest example, see Bryce 1998: 135 (annals of Tudhaliyas I, 1430-1400 BC); Woudhuizen 1994-5: 181, note 131; Woudhuizen 2004a: 38, note 42 (the literal translation of Hittite *pīran ḥ uya-* or *ḥ uwā(i)-* is “to run before”); see Yalbert, phrases 4, 7, 11, and 32 for Luwian hieroglyphic examples.

⁵⁷ Latacz 2003: 58; 138 (§ 20).

3. HISTORICAL SETTING

In this section I will present a brief overview of the main historical developments in the Near East with a bearing on the Levant from the catastrophic events at the end of the reign of Narâm-Sin of Akkad and during the First Intermediary Period in Egypt to those marking the end of the Bronze Age. In doing so, I will base myself on Redford 1992 (with chronology adapted to Kitchen 1989) and Bryce 1998, unless indicated otherwise.

At the end of his reign, Narâm-Sin of Akkad (2291-2255 BC) was defeated by a group of mountain dwellers called the Gutu, who conquered Babylon and ruled it for a period of about one century. At the time of their onslaught on Babylon, these Gutu came from the mountainous region of the Lower Zāb in western Iran. A later source from the time of Hammurabi (1792-1750 BC) reports that part of their land was called Tukri. From this piece of information, W.B. Henning deduced that we may well be dealing with the Tocharians inhabiting the Tarim basin along the western border of China in the historical period, who addressed themselves both as Tugri and as Kuči (< Gutu).⁵⁸ If this is correct, we actually have here the first historical evidence about a group of Indo-Europeans.

In about the same time as the Gutian onslaught on Akkad, at the end of Early Bronze Age II, there is massive evidence for large-scale destruction of settlements in Anatolia, especially in the Konya region and Cilicia later occupied by Luwians. The subsequent lack of reoccupation suggested to James Mellaart that the affected regions became the grazing grounds of nomads.⁵⁹ The origin of the nomads in question may perhaps be indicated by the evidence of the royal burials at Alaca Höyük, which are of similar type as those of the later Mycenaean and Phrygians, and characterized by solar discs and theriomorphic standards recalling counterparts from Horoztepe and Mahmatlar in the Pontic region: all these elements have been attributed by Ekrem Akurgal to Indo-Europeans⁶⁰ – nomadic cattle-breeders and herdsmen originating from⁶¹ the steppe zone north of the Black Sea, the Caucasus, and

beyond. Accordingly, we appear to be confronted with two concerted invasions by Indo-Europeans in the 23rd century BC: one by the ancestors of the later Tocharians across the Caucasus into Mesopotamia and another by the ancestors of the later Hittites, Luwians, and Palaians across the Bosphorus into the Anatolian highland and along the western and southern coasts into the plains of Konya and Cilicia – the latter event marked by the spread of Trojan IIg ware with as its “Leitmotiv” the so-called *depas amphikupellon*.

The upheavals at the end of Late Bronze Age II in the 23rd century BC also affected the Greek mainland, Crete, and the Levant. In Greece, for instance the “House of the Tiles” at Lerna was burned down and covered by a tumulus – a burial custom characteristic of the Kurgan culture of the Russian steppe. This event is commonly associated with the arrival of the earliest Indo-Europeans in southern Greece (see further section 7). As far as Crete is concerned, the flourishing settlements at Vasiliki near the bay of Mirabello and Myrtos (Fournou Korifi) along the south coast were destroyed by fire and the ruins of the first covered by simple hovels and that of the second by a peak-sanctuary – a completely new phenomenon for the island.⁶² Against the background of the events in Anatolia and Greece, it seems not farfetched to assume that the Indo-European invasions also affected eastern Crete – an assumption which would allow us to explain the evidence for the Luwian language in Cretan hieroglyphic documents dating from the Middle Bronze Age onwards (see further section 12 and appendix I). Finally, the Levant bears testimony of a similar lapse to nomadism as Anatolia: if Indo-Europeans were responsible for this development, as Marija Gimbutas argued on the basis of Kurgan-like shaft-tombs (among which a twin catacomb grave) at Bâb edh-Drâ east of the Dead Sea, these have not been traced in the records which surface again from the Middle Bronze Age onwards.⁶³

⁵⁸ Henning 1978.

⁵⁹ Mellaart 1971: 406-10.

⁶⁰ Akurgal 1992: 1-5.

⁶¹ Mallory 1989.

⁶² Caskey 1971: 803; Best 1981b: 8-9. Note that according to Hiller 1985: 127 there was no peak-sanctuary at Myrtos after its destruction, even though Warren 1972: 92 does suggest such a function for an Early Minoan III arc-shaped building.

⁶³ Gimbutas 1973 groups these Indo-European migrations together as her “second wave of Indo-Europeanization”. As opposed to this, Best 1976: 218 associates these graves with the apsidal hou-

It lies at hand to correlate the fall of central authority during the First Intermediate Period in Egypt, assigned to about 2140 BC, with the upheavals at the end of Early Bronze Age II.

Under the 11th dynasty the unity of Egypt was restored and the country rose to great power during the 12th dynasty. At that time Byblos in the Levant was drawn within the orbit of Egyptian influence, as can be deduced from inscriptions by its rulers in Egyptian hieroglyphic and the influence of the latter script on the indigenous Byblian proto-Linear script. Synchronous with the rise of Egypt under the 12th dynasty (= 20th and 19th centuries BC) was the regular trade connection between Assyria and Anatolia as exemplified by Assyrian trading colonies or *kāru* associated with major Anatolian towns. The cuneiform tablets from the *kāru* inform us that the Assyrian merchants imported *annukum* “tin” and woolen textiles in exchange for Anatolian metals, especially silver and gold. The metal tin played a crucial role in international trade from c. 2000 BC onwards, when the bronze industry went over from arsenic bronze to the much harder alloy of copper and tin for the production of weapons and other artefacts. In response to the introduction of cuneiform writing by the Assyrian traders, the indigenous Anatolians – who on the basis of onomastic evidence were to a large extent Indo-European, *in casu* Hittite and Luwian – developed their own writing system, the so-called Luwian hieroglyphic, which to some extent follows the model of Egyptian hieroglyphic but derives its values acrophonically from the indigenous Anatolian vocabulary.⁶⁴ Under influence of the international tin trade, the island Crete, which lies on a junction of maritime trade routes, acquired great wealth and developed a palatial civilization,⁶⁵ with a script to write down the economic transactions basically derived from Luwian hieroglyphic but with a more substantial Egyptian component than the original received either through the medium of

ses of Meşer, dated c. 3300 BC, which by and large coincides with the early 3rd millennium BC date of a comparable twin catacomb grave at Palermo in Sicily (Conca d’Oro culture) and catacomb grave with a single chamber of the Rinaldone culture in Tuscany, see de Vries 1976. At any rate, early Indo-European presence in the region is indicated by the river name *Jordan*, based on Proto-Indo-European **dānu-* “river”, see Rosenkranz 1966: 136.

⁶⁴ Woudhuizen 1990-1; Woudhuizen 2004a: appendix I.

⁶⁵ Note that the Mari-texts from the reign of Zimri-lim (early 18th century BC) bear testimony of *kaptaraim* “Cretans” (< *Kaptara-* = Biblical *Kaphtor* “Crete”) involved in the tin-trade, see Dossin 1970: 99.

Byblos or through direct contacts with Egypt itself (see further section 12 and appendix I).

The period of the Assyrian merchant colonies ended in destruction, and when the smoke screen rose, a new era had arrived. From a military point of view, a dominant factor in this new era was formed by the war chariot, which maintained its central position until the end of the Bronze Age. It is true that experiments with the chariot are already recorded for the Karum-period, as the Anatolian king Anittas, who ruled in the late 19th century BC and is considered the founder of the Hittite royal house, reported his acquisition of forty teams of horses in the course of his capture of the town Salatiwara – teams of horses which no doubt pulled war chariots.⁶⁶ Now, the war chariot was introduced in the Near East by Indo-Europeans, to be more specific speakers of Indo-Aryan, the forerunner of Indo-Iranian. These Indo-Aryan chariot fighters, thanks to their military superiority, conquered the Hurritic population living along the upper Euphrates river, and established a royal house here. At least, this course of events is deducible from the fact that the 14th century BC text by a Mitannian horse trainer named Kikkuli contains Indo-Aryan technical terms, that the Mitannian royal house was characterized by personal names with the Indo-Aryan element *ratha-* “chariot”, and that the Mitannian nobility consisted of *maryannu*, an Indo-Aryan indication of chariot fighters. Next, they went on to the Levant and even further to Egypt in the south, where they founded the royal house of the Hyksos (= “foreign ruler”), also known as the 15th dynasty (c. 1720-1550 BC), which was centred at Tell el-Dab’a/Avaris in the eastern Delta.⁶⁷ The connection of the Hyksos with the Levant is stressed by the fact that in the lowest levels of their capital Tell el-Dab’a/Avaris so-called Tel el-Jehudiya ware has been found comparable to that of Byblos, and that, when they were finally kicked out by Ahmose, the founder of the 18th dynasty who had organized his own chariot force, a remnant of their regime fled to Sharuhon on the coast south of Gaza. Yet another Indo-Aryan conquest with the help of the chariot is that of Babylon by the Kassites, who, in the wake of the Hittite king Mursilis I’s sack of the latter city in 1595 BC, took over control and founded a royal dynasty here. Finally, as

⁶⁶ Drews 1988: 101-2.

⁶⁷ See now Oren 1997, and note especially the warrior graves and introduction of the horse as characteristic elements of Hyksos culture.

evidenced by the decoration of their stone stelae the rulers buried in the shaftgraves at Mycenae in Greece around 1600 BC were chariot fighters, and therefore likely foreign conquerors.

In his eager to whipe out the last remnants of the hated Hyksos, Ahmose (1550-1525 BC) grabbed the opportunity to conquer Palestine *in toto* and brought back Byblos into the Egyptian sphere of influence, thus laying the foundations for the Empire period. This imperial policy of territorial expansion was subsequently continued by Ahmose's successor, Amenhotep I (1525-1504 BC), who conquered Tunip along the upper Orontes river, and Tuthmoses I (1504-1492 BC), who campaigned up to the Euphrates river. However, after a lull especially during the reign of Hatshepsut (1479-1457 BC), it reached its zenith under Tuthmoses III (1479-1425 BC), who even crossed the Euphrates, defeated Mitanni, and incorporated North Syria up to and including Ugarit, where a garrison was stationed. As a corollary to Tuthmoses III's defeat of Mitanni, the latter sought a truce with Egypt, which materialized under Amenhotep II (1427-1400 BC) in an alliance cemented by the marriage of Amenhotep II's son, the later Tuthmoses IV, with the daughter of the Mitannian king Artatama I. What followed is a period of consolidation by diplomacy, vividly described in the Amarna tablets covering the period from the later part of the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) to the reign of Tutankhamon (1336-1327 BC).⁶⁸ Most striking in this correspondence is the reluctance of Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC) to comply with the desperate appeals by his loyal vassal king of Byblos, Rib-addi, and curb the encroachments on the latter's territory by the upcoming power of Amurru under the leadership of Abdi-asirta and his son Aziru. The story ended with the death of Rib-addi by the hand of Aziru. The Amarna tablets also provide early mentions of some groups of the Sea Peoples, namely the Lukka and the Sherden – the first as pirates raiding Alasiya (= Cyprus)⁶⁹ and the coast of Egypt and the second as body guards or mercenaries of Rib-addi of Byblos.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Moran 1992: xxxv.

⁶⁹ Hellbing 1979; note, however, that Egyptian *'Isy* is not an alternative indication of Cyprus, as the author maintains, but a reference to the western Anatolian region *Asiya* or *Assuwa*, see section 8.

⁷⁰ The earliest mention of the Lukka occurs in an Egyptian hieroglyphic text on an obelisk from Byblos dated *c.* 2000 BC, which

In the long run, however, the major concurrent of the Egyptians for control in North Syria was not the kingdom of Mitanni, but that of the Hittites. These had already campaigned in the region under the kings of the Old Kingdom, Hattusilis I (1640-1620 BC), who burned down Alalakh along the lower Orontes river, and Mursilis I (1620-1590 BC), who, as we have already noted, went all the way to Babylon, but both were not able to consolidate their conquests. The same holds good for Tudhaliyas I (1430-1400 BC) of the New Kingdom, who is recorded to have made peace with Aleppo, probably after a campaign in the wake of Tuthmoses III's defeat of Mitanni. After a period of serious troubles under Tudhaliyas III (1360-1344 BC), in which the Hittite realm had to be rebuilt from scratch, the Hittites manifested themselves again in the North Syrian theatre during the reign of Suppiluliumas I (1344-1322 BC). The latter defeated Mitanni decisively and was subsequently able to draw Mitanni's dependencies in North Syria within his orbit. But that is not all, Suppiluliumas I also extended his sphere of influence to Kadesh, Amurru, and Ugarit, which fell under Egyptian suzerainty. When he beleaguered Karkamis along the Euphrates river and expected retaliation by the Egyptians for his transgression in their dominions, a miracle happened: the Egyptian queen, whose husband Tutankhamun had been murdered, asked Suppiluliumas I for a son to be remarried with, which would mean not only an alliance but also that a Hittite prince became king of Egypt. Unfortunately, the son which Suppiluliumas I sent for the marriage got killed by machinations of the Egyptian court. Nevertheless, he was able to consolidate his foothold in North Syria without the danger of Egyptian retaliation, and, after the capture of the city, he appointed one of his sons, Piyassilis, as king of Karkamis, who under the Hittite throne-name Sarri-Kusuḫ ruled from here as viceroy over the dependencies in North Syria – an arrangement which through the latter's heirs would last to the end of what now truly may be called the Hittite Empire.

After the untimely death of his elder brother, the youngest son of Suppiluliumas I inherited the throne and ruled as Mursilis II (1321-1295 BC). His main achievement was the conquest of Arzawa in western Anatolia, from where he deported as much as 65,000 or 66,000 prisoners of war to other parts of the Hittite realm. Further-

renders the sequence *kwkwn s rwqq* "Kukkunis, son of the Lycian", see Albright 1959; but cf. van Seeters 1966: 79, note 24, who dates this inscription *c.* 1700 BC.

more, he rearranged the western province into four Arzawa lands, Mira-Kuwaliya, the Seḫa River Land, Ḫapalla-Appawiya, and Wilusa, each under a vassal king – an arrangement which lasted to at least an advanced stage of the reign of Tudḫaliyas IV near the end of the 13th century BC, its resilience being due largely to the fact that it was cemented by dynastic marriages so that the vassal kings in question became members of the royal family themselves. Mursilis II was followed by his son and successor, Muwatallis II (1295-1272 BC). By this time, the Egyptian throne had come into the hands of a new and militant dynasty, founded by a former general, Ramesses I (1295-1294 BC). With the accession of his descendant Ramesses II (1279-1223 BC), it became clear that Egypt wanted to regain its former dependencies in North Syria by force. In anticipation of the coming war with Egypt, Muwatallis II moved the Hittite capital from the somewhat eccentric Ḫattusa to Tarḫuntassa in the south. Furthermore, to gather allied forces or mercenaries he launched a campaign in the west. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that at the inevitable showdown of forces which eventually took place near Kadesh in the fifth year of Ramesses II's reign (1274 BC), the Hittites according to the Egyptian records were, *inter alia*, aided by troops from Arzawa (≈ later Lydia), Dardania (= Troas), Masa (= Mysia), Karkisa (= Karia), and Lukka (= Lycia). (Interesting for our purposes is that the same records bear testimony of Sherden mercenaries on the Egyptian side.) During his campaign in the west, however, Muwatallis II wanted to avoid a conflict with the Aḫḫiyawans (= Akhaians or Mycenaean Greeks), who were in control of Millawanda (= Miletos) at the time, and for this reason settled his dispute in diplomatic terms, addressing the king of Aḫḫiyawa as his brother and hence including him into the illustrious ranks of the great kings (see further section 8). According to the Egyptian records, again, the Hittite forces at the ensuing battle of Kadesh numbered in total 3,500 chariotry and 37,000 infantry. The propaganda of Ramesses II claimed the outcome as an outstanding victory for the Egyptians, but at the end of the day the bone of contention, Kadesh, remained within the sphere of influence of the Hittites!

The eldest son of Muwatallis II, Urḫitesup, who on his ascendance took the throne-name Mursilis III, occupied the throne only for a brief period (1272-1267 BC), before he was deposed by his uncle Ḫattusilis III (1267-1239 BC). The latter distinguished himself particularly in international diplomacy, as he was responsible for the peace

treaty with Egypt of 1259 BC – an entente between the two great powers which lasted till the end of the Bronze Age. Furthermore, his wife Puduḫepa played a vital role in cementing the relationship by dynastic marriages, which boiled down to a one-sided affair in which Ḫatti dispatched princesses to the harem of the pharaoh, but the latter did not return the favor as no princesses of Egypt were allowed to be betrothed to a foreigner – with all possible consequences for foreign claims on the throne (the request by the widow of Tutankhamun for a Hittite prince to remarry with mentioned above was quite exceptional, indeed, and, as we have seen, doomed to fail). In the reign of Ḫattusilis III mention was first made of shipments of grain from Egypt to Ḫatti, which later under Merneptah became so important that they were claimed “to keep Ḫatti alive”. Evidently, the Hittite Empire suffered from food shortage, but it is a longstanding problem which cannot be held responsible, as it often is, for its final downfall.

The son and successor of Ḫattusilis III, Tudḫaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC) exercised an active military policy in the west. In the text of a bronze tablet found during the late 80s of the last century in the capital Boğazköy/Ḫattusa, which meticulously describes the borders of the viceregal province of Tarḫuntassa under his uncle Kuruntas, a campaign against Parḫa (= Perge) along the Kastaraya (= Kestros) in Pamphylia to the west of Tarḫuntassa was anticipated, the spoils of which would fall to Kuruntas. Next, a Luwian hieroglyphic text from Yalburt commemorizes a campaign in the Xanthos river valley of Lycia, where the towns Talawa (= Tlōs), Pinata (= Pinara), and Awarna (= Arinna) were subdued, as Tudḫaliyas IV proudly claims, for the first time in Hittite history. After this, the so-called Milawata-letter informs us that the governor of Millawanda (= Miletos), which formerly resided under the king of Aḫḫiyawa (= Akhaia or Mycenaean Greece), turned sides and joined the Hittites.⁷¹ In this manner, then, a longstanding source of troubles in the west was eventually eliminated. Tudḫaliyas IV's next move was in the east: in a

⁷¹ In the Milawata Letter mention is made of an exchange of hostages from Pina(ta) and Awarna with those from Atria and Utima, which can only be situated after Tudḫaliyas IV's Lycian campaign. Also prior to, and as a kind of *conditio sine qua non* for, the change of sides by Millawanda is Tudḫaliyas IV's campaign against Tarḫundaradus of the Seḫa River Land (= the Meander valley) as reported in his Chronicle, when Aḫḫiyawa is specified to have withdrawn, see Garstang & Gurney 1959: 120-1 (note that according to Güterbock's (1992) improved translation of this text, Tarḫundaradus is stated to have relied on the king of Aḫḫiyawa.)

treaty with Sausgamuwa of Amurru he forbade the latter to serve as an intermediary for trade between Aḫḫiyawa and Assyria – the new enemy in the east since Suppiluliumas I's decisive victory over Mitanni. Bereft of his stronghold in western Anatolia, the king of Aḫḫiyawa was no longer considered a great king, which must have been a recent development as he was first enumerated among the great kings in the text of the Sausgamuwa treaty but then deleted. The ultimate goal of Tudḫaliyas IV's campaigns in the west, and a further guarantee for the success of his economic boycott against the maritime trade between Aḫḫiyawa and Assyria, was the conquest of Alasiya (= Cyprus), which he achieved near the end of his reign. Notwithstanding a serious defeat against the Assyrians under the able leadership of Tikulta-Ninurta (1233-1197 BC) somewhere in between of the given events, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the reign of Tudḫaliyas IV marked a high point in the history of the Hittite Empire.

After the death of Tudḫaliyas IV, there was a short reign of his eldest son, Arnuwandas III (1209-1205 BC). In this period, to be more exact the fifth year of Merneptah (1213-1203 BC), the Egyptians had to deal with an attack by the Libyan king Meryey, who was supported by mercenaries from various groups of the so-called "Sea Peoples", viz. the *Sherden*, *Shekelesh*, *Ekwesh*, *Lukka*, and *Teresh*. Merneptah succeeded in defeating this coalition and in preventing the Libyan king Meryey to settle himself in the Nile-delta – apparently the latter's ultimate objective.

Arnuwandas III was succeeded by his brother Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC). The latter was forced to reconquer Cyprus-Alasiya, again, which apparently had taken advantage of the mishap during the short reign of Arnuwandas III. After his victory, he set up a memorial (= Nişantaş at Boğazköy/Ḫattusa) also for that of his father, who did not have the time to do so. Later in his reign, Suppiluliumas II was forced to conduct a campaign in western Anatolia against, *inter alia*, Masa (= Mysia), Wiyana-wanda (= Oinoanda in the upper Xanthos valley), and Lukka (= Lycia), the ensuing victory of which he commemorated in the Südburg monument at Boğazköy/Ḫattusa. The same Luwian hieroglyphic inscription, however, shows him very much in control of the imperial machinery in provinces like Pala, Walma, and Tarḫuntassa.⁷² The final downfall caused by the Sea Peo-

ples (this time the *Peleset*, *Tjeker*, *Shekelesh*, *Denye(n)*, and *Weshesh*) as vividly described by the letters from Ras Shamra/Ugarit and Ramesses III's (1184-1153 BC) memorial at Medinet Habu, came as a flash of lightning in a clear sky by total surprise.

Under the energetic leadership of Ramesses III, the second pharaoh of the 20th dynasty, Egypt survived the onslaught by the Sea Peoples, who, unsuccessful in their plan to settle in Egypt, took up their abode in various places along the Levant, especially in the Philistine pentapolis. In the former Hittite Empire, there was some continuity in the earliest phase of the Iron Age at Karkamis, where the viceregal family planted by Suppiluliumas I maintained its position through Aritesup and Initesup, and in the former province of Tarḫuntassa, where likewise a descendant of the Hittite royal family, Ḫartapus, son of Mursilis, is recorded. According to their inscriptions in Luwian hieroglyphic, both these branches of the Hittite royal family claimed the imperial title of great king. Only after this imperial afterglow, a dearth of material sets in which lasts to the beginning of the 10th century BC, when a new royal house at Karkamis under great king Uratarḫundas entered the stage.⁷³

⁷² On the Yalburt and Südburg texts, see Woudhuizen 2004a, sections 3 and 7, respectively.

⁷³ See Woudhuizen 1992-3 and Woudhuizen 2004a: appendix V.

4. AN HISTORIOGRAPHIC OUTLINE


In this section we will present an outline of the most important modern literature on the Sea Peoples. Special attention in this historiographic outline will be given to the identification of the individual population groups, which is still a matter of debate. Another point of interest is the cause (or causes) of their sudden appearance on the stage during the period aptly called the catastrophe at the end of the Late Bronze Age. Our main purpose, to determine whether the shortlived coalition of forces which we call the Sea Peoples consists of a number of individual cohesive *ethnē*, is a question barely touched upon in the literature: it surfaces only in the discussion between Gustav Adolf Lehmann and Wolfgang Helck in the 1980s and in Drews 1993. For convenience's sake, I will in the following use standardized transcriptions for the ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples as commonly used in the English language. An example of how these ethnonyms can be written in Egyptian hieroglyphic – the writing is not standardized and therefore can vary per attestation – and their proper transliteration is rendered in figure 3.⁷⁴ Note that the ethnonyms are distinguished as such by the determinative of foreign people (Gardiner 1994: T14 + A1).

The modern literature on the Sea Peoples commences with the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphic by Jean-François Champollion in the first half of the 19th century AD. In his *Grammaire égyptienne* of 1836 he proposed to identify the Peleset as mentioned in the texts of Ramesses III (1184-1153 BC) in his mortuary temple at Medinet Habu (Thebes) with the Biblical Philistines – an identification which goes unchallenged till the present day. Following in his footsteps, Emmanuel de Rougé set out in his contribution to the *Revue Archéologique* 16 of 1867 to connect the other ethnonyms in the same texts and in the one of Merneptah (1213-1203 BC) on a wall of the main temple at Karnak (Thebes) with names of known Mediterranean peoples or locations on the basis of similarity in sound (“Gleichklang”). Thus he proposed to identify the Teresh with the Tyrrhenians or Etruscans, the Shekelesh with the Sicels, the Sherden with the Sardinians, all in the

central Mediterranean, the Ekwesh with the Akhaians in mainland Greece, and the Lukka with the Lycians in southwest Asia Minor. These suggestions were subsequently amplified by François Chabas in his *Études sur l'Antiquité Historique d'après les sources égyptiennes et les monuments réputés préhistoriques* of 1872, who connected the Tjeker with the Teukroi of the Troas in northwest Asia Minor, the Denye(n) with the Daunians and the Weshesh with the Oscans, the latter two both at home in Italy. Moreover, he ventured to equal the Peleset, which we have seen to be identified with the Biblical Philistines since the time of Champollion, with the Pelasgians of Greek literary sources – an equation, as far as the Philistines are concerned, with a respectable history, first being put forward by Etienne Fourmont in 1747.

The proposals of de Rougé and Chabas, with identifications of the ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples running as widely as from the western part of Asia Minor in the east via mainland Greece in the centre to Sicily, Italy, and Sardinia in the west were almost directly challenged by Gaston Maspero – who, by the way, coined the term Sea Peoples (“peuples de la mer”) in 1881, which is an apt form of address considering the association of these peoples with the sea and islands in the midst of the sea in the Egyptian texts – in review articles of the former authors' works and, more elaborately, in his monographs *Histoire Ancienne des peuples de l'orient classique* of 1875 and *Struggle of the Nations, Egypt, Syria and Assyria* of 1910. In Maspero's view, then, the homeland of the Sea Peoples should be restricted to western Anatolia and mainland Greece. Thus, apart from embracing the equation of the Ekwesh with the Akhaians of mainland Greece, the Sherden were supposed to be linked up with the Lydian capital Sardis, the Shekelesh with the Pisidian town of Sagalassos, and the Weshesh with the Carian place name Wassos. His main reason for the central position of Anatolia in his reconstructions was formed by Herodotos' location of the ultimate homeland of the Tyrrhenians in Lydia (*Histories* I, 94). Like in the case of the Tyrrhenians, these Anatolian peoples were suggested to have moved after their attack on Egypt to their later Central Mediterranean homelands. Only the Philistines were supposed to have turned east and settled in Canaan.

⁷⁴ As the Egyptologist J.F. Borghouts assures me, the use of Gardiner 1994: T 12 “bowstring” (phonetic value *3r*) for Gardiner 1994: V 4 “lasso” (phonetic value *w3*) in the ethnonym *Ekwesh* is a peculiarity of the Karnak text, paralleled, for example, in the writing of *Meswesh*.



I no.	II hieroglyphics	transliteration (Borghouts)	vocalization as employed in the present study
1*		š3rdn	Sherden
2*		š3krš3	Shekelesh
3*		ik3w3š3	Ekweh
4*		rkw	Lukka
5*		twrš3	Teresh
1		prwst	Peleset
2		t3k3r	Tjeker
3		š3krš3	Shekelesh
4		d3iniw	Denyen
5		w3š3š3	Weshesh

Fig. 3. The ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples in Egyptian writing, transliteration, and standardized transcription (from Kitchen 1982: IV, 4 and Kitchen 1983: V, 40).⁷⁵

(a) Merneptah, Karnak, marked with * in column I above

(b) Ramesses III, Medinet Habu

⁷⁵ I am indebted to J.F. Borghouts for providing the transliteration, and to Wim van Binsbergen for identifying the specific transliterated strings with the hieroglyphic sections, and preparing and tabulating the graphics in this table.

The view of Maspero that the Sea Peoples originated solely from the eastern Mediterranean has had a great influence on his successors, even up to the present day (cf. Redford 1992: 246). At any rate, it has been taken over without much critical reflection by H.R. Hall, who dominated the field in the first half of the 20th century AD. In a first contribution to the *Annual of the British School at Athens* 8 of 1901-2, he expressed himself in favor of Maspero's identifications with the only noted exception of Weshesh, which he preferred to connect with Cretan Waksioi instead of Carian Wassos. Next, in a collection of papers to the memory of Champollion which appeared in 1922 Hall presented a useful summary of the literature on the topic of the Sea Peoples up to that moment. In this summary, he proposed to identify the Denye(n), whom Maspero had equated with the Danaoi of the Argolid in mainland Greece, with the Danuna of Cilicia as mentioned in the El-Amarna texts from the reigns of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) and Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC). Hall's work culminates in his contribution to the first edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, which appeared in 1926. Here he expressly distinguished the Sea Peoples, which, as we have seen, according to him originated from western Anatolia and mainland Greece, from the Keftiu, i.e. the designation of the Cretans in Egyptian texts. Confronted with the Biblical sources, according to which the Peleset originated from Crete, he came up with the solution that they had come from Asia Minor *via* Crete. Furthermore, he noted in alignment with his earlier association of the Denye(n) with the Danuna, that some of the Sea Peoples, like the Sherden and the Lukka, were already mentioned in the El-Amarna texts. Of them, the Sherden were stipulated to have fought both on the Egyptian side and that of the Sea Peoples in the upheavals at the time of Ramesses III. Finally, in true Masperonian way, he envisioned the Sherden, Shekelesh, and Teresh, after their failing attack on Egypt, as being on their way to their ultimate homes in the central Mediterranean. The career of Hall ended with his "going Caucasian" so to say: in his last contribution on the subject of 1929 he explained all ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples as reflections of similar sounding Caucasian tribal names – a fine example of the dangers of the etymological approach when applied without further backing.

After the second World War, the first to take up the subject of the Sea Peoples again, was Alan Gardiner. In his *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica* of 1947 he meticulously described all that was known at the time of a number of the ethnonyms, especially so of the Sherden and the Peleset.

Remarkable is that in connection with the Denye(n) he spoke against their relation with the Danuna in Cilicia and in favor of that with the Danaoi of the Argolid in mainland Greece. Moreover, he sided with Hall in his opinion that the Peleset were not originally at home in Crete, but used this island as an intermediary station in their way to the Levant. In connection with the Sherden, finally, he remarked, with reference to an earlier contribution by Wainwright (1939: 148), that the Teresh were known to the Hittite world (probably implying a linguistic relation of the ethnonym with Tarwisa (= Troy), which, however, is dubious), but the Sherden and the Shekelesh not and hence that the latter might be assumed to originate from outside of it – the first rudimentary attempt to bring the controversy between de Rougé and Chabas on the one hand and Maspero on the other to a higher level.

Next, Paul Mertens presented in the *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 of 1960 a nice overview of the Egyptian sources on the Sea Peoples from their first occurrence in the El-Amarna texts and those of Ramesses II (1279-1212 BC) up to their alignment with the Libyan king Meryre (= Meryey) in the reign of Merneptah and their ultimate attack on Egypt in the reign of Ramesses III. However, as far as origins are concerned, he did not choose between the central to east Mediterranean thesis of de Rougé and the solely east Mediterranean antithesis of Maspero, whereas, in connection with the Peleset, he followed Bonfante (1946) in identifying them as Illyrians who migrated to the Levant via Crete.

The first to address the question what caused the upheavals of the Sea Peoples at the end of the Late Bronze Age was Wolfgang Kimmig in a lengthy paper in the *Festschrift Tackenberg* of 1964. In his view, these are a mere function of the expansion of the Urnfield peoples of central and eastern Europe into all directions, so also to the Mediterranean in the south. As Kimmig keenly observed, the contribution of bearers of the Urnfield culture to the movement of the Sea Peoples is indicated by their ships as depicted in the reliefs at Medinet Habu having bird head protomes at the stern as well as the prow – a typical Urnfield feature. He further rightly stipulated that some of the Sea Peoples were already in contact with the Near East when the expansion of the Urnfielders motivated them to look for new homelands in an agreeable surrounding. Although he tried to avoid the vexed question of the origins of the Sea Peoples as much as possible, Kimmig restricted his Urnfield model for the cause of the latter's movement to the eastern Mediterranean: an incursion of Urnfielders

into mainland Greece in his eyes set the whole process in motion.

Against the background of Kimmig's answer to the question of causality, Richard D. Barnett's treatment of the Sea Peoples in the 3rd edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, which first appeared as a separate issue in 1969 and subsequently as an integral part of Volume II, 2 in 1975, means a step back to the level of identifications on the basis of likeness in sound, in which the author sides with Maspero's eastern Mediterranean thesis: thus the Teresh are said to originate from Lydia, the Shekelesh to be on their way to Sicily, whereas for the Sherden a homeland in Cyprus is taken into consideration, from where, of course, they departed to colonize Sardinia. As far as the Peleset are concerned, he saw no problem in identifying them with the Philistines and having them colonize cities in Canaan – in his view Gaza, Askelon, Asdod and Dor – from Crete. From an historical point of view, Barnett pointed to the fact that the famine reported by Herodotus (*Histories* I, 94) as the cause of part of the Lydian population to leave their country and settle in Etruria might be a reflection of the grain shipments by Merneptah to keep the country of Hatti alive. Furthermore, he suggested that the naval victory of the last Hittite great king Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC) against the island of Alasiya has a bearing on his battle against the Sea Peoples having gained themselves a foothold on Cyprus.⁷⁶

In the same year that Barnett's contribution first appeared, Rainer Stadelmann put forward an interesting paper in *Saeculum* 19 in which he offered an alternative answer to what caused the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. In his view the prime move is made by the Phrygians, who, originating from the Balkans, overran the Anatolian plateau at the end of the Late Bronze Age and destroyed the Hittite Empire. As a corollary to this migration, the Philistines joined the Phrygians in their movement from the Balkans to Asia Minor, but, instead of settling here, they moved on to the Levant and Egypt via Crete and Cyprus. Having been defeated by Ramesses III, the Philistines settled in Palestine – an event which was previously assumed by Albright (1932) and Alt (1944) to have been orchestrated by the Egyptian pharaoh, but, taking the evidence at face value, the latter appeared no longer in control of this re-

⁷⁶ For a critical review of Barnett's contribution to the *Cambridge Ancient History*, pointing out numerous instances of sloppiness, see Astour 1972.

gion. As opposed to this, Stadelmann assumed that the Sherden, Shekelesh, and Teresh went to the central Mediterranean to find their new homes in Sardinia, Sicily, and central Italy, from where they maintained trade contacts with their former comrades in arms in the Levant up to the time that the Phoenicians seized the opportunity to take these over.

The following years are dominated by a German scholar, Gustav Adolf Lehmann. In a series of works, starting in 1970 and continuing to 1996, he tried to reconstruct an historical outline of the events that led to and made up the catastrophe at the end of the Late Bronze Age, using a wide range of sources from Egyptian hieroglyphic through Ugaritic alphabetic up to Hittite cuneiform. With only slight adaptations, this historical picture forms the basic background for my own studies on the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples; for a brief summary of the main events, see section 3 above. Two points are of special interest to us here, namely Lehmann's position on the cause (or causes) of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples and that on their ethnic relevance. Now, as to what caused the catastrophe, it can be deduced from the distribution map of groups of the Sea Peoples in the central and eastern Mediterranean in *Die mykenisch-frühgriechische Welt und der östliche Mittelmeerraum in der Zeit der "Seevölker"-Invasionen um 1200 v. Chr.* of 1985 (p. 47) and the accompanying text (pp. 43-9) that he considered the Adriatic as the source of trouble for the wider Mediterranean, population groups here possibly being uprooted by developments in the Danubian area. As against this model, it might be objected that the aforesaid distribution map rather reflects the situation *after* the catastrophe, when the Sea Peoples had been subject to a widespread diaspora. With respect to the ethnic relevance of the ethnonyms, Lehmann pointed out that the Egyptian depictions of the Sherden in reliefs from the reigns of Ramesses II and Ramesses III with very specific features testifies to the fact that at least the nucleus of the Sea Peoples consisted of pronounced ethnic groups (p. 58; see also our motto). In a review article of Lehmann's work of 1985 in *Gnomon* 58 of 1986, Wolfgang Helck reacted against this inference with the words that

“Der Gedanke, daß wir es mit reinen ‘Seeräuber’ zu tun haben, die sich – durch eine Naturkatastrophe veranlaßt – in den Ausgangszentren des bisher von ihnen nur auf See geplünderten Handels festsetzen, wird nicht herausgezogen.” (p. 628).

Hand-in-hand with this degradation of the Sea Peo-

ples as mere pirates goes Helck's denial of a migrational aspect to the period of the upheavals set in motion by the expansion of the bearers of the Urnfield culture – whereas in his *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* of 1971 he still held the Phrygian migrations from the Balkans to Anatolia responsible as a prime mover for the ensuing catastrophe.

An even more extreme position with reference to the migrational aspect of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples than the one maintained by Helck was presented by Alexandra Nibbi in her *The Sea Peoples and Egypt* of 1975. According to this author the Sea Peoples are all Asiatics living in the Nile delta, with the exception of the Peleset, the identification of whom with the Philistines from Palestine as proposed already by Champollion she accepts. At the background of Nibbi's views lurks the interpretation of what is generally considered as the Egyptian words for the Mediterranean sea (*w3d-wr* “great green”), islands (*iw*), and sea (*ym*) as references to the Nile delta and inland lakes here. She even went as far as to suggest that *Retenu*, which is generally considered as an indication of the Levant, is a reference to the Nile delta, too. I think it is not advisable to follow Nibbi in her extremist standpoint.⁷⁷

In the next year, 1976, August Strobel published his *Der Spätbronzezeitliche Seevölkersturm, Ein Forschungsüberblick mit Folgerungen zur biblischen Exodusthematik*, which offers a wealth of detailed information on the individual groups of the Sea Peoples and the Near Eastern texts in which they appear, and hence may serve us as a valuable reference book. However, it is less outspoken about the matters which primarily concern us here, like the origins of the Sea Peoples, the causes for the catastrophe – though Strobel favors a severe drought in this respect – and the articulation of the Sea Peoples' ethnicity.

Still a classic in the field is Nancy K. Sandars *The Sea Peoples, Warriors of the ancient Mediterranean 1250-1150 BC* of 1978, which two years afterwards appeared in Dutch translation as *De Zeevolken, Egypte en Voor-Azië bedreigd, 1250-1150 v.C.* – both editions being highly

valuable for their rich illustrations.⁷⁸ However, as far as the origins of the individual population groups are concerned, the author happens to be wavering between the views of de Rougé on the one hand and Maspero on the other hand. Thus the Sherden are in first instance linked up with either Sardinia or Sardis, whereas later they are supposed to have migrated from Cyprus or North Syria to Sardinia. Similarly, the Shekelesh are now associated with Anatolia and then with southern Italy and Sicily. Only with respect to the Teresh Sandars straightforwardly committed herself to an Anatolian homeland, be it Lydia or the Troas. The latter region is also considered the place of origin of the Tjeker and, less persuasively, of the Weshesh, whilst the Lukka, the Ekwesh, and the Denye(n) are more or less conventionally identified as the Lycians of southwest Anatolia, the Akhaians of western Anatolia, the Aegean islands or mainland Greece, and the Danuna of Cilicia, respectively. Finally, the Peleset are, like the Teresh, traced back to an Anatolian homeland. Also as far as the causes of the catastrophe are concerned, Sandars' position is rather diffuse, now stressing internecine war and internal decay (= systems collapse), then economic crisis and last but not least attacks from hostile tribes or states along the borders. This unsatisfactory mixture of causes of the catastrophe should not surprise us, because, as long as the problem of the origins of the Sea Peoples remains unsolved, the related problem of these causes can in fact not possibly be adequately dealt with.

In his book on *Caphtor/Keftiu*, subtitled *A new Investigation*, from 1980, John Strange also pays some attention to the Sea Peoples (pp. 138-142; 157-165). In doing so, he is exceptional in presenting the spelling of the five ethnonyms recorded for Medinet Habu in Egyptian hieroglyphic writing. As far as the origins of the Sea Peoples are concerned, however, he adheres to common views in the literature at the time according to which most of them originated from Asia Minor (Denye(n)), particularly its western outskirts (Lukka, Shekelesh, Teresh, Tjeker), but some came from farther west, the Aegean (Ekwesh), or north, the Caucasus (Sherden), and the Balkans (Peleset). Crucial to his main theme, the identification of Biblical Kaphtor and Egyptian Keftiu with Cyprus, is the fact that a substantial number of the Sea Peoples can be shown to have colonized the Syro-Palestine coast from the latter is-

⁷⁷ In variant form Nibbi's extremist point of view has recently been embraced by Yves Duhoux, according to whom (2003: 272) “la base opérationnelle des envahisseurs était le centre du Delta”. Although I am not challenging the fact that, for example, *w3d-wr* “great green” in certain contexts does refer to the Nile and the Red Sea, it certainly goes too far to deny that in *other* contexts, like that of the Sea Peoples, it clearly denotes the Mediterranean Sea.

⁷⁸ Cf. the reviews of this book by Muhly 1979 and Snodgrass 1978.

land, which Strange correlates to the well-known Biblical information that the Philistines originated from Kaphtor, hence his adagium Kaphtor = Cyprus. Although Cyprus may have functioned as a way station for some of the Sea Peoples in their trek to the Levant, it is an oversimplification of the evidence to consider it as their main sallying point – as we will see, the diagnostic ceramics in the form of Mycenaean III C1b ware have a much wider distribution, including Crete and western Anatolia. To this comes that there is positive evidence, duly assembled by Strange himself, indicating that Alasiya is the Late Bronze Age name of Cyprus, and Kaptara (> Kaphtor) or Keftiu that of Crete.

In line with Lehmann's view on the cause of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples, Fritz Schachermeyr in his *Die Levant im Zeitalter der Wanderungen, Vom 13. bis zum 11. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* of 1982 traces the origin of some of the Sea Peoples back to the Adriatic, in particular Illyria, from where the Shekelesh and Sherden are supposed to have migrated to the Levant by sea, uprooting the Mycenaean Greeks along the route, and the Tjekker and Peleset to have done the same by land, in this way causing the fall of the Hittite empire.

Another milestone in the study of the Sea Peoples next to Sandars' work is formed by Trude Dothan's *The Philistines and their Material Culture* of 1982, which provides the archaeological evidence of the settlements in Palestine on a site to site basis – an indispensable working tool. For a more popular representation of this material, focussing on the personal contribution of Trude and her husband Moshe Dothan to the excavation of Philistine sites, see Trude Dothan & Moshe Dothan, *People of the Sea, The Search of the Philistines* of 1992.

In the next year, 1983, Günther Hölbl argued emphatically for the historical relevance of the Egyptian texts on the Sea Peoples by Merneptah at Karnak and by Ramesses III at Medinet Habu in his contribution to the *Zwettl Symposium* – dedicated to the Aegean and the Levant during the period of the Dark Age. In doing so, he was able to distinguish two phases in the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples: (1) a strictly military one at the time of Merneptah in which the groups of the Sea Peoples mentioned act as mercenaries or auxiliaries to the Libyan king Meryre (= Meryey) – who himself takes with him his wife and children with the obvious intent of settling in the Egyptian delta; and (2) a migratory one at the time of Ramesses III in which at least some of the groups of the Sea Peoples mentioned are decided to settle in the Egyptian

delta as evidenced by the fact that they take with them their wives and children in ox carts.

In 1984 appeared the *Lexicon der Ägyptologie*, Band V, edited by Wolfgang Helck and Eberhard Otto, which contains the lemma *Seevölker* written by Rainer Stadelmann. This section is well-referenced and therefore still handy to consult, notwithstanding its Masperonian bias (e.g. the Sherden are traced back to Sardis, and, with the Shekelesh and Teresh, believed to have reached the central Mediterranean only after the resurrections at the end of the Bronze Age) and the mistaken opinion that the Sherden only fought on the side of the Egyptians in the land- and sea-battles of Ramesses III's years 5 and 8 (as a distinction the Sherden on the side of the enemies wear horned helmets *without* a sun-disc in between them).

Subsequently, Jacques Vanschoonwinkel dedicated a section to the Sea Peoples in his *L'Égée et la Méditerranée orientale à la fin du II^e millénaire* of 1991. In this section, he decisively refuted Nibbi's thesis according to which the Sea Peoples (with the noted exception of the Philistines) are Asiatics who had already been living in the Nile delta for a long time. As it comes to the question of the origins of the Sea Peoples, however, Vanschoonwinkel merely sums up the various possibilities circulating since the times of de Rougé and Maspero without showing any preference for the one or the other. No wonder, therefore, that his view on the cause or causes of the catastrophe is as diffuse as that of Sandars – adding in particular violent earthquakes.

One of the most important and stimulating contributions on our topic is formed by Robert Drews' *The End of the Bronze Age, Changes in Warfare and the Catastrophe ca. 1200 B.C.* of 1993. In this work, the author set out to treat the various causes of the catastrophe as suggested in the relevant literature, like earthquakes, drought, systems collapse, and migrations, in order to refute them all; in his criticism of the migrational explanation, he launched a vehement attack on Maspero's identification of the Sherden, Shekelesh, and Teresh with peoples from Anatolia, maintaining instead that these are just persons from Sardinia, Sicily, and Etruria. As indicated by the subtitle of his book, according to Drews the real explanation of the catastrophe at the end of the Late Bronze Age constitutes a military innovation. In the palatial societies of the Late Bronze Age empires, chariot warfare formed the heart and core of the army, being supplemented only by infantry auxiliaries, particularly handy for special tasks like guarding the camp

site or manoeuvring in mountainous terrain. At the end of the Bronze Age, however, a new style of infantry is introduced with, amongst others, round shields, slashing swords, metal greaves, and javelins, which can outmatch the until then unchallenged chariotry, especially by eliminating the horses with javelins thrown in full run. In general, this shift from chariotry to infantry warfare during the period from the end of the Late Bronze Age to the early phase of the Iron Age is undisputable. But it did take place more gradually than Drews wants us to believe. In the first place, especially the Egyptian pharaohs from the time of Ramesses II onwards were quick to adapt to the military innovations by hiring Sherden mercenaries from (as we will argue) Sardinia, who were specialists in the new style of fighting. Secondly, certain groups that overran the Late Bronze Age states during the catastrophe, like the Kaskans of Anatolia and the Philistines of Palestine, still used chariots in their army during the Early Iron Age. This being so, it should not be overlooked that one of the greatest military assets of the Sea Peoples was (as their name implies) their sea power: once they had cleared the waters of the eastern Mediterranean from enemy ships, they could, just like the Vikings in a later age, attack any location of their choosing by hit and run actions, thus leaving the landlocked imperial armies no chance at a proper defence! Another point of criticism of Drews' views concerns his denial of a migratory aspect to the catastrophe, which leads him to the assertion that the Peleset and Tjeker were already living in Palestine during the Late Bronze Age – a supposition which, insofar as the period of Ramesses III is concerned, is simply untenable. As Drews himself admits, the innovative infantry is only effective when applied in “overwhelming numbers” (p. 211). Furthermore, the Peleset and the Tjeker are never mentioned in contemporary Late Bronze Age texts, thanks to which the situation in the Levant before the catastrophe is reasonably clear; for the Peleset, Drews can only fall back on the Biblical account of the Philistine ruler Abimelech from the times of Abraham and Isaac, which, however, is a patent anachronism. Finally, as we have just noted, in the period of Ramesses III some of the groups of the Sea Peoples clearly had the intention to settle in the Egyptian delta as evidenced by the ox carts with women and children depicted on the enemy's side in the reliefs of Medinet Habu. Of special interest to our main theme is the fact that Drews denies that the persons referred to by the ethnonyms which belonged to the Sea Peoples “were ever a *cohesive* group” (p. 71; my ital-

ics). In my opinion, his military explanation of the catastrophe, stressing the advancement of infantry, would gain a lot if the groups were indeed cohesive. In a contribution to the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 59 of 2000, Drews elaborates his anti-migratory view on the catastrophe at the end of the Bronze Age.

The treatment of the Philistines by Ed Noort in his *Die Seevölker in Palästina* of 1994 is, like the work of Drews just discussed, characterized by the modern fashion to minimize the migratory aspect of the catastrophe. In the end, however, he cannot but admit that the Philistine culture of the Early Iron Age is a mixture of an intrusive element from Crete, the Peleset, with the indigenous Late Bronze Age population of Canaan. Consistently within this frame of reference, he considers the mention of Abimelech in the Bible as a Philistine ruler in the period of the Patriarchs an anachronism.

In his work of 1999 on Ugarit, Cyprus and the Aegean, Hans-Günter Buchholz, specifically discussed the problem of the Sea Peoples, especially in his concluding remarks (pp. 708-741), where he presents a wealth of recent literature. Like many of his predecessors, however, he considers it an open question whether the Sherden and the Shekelesh originated from the West or not.

In 2000 appeared a collection of papers edited by Eliezer D. Oren entitled *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*.⁷⁹ Most shocking news is that Annie Caubet informs us that the famous oven in Ras Shamra/Ugarit, in which tablets were found which presumably had a bearing on the last days of Ugarit, is not an oven at all but a ceiling from an upper storey. In addition to this, Peter Machinist presents a valuable overview of the sources on the Philistines in their pentapolis of Asdod, Askelon, Gaza, Ekron, and Gath. Also worthy of note here, finally, is the fact that Shelley Wachsmann takes up the suggestion by Kimmig, again, that the ship(s) of the Sea Peoples as depicted at Medinet Habu are characterized by Urnfield influence for their having a bird head ornament at the stern as well as the prow.

The latest publication on the topic I know of is Eric H. Cline's and David O'Connor's contribution to a collection of papers edited by David O'Connor and Stephen Quirke entitled *Mysterious Lands*, which appeared in 2003. This presents a handy and up-to-date overview of the Egyptian sources on the Sea Peoples, but, as it leaves out

⁷⁹ Cf. Barako 2004.

all the relevant evidence from other sources, it fails to answer the question of their origins – not to mention that of their ethnicity.

Whilst we are writing this overview of the literature of the Sea Peoples, a new major study on the topic has been announced by Killebrew *et al.* (in preparation), but it had not yet appeared.

5. CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

The contemporary sources with a bearing on the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples at the end of the Late Bronze Age are threefold: Egyptian, Cypro-Minoan, and Ugaritic. Egyptian records inform us about the Libyan attack supported by allies or mercenaries from the Sea Peoples in year 5 of the reign of Merneptah (= 1208 BC), about the ultimate combined land- and seaborne attack of the Sea Peoples themselves in years 5 and 8 of the reign of Ramesses III (= 1179 BC and 1176 BC), and, in the form of the Wen Amon story, about the immediate aftermath of the crisis. Next, in Cypro-Minoan documents we encounter representatives of the Sea Peoples engaged in maritime trade in the interlude between the Libyan invasion from the reign of Merneptah and the ultimate combined land- and seaborne attack from the reign of Ramesses III. Finally, Ugaritic letters vividly describe the situation just before the ultimate attack by the Sea Peoples on Egypt in the reign of Ramesses III. I will present the Cypro-Minoan and Ugaritic texts both in transliteration and translation, whereas in connection with the Egyptian ones I will confine myself to the translation only as a transliteration of the full set is, to the best of my knowledge, yet to be published.

Egyptian

The chief source on the Lybian invasion is formed by the great historical inscription of Merneptah (1213-1203 BC) inscribed on a wall of the main temple at Karnak (Thebes). The inscription consists of 79 lines in sum, but unfortunately the text is only lacunarily preserved, about half of it being lost.⁸⁰ The following two passages are relevant to our subject:

Karnak inscription

Lines 13-15

⁸⁰ Schulman 1987: 23.

“[Year 5, 2nd month of] Summer, day (1), as follows: the wretched, fallen chief of Libya, Meryey, son of Ded, has fallen upon the country of Tehenu with his bowmen (...) *Sherden, Shekelesh, Ekwesh, Lukka, Teresh*, taking the best of every warrior and every man of war of his country. He has brought his wife and his children (...) leaders of the camp, and he has reached the western boundary in the fields of Perire.”⁸¹

In conjunction with the information from the so-called Athribis stele (numbers between parentheses), the count of the victims (lines 52-54) can be reconstructed as follows:

Libyans 6359, *Shekelesh* 222 (200), *Teresh* 742 (722), *Ekwesh* (2201), *Sherden* – (–).⁸²

Note that the allies of the Sea Peoples are explicitly referred to as being circumcised, for which reason their hands instead of their penises are cut off and counted.⁸³

Cypro-Minoan

The Cypro-Minoan documents bearing testimony of representatives of the Sea Peoples engaged in maritime trade come from Enkomi (cylinder seal Inv. no. 19.10) and Kalavassos (cylinder seal K-AD 389) in Cyprus and Ras Shamra/Ugarit (tablet RS 20.25) on the adjacent coast of the Levant. Of these documents, two were discovered in a datable context, the Kalavassos cylinder seal in an ashlar (= dressed stone) building abandoned at the end of Late Cypriote IIC and the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit in the remains of an archive of a villa in the residential area east of the palace, destroyed, like the entire town, at the end of the Late Bronze Age.⁸⁴ Accordingly, we arrive at a date of c. 1180 BC as a *terminus ante quem* for the recording of

⁸¹ Breasted 1927: Vol. III, no. 574; Davies 1997: 155; cf. Drews 1993a: 49.

⁸² Breasted 1927: Vol. III, nos. 588, 601; Davies 1997: 163; cf. Lehmann 1979: 490; Drews 1993a: 49.

⁸³ Widmer 1975: 71, note 23.

⁸⁴ For the exact location of tablet RS 20.25, see Buchholz 1999: 134-5, Abb. 34 (TCM).

these texts.⁸⁵ That the Enkomi cylinder seal belongs to the same chronological horizon is indicated by the fact that some of the persons mentioned in its text also figure in the texts of the Kalavassos cylinder seal and the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit.

The relationship between these three texts not only involves the mention of the same persons, but also entails the underlying structure of recording.⁸⁶ Thus, in all three there can be distinguished basically four types of information, (1) heading(s), (2) indications of deliverers, (3) indications of recipients, and (4) indications of products. The headings are mostly singled out as such by the locative in *-ti*: *Umi(a)tisiti* “at Amathus” in the texts of the Enkomi and Kalavassos cylinder seals, and *Lamiyaneti kapariti* “at the Lamiyan trade centre” in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit.⁸⁷ Of the deliverers, only the name of the scribe, who identifies himself by the Luwian personal pronoun of the 1st person singular *emu* or *-mu* “I”, is purposely put in the nominative – written without its proper ending *-s* according to the standards in Linear B and Luwian hieroglyphic at the time. Thus: *Pika, tamika Likike -mu* “Piḥas, I, trader from Lycia” in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, *emu Sanema* “I, Sanemas” in the text of the Kalavassos cylinder seal, and *Wesa -mu* “I, Wesas” in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit. As opposed to this, the main deliverer next to the scribe is written in the Luwian dative in *-i*,⁸⁸ to stress that the transactions are re-

corded “on behalf” of the person in question: *samuri mane<si>kaasi* “on behalf of the Samian, representative of the Maeonians (?)” in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, *Remi taasa wetuti wasaka* “on behalf of Remus, governor of this town” in the text of the Kalavassos seal, and *Akami pini Mali ati pini Apesa* “on behalf of Akamas, representative of Malos and representative of Ephesos” in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit.⁸⁹ If there are more deliverers, as in the case of the Enkomi and Kalavassos cylinder seals, these are likewise intended to be in the dative – even if this case is not always properly indicated by oversight or because of sloppiness. The recipients, distinguished as such by the fact that they follow the deliverers after a punctuation mark and/or a transaction term (*telu, pi*, etc.), are also rendered in the dative case, either in *-ti*⁹⁰ or in *-we*⁹¹ as in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, or also in *-i* as in the text of the Kalavassos seal, or exclusively in *-i* as in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit – with only a few exceptions from oversight or sloppiness. E.g.: *Sanemeti Sikerisikaasi* “to Sanemas, representative of the Shekelesh” and *Lemapesiti Talimetu/natewe Sekeriyakati* “to Lemapesi from Talmite-sup’s town in Sangaria” in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, *Isimiriti mitisa* “to the servant from Smyrna” and *tameki Pese<we>we* “to the Pisidian trader” in the text of the Kalavassos seal, and *Isipali* “to Isiba’al” in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit. Finally, the indications of products, often occurring in abbreviation and in combination with numbers, so far identifiable appear to have a bearing on the cloth industry: *ketu* “cotton”, *MA* for *maru* “wool”, *PA* for *pharweha* “cloth”, *pupuru* “purple (colored cloth)”, *RI* for *linon* “linen”, and *SA* for *sarara* “spun flax” – with the exception of *E* for *elaiwon* “(linseed) oil” in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal and *WA* or *wane* “wine” in the texts of the Kalavassos cylinder seal and the tablet from Ras Shamra/Ugarit.

⁸⁵ Yon 1992: 120 dates the destruction of Ras Shamra-Ugarit between 1195 and 1185 BC, but note that her dates of the Egyptian pharaohs are 4 years higher than the ones presented by Kitchen 1989, which are followed here. The destructions in Cyprus at the end of Late Cypriote II, assigned by Karageorghis 1992: 80 to c. 1190 BC, are likely to be synchronized with the destruction of Ras Shamra/Ugarit.

⁸⁶ For a full treatment, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 94-145 and Woudhuizen 1994.

⁸⁷ This ending corresponds with the Luwian hieroglyphic locative singular in *-ti*, as attested for the Cekke text, see Woudhuizen 2005: section 1.

⁸⁸ Bulgarmaden, phrase 10: *Mutiā MASANA WATIī* “for the divine mountain Muti”, Boğça, phrase 4: *MASANA RUWANTIī* “to, for Runt”, Karaburun, phrases 8 and 9: *Sapiā HANTAWATIī* “for king Sapis”, Boğça, phrase 2: *MASANA TARHUNTIī* “for Tarḥunt”, see Hawkins 2000: *passim*; Çineköy, phrase 10: *parnāwai* “for the house”, see Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000: 988, etc.; also cf. Woudhuizen 2004b.

⁸⁹ For the improvement of our interpretation of this phrase, see section 13, note 530 below.

⁹⁰ This ending corresponds with the Luwian hieroglyphic dative singular of the pronoun in *-ti*, see Meriggi 1980: 322-3.

⁹¹ This ending corresponds with the Sidetic dative singular in *-va* as attested for the form *Trataševa* “for Tratases” in Sid. no. 3, line 1, see Woudhuizen 1984-5: 124.

Enkomi cylinder seal (Inv. no. 19.10)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. <i>u-mi-a-ti-si-ti^o</i>
 2. <i>ya-sa.sa-ne-me-ti/i</i>
 3. <i>te/ma-li-ki-pi-ti/E</i>
 4. <i>i₁-ma-[..].pe-pa-e-ru-</i>
 5. <i>ti/RI₁[/]<i>sa-mu-ri.</i></i>
 6. <i>i/ti-pa-pi-ti/PA/</i>
 7. <i>ke-tu/.PA/e₁-ma-pi-</i>
 8. <i>ti/SA/pi-ka.E/</i>
 9. <i>sa-ne-me-ti/li-ki-ke(-)</i>
 10. <i>mu/ta-mi-ka.pu-pu-</i>
 11. <i>ru/u-li-mu-te-we/u-</i>
 12. <i>we/MA₁/le(?)<i>-ma₁-pe-si-</i></i>
 13. <i>ti/ta-li-me-tu(or na)-te-we</i>
 14. <i>se-ke-ri₁-ya-ka-ti ta-</i>
 15. <i>mi-ka.se-wa-ru a-</i>
 16. <i>ka-mu a-pe-si-ka-a-</i>
 17. <i>si ta-mi-ka.mi-we-tu(or na)-</i>
 18. <i>we pa-ma₁-ti -ma 2 I a-</i>
 19. <i>ka-i₁-ru-tu(or na).wa₁-we-</i>
 20. <i>ru-ti/ya-ru/ri₁-ti-</i>
 21. <i>si-te-we/e₁-ka-ta-ti</i>
 22. <i>pe-lu ka-ta-ri[-te]-ti</i>
 23. <i>ta-mi-ka.se-wa-ru-ti</i>
 24. <i>ka-ta-ri-te 3 PA ma-ne<-si>-</i>
 25. <i>ka-a-si sa-mu-ri.te-lu</i>
 26. <i>sa-ne-me-ti si-ke-ri-</i>
 27. <i>si-ka-a-si sa-mu-ri</i></p> | <p>“At Amathus.”
 “(On behalf of) Iasos: to Sanemas, this, delivery to Malkipi(ya)s, (linseed) oil”
 “<i>I-ma-??</i>: to <i>Pe-pa-e-ru</i>, linen” “On behalf of the Samian: this to Tispapi(ya)s, cloth (and) cotton.; cloth to Ermapi(ya)s, spun flax” “Piḥas: (linseed) oil to Sanemas” “I, trader from Lycia: purple (colored) cloth to U(wa)s from Urimu(wa)s’ town, wool to <i>Le-ma₁-pe-si</i> from Talmitesup’s town in Sangaria” “Trader (from Lycia): (to) lord Akamas, representative of Ephesos, trader (from Lycia): to <i>Mi-we-tu/na</i> and Ba’am 2 (units of) <i>I</i>”
 “(On behalf of) <i>A-ka-i-ru-tu/na</i>: to <i>Wa₁-we-ru</i>, master (?) from the town of Rhytiassos (and) to <i>E₁-ka-ta</i>, lord from the town of Gadara; trader (from Lycia): to the lord from Gadara, 3 (units of) cloth”
 “On behalf of the Samian, representative of the Maeonians (?), delivery to Sanemas, representative of the Shekelesh”
 “On behalf of the Samian”</p> |
|---|---|

Kalavassos cylinder seal (K-AD 389)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>12. <i>u-mi-ti-si-ti sa-mi-</i>
 13. <i>ya we-tu-ti.i-le-mi</i>
 14. <i>i se-mi/a ne-si-</i>
 15. <i>ri sa-re-ki/[I] SA.</i>
 16. <i>i-ya/pi-ti(?)</i>
 17. <i>[]/a</i>
 18. <i>i-le-mi/[le(?)]-mu-ne[-ti]</i>
 1. <i>i-le-mi/i-si-mi-ri-ti</i>
 2. <i>mi[-ti]-sa/i-a 2 I/SA;</i></p> | <p>“At Amathus, for the Samian town.” “On behalf of Ilm (he brings) this for Samos, i.e. for the Hittite from Sarawa: <i>I</i> (and) spun flax.”
 “These (products) he gives (...) (...), i.e. (...).”
 “On behalf of Ilm to (the servant from) Lemnos, on behalf of Ilm to the servant from Smyrna: these 2 (units of) <i>I</i></p> |
|---|--|

3. *re-mi/a-wa/mu₁-sa-se*
4. *wa-ne/e-we₁/a-ti-mi-we₁*
5. *mu₁-sa/wa-si-ri-ti₁*
6. *e-mu sa-ne-ma/ya-sa-ti*
7. *re-mi/ta-a-sa/we[-tu]-ti*
8. *wa-sa-ka/i-si-mi-ri[-ti]*
9. *ISA.wa-sa-ka*
10. *e-pe[-se]/pi-mi-se/i₂*
11. *ta-me-ki/pe-se-we₁ PA*

(and) spun flax;”
 “On behalf of Remus he brings
 divine wine in veneration to
 the goddess Artemis”
 “I, Sanemas, to Iasos,
 on behalf of Remus, governor of
 this town, to Smyrna:
 I (and) spun flax.”
 “(On behalf of) the governor himself being given
 this to the Pisidian trader: cloth”

Tablet RS 20.25 from Ras Shamra/Ugarit

Side A

1. *a-ka-mi/pi-ni/ma-li*
2. *a-ti pi-ni/a-pe-sa PI.*
3. *i-si₁-pa-li.*
4. *a-we₁-ri/ma-ka-pi-ti₁*
5. *a-ta-ta-ne/pi-ni/ta-si-ri*
6. *i-si-pa-ti/pi-ni/u-ri₂-ka-si₁*
7. *pi-ni/u-wa₁-ri.*
8. *a wa₁-sa PI/pi-ni/ka-pi-li*
9. *wa₁-ta-ri.i-li-si-ri/wa₁-si-ri-ti₁*
10. *ta-pa-ri/pi-ni/i-li-ta-ma-ne*
11. *a-we-si-ri/pi-ni/me-ni-wa-ri*

“On behalf of Akamas, representative of Malos
 and representative of Ephesos, he (= Wasas) gives
 to Isiba‘al;
 (at) the entrepôt of the frontier outpost
 to Adadanu, representative of *tasiri*;
 to Sipat, representative of *urikasi*;
 to the representative of the frontier outpost.”
 “Wasas, representative of the municipal
 cloth industry, gives in veneration to the Syrian god (?);
 to Tabaris, representative of *ilitamane*;
 to Awesiri, representative of *meniwari*.”

Side B

12. *la-mi-ya-ne-ti/ka-pa-ri-ti₁*
13. *we-sa -mu PI*
14. *i-li-ma-li-ki/pi-ni/la-mi-ya-ti*
15. *a-ka-mi PI/pi-ni/ma-ki*
16. *u-we₁-ta-sa-li/
a-mu PI ma-sa-we-li*
17. *a-pe-mu -ma/ZITI-si/ma-ki
3 PA NE WA₁*
18. *ya-me-ri/pi-ni/ma-ki*
19. *sa-si₁-ma-li-ki/ME 2 NE/PA*

“At the Lamiyan trade centre:
 I, Wesas, give
 to Ilimalik, representative of Lamiya;
 on behalf of Akamas I give to
 Uwatasalis, representative of the customs collector;
 I give to Masawalis
 and Apamuwas, officers (?) of the customs collector:
 3 (units of) cloth, *NE* (and) wine;
 to Yameri, representative of the customs collector;
 to Sasimalik: 2 (units of) *ME*, *NE* (and) cloth.”

The fragmentarily preserved tablet 1687 from Enkomi, inscribed in the so-called Cypro-Minoan II script or Linear D, appears to contain correspondence dealing with a naval battle in the waters of southwest Asia Minor,⁹² and hence may plausibly be assigned to the same period as the Ugaritic correspondence given below. The tablet is found in

the foundation course of a hearth outside its proper context in an Enkomi IIIA (= Late Cypriote IIIA) level, postdating the period of upheavals of the Sea Peoples.⁹³

⁹² Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 98-110; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 64, note 39; Woudhuizen 1992a: 117.

⁹³ Dikaios 1971: 885; Pl. 317.

Tablet 1687 from Enkomi

Side A

(15) *a-ka-mu[/]e-le-ki/nu-ka-ru-ra/*

tu-pa-ta -mu

“Akamas of Ilion, the great enemy, smote me.”

Note that the phonetic reading of ^{lú}KUR₂.ME in Ugaritic is *nakrū* “enemies”, the root of which occurs here in variant *nukar-* characterized by *a/u*-vowel change in combination with a suffixed form of Luwian *ura-* “great”.

Ugaritic

The advent of the Sea Peoples in the eastern Mediterranean waters is vividly described in four Ugaritic letters, three of which (RS L 1, RS 20.238, RS 20.18) belong to the so-called Rap’anu-archive, named after an Ugaritic dignitary living in the residential area east of the palace (Lehmann 1979: 53; 59; cf. von Reden 1992: 266, Fig. 32), whereas one (RS 34.129) originates from an archive which came to light as a result of military defense works in the south of the city (Lehmann 1979: 481; Lehmann 1985: 32, note 64). Although the destruction of Ras Shamra/Ugarit c. 1180 BC only serves as a *terminus ante quem* for both archives, it

seems clear from the contents that all four letters actually have a bearing on the city’s last days.

The transcription of the texts, which varies in the different publications, has been systematized and improved by the Assyriologist Frans A.M. Wiggermann (letter d.d. 27 December 2003).

Contrary to the sequence of their publication, I believe, with Hofijzer & van Soldt (1998: 343), that letter RS L 1 precedes RS 20.238, because in the latter an answer is given to the question from the former where the troops and the chariotry of the king of Ugarit are stationed.

RS 34.129⁹⁴

1. *um-ma* ^dUTU-ši-m[a]
LUGAL GAL-ú
a-na ^{lú}sà-ki-in-ni
qi-bi-ma

“Thus says His Majesty, the
Great King.
Speak to the Prefect:

5. *a-n[u]-um-ma it-tu-ka*
LUG[AL] EN-ka *še-ḥe-er*
mi-i[m-m]a la-a i-de
ù a-na-ku ^dUTU-ši
a-na UGU-ḥi-šu *um-da-e-ra-šu*

Now, (there) with you, the
king your lord is (still too)
young. He knows nothing.
And I, His Majesty, had
issued him an order
concerning Ibnadušu,
whom the people from
Šikala – who live on
ships – had abducted.

10. *aš-šum* ^mib-na-du-šu
ša LU₂.MEŠ ^{kur.uru}ši-ka-la-iu-ú
i[s]-bu-tu-šu-ú-ni
ša i-na UGU-ḥi ^{giš}MA₂.ME[š]
us-bu-ú-ni

15. *a-nu-um-ma n[i-i]r-ga-i-li*
it-tu-ia
^{lú}*kar-tap-pu*

Herewith I send Nirga’ili,
who is *kartappu* with me, to
you.

⁹⁴ Malbran-Labat 1991: 38-9; cf. Dietrich & Loretz 1978.

- a-na* UGU-*ḥi-ka*
um-da-e-ra-ku
20. *ù at-ta*^m*ib-na-du-šu*
ša LU₂.MEŠ^{kur.uru}*ši-ka-la-ú*
iš-bu-tu-šu-ni
a-na UGU-*ḥi-ia*
šu-up-ra-šu
25. *a-ma-te ša*^{kur.uru}*ši-ki-la*
a-ša-al-šu
ù a-na ku-ta-li-šu
a-na^{kur.uru}*u-ga-ri-ta*
i-tu-ur-ra
30. *i-ta-la-ka*

And you, send Ibnadušu,
whom the people from Šikala
had abducted, to me.

I will question him about the
land Šikala,
and afterwards he may leave
for Ugarit again.”

(three erased lines)

RS L 1⁹⁵

1. *u[m-m]a* LUGAL-*ma*
a-na^m*am-mu-ra-pi*
LUGAL^{kur}*ú-ga-rít*
qí-bi-ma
5. *lu-ú š[u]l-mu a-na* UGU-*ḥi-ka*
DINGIR-*nu a-na šul-ma-ni*
PAP-*ru-ka*
10. *ša tàš-pu-ra ma-a*^{gis}MA₂.MEŠKUR₂
i-na ŠA₃ A.AB.BA
i-ta-am-ru-m[a]
ù šúm-ma ki-it-tu
^{gis}MA₂.MEŠ *i-ta-am-ru*
ù lu dú-nu-na[-ta]
dan-niš i-na-an-n[a]
15. *at-tu-ka [(x-x)]*
ERIN₂.MEŠ-*ka*^{gis}GIGIR.M[EŠ-*ka*]
a-ia-ka-ma-a
aš-bu ul it-ta-ka-ma-a
aš-bu i-i[a]-nu-um-ma-a
20. *i-na ḥi*²¹*-re-et*^{lu}KUR
ma-am-ma ú-nam-maš-ka
URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A-*ka* BAD₃.MEŠ
li-i-mi
ERIN₂.MEŠ *ù*^{gis}GIGIR.MEŠ
25. *i-na* ŠA₃ *šu-ri-ib*
pa-ni^{lu}KUR *dú-gu₅-ul*

“Thus says the king [of
Alashiya]. Speak to
Ammurapi, king of Ugarit:

May you be well! May the
gods keep you in good health!

Concerning what you wrote to
me: “They have spotted
enemy ships at sea”;
if they have indeed spotted
ships, make yourself as
strong as possible.
Now, where are your own
troops (and) chariotry
stationed?

Are they not stationed with
you? If not, who will deliver
you from the enemy *forces*?
Surround your towns with
walls;

bring troops and chariotry
inside. (Then) wait at full
strength for the enemy.”

⁹⁵ Nougayrol 1968: 83-9.

RS 20.238

1.	<p><i>a-na</i> LUGAL^{kur} <i>a-la-ši-ia</i> <i>a-bi-ia</i> <i>qí-bi-ma</i> <i>um-ma</i> LUGAL^{kur} <i>u-ga-ri-it</i> DUMU-<i>ka-ma</i></p>	“Speak to the king of Alashiya, my father: Thus says the king of Ugarit, your son.
<hr/>		
5.	<p><i>a-na</i> GIR₃.MEŠ <i>a-bi-ia a[m-qu]t</i> <i>a-na</i> UGU-<i>ḥi a-bi-ia lu-ú š[u]l-m[ʔu]</i> <i>a-na</i> E₂.ḪI.A-<i>ka</i> NITLAM₄.MEŠ-<i>k[a]</i> ERIN₂-<i>ka</i> <i>a-na gab-bi [m]im-mu-ú</i> <i>ša</i> LUGAL^{kur} <i>a-la-ši-i[a]</i></p>	I fall at the feet of my father. May my father be well! May your estates, your consorts, your troops, everything that belongs to the king of Alashiya, my father, be very, very well!
10.	<p><i>a-bi-ia d[a]n-niš dan-niš</i> <i>lu-ú šul-m[u]</i></p>	
<hr/>		
15.	<p><i>a-bi a-nu-ma</i> ^{giš}MA₂.MEŠ <i>ša</i> ^{lú.meš}KUR₂ <i>il-l[a]-ka</i> [U]RU.ḪI.A-<i>ia i-na IZI : i-ša-ti</i> <i>i-ša-ri-ip</i> <i>ù a-ma-at</i> <i>[la]-a ba-ni-ta</i> <i>[i-n]a</i> ŠA₃-<i>bi</i> KUR <i>i-te-e[p]-šú</i> <i>a-bu-ia ú-ul i-[d]e</i></p>	My father, now enemy ships are coming (and) they burn down my towns with fire. They have done unseemly things in the land!
20.	<p><i>ki-i gab-bu</i> ERIN₂.MEŠ E[N] <i>a-bi-ia</i> <i>i-na</i> ^{kur}ḥa-<i>at-ti</i> <i>aš-bu</i> <i>ù gab-bu</i> ^{giš}MA₂.MEŠ-<i>[i]a</i> <i>i-na</i> ^{ku[r]}lu-<i>uk-ka-a</i> <i>aš-bu [a-d]i-ni ul ik-šu-da-ni</i></p>	My father is not aware of the fact that all the troops of my father’s overlord are stationed in Ḫatti and that all my ships are stationed in Lukkā. They still have not arrived and the country is lying like that!
25.	<p><i>ù</i> KUR-<i>[t]u₄ ka-am-ma na-da-at</i> <i>a-bu-ia a-ma-at an-ni-ta₅</i> <i>[l]u-ú i-de i-na-an-na</i> 7 ^{giš}MA₂.MEŠ <i>ša</i> ^{lú.meš}KUR₂ <i>[š]a il-la-ka-a[n]-ni</i></p>	My father should know these things. Now, the seven enemy ships that are approaching have done evil things to us.
30.	<p><i>ù a-ma-at maš-ik-ta</i> <i>it-ep-šu-na-a-ši</i> <i>i-na-an-na šum-ma</i> ^{giš}MA₂.<i>[MEŠ]</i> <i>ša</i> ^{lú.meš}KUR₂ <i>ša-na-t[u₄]</i> <i>i-ba-aš-ši-mi t[é]-m[a]</i></p>	Now then, if there are any other enemy ships send me a report somehow, so that I will know.”
35.	<p><i>[a-i]a-ka-am-ma šu-up-r[a]-ni</i> <i>ù lu-ú i-de₄</i></p>	

RS 20.18

1.	<p><i>um-ma</i> ^m<i>e-šu-wa-ra</i> ^{lú}MAŠKIM GAL <i>ša</i> ^{kur}<i>a-la-ši-a</i> <i>a-na</i> LUGAL ^{kur}<i>ú-ga-ri-it</i> <i>qí-bi-ma</i></p>	<p>“Thus says Eshuwara, the chief prefect of Alashiya. Speak to the king of Ugarit:</p>
<hr/>		
5	<p><i>a-na ku-a-ša</i> KUR-t[i]-ka₄-ma <i>lu-ú šul-mu</i></p>	<p>May you and your country be well.</p>
<hr/>		
10.	<p><i>aš-šum a-ba-te</i>.ME <i>ša</i> ^{lú}KUR₂.ME <i>al-lu-ti</i> DUMU.ME KUR-ti-ka₄ ^{giš}MA₂.ME-ka₄-ma <i>a-ba-ta an-ni-ta</i> <i>i-te-ep-šu-ni</i> <i>ù i-te-eq-ta an-nu-ti</i> DUMU.MEŠ KUR-ti-ka₄ i-[t]e-ep-šu</p>	<p>As for the matter concerning those enemies: (it was) the people from your country (and) your own ships (who) did this!</p> <p>And (it was) the people from your country (who) committed these transgres- sion(s).</p>
<hr/>		
15.	<p><i>ù it-ti-ia-ma</i> <i>lu la te-ze-em-me</i></p>	<p>So do not <i>be angry</i> with me!</p>
<hr/>		
20.	<p><i>ù i-na-an-na</i> 20 ^{giš}MA₂.MEŠ <i>ša</i> ^{lú}KUR₂.ME <i>i-na</i> ḪUR.S[A]G.ME <i>la-a-ma</i> <i>it-ta[l-ka]-ni-me</i> <i>ù l[a] it-ta-za-za</i> <i>ù ḫa-mut-ta</i> <i>it-ta-mu-uš-me</i> <i>ù a-šar it-ta-dú-ú</i> <i>la ni-i-de₄-me</i></p>	<p>But now, (the) twenty enemy ships – even before they would reach the mountain (shore) – have not stayed around, but have quickly moved on, and where they have <i>pitched camp</i> we do not know.</p>
25.	<p><i>aš-šum ud-dá-i-ka₄</i> <i>aš-šum na-ša-ri-ka₄</i> <i>al-tap-ra-ku</i> <i>lu-ú ti-i-de₄-me</i></p>	<p>I am writing to you to inform and protect you. Be aware!”</p>

Translation of all four Ugaritic texts according to Hoftijzer & van Soldt 1998: 343-4

Egyptian

Our main source on the upheavals of the Sea Peoples is Ramesses III's mortuary temple at Medinet Habu,⁹⁶ which

offers depictions of the battles and their description in text. However, the monument commemorates not only the wars with the Sea Peoples from years 5 and 8 of Ramesses III's reign (= 1179 BC and 1176 BC), but also preceding ones against the Nubians (considered to be fictitious) and the

⁹⁶ i.e. Thebes.

Libyans (year 5) as well as successive ones against the Libyans (year 11), again, and the Asiatics (considered to be fictitious).⁹⁷ The depictions of the land- and sea battle against the Sea Peoples are located central on the outer east side of the monument (nos. 31 and 37-9), whereas the texts describing the wars of year 5 and year 8 are situated on the inner west side of court 2 (nos. 27-8) and inner north side of court 1 (nos. 44 and 46), respectively. Yet another text referring to a military engagement with Sea Peoples – this time in year 12 –, the so-called Südstele, can be found on the outer south side of the temple (no. 107) (Fig. 4).




Fig. 4. Plan of Ramesses III's temple at Medinet Habu, Thebes (after Cifola 1991: 12).

The scenes of the land- and sea battles are embedded in a pictorial narrative, which starts with the religious (1. command of the god, 2. pharaoh leaves the temple) and military (1. equipping the troops, 2. king's departure, 3. march) preparations and ends with the military (1. seizure of prisoners, 2. celebration of victory, 3. return in triumph) and religious (presentation of prisoners to the god) outcome. The central military action in form of the land- and sea battle is broken in two by a lion hunt in the middle,

whereas this cluster is followed by a town siege.⁹⁸

The information on the wars with the Sea Peoples of Ramesses III's Medinet Habu memorial is supplemented by the text of the Stele from Deir el Medineh and the Papyrus Harris.

Medinet Habu

Inscription of year 5 (= 1179 BC)

“The northern countries quivered in their bodies, namely the *Peleset*, *Tjek[er]*, [...]. They were cut off <from> their land, coming, their spirit broken. They were *thr*-warriors on land; another (group) was on the sea. Those who came on [land were overthrown and slaughtered]; Amon-Re was after them, destroying them. They that entered the Nile mouths were like birds ensnared in the net (...). Their hearts are removed, taken away, no longer in their bodies. Their leaders were carried off and slain; they were cast down and made into pinioned ones (...).”⁹⁹

Inscription of year 8 (= 1176 BC)

“As for the foreign countries, they made a conspiracy in their isles. Removed and scattered in the fray were the lands at one time. No land could stand before their arms, from *Hatti*, *Kodi*, *Karkemis*, *Yereth* [= *Arzawa*], and *Yeres* [= *Alasiya*] on, (but they were) cut off at (one time). A camp (was set up) in one place in *Amor*. They desolated its people, and its land was like that which has never come into being. They were coming, while the flame was prepared before them, forward toward Egypt. Their confederation was the *Peleset*, *Tjeker*, *Shekelesh*, *Denye(n)*, and *Weshesh*, lands united. They laid their hands upon the lands to the (very) circuit of the earth, their hearts confident and trusting ‘our plans will succeed!’

Now the heart of this god, the Lord of the Gods, was prepared, ready to ensnare them like birds. He made my strength to exist, while my plans succeed. (...) I organized my frontier in *Zahi* [= southern Levant], prepared before them, (to wit,) the princes, the commanders of the garrisons, and the *Mariannu* [= charioteers]. I caused the Nile mouth to be prepared like a strong wall with warships, galleys, and coasters, equipped, for they were manned completely from bow to stern with valiant warriors, with their weapons; the militia consisting of every picked man of Egypt, were like lions roaring upon the mountain tops. The chariotry consisted of runners, of picked men, of every good and capable chariot-warrior. Their horses were quivering in every part of their bodies, ready to crush the countries under their hoofs.

⁹⁸ Cifola 1991: 15-6.

⁹⁹ Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 30; cf. Breasted 1927: Vol. IV, no. 44; Pritchard 1969: 263; Strobel 1976: 8; Peden 1994: 17.

⁹⁷ Widmer 1975: 68.

I was the valiant Montu [= war-god], standing fast at their head, so that they might gaze upon the capturing of my two hands; King of Upper and Lower Egypt: Usermare-Meriamon; Son of Re: Ramses III.

As for those who reached my frontier, their seed is not, their heart and soul are finished forever and ever. As for those who came forward together on the sea, the full flame was in front of them at the Nile mouths, while a stockade of lances surrounded them on the shore, (so that they were) dragged (ashore), hemmed in, prostrated on the beach, slain, and made into heaps from tail to head. Their ships and their goods were as if fallen into the water.

I made the lands turn back from mentioning Egypt; for when they pronounce my name in their land, then they are burned up. Since I have sat upon the throne of Harakhte [= manifestation of Horus] and the Great Enchantress [= uraeus] was fixed upon my head like Re, I have not let the countries behold the frontiers of Egypt, to boast thereof to the Nine Bows [= Egypt's traditional enemies]. I have taken away their land, their frontiers being added to mine. Their chiefs and their tribespeople are mine with praise, for I am upon the ways of the plans of the All-Lord, my august, divine father, the Lord of Gods.¹⁰⁰

Text to the scene of the land battle (Fig. 5)

“His majesty sets out for Zahi like unto Montu, to crush every country that violates his frontier. His troops are like bulls ready on the field of battle; his horses are like falcons in the midst of small birds before the Nine Bows, bearing victory. Amon, his august father, is a shield for him; King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ruler of the Nine Bows, Lord of the Two Lands (...).¹⁰¹

Text to the scene of the sea battle (Fig. 6)

“Now the northern countries, which were in their isles, were quivering in their bodies. They penetrated the channels of the Nile mouths. Their nostrils have ceased (to function, so that) their desire is <to> breathe the breath. His majesty is gone forth like a whirlwind against them, fighting on the battle field like a runner. The dread of him and the terror of him have entered in their bodies; (they are) capsized and overwhelmed in their places. Their hearts are taken away; their soul is flown away. Their weapons are scattered in the sea. His arrow pierces him whom he has wished among them, while the fugitive is become one fallen into the water. His majesty is like an enraged lion, attacking his assailant with his pawns; plundering on his right hand and powerful on his left hand, like Set[h] destroying the serpent ‘Evil of

Character’. It is Amon-Re who has overthrown for him the lands and has crushed for him every land under his feet; King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands: Usermare-Meriamon.¹⁰²

Depicted prisoners of war (Fig. 7):

1. chief of Ḫatti, 2. chief of Amor, 3. chieftain of the foe of the *Tjeker*, 4. *Sherden* of the sea, 5. chieftain of the foe Sha[su], 6. *Teresh* of the sea, 7. chieftain of the *Pe(leset)*.¹⁰³

Südstele, year 12 (= 1172 BC).

Mention of *Tjeker*, *Peleset*, *Denyen*, *Weshesh* and *Shekelesh*.¹⁰⁴

Stele from Deir el Medineh

Pharaoh boasts of having defeated *Peleset* and *Teresh* who attacked Egypt.¹⁰⁵

Papyrus Harris

“I extended all the boundaries of Egypt: I overthrew those who invaded them from (or: in) their lands. I slew the *Denyen* in (= who are in) their isles, the *Tjeker* and the *Peleset* were made ashes. The *Sherden* and the *Weshesh* of the sea, they were made as those that exist not, taken captive at one time, brought as captives to Egypt, like the sand of the shore. I settled them in strongholds, bound in my name. Numerous were their classes like hundred-thousands. I taxed them all, in clothing and grain from the storehouses and granaries each year.¹⁰⁶

The Wenamon story, as preserved on the Golenischeff papyrus, informs us about the period after the wars with the Sea Peoples, in which Egypt can no longer exert its power in its former dependencies along the coastal region of the Levant.

¹⁰⁰ Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 53-6; cf. Breasted 1927: Vol. IV, no. 64; Pritchard 1969: 262-3; Strobel 1976: 14; Drews 1993a: 51; Peden 1994: 29-31.

¹⁰¹ Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 38; cf. Pritchard 1969: 263.

¹⁰² Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 41-2; cf. Pritchard 1963: 263.

¹⁰³ Strobel 1976: 18; Sandars 1980: 106-7,afb. 68.

¹⁰⁴ Kitchen 1983: no. 73, 9 f.; cf. Lehmann 1985: 23-4.

¹⁰⁵ Lepsius 1900: Vol. III, 218c; Drews 1993a: 51.

¹⁰⁶ Breasted 1927: Vol. IV, no. 403; Strobel 1976: 18.




Fig. 5. Land battle scene of Medinet Habu (from Oren 2000: 96, Fig. 5.5).




Fig. 6. Sea battle scene of Medinet Habu (from Oren 2000: 98, Fig. 5.6).




Fig. 7. Prisoners of war: (a) Hittite, (b) Amorite, (c) Tjeker, (d) Sherden, (e) Shasu, and (f) Teresh (from Nibbi 1975: Pl. I).

Golenisheff papyrus

“Year 5, 4th month of the 3rd season, day 16 [= 23rd year of Ramesses XI (1099-1069 BC)]: the day on which Wen-Amon, the Senior of the Forecourt of the House of Amon, [Lord of the Thrones] of the Two Lands, set out to fetch the woodwork for the great and august barque of Amon-Re, King of Gods, which is on [the River and which is named:] “User-her-Amon.” On the day when I reached Tanis, the place [where Ne-su-Ba-neb]-Ded and Ta-net-Amon were, I gave them the letters of Amon-Re, King of the Gods, and they had them read in their presence. And they said: “Yes, I will do as Amon-Re, King of the Gods, our [lord], has said!” I spent up to the 4th month of the 3rd season in Tanis. And Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded and Ta-net-Amon sent me off with the ship captain Mengebet, and I embarked on the great Syrian sea in the 1st month of the 3rd season, day 1.

I reached Dor, a town of the *Tjeker*, and Beder, its prince, had 50 loaves of bread, one jug of wine, and one leg of beef brought to me. And a man of my ship ran away and stole one [vessel] of gold, amounting to 5 *deben*, four jars of silver, amounting to 20 *deben*, and a sack of 11 *deben* of silver. [Total of what] he [stole]: 5 *deben* of gold and 31 *deben* of silver.

I got up in the morning, and I went to the place where the Prince was, and I said to him: “I have been robbed in your harbor. Now you are the prince of this land, and you are its investigator who should look for my silver. Now about this silver – it belongs to Amon-Re, King of the Gods, the lord of the lands; it belongs to you; it belongs to Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded; it belongs to Heri-Hor, my lord, and the other great men of Egypt! It belongs to you; it belongs to Weret; it belongs to Mekmer; it belongs to Zakar-Baal, the Prince of Byblos!”

And he said to me: “Whether you are important or whether you are eminent – look here, I do not recognize this accusation which you have made to me! Suppose it had been a thief who belonged to my land who went on your boat and stole your silver, I should have repaid it to you from my treasury, until they had found this thief of yours – whoever he may be. Now about the thief who robbed you – he belongs to you! He belongs to your ship! Spend a few days visiting me, so that I may look for him.”

I spent nine days moored (in) his harbor, and I went (to) call on him, and I said to him: “Look, you have not found my silver. [Just let] me [go] with the ship captains and with those who go (to) sea!” But he said to me: “Be quiet! (...)”

(...) I went out of Tyre at the break of dawn (...). Zakar-Baal, the prince of Byblos, (...) ship. I found 30 *deben* of silver in it, and I seized upon it. [And I said to the *Tjeker*: “I have seized upon] your silver, and it will stay with me [until] you find [my silver or the thief] who stole it! Even though you have not stolen, I shall take it. But as for you, (...)” So they went away, and I joined my triumph [in] a tent (on) the shore of the [sea], (in) the harbor of Byblos. And [I hid] Amon-of-the-Road, and I put his property inside *him*.

And the [Prince] of Byblos sent to me, saying: “Get [out of my] harbor!” And I sent to him, saying: “Where should [I go to]? (...) If [you have a ship] to carry me, have me taken to Egypt again!” So I spent twenty-nine days in his [harbor, while] he [spent] the time sending to me every day to say: “Get out (of) my harbor!”

Now while he was making offering to his gods, the god seized one of his youths and made him possessed. And he said to him: “Bring up [the] god! Bring the messenger who is carrying him! Amon is the one who sent him out! He is the one who made him come!” And while the possessed (youth) was having his frenzy on this night, I had (already) found a ship headed for Egypt and had loaded everything that I had into it. While I was watching for the darkness, thinking that when I descended I would load the god (also), so that no other eye might see him, the harbor master came to me, saying: “Wait until morning – so says the Prince.” So I said to him: “Aren’t you the one who spend the time coming to me every day to say: ‘Get out (of) my harbor’? Aren’t you saying ‘Wait’ tonight in order to let the ship which I have found get away – and (then) you will come again (to) say: ‘Go away!’?” So he went and told it to the Prince. And the Prince sent to the captain of the ship to say: “Wait until morning – so says the Prince!”

When morning came, he sent and brought me up, but the god stayed in the tent where he was, (on) the shore of the sea. And I found him sitting (in) his upper room, with his back turned to a window, so that the waves of the great Syrian sea broke against the back of his head. So I said to him: “*May Amon favor you!*” But he said to me “How long, up to today, since you came from the place where Amon is?” So I said to him: “Five months and one day up to now.” And he said to me: “Well, you’re truthful! Where is the letter of Amon which (should be) in your hand? Where is the dispatch of the High Priest of Amon which (should be) in your hand?” And I told him: “I gave them to Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded and Ta-net-Amon.” And he was very, very angry, and he said to me: “Now see – neither letters nor dispatches are in your hand! Where is the cedar ship which Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded gave to you? Where is its Syrian crew? Didn’t he turn you over to this foreign ship captain to have him kill you and throw you into the sea? (Then) with whom would they have looked for the god? And you too – with whom would they have looked for you too?” So he spoke to me.

But I said to him: “Wasn’t it an Egyptian ship? Now it is Egyptian crews which sail under Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded! He has no Syrian crews.” And he said to me: “Aren’t there twenty ships here in my harbor which are in commercial relations with Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded? As to Sidon, the other (place) which you have passed, aren’t there fifty more ships there which are in commercial relations with Werket-El, and which are drawn up to his house?” And I was silent in this great time.

And he answered and said to me: “On what business have you come?” So I told him: “I have come after the woodwork for the great and august barque of Amon-Re, King of the Gods. Your father did (it), your grandfather did (it), and you will do it too!” So I spoke to him. But

he said to me: “To be sure, they did it! And if you give me (something) for doing it, I will do it! Why, when my people carried out this commission, Pharaoh – life, prosperity, health! – sent six ships loaded with Egyptian goods, and they unloaded them into their store-houses! You – what is it that you’re bringing me – me also?” And he had the journal rolls of his fathers brought, and he had them read out in my presence, and they found a thousand *deben* and all kind of things in his scrolls.

So he said to me: “If the ruler of Egypt were the lord of mine, and I were his servant also, he would not have to send silver and gold, saying: ‘Carry out the commission of Amon!’ There would be no carrying of a royal-gift, such as they used to do for my father. As for me – me also – I am not your servant! I am not the servant of him who sent you either! If I cry out to the Lebanon, the heavens open up, and the logs are here lying (on) the shore of the sea! Give me the sails which you have brought to carry your ships which would hold the logs for (Egypt)! Give me the ropes [which] you have brought [to *lash the cedar*] logs which I am to cut down to make you (...) which I shall make for you (as) the sails of your boats, and the *spars* will be (too) heavy and will break, and you will die in the middle of the sea! See, Amon made thunder in the sky when he put Seth near him. Now when Amon founded all lands, in founding them he founded first the land of Egypt, from which you come; for craftsmanship came out of it, to reach the place where I am, and learning came out of it, to reach the place where I am. What are these silly trips which they have had you make?”

And I said to him: “(That’s) not true! What I am on are no ‘silly trips’ at all! There is no ship upon the River which does not belong to Amon! The sea is his, and the Lebanon is his, of which you say: ‘It is mine!’ It forms the *nursery* for User-het-Amon, the lord of [every] ship! Why, he spoke – Amon-Re, King of the Gods – and said to Heri-Hor, my master: ‘Send me forth!’ So he had me come, carrying this great god. But see, you have made this great god spend these twenty-nine days moored (in) your harbor, although you did not know (it). Isn’t he here? Isn’t he the (same) as he was? You are stationed (here) to carry on the commerce of the Libanon with Amon, its lord. As for your saying that the former kings sent silver and gold – suppose that they had life and health; (then) they would not have had such things sent! (But) they had such things sent to your fathers in place of life and health! Now as for Amon-Re, King of the Gods – he is the lord of this life and health, and he was the lord of your fathers. They spent their lifetimes making offering to Amon. And you also – you are the servant of Amon! If you say to Amon: ‘Yes, I will do (it)!’ and you carry out his commission, you will live, you will be prosperous, you will be healthy, and you will be good to your entire land and your people! (But) don’t wish for yourself anything belonging to Amon-Re, (King of) the Gods. Why, a lion wants his own property! Have your secretary brought to me, say that I may send him to Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded and

Ta-net-Amon, the *officers* whom Amon put in the north of his land, and they will have all kinds of things sent. I shall send him to them to say: ‘Let it be brought until I shall go (back again) to the south, and I shall (then) have every bit of the debt still (due to you) brought to you.’” So I spoke to him.

So he entrusted my letter to his messenger, and he loaded in the *keel*, the bow-post, the stern-post, along with four other hewn timbers – seven in all – and he had them taken to Egypt. And in the first month of the second season his messenger who had gone to Egypt came back to me in Syria. And Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded and Ta-net-Amon sent: 4 jars and 1 *kak-men* of gold; 5 jars of silver; 10 pieces of clothing in royal linen; 10 *kherd* of good Upper Egyptian linen; 500 (rolls of) finished papyrus; 500 cowhides; 500 ropes; 20 sacks of lentils; 30 baskets of fish. And she [= Ta-net-Amon] sent to me (personally): 5 pieces of clothing in good Upper Egyptian linen; 5 *kherd* of good Upper Egyptian linen; 1 sack of lentils; and 5 baskets of fish.

And the Prince was glad, and he detailed three hundred men and three hundred cattle, and he put supervisors at their head, to have them cut down the timber. So they cut them down, and they spent the second season lying there.

In the third month of the third season they dragged them (to) the shore of the sea, and the Prince came out and stood by them. And he sent to me, saying: “Come!” Now when I presented myself near him, the shadow of his lotus-blossom fell upon me. And Pen-Amon, a butler who belonged to him, cut me off, saying: “The shadow of Pharaoh – life, prosperity, health! – your lord, has fallen on you!” But he [= Zakar-Baal] was angry at him, saying: “Let him alone!”

So I presented myself near him, and he answered and said to me: “See, the commission which my fathers carried out formerly, I have carried out (also), even though you have not done for me what your fathers would have done for me, and you too (should have done)! See, the last of your woodwork has arrived and is lying (here). Do as I wish, and come to load it in – for aren’t they going to give it to you? Don’t come to look at the terror of the sea! If you look at the terror of the sea, you will see my own (too)! Why, I have not done to you what was done to the messengers of Kha-em-Waset, when they spent seventeen years in this land – they died (where) they were!” And he said to his butler: “Take him and show him their *tomb* in which they are lying.” But I said to him: “Don’t show it to me! As for Kha-em-Waset – they were men who he sent to you as messengers and he was a man himself. You do not have one of his messengers (here in me), when you say: ‘Go and see your companions!’ Now, shouldn’t you rejoice and have a stela [made] for yourself and say on it: ‘Amon-Re, King of the Gods, sent to me Amon-of-the-Road, his messenger – [life], prosperity, health! – and Wen-Amon, his human messenger, after the woodwork for the great and august barque of Amon-Re, King of the Gods, I cut it down. I loaded it in. I provided it (with) my ships and my crews. I caused them to reach Egypt,

in order to ask fifty years of life from Amon for myself, over and above my fate.’ And it shall come to pass that, after another time, a messenger may come from the land of Egypt who knows writing, and he may read your name on the stela. And you will receive water (in) the West, like the gods who are here!”

And he said to me: “This which you have said to me is a great testimony of words!” So I said to him: “As for the many things which you have said to me, if I reach the place where the High Priest of Amon is and he sees how you have (carried out this) commission, it is your (carrying out of this) commission (which) will *draw out* something for you.”

And I went (to) the shore of the sea, to the place where the timber was lying, and I spied eleven ships belonging to the *Tjeker* coming in from the sea, in order to say: “Arrest him! Don’t let a ship of his (go) to the land of Egypt!” Then I sat down and wept. And the letter scribe of the Prince came out to me, and he said to me: “What is the matter with you?” And I said to him: “Haven’t you seen the birds go down to Egypt a second time? Look at them – how they travel to the cool pools! (But) how long shall I be left here! Now don’t you see those who are coming to arrest me?”

So he went and told it to the Prince. And the Prince began to weep because of the words which were said to him, for they were painful. And he sent out to me his letter scribe, and he brought to me two jugs of wine and one ram. And he sent to me Ta-net-Not, an Egyptian singer who was with him, saying: “Sing to him! Don’t let his heart take on cares!” And he sent to me, say: “Eat and drink! Don’t let your heart take on cares, for tomorrow you shall hear whatever I have to say.”

When morning came, he had his assembly summoned and he stood in their midst, and he said to the *Tjeker*: “What have you come (for)?” And they said to him:

“We have come after the *blasted* ships which you are sending to Egypt with our opponents!” But he said to them: “I cannot arrest the messenger of Amon inside my land. Let me send him away, and you go after him to arrest him.”

So he loaded me in, and he sent me away from there at the harbor of the sea. And the wind cast me on the land of Alashiya [= Cyprus]. And they of the town came out against me to kill me, but I *forced my way* through them to the place where Heteb, the princess of the town, was. I met her as she was going out of one house of hers and going into another of hers.

So I greeted her, and I said to the people who were standing near her: “Isn’t there one of you who understands Egyptian?” And one of them said: “I understand (it).” So I said to him: “Tell my lady that I have heard, as far away as Thebes, the place where Amon is, that injustice is done in every town but justice is done in the land of Alashiya. Yet injustice is done here every day!” And she said: “Why, what do you (mean) by saying it?” So I told her: “If the sea is stormy and the wind casts me on the land where you are, you should not let them take me *in charge* to kill me. For I am a messenger of Amon. Look here – as for me, they will search for me all the time! As to the crew of the Prince of Byblos which they are bent on killing, won’t its lord find ten crews of yours, and he also kills them?”

So she had the people summoned, and they stood (there). And she said to me: “Spend the night (...).” (...)

At this point the papyrus breaks off. Since the tale is told in the first person, it is fair to assume that Wenamon returned to Egypt to tell his story, in some measure of safety or success (Pritchard 1969: 25-9).

	El-Amarna	Ramesses II	Merneptah	Ramesses III
Lukka	x	x	x	
Sherden	x	x	x	x
Shekelesh			x	x
Teresh			x	x
Ekwesh			x	
Denye(n)				x
Tjeker				x
Peleset				x
Weshesh				x

Table 1. Overview of the mention of the Sea Peoples in the various Egyptian sources from the Late Bronze Age.

6. LUKKA AND THE LUKKA LANDS

Since the time of Emmanuel de Rougé, who wrote in 1867, the *Lukka* have straightforwardly been identified with the *Lycians*.¹⁰⁷ The latter are known from Homeros onwards to inhabit the valley of the Xanthos river and its immediate surroundings in Anatolia.¹⁰⁸ As to the precise habitat of their equivalents in Hittite texts, Trevor Bryce has put forward two specific theses, namely (1) Lycaonia to the east and (2) Caria to the west of classical Lycia. Of these two theses, the first one is primarily based on the fact that in a fragment of Hattusilis III's (1264-1239 BC) annals, Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköy (= KUB) XXI 6a, the *Lukka lands* (KUR.KUR^{MEŠ} URU^{LU} Luqqa) appear in a paragraph preceding one on military campaigns against countries like Walma, Sanhata, and Walwara known from the border description of the province of Tarhuntaša – a Hittite province situated to the east of (the) Lukka (lands).¹⁰⁹ The second thesis takes as its starting point that in the so-called Tawagalawas-letter (KUB XIV 3), probably from the reign of Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC),¹¹⁰ people from Lukka (LU^{MEŠ} URU^{LU} Luqqa) are mentioned directly following the destruction of Attarima. In the same letter Attarima is associated with Iyalanda, which for its association with Atriya must be located close to Millawanda (or Milawata). If Millawanda (or Milawata) may be identified with classical Miletos (as is commonly asserted by now), it follows according to this line of reasoning that people from Lukka must be situated in its immediate Carian hinterland.¹¹¹ What strikes us about these suggestions is that precisely the region of the Xanthos valley and its immediate surroundings in the middle are left out – a situation which, for the lack of remains of Late Bronze Age settlements here, appears to be neatly reflected in the archaeological record (but as we will see deceitfully so).¹¹²

Bryce makes an exception, though, for the Lycian

coast. This seems to have formed part of Lukka according to the combined evidence of El-Amarna text no. 38 and RS 20.238 from Ras Shamra/Ugarit.¹¹³ Of these texts, the first one bears reference to piratical raids on Alasiya (= Cyprus) and apparently on the Egyptian coast by the people of the land of *Lukki*, which is therefore likely to have had a coastal zone. The second informs us that the king of Ugarit has sent his entire fleet to the waters off the coast of *Lukka*, presumably, as suggested by Michael Astour, in an attempt to ward off the passage of the Sea Peoples from the Aegean into the eastern Mediterranean.¹¹⁴ If this latter suggestion is correct, we are dealing here with the Lycian coast, indeed.

A dramatic change in the state of affairs as presented by Bryce occurred thanks to the recent discovery of a monumental hieroglyphic inscription from the reign of Tudhaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC) at Yalburt in the neighborhood of Ilgin. As demonstrated by Massimo Poetto, this text, which deals with a military campaign in the Lukka lands (*lūka*^{UTNAi}), bears reference to the place names *Pinata*, *Awarna*, *Talawa*, and *Patara*, which are identifiable with classical *Pinale* or *Pinara*, *Arñne* or *Arna*, *Tlawa* or *Tlōs*, and *Pttara* or *Patara* situated in the valley of the lower Xanthos river.¹¹⁵ It further mentions the place names *Luwanda* and *Hwalatarna*, which correspond to classical *Loanda* and *Xbide* or *Kaunos* in the valley of the Indus river.¹¹⁶ There can be little doubt, therefore, that, regardless the blank in the archaeological record, the Lukka lands are situated precisely within the confines of classical Lycia proper. This conclusion receives even further emphasis if Machteld Mellink is right in her identification of the *Siyanta* river, which figures in the border description of Mira in Mursilis II's (1321-1295 BC) treaty with Kupantakuruntas, with the Xanthos river.¹¹⁷

A question which remains to be answered is whether the expression “Lukka lands” designates the same geo-

¹⁰⁷ De Rougé 1867: 39.

¹⁰⁸ Bryce 1986: 13 “There can be little doubt that for Homer Lycia and the Xanthos valley were one and the same”.

¹⁰⁹ Bryce 1974: 397 (with reference to Cornelius); Bryce 1992: 121-3; cf. Otten 1988: 37-8.

¹¹⁰ Smit 1990-1 ; Gurney 1990.

¹¹¹ Bryce 1974: 398-403; Bryce 1992: 123-6.

¹¹² Bryce 1974: 130; cf. Keen 1998: 214.

¹¹³ Bryce 1992: 128-9; for EA no. 38, see Moran 1992: 111.

¹¹⁴ Astour 1965a: 255; cf. Otten 1993; Keen 1998: 27.

¹¹⁵ Poetto 1993: 47-8 (block 9); 78-80. Note that these identifications are only partly followed by Keen 1998: 214-20.

¹¹⁶ Woudhuizen 1994-5: 174; Woudhuizen 2004a: 30-1.

¹¹⁷ Mellink 1995: 35-6.

graphical range as Lukka or a wider one. To answer this question, we have little evidence to go on, as the Lukka lands are mentioned only twice, (1) in the fragment of the annals of Ḫattusilis III, KUB XXI 6a,¹¹⁸ and (2) the annalistic hieroglyphic Yalburt text from the reign of Tudḫaliyas IV. Now, it is interesting to observe that in the introductory section of the Yalburt text *Wiyānawanda* (= classical *Oinoanda* in the upper Xanthos valley) appears to be included in the Lukka lands,¹¹⁹ whereas in the hieroglyphic inscription of Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC) from the Südburg in Boğazköy/Ḫattusa the same place name occurs alongside Lukka as a separate entity.¹²⁰ This distinction may be further illustrated by the fact that in the afore-mentioned treaty of Mursilis II with Kupantakuruntas (CTH 68) *Wiyānawanda* is staged as a border town of the latter's province Mira.¹²¹ Next, as we have noted above, in the Yalburt text the region of Loanda and Xbide or Kaunos in the valley of the Indus river is likewise included into the Lukka lands. Finally, in KUB XXI 6a the hostile Lukka lands are mentioned in one and the same paragraph as *Parḫa*, which is convincingly identified by Heinrich Otten with classical *Pergē* in Pamphylia, on the eastern border of classical Lycia.¹²² It is interesting to observe in this connection that in his treaty with Kuruntas on the Bronze Tablet from Boğazköy/Ḫattusa, Tudḫaliyas IV is announcing a military campaign against the land of *Parḫa*, which, when conquered, will be included in the territory of Kuruntas' province Tarḫuntassa.¹²³ If we take this evidence at face value, it may reasonably be argued that Lukka refers solely to the lower Xanthos valley with Patara, Awarna, Pinata, and Talawa, whereas the Lukka lands includes the regions to the north, west, and east of Lukka proper.

In the Yalburt text Tudḫaliyas IV proudly stipulates:

*i-tá-i -pa-wa UTNA-ná-i URA+ḪANTAWAT-i ḪÁ(TI) UTNA
à-mi-i mTÁ(TI) ḪUḪA-i na₄-à ḪWA-ā-sa-ḫa ḪWÁ-ā-tá*

¹¹⁸ Note that Steiner 1993: 129 draws attention to yet another instance of the Lukka lands in Hittite cuneiform (KUB XXI 31), but the context is too fragmentary to be of any use here.

¹¹⁹ Poetto 1993: 48-9 (block 9); 80; cf. Woudhuizen 1994-5: 176 (phrase 4); Woudhuizen 2004a: 28; 32.

¹²⁰ Hawkins 1995: 22-3 (phrases 1 and 4); 29; 54; cf. Woudhuizen 1994-5: 200 (phrases 1 and 4); Woudhuizen 2004a: 78; 83-4.

¹²¹ Heinhold-Krahmer 1977: 201; cf. del Monte & Tischler, s.v.

¹²² Otten 1988: 37-8; VIII, 60-2; *Parḫa* along the *Kaštaraya* river, corresponding to classical *Pergē* along the *Kestros* in Pamphylia.

¹²³ Otten 1988: VIII, 63-4.

“in these lands, the great kings of Ḫatti, my fathers (and) grandfathers, no one has marched”,

with which reference is made to the region of Awarna, Pinata, and Talawa in the lower Xanthos valley.¹²⁴ As opposed to this, the earlier section of his campaign in the Indus valley concerns an uprising of territory already within the Empire, as it is expressly stated to be *apa muwa*- “reconquer(ed)”.¹²⁵ The inclusion of the land of *Parḫa* in the Empire, as hinted at in the Bronze Tablet from Boğazköy/Ḫattusa, plausibly antedates Tudḫaliyas IV's Lycian campaign as recorded for the Yalburt text. Finally, as we have seen, *Wiyānawanda* already figures as a border town of the province of Mira in the times of Mursilis II. From this sequence of affairs, we may safely deduce that the Hittites slowly, but confidently, encircled the region of the lower Xanthos valley before they ultimately went over to conquer it. The rationale behind this is easily explained by the geographic situation, according to which the lower Xanthos valley is separated from the surrounding regions by a spur of the formidable Taurus mountains (see Fig. 8). As I have argued elsewhere, the conquest of the lower Xanthos valley is not an objective *per se*, but a prelude to Tudḫaliyas IV's Cyprus-Alasiya campaign, launched by him in the final years of his reign and made more permanent by his son Suppiluliumas II.¹²⁶



Fig. 8. Map of Lycia (from Mellink 1995).

¹²⁴ Woudhuizen 1994-5: 179; Woudhuizen 2004a: 35-6 (phrase 42). Note that the mention of hostages from *Pina* (= hieroglyphic Pinata) and *Awarna* in the Milawata-letter (KUB XIX 55) plausibly postdates Tudḫaliyas IV's Lycian campaign as recorded for the Yalburt text, see Woudhuizen 2005: 115.

¹²⁵ Woudhuizen 1994-5: 176; Woudhuizen 2004a: 42 (phrase 12).

¹²⁶ Woudhuizen 1994-5: 175; cf. Woudhuizen 1994: 524-6; Woudhuizen 2004a: 31-2.

7. ETHNOGENESIS OF THE GREEKS

The decipherment of Linear B by the British architect Michael Ventris has proved that Greek existed as a language from the second half of the 15th century BC onwards: the earliest tablets are in fact from the Late Minoan II-III A1 period at Knossos in Crete (= *c.* 1450-1350 BC).¹²⁷ The question which will be addressed here is: when did the Greek language, and hence probably the Greek ethnos – in later times at least the Greek language is one of the most distinctive features of the Greek ethnos – , come into being? Was it the result of an immigration by proto-Greeks into the region we call Greece, or are there other processes at work? In order to tackle this question, we will look at the relevant archaeological, historical, and linguistic evidence.

From an archaeological point of view, there are three periods which might be of relevance to our question: first the transition from Early Helladic II to Early Helladic III (*c.* 2300 BC), then the transition from Early Helladic III to Middle Helladic (*c.* 2000 BC), and finally the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I (*c.* 1600 BC) (for alternative opinions focussing on different periods, see additional note at the end of this section). All these three transitional periods in varying degrees show evidence of discontinuity in occupation. The type site for the transition from Early Helladic II to Early Helladic III is Lerna, expertly excavated by the Americans under the leadership of John Caskey. Here the so-called “House of the Tiles” went up in flames and was covered by a tumulus, new house forms were introduced, characterized by apsidal ends, a new pottery style was developed, first hand-made only, which is baptized Minyan ware, and a new type of burial came into fashion, namely individual burials in cist graves. In the following transition from Early Helladic III to Middle Helladic, the new features characteristic of Lerna and some other sites, are also introduced at places that remained untouched in the first transitional period, sometimes, as at Eutresis, after a violent conflagration. Although related cultural traits were introduced at both pe-

¹²⁷ For the correlation of archaeological phases and absolute chronology, see Warren & Hankey 1989; note however that the lowering of the dates of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten as per Kitchen 1989 has its repercussions for the date of the transition from Late Minoan IIIA1 to Late Minoan IIIA2, which should likewise be lowered from *c.* 1370 BC to *c.* 1350 BC.

riods, what distinguishes the transition at *c.* 2000 BC from the previous one at *c.* 2300 BC is the presence at some sites of Matt-painted ware, originating from the Cycladic islands, and a little imported or locally imitated Middle Minoan IA ware. It further deserves notice that at Lerna in a context to be dated after the destruction of the “House of the Tiles” bones have been found, first, in the Early Helladic III period, of a horse-like animal and later, in the Middle Helladic period, of a true horse.

A majority of the archaeologists, led by Caskey, is of the opinion that in the two aforesaid transitional periods a new people arrived in Greece, coming from the north or east or both, which spoke an Indo-European language, if not already Greek then at least about to become Greek.¹²⁸ This majority standpoint is challenged by the penetrating study of René van Royen & Benjamin Isaac, who convincingly demonstrated that the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I, usually considered to be without a true break, shows evidence of discontinuity in occupation in about the same way as the two foregoing transitional periods. Thus it happens that sites are abandoned (Argos) or destroyed by fire (Eleusis, Kirrha) at the time of the introduction of the Minoanizing Late Helladic I ware.¹²⁹ Another new feature of this period, next to the Minoanizing pottery style, is the introduction of new types of graves: shaft graves, tholos- and chamber tombs – the latter for multiple burials. Of these, the shaft graves at Mycenae deserve special mention for their extremely rich contents: clearly here were buried valiant warriors who appreciated luxuries inspired by as far away a country as Egypt (think of the daggers with Nilotic scenes, the gold masks and Heinrich Schliemann’s observation that one of the corpses was mummified). As manifest from the scenes on the stelae which marked their graves, the dignitaries in question were specialized in chariot warfare. In line with these findings, there has come into being a minority view according to which the arrival of the proto-Greeks in Greece consists of a so-called takeover by a comparatively small but well-organized chariot-brigade in the transitional period from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I. As a variant, more

¹²⁸ Caskey 1973.

¹²⁹ Van Royen & Isaac 1979.

closely linked up with the given majority view, these invaders are also considered non-Greek foreigners.

In order to decide between these conflicting views, it may be of relevance to determine who were the inhabitants of Greece before the arrival of the proto-Greeks. The most serious attempt to tackle this question is formed by Jan Best's investigation into the origins of the cultural traits of the Middle Helladic period, *in casu* Minyan ware, cist graves with individual burials and apsidal houses. The closest parallels for these three features he was able to trace in the northern Balkans in the period antedating their introduction into Greece. As this region in historical times is inhabited by Thracian tribes, Best extrapolated that bearers of the Middle Helladic culture in Greece were kinsmen of the latter.¹³⁰ This conclusion could be backed up by literary tradition, according to which, as first noted by Stanley Casson, central Greece had once been inhabited by Thracians.¹³¹ Thus it is recorded that the Thracians with Eumolpos and his son Ismaros were driven from Eleusis by the Athenian Erekhtheus, and that they took refuge at the court of the Thracian king Tegyrion in Boeotian Tegyra.¹³² Furthermore, the Thracian king Tereus is of old situated at Daulis in Phokis, and the likewise Odrysian royal name Sitalkas is recorded as an epiklesis of Apollo at Delphi.¹³³ The presence of the Thracian tribe of the Odrysians in Phokis is strikingly confirmed by evidence from Linear B. On an inscribed stirrup jar from the destruction layer of the "House of Kadmos" at Thebes, dated *c.* 1350 BC, the ethnonym *o-du-ru-wi-jo* "Odrysian" is recorded. As another inscribed stirrup jar was found in Orkhomenos, it seems not unlikely to assume that the stirrup jars from the "House of Kadmos", which in fact are of

¹³⁰ Best in Best & Yadin 1973; cf. Coles & Harding 1979: 132 f. To the three given comparanda should be added the tumulus for elite burials as attested for Vraca in Bulgaria during the Early Bronze Age, i.e. either previous to or simultaneous with its introduction in southern Greece, see Coles & Harding 1979: 136, Fig. 47. Note that the tumulus ultimately constitutes a North Pontic steppe or Kurgan element, further represented by sherds of corded ware as recorded for Armenokhori in eastern Macedonia, Eutresis in Boeotia, and Agia Marina in Phokis at the end of the Early Bronze Age, see Sakellariou 1980: 151.

¹³¹ Casson 1968: 102-3.

¹³² Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Eumolpos*.

¹³³ Note in this connection that one of the harbors of Delphi, Krisa, exemplifies a Thracian toponym originating from Proto-Indo-European [= PIE] **krs-* "black", see Detschew 1976, s.v. *Krisos*.

Cretan type and of which as many as 120 in sum have been found, served export purposes for the at that time still predominantly Minyan hinterland of Thebes.¹³⁴ Finally, the Thracian nature of the ancient population of Phokis may be further enhanced by the fact that the Thracian tribe of the Abantes are recorded to have moved from their city Abai in Phokis to Euboeia across the Euripos.

It is rightly stipulated by Casson that there is also evidence of Phrygians among the earliest inhabitants of Greece. Most famous in this respect is, of course, the case of Pelops, after whom the Peloponnesos (= "island of Pelops") is named. In later times, the presence of the Phrygian Pelops in southern Greece was no longer understood and he was considered an immigrant from Anatolia – the later habitat of the Phrygians. But the fact that the Phrygians were originally at home in southern Greece is duly indicated by scores of Phrygian place names (Azania, Mideia, Mopsopia, Olympia, Phrikion, Phrixa, Phrixos, Phrygia) and personal names (Adrastos, Akrisios,¹³⁵ Atreus, Azan, Azeus, Kelainos, Kharites,¹³⁶ Khlōris,¹³⁷ Phorkys, Phrixos, Proitos) attested in the historical records. In some instances, like *a-da-ra-te-ja* (= Greek *Adrāsteja*) or *a-da-ra-ti-jo* (= Greek *Adrāstijos*), *u-ru-pi-ja* (= Greek *Olumpia*), *ke-ra-no* (= Greek *Kelainos*), and *mo-qo-so* (= Greek *Mopsos*) the ancient nature of these names can be emphasized by their occurrence or of that of related forms in Linear B.¹³⁸ With the Thracians and the Phrygians, we have by no means exhausted the historical documentaries on the earliest inhabitants of Greece. Yet another group which figures prominently in the sources is that of the Leleges, who Herodotos (*Histories* I, 171) identifies with the Carians from the Cycladic islands. Their presence in southern and central Greece may perhaps be reflected in

¹³⁴ Woudhuizen 1989.

¹³⁵ Brother of Proitos, see Sakellariou 1986: 133; cf. *Akrisias*, the Phrygian name for Kronos according to a gloss by Hesychios, see Diakonoff & Neroznak 1985: 91.

¹³⁶ Cult installed by Eteokles of Orkhomenos, see Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* IX, 35, 1; cf. Old Phrygian *agaritōi* "ungracious (D. sg.)" in G-02, see Brixhe & Lejeune 1984.

¹³⁷ Wife of Neleus, descendant of the Minyan royal house of Orkhomenos, see Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* IX, 36, 4 – 37, 1; cf. the Phrygian gloss *glouros* "gold" (< PIE **g^hlōro-* or **g^hel-*), see Haas 1966: 144, 209 and cf. Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 618, from which it follows that the personal name is of the same type as Greek *Khruseis* and English *Goldy*.

¹³⁸ Woudhuizen 1993b.

the archaeological record by the Mattpainted ware, which, as we have seen above, originates from the Cyclades as well and of which the introduction, as we have just seen, distinguishes the transition from Early Helladic III to Middle Helladic. As a complicating factor, it should be realized that there are still more population groups mentioned in the historical sources which cannot positively be assigned to either of the three tribes identified so far for the lack of evidence. On the whole, however, it may safely be stated that with the Thracians, Phrygians, and Leleges/Carians we have discussed the most prominent of the population groups present in Greece before the Greeks or living there simultaneously with the Greeks in their earliest history.

From a linguistic point of view, it deserves attention that the Thracian language, although barely known, is considered of Indo-European stock and most closely related to Phrygian, this to the extent that one speaks of the Thraco-Phrygian language group.¹³⁹ As opposed to this, Carian, which, it must be admitted, also largely eludes us because the script in which the language is recorded still goes undeciphered, is generally assumed to be a member of the Indo-European Anatolian group of languages, together with Hittite, Luwian, and Palaic. As such, it may be held responsible for place names in *-ss-* and *-nth-* in Greece, which are decidedly of Indo-European Anatolian type.¹⁴⁰ Furthermore, one may be tempted to point to related Lycian type of names like Glaukos (= Linear B *ka-ra-u-ko*), Lykaon, Pandion, Sandion, and Leda. At any rate, we obviously have to reckon with at least two distinct pre-Greek linguistic layers of Indo-European (= IE) stock, namely Thraco-Phrygian and IE Anatolian.

If the bearers of the Minyan culture of Middle Helladic Greece are rightly identified as Thraco-Phrygians, then it necessarily follows that the view according to which the Greeks arrived or otherwise came into being in the only remaining transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I at *c.* 1600 BC must be correct. Therefore, let us take a look at the various theories proposed. In the first place, Robert Drews in his stimulating monograph on the subject argued that the proto-Greeks were a chariot gang who came by boat from Pontos to Thessaly, from where they

colonized the rest of Greece.¹⁴¹ Secondly, Jan Best defended the thesis that the proto-Greeks were identical with the Hyksos, the foreign conquerors of lower Egypt in the Second Intermediary Period (*c.* 1720-1550 BC), who were driven from the country by the founder of the 18th dynasty, Ahmose, and with their kinsmen from Canaan and Syria took refuge to the southern shores of Greece.¹⁴² Finally, Frank Stubbings likewise painted the picture of a conquest of the Argolid by displaced Hyksos leaders from Egypt, only he did not consider them proto-Greeks, but a foreign warrior caste who, like they did in Egypt, adapted to the culture and language of the host country.¹⁴³ Of these three theories, the last two take into consideration the well-known historical evidence of Danaos, the ancestor of the Danaoi, coming from Egypt to the Argolid, and of Kadmos with his Phoenicians founding the city of Thebes. The validity of this literary evidence is strengthened a great deal by the fact that the Mycenaean Greeks are referred to by the name *Tanayu (Tin3y)* "Danaoi" in the Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions from the funerary temple of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) at Kom el-Hetan in Egyptian Thebes.¹⁴⁴

Which of the three models about what happened in Greece *c.* 1600 BC is the right one? In order to answer this question, we will examine them a little closer, starting with the one presented by Drews. This author takes as his starting point the view of the linguists Thomas Gamkrelidze & Vjačeslav Ivanov, who argued that the Greek language is closely related to Armenian on the one hand and Indo-Iranian on the other hand, and that the homeland of the proto-Greeks accordingly must be sought somewhere in the region of what was once Armenia, just south of the Caucasus. Here they found in abundance the different sorts of wood to build their chariots and the horses to drive them.¹⁴⁵ A problem posed by this view is that at the time that Greek is supposed to have split off from the parent language and the proto-Greeks are supposed to have undertaken their journey to their new home in Greece, the Ar-

¹³⁹ Crossland 1971: 857; *contra* Polomé 1982a: 888.

¹⁴⁰ Laroche 1957: 7; Laroche 1961a: 91; cf. Woudhuizen 1989: 193-4.

¹⁴¹ Drews 1988.

¹⁴² Best in Best & Yadin 1973.

¹⁴³ Stubbings 1973.

¹⁴⁴ Edel 1966; cf. Woudhuizen 1992a: 73; *pace* Strange 1980: 22, note 33; 148.

¹⁴⁵ Drews 1988: 32 ff.; 200-1; since 1995 the work of Gamkrelidze & Ivanov is available in English translation.

menians are not yet living in Armenia! As related by Herodotos (*Histories* VII, 73), the Armenians are an *apoikia* of the Phrygians, who prior to their migration to the Anatolian plateau inhabited the Olympos region in the borderland of northern Thessaly and southern Macedonia on the European continent, and before this, as we have seen above, even the region as far south as the Peloponnesos. There is some evidence that the Phrygians entered Anatolia already in the Late Bronze Age, as according to Homeros they are situated along the banks of the Sangarios in the period before the Trojan war (c. 1280 BC). Moreover, a Hittite text from the reign of Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) or Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC) makes mention of a certain Mita (= Phrygian Midas) of Paḫḫuwa, a region to the northeast of the Hittite capital Boğazköy/Ḫattusa.¹⁴⁶ However, there can be no doubt that the greatest surge of Phrygians into the highland of Anatolia took place only after the fall of the Hittite empire at the end of the Bronze Age, when, under the name of Muski, they are recorded by the annals of the Assyrian king Tiglathpileser I (1115-1077 BC) to have reached the region of the upper Euphrates in great numbers. As cogently argued by Igor Diakonoff, this particular historical event triggers the formative phase of the Armenian people, in a country formerly inhabited by Luwians and Ḫurrians.¹⁴⁷

Another weakness in the scenario presented by Drews is formed by the crucial role he attributes to the Thessalian plain in the colonization of Greece by the proto-Greeks. Thus it is assumed that the proto-Greeks first arrive in Thessaly and from there go on to take over central and southern Greece.¹⁴⁸ This view is contradicted by the archaeological evidence, which clearly shows that the Mycenaean culture first develops in the Argolid and only at a later time spreads to more northerly regions like Thessaly.¹⁴⁹ In fact, the plain of Thessaly, just like the hinterland of Thebes, remains predominantly Minyan in

character up to well in Late Helladic III. The centre from which Mycenaean influence radiates, ancient Iolkos in the south, is still characterized by Minyan cist graves as late as the Late Helladic IIB-III A period, whereas a Mycenaean palace is reported here only from Late Helladic IIB or IIIA1 onwards.¹⁵⁰ From an historical point of view, the persistence of Middle Helladic traditions in Iolkos during the earlier phase of the Mycenaean period coincides with the “Minysche Schicht” of its royal house as represented by Kretheus, Pelias (= the brother of Neleus who with Pelasgians settles at Pylos c. 1600 BC, see further below), and Akastos.¹⁵¹

Finally, it is noteworthy that Drews heavily leans on the linguistic thesis put forward by William Wyatt, who maintains that the Indo-European invaders of Greece knew the chariot and the horse when they first entered Greece. Wyatt arrived at this conclusion by comparing the words for chariot and its major parts to that for the four-wheel mule wagon, from which comparison it appeared that the first category is based on Indo-European roots, whereas the latter is not. However, the conclusion that the Greeks introduced these Indo-European words is only valid in case there is no evidence of Indo-European speech in Greece prior to the Greeks, as Wyatt explicitly asserts.¹⁵² In the previous pages, we have seen reason to believe that there were Indo-European speaking tribes in Greece before the arrival of the Greeks or their otherwise coming into being. This nullifies Wyatt’s reasoning. As we have noted in the foregoing, the horse was already known in Greece from c. 2300 BC onwards. In line with this observation, it is of interest to note that the Greeks have preserved the old centum form for “horse”, Mycenaean *i-go* (= later Greek *hippos*), instead of taking over the new Indo-Aryan satem form *aśva-* which came in vogue in other regions under the influence of the from the late 18th century BC onwards modern chariot warfare (cf. Luwian *asuwa-*).¹⁵³ Furthermore, the Greeks preferred their own word for the chariot itself, Mycenaean *a-mo* (= later Greek *harma*), instead of

¹⁴⁶ Woudhuizen 1993b; *contra* Drews 1993b, who also denies the European origin of the Phrygians on account of the fact that archaeological evidence, for which he is tendentiously looking only c. 1200 BC, is lacking.

¹⁴⁷ Diakonoff 1984 (65; 117 assigns a date of c. 1165 BC to the invasion of the Muski, which is incompatible with the reign of Tiglathpileser I, but suits their first mention in the Assyrian records, see Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 463).

¹⁴⁸ Drews 1988: 192-4.

¹⁴⁹ Dickinson 1977: 24.

¹⁵⁰ Hope Simpson 1981: 161; Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 135; Papadimitriou 2001: 129; cf. Smit 1989. Note that Stubbings 1973: 642 is mistaken in assigning the Mycenaean palace at Iolkos to the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I.

¹⁵¹ Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Iolkos*.

¹⁵² Wyatt 1970.

¹⁵³ In the centum languages the palatals *k'*, *g'*, and *g'^h* develop into gutturals, whereas in the satem languages they become assibilized.

adopting the then modern Indo-Aryan indication *ratha-*. More in general, I do not understand why Wyatt does not take into account the evidence from Kassite, where the parts of the chariot, with only one exception, are all indicated by Akkadian instead of Kassite words (Balkan 1954: 127-30).

If we next turn to the scenario presented by Best, it first deserves our attention that identification of the proto-Greeks with the Hyksos from Egypt and their kinsmen from Canaan and Syria, contrary to Drews' thesis, is in ba-

sic outline in harmony with the relevant archaeological and historical data. In order to estimate its validity, however, we have to go more into detail. As we have noted earlier, the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I c. 1600 BC shows evidence of discontinuity in occupation. From an historical point of view, it is highly interesting to observe that precisely the sites which show discontinuity of occupation figure prominently in the stories about the foundation of new royal houses or a memorable war (see Fig. 9). The evidence may be summarized as follows:

	site	conqueror(s)	subjected or expelled	source
1.	Argos	Danaos from Egypt	Pelasgos or Pelasgians	Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. <i>Danaos</i> .
2.	Thebes	Kadmos with Phoenicians	Hyantes and Aones	Pausanias, <i>Guide to Greece</i> IX, 5, 1.
3	Kirrhakrisa	Cretans from Knossos	women & daughters	Homeric Hymn to Pythian Apollo 388 ff.
4.	Pylos	Neleus with Pelasgians from Iolkos	Pylos with Leleges	Pausanias, <i>Guide to Greece</i> IV, 36, 1.
5.	Eleusis	Erekhtheus from Athens	Eumolpos with Thracians	Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. <i>Eumolpos</i> .

Table 2. Literary traditions with a bearing on the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I, c. 1600 BC.




Fig. 9. Distribution of centres of radiation of Late Helladic I material.

Square symbols: pottery in combination with architectural remains (Pylos, Kirrha, Thebes, Eleusis, and Athens). Triangular symbols: pottery in shaft graves, tholos- and chamber tombs (Koryphasion, Peristeria, Epidauros Limera, Lerna, Mycenae, Prosymna, and Thorikos). Sources: van Royen & Isaac 1979 and Hope Simpson 1981.

With respect to this overview it must be admitted that the association of Danaos with Argos is problematic, since the latter site is abandoned in the earliest phase of the Mycenaean period. Probably Argos has seized the myth at the expense of some other site in the Argolid. Furthermore, Thebes is not included in the list of sites which lent itself to a continuity/discontinuity analysis by van Royen & Isaac, even though it might be pointed out that the different orientation of the earliest Mycenaean walls as compared to their Middle Helladic predecessors rather suggests discon-

tinuity.¹⁵⁴ However this may be, what primarily concerns us here is the fact that in three instances the conquerors are explicitly identified as foreigners, whereas in two instances these are just locals from Greece itself. From an archaeological point of view, the latter adapted to the Mycenaean culture developed under the influence of the foreign invaders pretty quickly, so that they may fruitfully be considered as local allies. In linguistic terms, these local allies can, of course, not be held responsible for the introduction of the Greek language in Greece, which, in line with Best's scenario, must have been the privilege of the foreign invaders. Hence, let us take a closer look at them.

What can be said about the language(s) of the foreign invaders? One group, which settled in Kriasa, is straightforwardly identified as Cretans from Knossos. These may safely be assumed to have spoken one of the languages current on the island before the introduction of Linear B c. 1450 BC, recorded for documents in Linear A and Cretan hieroglyphic, respectively. A good case can be made that Linear A contains a west-Semitic idiom, whereas Cretan hieroglyphic probably bears testimony of both west-Semitic and Luwian (see further section 12 below).¹⁵⁵ At any rate, one thing is clear: our Cretans from Knossos did not speak a Greek vernacular. Next comes Kadmos with his Phoenicians. Taking this tradition at face value, the conquerors of Thebes are likely to have spoken a Semitic tongue. In fact, the name of Kadmos himself has been cogently interpreted as representing the Semitic root *qdm* "east", whereas that of his sister Europa, whom he was so desparately looking for, may likewise be based on a Semitic stem, viz. *'rb* "west" (in Astour's explanation, these names stand for the morning and evening star, respectively, of which the one seems to follow the other endlessly). Furthermore, Kadmos is held responsible for the introduction of the mystery cult of the Kabeiroi, the great gods whose name recalls Semitic *kbr* "great".¹⁵⁶ Again, not a trace of the Greek language. Remains the case of Danaos, after whom the Greeks were named Danaoi. First of all, it is interesting to note that the royal house he founded in Mycenae ends with the reign of Eurystheus, after whom the originally Phrygian, but by now fully Mycenaeanized, Pelopids take over: a clear instance of a reflux,

effectuated by intermarriage (the mother of Eurystheus, Nikippe, is claimed to be a daughter of Pelops). On the basis of the probable mention of Atreus in an Hittite text from the reigns of Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC), where he occurs in the form of Attarissiyas, this takeover by the Pelopids may safely be assumed to be anterior to the late 15th century BC or beginning of the 14th century BC – in fact it may perhaps even be surmised to have its archaeological reflection in the shift from shaft graves to tholos tombs, which occurred in Late Helladic IIA.¹⁵⁷ Because Danaos is reported to have come from Egypt, it has been plausibly assumed that he represents a conquest of the Argolid by the Hyksos, the foreign rulers of lower Egypt who were kicked out at about the time of the shaft graves in Mycenae.

Our question, therefore, is: who were the Hyksos? For sure, there was a Semitic component among them, as the first element of the name of one of their kings, Yakob-Har, strikingly recalls Biblical Jakob.¹⁵⁸ In addition to this, there may have been a Hurrian component among them: as pointed out by Wolfgang Helck, the sister and daughter of the Hyksos king Apophis bore Hurrian names.¹⁵⁹ It is even possible that there was an Indo-European component among them, to be more specific of the Indo-Aryan type: thus Drews draws our attention to the fact that the Indo-Aryan term *marya* is used in Egyptian texts to indicate a charioteer or chariot fighter¹⁶⁰ (note in this connection that the distribution of Indo-Aryan names [especially with the elements *aśva-* and *ratha-*] and terms over the Near East is intrinsically linked up with the spread of chariot warfare – the latter being introduced in Egypt by the Hyksos).¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ Hope Simpson 1981: 14.

¹⁵⁸ Redford 1992: 98-122.

¹⁵⁹ Helck 1971: 101; *contra* van Seters 1966: 182-3, who considers the names in question west-Semitic. It is interesting to note in this connection that, as remarked by Stubbings 1973: 637, the Egyptian name Apophis occurs in Greek mythology in form of Epaphos (or Epopeus).

¹⁶⁰ Drews 1988: 151.

¹⁶¹ Mayrhofer 1974; considering the personal names Tarḫundaradus, Piyamaradus, and Rhadamanthys, apparently based on the onomastic element *ratha-* "chariot", the Indo-Aryan influence may even be assumed to have radiated to the Aegean, though, as we have seen, not to the Greek mainland. This latter suggestion is further enhanced by Schachermeyr's (1984: 98) and Latacz's (2003: 312) identification of the Cretan personal name Meriones as a reflex of Indo-Aryan *maryannu*. As duly stressed by

¹⁵⁴ Symeonoglou 1973: 14-5; fig. 3.

¹⁵⁵ Best & Woudhuizen 1988; Best & Woudhuizen 1989; Woudhuizen 2001b.

¹⁵⁶ Astour 1965b; cf. Edwards 1979.

Evidently, the Hyksos were a highly mixed company. But of all the things it may be, there is not a shred of evidence for proto-Greek among them (the comparison of the Ugaritic royal name Niqmadu to Greek Nikomedes is an ingenious but futile attempt, not taking into account the fact that, considering the royal name Niqmepu as attested for Aleppo, the first element of the name appears to be Niqm-).¹⁶² And this is exactly the component which according to the scenario of Best was so dominant that it planted its language on the whole population of Greece. If proto-Greeks were present among the Hyksos at all, and if they entered Greece, I think their numbers must be assumed to have thinned out to homeopathic proportions!

The third and final model is that of Stubbings, who, in line with Best, paints the picture of a military conquest of the Argolid by displaced Hyksos rulers, but, contrary to Best, does not consider them proto-Greeks but simply foreigners who were not numerous enough to cause a language shift. The immediate consequence of this view is that Greek developed from the languages of the population groups already present in Greece at the time of the takeover by the foreign military caste, *in casu* Thracian-Phrygian and IE Anatolian. As a matter of fact, of these two languages Thracian-Phrygian is so closely related to Greek that it must be assumed to have once formed a linguistic continuum with the latter. The similarity of Greek to Phrygian was noted already by the ancient Greeks themselves. Thus Plato makes Socrates remark in a dialogue that the Phrygians have the same word slightly changed for *pur* “fire”, *hudōr* “water” and *kunes* “dogs” and many other words.¹⁶³ Especially the case of *kunes* (< PIE **k(u)won-*) is interesting, because it demonstrates that Phrygian, like Greek, is a

centum language.¹⁶⁴ The same holds good for Thracian, which in an early inscription from Kjolmen shows the form *ekoa* “mare” (< PIE **ekwo-*).¹⁶⁵ Another outstanding feature is formed by the relative pronoun, in which respect Phrygian with the form *ios* or *yos* exhibits a particular affinity to the Mycenaean forerunner of later Greek *hos*, i.e. *jo-* as represented in the composite *jo-qi* (the use of these forms instead of reflexes of PIE **k^wi-* or **k^wo-* is an innovation which Greek and Phrygian share with Indo-Iranian, which has *ya-*).¹⁶⁶ This Phrygian affinity to particularly Mycenaean Greek can be further illustrated by the sequence *lavagtaei vanaktei* (D sg. in *-i*) from a dating formula, the roots of which strikingly recall the Mycenaean titular expressions *ra-wa-ke-ta* (= Greek *lāvāgetās*) “leader of the host” and *wa-na-ka* (= Greek (*v*)*anaks*) “king”, respectively. The preservation of the *wau*, a typical archaic feature, also characterizes Phrygian forms like *ev(e)-* (cf. Greek *eu-* “good”), *venavtun* (cf. Greek *heauton* “himself”), *vetei* (cf. Greek *etos* “year”), *otuvoi* (cf. Greek *ogdoos* “eighth”), etc.¹⁶⁷ Of these forms *venavtun* (with first element *ven-* < PIE **swe-*) is also interesting in another respect, as it shows the loss of the initial *s* which in Greek becomes *h* (a development which Greek has in common with Iranian and Armenian).¹⁶⁸ Furthermore, it may be pointed out that both Phrygian and Thracian share with Greek the use of the augment in the indicative of the past tense, cf. Phrygian *edaes* “he dedicated” and Thracian *edakat* “he made” (this is again an innovation which Greek and this time Thracian-Phrygian share with this time Sanskrit).¹⁶⁹ If we realize, finally, that medio-passive forms in *-tor* reported for Neo-Phrygian are problematic as Old

Drews 1988: 96-7, the temporary military superiority of the Indo-Aryan invaders, probably originating from the Transcaucasian steppes, during the late 18th and early 17th centuries BC is based on their combination of the Near Eastern war-chariot with horse-control in the form of the bit – a steppe innovation –, of which the seal impressions and seal depicted in Littauer & Crouwel 1979: figs. 33-4 and 36 bear testimony, whereas their Near Eastern opponents up to that time were accustomed to the technical inferior nose-ring, see, for example, the sealing depicted in Littauer & Crouwel 1979: fig. 29.

¹⁶² Best 1992-3. Note, however, that the ethnonym Danaoi is likely to be based on the PIE root **dānu-* “river” as exemplified by the Old European and North Pontic steppe river names Danube, Don, Dnieper, and Dniester (see Sakellariou 1980: 175-7), which would explain the mythical identification of the daughters of Danaos as water nymphs.

¹⁶³ Plato, *Cratylus* 410.

¹⁶⁴ Note, however, that in New Phrygian satem influences as witnessed by the form *seiti* < PIE **kei-* “to lie, to be put to rest” may have slipped in, see Diakonoff & Neroznak 1985: 132-3.

¹⁶⁵ Woudhuizen 2000-1. Like it is the case with Phrygian (see the previous note), in the late period satem influences, as represented by *esbi-* “horse”, may have slipped in, see Detschew 1976: 171.

¹⁶⁶ Crossland 1971: 866; cf. Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 339; 345.

¹⁶⁷ Woudhuizen 1993b. The given examples are based on the Old Phrygian texts (8th-6th centuries BC) as discussed in Woudhuizen 1993a. I have purposely avoided to make use of parallels from New Phrygian texts (2nd-3rd centuries AD), because, under the overwhelming influence of Hellenism, this is actually on the way of becoming a provincial form of Greek.

¹⁶⁸ Crossland 1971: 853.

¹⁶⁹ Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 312.

Phrygian already bears testimony of the innovative middle forms in *-toy* or *-toi*, Phrygian may well be considered to side with Greek with respect to the loss of the medio-passive in *-r-* as well (yet another innovation which Greek and Phrygian share with Indo-Iranian).¹⁷⁰ Against the background of this considerable overlap in lexicon, phonological, and grammatical features between Greek and Thracio-Phrygian, then, I think it is not farfetched to assume that Greek came into being as a split from Thracio-Phrygian under the impetus of foreign tongue(s) introduced, as we have seen, by conquerors from Egypt, Phoenicia, and Crete in the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I (c. 1600 BC) (see Fig. 10).




Fig. 10. Reconstruction of the split between Greek and Thracio-Phrygian on the basis of the development of the mediae aspiratae (after Haas 1966: 209).¹⁷¹

In retrospect, it may be concluded that our investigation into the theories on the ethnogenesis of the Greeks has led us to a point of view which is very close to the one held by the majority of scholars and expressed by the contributors to the prestigious Cambridge Ancient History.

¹⁷⁰ Note that the supposed medio-passive forms *addaketor* and *abberetor* turn up instead of active *addaket* in variants of the prothesis of the damnation formula, which usually runs as follows: *ios ni semoun tou knoumanei kakoun addaket* “whoever will bring any damage to this grave”, see Diakonoff & Neroznak 1985: 31; *contra* Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 341-3; 345. For the middle forms in *-toy* or *-toi*, see Woudhuizen 1993a: 5-6. It should be stressed in this connection, however, that passive forms in *-r-* have been preserved in Armenian as well, see Haas 1966: 247.

¹⁷¹ I am indebted to Wim van Binsbergen for drawing this diagram.

Thus, it appears that Caskey is essentially right in his assumption that in the transitional periods from Early Helladic II to Early Helladic III (c. 2300 BC) and from Early Helladic III to Middle Helladic (c. 2000 BC), a new people arrived in Greece which spoke an Indo-European language which was later to become Greek. And Stubbings is essentially right in his assumption that in the transitional period from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I (c. 1600 BC) Greece was conquered by foreign invaders from Egypt and Palestine who, however, were not numerous enough to plant their language(s) on the at that time indigenous population. The only ingredients which we have added is that, in accordance with Best’s view, the bearers of the Minyan culture were Thracian and Phrygian tribes, and that Greek is a split from Thracio-Phrygian taking place in southern and central Greece under the influence of foreign tongue(s) introduced by the conquering warrior caste of expert charioteers who take over control of these areas c. 1600 BC. I can only hope that these new ingredients have been presented in such a manner that they will become as influential as the old ones.

Additional note: Remaining models

In the above, I have not treated all models, only the historically viable ones. Remaining models for the ethnogenesis of the Greeks are:

- (1) during the Neolithic, c. 6000 BC (Renfrew),¹⁷²
- (2) at the beginning of the Early Bronze Age, c. 3200 BC (Coleman),¹⁷³
- (3) at the end of the Late Bronze Age, c. 1200 BC (Grumach, Hood).¹⁷⁴

Of these models, the Neolithic option has become “en vogue” lately, being further propagated by Robert Drews in his collection of papers by various scholars entitled *Greater Anatolia*.¹⁷⁵ In theory, however, a connection between the spread of Neolithic agricultural economy with that of the Indo-European languages as defended by Colin Renfrew would lead us to assume a gradual diffusion of

¹⁷² Renfrew 1987.

¹⁷³ Coleman 2000.

¹⁷⁴ Grumach 1969; Hood 1974.

¹⁷⁵ Drews 2001.

linguistic features from an hypothetical centre, Anatolia in Renfrew's view, to the outlying districts (= wave of advance). Hence, it cannot explain the intrusion of a more developed Indo-European layer as represented by Phrygian and Greek in between conservative IE Anatolian on the one hand and an as yet undivided Italo-Celtic in eastern and central Europe on the other hand:¹⁷⁶ like the presence of an Hungarian speaking "island" in a Slavic speaking "sea", this distribution pattern indicates disruption by immigrants from elsewhere than the hypothetical centre Anatolia – the more so because it is repeated to the east, with innovative Indo-Iranian in between conservative IE Anatolian on the one hand and Tocharian on the other hand. Moreover, the more developed features of Phrygian and Greek, which these have in common with Sanskrit, like the relative **yo-*, the augment in the indicative of the past tense, and the loss of medio-passive *-r-*, or with Iranian, like the loss of initial *s*, are unlikely to have been crystalized already as early as the beginning of the Early Bronze Age. My reconstruction of the relatively late split between Phrygian and Greek on the one hand and Indo-Iranian on the other would be as follows:

progressive use of the horse	developments in the innovative group of Indo-European languages	
domesticated horse attested in mainland Greece	augment relative <i>*yo-</i> loss of medio-passive <i>-r-</i> loss of initial <i>s</i>	split of Indo-Iranian from Phrygo-Greek
chariot	<i>satem</i>	Indo-Iranian only

Table 3. Developments in the innovative group of Indo-European languages related to the progressive use of the horse

To this comes that the hiatus between the Neolithic

¹⁷⁶ For the reflex of PIE **k^wi-* or **k^wo-* in Celtic, cf. the Celtiberian indefinite *kuekue-* "whosoever" in *kuekuetikui* (D sg. in *-i*) "to whomsoever it may concern" as attested for the so-called *res* bronze, see Meid 1996: 30-1; Meid 2000: 12; for the reflex of PIE **swe-* in Celtic, cf. the Gallic reflexive pronoun of the 3rd person *sue-* "self-", see Meid 1996: 31, and the possibly related Celtiberian forms *sue* and *sues*, see Meid 1993, Glossar s.v. Note, however, that the significance of the relative **yo-* for the innovative group of Indo-European languages is somewhat undermined by the fact that its reflex is also attested for conservative (also medio-passive *-r* and centum, see Meid 1993: 59 and 44, respectively) Celtiberian, see Meid 1993: 96.

and Early Bronze Age in Greece would seriously hamper the transmission of the pre-Greek place names in *-ss-* and *-nth-*, no inhabitants being left to execute this transmission. Finally, arrival of the Greeks at the end of the Bronze Age is definitely ruled out by the decipherment of Linear B as an old form of Greek.

8. THE RISE AND FALL OF THE MYCENAEAN GREEKS

In the history of the Greeks from the time of their formation to that of the downfall of the Mycenaean palaces, we can distinguish three major phases: 1. the period of the Minoan thalassocracy (c. 1550-1450 BC), 2. the Minoan-Mycenaean transitional period (c. 1450-1350 BC), and 3. the period of the Mycenaean *koinē* (c. 1350-1185 BC).

In the period of the Minoan thalassocracy, the Greek mainland appears to have been at least partly subject to Minoan overlords. This is suggested by the Attic tradition according to which in the time of king Aigeus, the father of the Athenian hero Theseus, a yearly tribute of seven young girls and seven boys was due to the Cretan king Minos. These girls and boys, so the story goes, were to be sacrificed to the Minotaur of the labyrinth in king Minos' palace at Knossos. That Theseus, with the help of Ariadne, the daughter of king Minos, slayed the Minotaur and freed Athens from the ignominious yoke of Minoan domination, does not, of course, alter the fact that the Athenians were tributaries beforehand.¹⁷⁷

The period of Minoan thalassocracy ends with the for the Minoans disastrous eruption of the Santorini volcano. The discussion on the chronology of this event – and hence its impact – has recently received a new impetus by Manfred Bietak's sensational find of tephra from the Minoan eruption of the Santorini volcano in Tel el-Dab'a/Avaris in a layer dated to the reign of Tuthmosis III (1479-1425 BC). As the reign of the latter pharaoh synchronizes with Late Minoan IB, the eruption in question can now safely be held responsible for the massive destructions at the end of this particular period (c. 1450 BC).¹⁷⁸ Having lost the ships of their fleet because of this disaster, the Minoans were an easy prey to the Mycenaean of mainland Greece.

Soon after the eruption of the Santorini volcano, the Mycenaean, archaeologically traceable by warrior graves of mainland type and their predilection for so-called Ephyraean goblets, took over control of the island of Crete,

which they ruled from the palace of Knossos.¹⁷⁹ As first pointed out by Fritz Schachermeyr, this takeover of power in Crete has its reflection in the wall paintings of Aegean embassies in the graves of Egyptian dignitaries. Thus, in the tomb of Rekhmare, which was finished early in the reign of Tuthmosis III's successor Amenhotep II (1427-1400 BC), the Minoan kilts with "codpieces" are replaced by Mycenaean ones without "codpieces", whereas in the slightly later tomb of Menkheperreseneb a prince of the land of Keftiu (= Crete) is depicted in altogether Mycenaean style with a beard.¹⁸⁰ Further proof is afforded by the Linear B tablets from Knossos, which are accidentally preserved by the fire that destroyed the palace at the end of our Minoan-Mycenaean transitional period (= Late Minoan IIIA1/2, c. 1350 BC). Owing to the decipherment of Linear B by Michael Ventris in 1952, we know namely that this script was used to write Greek.¹⁸¹ At the same time, however, a Minoan rest group is allowed to continue their own traditions in the Mesara plain, of which fact modest Linear A archives of about 150 tablets in sum at Hagia Triada (= HT) and two Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions, the famous discus of Phaistos and the double-axe of Arkalokhori, bear testimony (see further section 12 below).

Within the frame of international politics, our Minoan-Mycenaean transitional period can itself be subdivided into three distinct subphases.¹⁸² The first subphase is characterized by the vicissitudes of the so-called Assuwan league – a short lived coalition of forces from Troy in the north to Lycia in the south of western Anatolia under the leadership of the royal house of the later kingdom of Arzawa and named after the *Asios leimōn* "Asian field" near the latter's capital Apasa (= Ephesos). As indicated by a retrospective passage in a Hittite text of later date, the influence of this league radiated to the islands (Luwian *gursawara*) of the Aegean.¹⁸³ Among these islands may well

¹⁷⁷ Woudhuizen 1992a: 55.

¹⁷⁸ Bietak 2000: 194; this evidence now supersedes that presented by Driessen & Macdonald 1997 (end of Late Minoan IA, c. 1500 BC) and Manning 1999 (1628 BC). For an overview of the problem of the Santorini eruption, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 47-79.

¹⁷⁹ Woudhuizen 1992a: 66-77.

¹⁸⁰ Schachermeyr 1960; Schachermeyr 1980: 457-8.

¹⁸¹ Ventris & Chadwick 1973.

¹⁸² See on this subdivision Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004, section 8.

¹⁸³ Starke 1981.

have been Crete, since in the text of the Phaistos disc (if we are allowed to make use of the reading and interpretation of the latter document recently put forward by a group of Dutch scholars, referred to in note 182) this town is called “Assuwian” (B 10-11) and in the tablets of Hagia Triada mention is made of *a-si-ja-ka u-mi-na-si* “of the Asian town” (HT 28a), which likely refers to Phaistos, again.¹⁸⁴ The radiation of Assuwa’s influence to Crete might also account for its occurrence in form of *Asiya* (*’Isy*) in the annals of Tuthmoses III for the years just after the eruption of the Santorini volcano (*in casu* 1445 and 1441-1440 BC). This subphase ends with the defeat of the Assuwian league by the Hittite king Tudḫaliyas I (1430-1400 BC).

With the elimination of the Assuwian league by the Hittites again a vacuum of power is created in the Aegean region – thus marking the start of our second subphase. One of the parties taking advantage of this situation is Attarissiyas, the man of Aḫḫiyā, in whom we may recognize Atreus, the father of Agamemnon, king of Mycenae and leader of the Akhaians at the time of the Trojan war. According to the annals of the Hittite kings Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC), this Akhaian ruler repeatedly attacked Madduwattas – a Hittite vassal in the region of southwest Anatolia – and with the latter held a raid on the island of Alasiya (= Cyprus), using as much as 100 chariots.¹⁸⁵

The third and final subphase of the Minoan-Mycenaean transitional period is characterized by the renewed prominence of Arzawa under its king Tarḫundaradus. This king corresponded with the Egyptian pharaoh Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) about the marriage of his daughter to the latter. In this correspondence, recovered at Tell El-Amarna, it is stipulated that the land of Ḫatti is “shattered”.¹⁸⁶ The latter situation is plausibly connected with the historical preamble to a decree of Ḫattusilis III (1264-1239 BC) according to which before the reign of Suppiluliumas I (1344-1322 BC) the realm of Arzawa

reached to Uda and Tuwanuwa, which means to the territory south of the Halys river deep in the ancestral Ḫatti lands. Furthermore, the Egyptian pharaoh requests Tarḫundaradus to send Kaskans, a people situated to the north of the Hittite capital Boğazköy/Ḫattusa, but at the time even occupying Nenassa south of the Halys bow. The marriage of Amenhotep III with a daughter of Tarḫundaradus was part of a grander scheme, namely to curb Hittite power both in the east and the west. Another part of this scheme was formed by the political support rendered to the Mycenaean Greeks. As argued by Eric Cline, this support is emanating from the discovery of scarabs and faience plaques of Amenhotep III and his wife Tiyi in the Aegean region, a concentration of which was found in the capital Mycenae itself. Moreover, there is a remarkable correspondence between the findspots of these Egyptian imports and the places mentioned in the list of Aegean place names on a statue base found in Amenhotep III’s temple tomb at Kom el-Hetan, Thebes, which, though starting and ending in Crete, likewise attributes a central position to the Greek mainland if not actually to Mycenae itself. Interestingly, the distribution of the Egyptian imports plausibly suggested to reflect political support includes western Asia Minor, as a scarab of Amenhotep III has been discovered at Panaztepe in the Hermos valley, which conceivably belonged to the realm of Tarḫundaradus.¹⁸⁷ The rationale behind lending political support to both Tarḫundaradus and the Mycenaean Greeks in a containment policy of the Hittites may perhaps be provided by the information from the discus of Phaistos – if, at least, one is allowed to make use of the aforesaid reading and interpretation of this hieroglyphic text as recently offered by a group of Dutch scholars.¹⁸⁸ Here great king Tarḫundaradus, who, although not mentioned explicitly by name, is likely to be identified as the sender of the letter, is staged as the overlord of the Mycenaean Crete under leadership of king Nestor of Pylos in mainland Greece¹⁸⁹ – the

¹⁸⁴ Meijer 1982: 97. For Luwian *umina-* “town”, see Laroche 1960a: *228; Woudhuizen 1994-5: 183; Woudhuizen 2004a: 41.

¹⁸⁵ Note the diffusion of Mycenaean ware from the Argolid, reaching Kos in Late Helladic IIB and Ialysos in Rhodes in Late Helladic IIB-III A1, thus providing us with stepping stones for Attarissiyas’ actions in southwest Anatolia and Cyprus, see Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 164-5.

¹⁸⁶ Moran 1992: 101 (= EA no. 31); cf. Mercer 1939: EA no. 31 (“zersplittert”).

¹⁸⁷ Cline 1987; Cline 2001; note, however, that a scarab of queen Tiyi has also been found outside the Aegean proper in Cyprus, see Kenna 1971: 24, no. 47.

¹⁸⁸ Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004.

¹⁸⁹ On the relation of Pylos with Crete, see Hiller 1996: 81-2 with reference to tablet fragments in Knossian scribal tradition from the old palace at Pylos and the mention in the Pylos tablets of the Cretan towns *Aminiso* “Amnisos” (PY 943) and *Kotuwe* “Gortys (D)” (PY An 233, etc.).

latter no doubt also a vassal of the king of Mycenae.¹⁹⁰ Hence, the political destinies of great king Tarḫundaradus of Arzawa and the Mycenaean Greeks are intricately linked up with each other. An interesting detail in this connection is that with the specification of Phaistos as Assuwan Tarḫundaradus refers back to the Assuwan league of his predecessor of about a generation ago in order to legitimize his claim on Crete.

This intricate political situation in which Nestor of Pylos, who, as we have just noted, was a vassal of the king of Mycenae, ruled over Crete in his capacity as vassal of great king Tarḫundaradus of Arzawa, and in which there was some room for the continuity of Minoan traditions, was abruptly put to an end by the Mycenaean Argolid at the beginning of Late Helladic IIIA2 (c. 1350 BC), when these burned down the palace of Knossos and introduced *megaron* houses and standardized types of pottery, the so-called Mycenaean *koinē*, all over the island.¹⁹¹ This expansionism of Mycenaean Argolid coincides with their conquest of Thebes – which had strong Cretan connections as exemplified by the inscribed stirrup jars! – and the setting up of Orkhomenos as a Minyan (= non-Greek) satellite state in central Greece.¹⁹² Furthermore, the Mycenaeanization of Thessaly to the northeast probably sets in from Late Minoan IIIA2 onwards.¹⁹³ Finally, the Mycenaean Argolid extend their influence over the Aegean islands and as far east as Miletos – a former Minoan colony named after Milatos in Crete¹⁹⁴ – on the west coast of Asia Minor.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁰ Note in this connection that according to Homeros, *Iliad* XI, 690-3 Herakles defeated the Pylian king Neleus and killed 11 of his 12 sons, leaving only Nestor as his successor.

¹⁹¹ Schachermeyr 1980: 446; Woudhuizen 1992a: 75.

¹⁹² Woudhuizen 1989: 199-202.

¹⁹³ Smit 1989, who, unfortunately, does not distinguish between Late Minoan IIIA1 and 2.

¹⁹⁴ Niemeier 1998a: 27 ff. first building phase, Late Minoan IA to Late Minoan IB; cf. Fick 1905: 29; 117.

¹⁹⁵ Niemeier 1998a: 33 second building phase, Late Helladic IIIA2 to Late Helladic IIIB. Note that the extension of the Mycenaean sphere of influence in the eastern Aegean is reflected in the later Pylos tablets by ethnica like *Kinidija*, *Miratija*, *Raminija*, *Kisiwija*, and *Aswija*, bearing reference to what appear to be female captives from Knidos, Miletos, Lemnos, Chios, and Asia/Assuwa, respectively, see Parker 1999. Note further that *Miratijo* “man of Miletos, Milesian” figures prominently in the recently edited Theban tablets, see Aravantinos, Godart & Sacconi 2001: Fq 177, 198, [214], 244, 254+255, 269, and 276.

The history of the Mycenaean Argolid during the period of the *koinē* can be followed from the sidelines by their role in the Hittite sources, where they are addressed as Aḫḫiyawa “Akhaian”.¹⁹⁶ Basic to this role is the fact that with Millawanda (= Miletos) they have a foothold in western Asia Minor. This history begins with a major setback, since, according to his annals, the Hittite great king Muršiliš II (1321-1295 BC) razed Millawanda down to the ground in the third year of his reign, which information agrees with an archaeologically detected destruction layer for Miletos in the Late Helladic IIIA2 to Late Helladic IIIB transitional period.¹⁹⁷ The Mycenaean Argolid, however, retained their hold on the site, as in the next episode, under the Hittite great king Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC), a certain Piyamaradus, who is the father-in-law of the governor of Millawanda, Atpas, raided Hittite territory apparently with the backing of the king of Aḫḫiyawa. Muwatallis II, who was preparing himself for the battle of Kadesh with Egypt (1274 BC), preferred to settle the matter in diplomatic terms, and, in doing so, addressed the king of Aḫḫiyawa as his “brother”, which means recognition as an equal and hence great king. His Aḫḫiyawan colleague was of the same mood, as with respect to a former conflict about Wilusa (= Homeric Ilios or Ilion) he is stated to have remarked:

LUGAL KUR ḫa-at-ti- ȳa-an-aš-kán ú-ug 8. ku-e-da-ni
A.NA [INI]M URU ȳi-l[u]-[š]a še-ir ku-ru-ur 9. e-šu-u-
en nu- ȳa-[m]u a-p[i]-e-[d]a-ni INIM-ni la-ak-nu-ut
10. nu- ȳa ták-šu-la-u-en X (X) X- ȳa-an-na-aš ku-ru-
ur a-a-ra

“In der Angelegenheit von Wilusa, der entgegen der König des Landes Hattusa und ich uns feind waren, in der hat er mich umgestimmt, und wir haben uns vertragen. Ein ... Krieg ist Unrecht für uns.”¹⁹⁸

As it seems, this sidely remarked conflict about Wilusa became conflated in Greek memory as the Trojan

[214], 244, 254+255, 269, and 276.

¹⁹⁶ This identification, already implied in the discussion of Attarissiyas above, is now commonly accepted; note, however, that Heinhold-Krahmer 2003 is still hesitating about it.

¹⁹⁷ Niemeier 1998a: 38; Niemeier 1998b: 150-1 end of second building period.

¹⁹⁸ Sommer 1932: KUB XIV 3 iv 7-10 (cited without the numerous question marks for uncertain signs). For the dating of the Tawagalawas-letter to the reign of Muwatallis II and an overview of the discussion about this, see Smit 1990-1 and, most recently, Guney 2002.

war¹⁹⁹ – a suggestion further emphasized by the fact that the name of the king of Wilusa at the time of Muwatallis II, Alaksandus, corresponds to Greek Alexandros/Paris;²⁰⁰ at any rate, a date of say *c.* 1280 BC for this conflict correlates perfectly with the archaeologically established destruction of Troy VI, usually assigned to *c.* 1300 BC.




Fig. 11 (see next page). Sites in southern and central Greece destroyed and/or abandoned at the end of Late Helladic III B. Source: Hope Simpson & Dickinson 1979.

shown are the following sites: Teikhos Dymaion, Pylos, Nixhoria, Menelaion, Ayios Stephanos, Krisa, Tsoungiza, Mycenae, Zy-

¹⁹⁹ So also Bryce 2003: 208, who, however, wrongly dates the Tawagalawas-letter to the reign of Ḫattusilis III. It is interesting to note in this connection that according to Webster 1960: 67 the Hittites are mentioned in Homeros among the Trojan allies as 1. Halyzones from Alybe – a city, like Ḫattusa, associated with silver – (*Iliad* II, 856) [but note that Meyer 1968: 12 connects Alybe with the Khalybians of the Early Iron Age], and 2. Keteians (*Odyssey* XI, 521); they may further appear as adversaries of the Phrygians along the Sangarios in form of Amazones in a retrospective passage referring to the time that Priamos still fought himself (*Iliad* III, 184) – the same Amazones upon whom Bellerophon stumbles during his adventures in the hinterland of Lycia (*Iliad* VI, 186), cf. Leonhard 1911: 15-6. See also section 2, notes 52 and 53 above.

²⁰⁰ Note that a reflection of these events is preserved by Stephanos of Byzantion's remark in his *Ethnika*, s.v. *Samylia* that Motylos, after founding this Carian city, received Helena and Paris there, see Riemschneider 1954: 40.

gouries, Berbati, Prosymna, Midea/Dendra, Tiryns, Orkhomenos, Iria, Gla, Eutresis, Thebes, Brauron.

After this glorious episode, however, it goes down with the image of the Mycenaean king in the eyes of the Hittites. It has been argued that in the reign of the Hittite great king Tudḫaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC) the Mycenaeans had lost their Anatolian bridgehead in the region of Miletos. Thus there is documentary evidence that the ruler of Milawata (= variant of Millawanda) at the time turned sides and went over to the Hittite camp.²⁰¹ In the archaeological record this seems to be reflected by Hittite features in the material culture of Miletos in the second half of the 13th century BC.²⁰² Whatever the extent of these arguments, fact is that in a treaty with Sausgamuwa of Amurru, in which Tudḫaliyas IV ordered a ban on traffic between Aḫḫiyawa and Assyria via the harbors of Amurru, the name of the king of Aḫḫiyawa, initially summed up among the kings equal in rank with the Hittite great king, has been erased.²⁰³ Evidently, the king of Aḫḫiyawa was downgraded in the eyes of the Hittites as compared to the situation at the time of Muwatallis II. To this comes that the ban on traffic of Aḫḫiyawa as referred to in the Sausgamuwa-treaty may have become more serious in the course of time. Tudḫaliyas IV had a program of incorporating all of southwest Anatolia into his realm: early in his reign he announced the plan to conquer the territory west of Parḫa along the Kastaraya (= Perge along the Kestros in Pamphylia) and to add the newly won territory to the province of Tarḫuntassa (= Cilicia Aspera).²⁰⁴ At a later stage in his reign, he conquered the region of the lower Xanthos valley in Lycia – a country where no one of his ancestors had ever marched.²⁰⁵ The rationale behind this scheme is to clear the sea from pirates – the Lycians were notorious for this activity already in the time of the El-Amarna archive in the 14th century BC – as a preparation for his ultimate goal: the conquest of Alasiya (= Cyprus). In the final years of his reign, then, he ultimately launched a campaign against the island of Alasiya, but a definite result was reached only by his son and successor, Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC), who also set up a memorial for this

²⁰¹ Bryce 1998: 339-42 (Milawata-letter).

²⁰² Niemeier 1998b: 153.

²⁰³ Bryce 1998: 342-4.

²⁰⁴ Otten 1988: VIII, 62-4 and commentary.

²⁰⁵ Poetto 1993; Woudhuizen 1994-5: 168-179; Woudhuizen 2004a: section 3 ; see section 6 above.

campaign.²⁰⁶ Now, most of the inscriptions in Cypro-Minoan date to the period of Hittite rule, say *c.* 1210-1180? BC, if not actually from the last days before the conquest by the Sea Peoples. The larger texts among the inscriptions are bills of lading, registering the sea-borne traffic between western Anatolia and the Near East, especially Ras Shamra/Ugarit.²⁰⁷ What really strikes us about these documents is the absence of Greek names. Of course, a Greek trader may be hidden behind geographically inspired indications like “Iasos” or “the Samian”, but the same absence of Greek names also characterizes the much more substantial archives at Ras Shamra/ Ugarit.²⁰⁸ At any rate, it is clear that the responsible persons specified by ethnonyms are men like Piḥas,²⁰⁹ trader from Lycia, Sanemas,²¹⁰ representative of the Shekelesh, or Akamas, representative of Ephesos and a place plausibly situated in the Troad (see section 13) – members of Sea Peoples who later knew their way to the Orient, but decidedly no Greeks! Accordingly, the evidence amounts to a serious ban of the Mycenaean Greeks from the waters bordering the Anatolian peninsula in the west and the south during the final phase of the Hittite Empire period.²¹¹

Just antedating the coming to power of Suppiluliumas II, in year 5 of Merneptah (= 1208 BC), the Akhaians in form of *Ekwesh* – the final *-sh* is likely to be identified as a suffix also present in Shekelesh (= Sicels) and Weshesh (= Ausones or Oscii)²¹² – are recorded to have taken part in the campaign of the Libyan king Meryey against Egypt. In this campaign the Akhaians served as foreign allies or

mercenaries alongside the Teresh, Lukka, Sherden, and Shekelesh. The only one planning to settle in the Egyptian delta was the Libyan king himself who is reported to have been accompanied by his family and to have carried with him all his possessions.²¹³ As such the Libyan campaign is clearly distinct from the later attacks by the Sea Peoples in the reign of Ramesses III (years 1179 and 1176 BC), when, according to the reliefs at Medinet Habu, the Sea Peoples themselves carried with them ox-drawn carts with their wives and children.²¹⁴ Interesting to observe in this connection is that the Greeks are referred to in the Egyptian records of the Libyan campaign by a reflex of their Hittite name, *Aḫḫiyawa*, instead of their usual Egyptian designation *Tanayu*, which in variant form *Denye(n)* is re-introduced by Ramesses III (see section 9). Another strange thing is that the fallen of the Ekwesh are explicitly stated to have been circumcized (hence their hands were cut off as a trophy instead of their penises) – a rite well-attested for the Egyptians and the Semites, but so far not for the Mycenaean Greeks.²¹⁵

The period of the Mycenaean *koinē* ends in massive destructions and/or abandonment of sites on the Greek mainland: in southern and central Greece 10 important sites show a destruction layer at the end of Late Helladic IIIB (*c.* 1185 BC),²¹⁶ 5 of which are abandoned afterwards, whereas at least 9 more important sites are just abandoned at the time (see Fig. 11 on the previous page).²¹⁷ In view of these figures, the transition from Late Helladic IIIB to Late Helladic IIIC is much more discontinuous than preceding periods of an archaeological break discussed in the foregoing section (but note that the density of the Late Helladic IIIB sites is higher than ever before). Yet, as we know from later records, the language spoken in Greece remains Greek and the inhabitants of the Early Iron Age and following periods are Greeks, thus in this sense –

²⁰⁶ Güterbock 1967; Woudhuizen 1994: 524-6; Woudhuizen 1994-5: 175; Woudhuizen 2004a: 32; the memorial in question is Niṣantaṣ in Boğazköy/Ḫattusa, see Woudhuizen 2004a: 72-5.

²⁰⁷ Woudhuizen 1992a: 94-145; Woudhuizen 1994.

²⁰⁸ Astour 1964; Sandars 1980: 35; 46. Note, however, that Ugaritic *Yman* likely refers to Ionia, see Dietrich & Loretz 1998: 337-46, of which the related ethnonym, contrary to the opinion of Dietrich & Loretz 1998: 344, is already attested for Linear B in form of *Ijawone* “Ionians”, see Ventris & Chadwick 1973, glossary, s.v. and cf. Driessen 1998-9.

²⁰⁹ For Luwian hieroglyphic seals bearing testimony of the MN *Piḥas*, see Güterbock 1942: 68, no. 66; Kennedy 1959: 160, no. 39.

²¹⁰ Note that this name is strikingly paralleled for a Cretan hieroglyphic sealing from Gortys (# 196), reading, with the cross at the start and hence from right to left, 019-061-E74 *sa-ná-ma*.

²¹¹ Cf. Cline 1991.

²¹² Wainwright 1961: 72; Redford 1992: 252, note 54; cf. Hittite *Karkisa* alongside *Karkiya* “Caria”. On the identification of the Sea Peoples in question, see section 14 below.

²¹³ Sandars 1980: 101.

²¹⁴ Sandars 1980: 117, *afb.* 77; 118-20. As we have seen in section 4 above, the given distinction was particularly made by Hölbl 1983.

²¹⁵ Barnett 1969: 11; note that the Philistines from Crete were also not circumcized, see section 12.

²¹⁶ Warren & Hankey 1989: 161 association of Late Helladic IIIB with Tewosret 1188-1186 BC at Deir ‘Alla.

²¹⁷ Hope Simpson & Dickinson 1979; cf. Shelmerdine 1997: 581. See also Betancourt 1976: 40 with even larger figures, but without specification of the names of the sites in question.

give and take a few dialectal reshuffles – there is no real break, but only continuity.²¹⁸ As an explanation of this paradox between archaeological evidence and linguistic data, it has been suggested that the enemy which attacked the Mycenaeans at the end of Late Helladic IIIB wasted the country but – apart from some minor exceptions indicated by the presence of handmade foreign ware (see also sections 10 and 14)²¹⁹ – did not come to settle in it.²²⁰ At any rate, the Pylos tablets indicate that the enemy came by sea from the northwest, as ships are sent to cape Pleuron in Aitolia to cope with the emergency situation.²²¹ This does not exclude, however, a simultaneous or slightly posterior attack from the north over land, to which the large scale destructions in Thessaly bear testimony (see Fig. 12)²²² and against which the inhabitants of the Peloponnesos tried to protect themselves by building a wall on the Isthmos.²²³

As a result of the breakdown of the Mycenaean civilization, a number of people from the Peloponnesos decided to join the seaborne attackers and took the boat to the Orient in order to settle in Cyprus and in the region of Adana on the adjacent side of the mainland. For the last mentioned region this is proved by the recently discovered Luwian hieroglyphic-Phoenician bilingual inscription of Çineköy, dated to the reign of Urikki in the late 8th century BC, in which the land of Adana is called *Hiāwa*, the

Luwian hieroglyphic equivalent of Hittite *Aḫḫiyawa*, characterized, just like it is the case for the text of the Phaistos disc, by aphaeresis.²²⁴ In the archaeological record, this event is reflected in the destruction of Tarsus at the end of the Late Bronze Age and the subsequent introduction of Late Helladic IIIC ware of Argive background.²²⁵ Another branch of the Mycenaean Greeks, referred to as Denye(n) by the Egyptians and Dan by the Hebrews, went further south and settled initially in the region of Tel Qasile – a new foundation – in Canaan, perhaps some time after the settlement of the Philistines (see section 9).²²⁶ Both these migrations, however, were not massive enough to plant the Greek language: the Akhaians in the region of Adana went over to Luwian and the Danaoi of Canaan to Semitic.

Apart from emigration to Cyprus and the Orient, which may have been an ongoing process from Late Helladic IIIC to Submycenaean,²²⁷ there can be observed a clustering together of the population in Greece itself into refuge areas during this time. These refuge areas, like Akhaia, Kephaleia, and Attica, but especially the Aegean islands Naxos, Kos, and Rhodes, could bear testimony to a considerable degree of recovery.²²⁸ Moreover, the population in Crete withdrew to mountain sites like Karphi, Vrokastro, and Kastri.²²⁹ From Attica the Ionian emigration to the region of Miletos in western Asia Minor took place, probably in the Submycenaean period;²³⁰ the Aiolian mi-

²¹⁸ For religious continuity, see Nilsson 1927: 400-14; Schnapp-Gourbeillon 2002: Chapitre IV.

²¹⁹ Rutter 1975; Deger-Jalkotzy 1983; Popham 2001; for further literature, see section 14, note 600.

²²⁰ Desborough 1964: 224; cf. Betancourt 1976: 41.

²²¹ Ventris & Chadwick 1973: 185-6: PY An 12 *ereta Pereuro-nade ijote* (= Greek *eretai Pleurōnade iontes*) “rowers to go to Pleuron”. Further maritime measures are forthcoming from the *oka*-tablets, which, notwithstanding the linguistic criticism by Risch 1958: 354 and Palmer 1998: 154, deal with *holkades* “ships for transportation”, see Pugliese Carratelli 1954: 469; Mühlstein 1956: 36 ff.; cf. Best 1996-7: 120-7; for the state of emergency exemplified by these tablets, one of which is headed by the phrase *ouruto opia;ra epikowo* (= Greek *(h)ō(s) wruntoi opi(h)ala epikouroi*) “Thus the watchers are guarding the coast” (PY An 657), see Palmer 1956; Palmer 1965: 143-54.

²²² Schachermeyr 1980: 393; Popham 2001: 282-3 (figs.). As a historical parallel one might point to the fact that when Dionysios of Syracuse raided the Caeretan harbor Pyrgi in 384 BC, the Celts in the hinterland seized the opportunity to attack the Etruscans from the rear.

²²³ Sandars 1980: 173; Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 108-9 (Late Helladic IIIB/C transitional period).

²²⁴ Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000; for the Phaistos disc, see Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004: 85; 98; 110.

²²⁵ Goldman 1956: 63; 350-1; Mee 1978: 150, who stipulates that the number of Late Helladic IIIC sherds (875 in sum) allows for the actual presence of Mycenaeans. Cf. Strabo, *Geography* XIV, 5, 12, according to which Tarsus is colonized from Argos.

²²⁶ For the absence of Late Helladic IIIC1b ware here, see Bietak 1993: 257-8.

²²⁷ Dikaios 1971: 519 (Late Helladic IIIC1b from the Argolid); Catling 1973; Vanschoonwinkel 304-5 (Paphos, Late Helladic IIIC); Schachermeyr 1980: 380 (sub-Mycenaean from the Peloponnesos). The earliest evidence of the Greek language on Cyprus is provided by the Opheltas-obelos, dating to the middle of the 11th century BC, which bears testimony of the Arcado-Cyprian genitive (*Opeletau*), see Masson 1983: 408.

²²⁸ Desborough 1964: 226 ff.; Betancourt 1976: 40; Schachermeyr 1980: 51.

²²⁹ Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 156-9.

²³⁰ Schachermeyr 1980: 375; cf. Herodotos, *Histories* I, 146, who stipulates that the Ionians killed the male Carians and married with their wives.

gration from Boeotia and Thessaly to the coastal zone of Mysia may well have occurred in about the same period or just a little afterwards.²³¹ The Dorians, who repopulated an almost deserted Peloponnesos at the end of the Submycenaean or the beginning of the Protogeometric period,²³² followed in the footsteps of their Ionian and Aiolian tribesmen, colonizing Crete, Rhodes, and the region of Halikarnassos still later. Not for a long time, however, the Greeks were to reach a degree of unity as we have experienced for the period of the Mycenaean *koinē* – and then only under foreign pressure!




Fig. 12. Sites and cemeteries (a) in Late Helladic III B and (b) in Late Helladic III C (from Popham 2001: 282-3).

²³¹ Spencer 1995: 275-7 (repopulation of Mytilene and Pyrrha on Lesbos during the Protogeometric period).

²³² Eder 1998. See also section 2 above.

9. FROM DANAIO TO DAN

In Homeros there are three indications of the Mycenaean Greeks: Akhaioi (= Akhaians in our English transcription), Argeioi, and Danaoi.²³³ As we have seen in the preceding section, a reflection of the first of these ethnonyms, *Aḫḫiyawa*, is used by the Hittites to refer to the Mycenaean Greeks. As opposed to this, the Egyptians rather preferred reflections of the third ethnonym, *Tanayu* or *Denye(n)*. The interesting thing about this Egyptian preference is that the ethnonym Danaoi is derived from the heros eponym Danaos, who according to myth originated from Egypt. Thus it is reported that Danaos, son of Belos, fled before his brother Aigyptos from Egypt to Argos in Greece.²³⁴ Taking this myth at face value, the name Danaoi may at first have had a bearing on the inhabitants of the Argolid only, in order to receive a wider connotation in the course of time. This would tally with the information provided by Pindaros, according to which Danaoi refers to the pre-Doric inhabitants of Argos, Mycenae, and Lacedaimon.²³⁵

Egyptian *Tanayu* is first attested for the annals of Tuthmoses III (1479-1425 BC).²³⁶ Next, it occurs on a base of a column of the royal temple tomb of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) at Kom el-Hetan (Thebes) in direct association with place names from the Greek mainland like Mycenae, Thebes, Messenia, and Nauplia.²³⁷ After an intermezzo in the reign of Merneptah (1213-1203 BC), in which in line with the Hittites a reflection of Akhaioi (= Ekweš) is used, the related form *Denye(n)* turns up amongst the attackers of Egypt in year eight of Ramesses III (1184-1153 BC). This latter ethnonym has been identified with the Danaoi since the time of Emmanuel de Rougé.²³⁸ As noted by Alan Gardiner, this identification receives further emphasis from the fact that the name in question also occurs in shorthand variant *Denye* without

repetition of the *n*.²³⁹

In the relevant literature, the Denye(n) are often, together with the Danaoi, identified with the *Danuna* of the El-Amarna texts (*in casu* the letters by Rib-addi of Byblos and Abimilki of Tyre).²⁴⁰ However, the form *Danuna* corresponds to the root of *Dnny* “people of Adana” as recorded for the Phoenician version of the bilingual Karatepe text (late 8th century BC), and has nothing to do with the Danaoi of mainland Greece.²⁴¹ This conclusion is further substantiated by the fact that, according to the Ugaritic texts, the line of defence against the Sea Peoples is organized in the waters of Lycia in southwest Anatolia: there is no question of a revolt in the Hittite province of Kizzuwatna – to which the town of Adana belongs – at the time. Only after the period of the resurrection of the Sea Peoples and the fall of the Hittite Empire, the region of Adana is colonized by a number of Greek settlers – an historical fact of which the recently found Luwian hieroglyphic-Phoenician bilingual inscription from Çineköy (late 8th century BC) bears testimony, in which the land of Adana is referred to by the name *Hiāwa*, i.e. the Luwian equivalent of Hittite *Aḫḫiyawa* “Akhaian”,²⁴² and which is furthermore reflected in the archaeological record by the introduction of Late Helladic IIIC ware of Argive background in the region after the destruction of Tarsus (see also section 8)!²⁴³

Next to this settlement by a branch of Mycenaean Greeks under the name of Akhaians in the region of Adana, another group under the name of *Dan* (< Danaoi) went further south and settled initially in the region of Tel Qasile – a new foundation – in Canaan, perhaps, for the lack of Late Helladic IIIC1b ware, some time after the settlement of the Philistines.²⁴⁴ As suggested by Yigael

²³³ Hall 2002: 53, note 98 (with specification of their frequency).

²³⁴ Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Danaos*.

²³⁵ Pindaros, *Pythian Odes* 4, 85 f.

²³⁶ Mégalomatis 1996: 811.

²³⁷ Edel 1966; Edel 1988.

²³⁸ De Rougé 1861: 145.

²³⁹ Gardiner 1947: 126.

²⁴⁰ EA no. 117, 90 ff.; EA no. 151, 52; cf. Hall 1926: 281; Gardiner 1947: 125; Laroche 1958: 263-75; Barnett 1969: 9; Strobel 1976: 202; etc.

²⁴¹ Cf. Schachermeyr 1982: 193 ff.

²⁴² Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000.

²⁴³ Goldman 1956: 63; 350-1; Mee 1978: 150.

²⁴⁴ Bietak 1993: 257-8; cf. Singer 1985: 114-5 who for this absence altogether doubts the colonization of the site by Dan.

Yadin, a line from the song of Deborah, running as follows: “And Dan, why did he remain in ships?”, preserves the memory of the precolonial stage in the history of the tribe of Dan.²⁴⁵ At any rate, historical sources locate the Danites on the coast between Asdod in the south and Dor in the north,²⁴⁶ and more specifically situate the region of their inheritance near Joppa.²⁴⁷ In the course of time, then, the Danites expanded their territory to Zora and Eshtaol in the hinterland of Tel Qasile and Joppa, from where they are recorded to have conquered Laish in the sphere of influence of Sidon to the north, of which they changed the name into Dan.²⁴⁸ This latter event may well be linked up with the fact that the foundation layer of Tel Qasile (stratum XII) ends with a destruction of the site.²⁴⁹

²⁴⁵ Bible, *Judges* V, 17; Yadin in Best & Yadin 1973: 69.

²⁴⁶ Josephus, *Antiquities* V, 87.

²⁴⁷ Bible, *Joshua* XIX, 40-8.

²⁴⁸ Bible, *Judges* XVIII, 1-31.

²⁴⁹ Yadin in Best & Yadin 1973: 70.

10. ETRUSCAN ORIGINS

Models

The problem of Etruscan origins has received scholarly attention already in antiquity. First of all, there is the testimony of Herodotus of Halikarnassos (5th century BC) according to which the Etruscans were Lydian colonists from western Asia Minor. Hard pressed by a famine, so the story goes, half of the Lydian population under the leadership of king Atys' son Tyrsenos mustered on ships at Smyrna and sailed to Italy, where they settled in the territory of the Umbrians.²⁵⁰ As opposed to this, we have the opinion of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (1st century BC), who, on the basis of a comparison between the customs and the languages of the Etruscans and the Lydians, reached the conclusion that these two peoples were unrelated. He extrapolated from this conclusion that the Etruscans were no Lydian colonists, but had always lived in Italy.²⁵¹

As divided as opinions were on the subject of Etruscan origins in antiquity, so they are in our present era. A majority among scholars in the field holds that the Etruscans were autochthonous. In accordance with this view, the Etruscans are considered a remnant population surviving the onset of Indo-European migrations which brought the Umbrians, Oscans, Latins, and Faliscans to the Italian peninsula. Their language, so this line of approach continues, is not comparable to any other in the world, except for the one attested for the famous stele from Kaminia on the island of Lemnos in the Aegean. This only linguistic relationship acknowledged by the adherents of the autochthonous thesis receives meaningful explanation in two ways. In the first place, Lemnian is, on the analogy of Etruscan in Italy, considered a remnant of a once widely dispersed Mediterranean language surviving the onset of Indo-European migrations into the Aegean basin.²⁵² Second, Lemnian is seen as the result of a colonization by Etruscans from Italy into the north-Aegean region.²⁵³

A minority among scholars, but a persistent one, is of the opinion that the Etruscans were colonists from western

Asia Minor. These so-called orientalist can be subdivided into two groups: those who situate the colonization of Etruria at the end of the Late Bronze Age (c. 1200 BC),²⁵⁴ and those who rather place this event in the Early Iron Age (c. 750-675 BC).²⁵⁵ A representative of the first mentioned group of orientalist is the Indo-Europeanist Robert Beekes. However, he is exceptional in combining the idea of an oriental origin with the linguistic analysis of the adherents of the autochthonous thesis. Thus, Beekes likewise considers Etruscan and Lemnian relics of a language once spoken in the Aegean before the Indo-European migrations.²⁵⁶ Much more common among orientalist is it to consider Etruscan related to the Indo-European languages of Asia Minor, and in particular to Luwian.²⁵⁷ The latter language was spoken in southern and western Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age, and, in its western extremity, was subject to a dialectal development which resulted in Lycian and Lydian of the Classical period.²⁵⁸

Now, there is some evidence of non-Indo-European languages in Asia Minor, originally going back to the time before the Indo-European migrations. In the first place, mention should be made of Hattic, the language of the inhabitants of Hattusa before this city was taken over by the Hittites, as recorded in Hittite texts dating from the 2nd millennium BC. Next, there is Hurrian, the language of the realm of Mitanni, once a formidable rival of the Hittites in their strive for hegemony in eastern Anatolia and North Syria. This language developed into Urartian of the Early Iron Age. Finally, we cannot omit the Semitic language, which in the form of Akkadian was used as a *lingua franca* for international correspondence between the empires of the 2nd millennium BC – a function taken over by Aramaic during the Early Iron Age. But, except for some bilinguals with Aramaic for Lycian and Lydian, this evidence has a bearing on eastern Asia Minor only. In

²⁵⁰ *Histories* I, 94.

²⁵¹ *Roman Antiquities* I, 25-30.

²⁵² Pallottino 1988: 98.

²⁵³ Gras 1976; Drews 1992; de Simone 1996.

²⁵⁴ Hencken 1968.

²⁵⁵ Schachermeyr 1929.

²⁵⁶ Beekes & van der Meer 1991; Beekes 1993; Beekes 2002: 219-20; cf. Steinbauer 1999: 389.

²⁵⁷ Meriggi 1937; Laroche 1961b.

²⁵⁸ For Lydian as a Luwian dialect, see Woudhuizen 1984-5a; Woudhuizen 1990; Woudhuizen 2005: appendix IV.

western Asia Minor the linguistic situation is much less complicated. Here we find evidence of two language groups, both of them Indo-European, namely Luwian, which, as we have seen, developed into Lycian and Lydian of the Classical period, and Thracian-Phrygian, presumably the vernacular of the common people of the Troas already in the Bronze Age (see section 13, especially note 520, below) and, after the fall of the Hittite Empire *c.* 1180 BC, introduced further east into the Anatolian highland. If, for the sake of argument, we have to allow for remnants of a non-Indo-European language in western Anatolia, this can only entail small pockets, incapable of providing the amount of people necessary for the colonization of Etruria as envisaged by the orientalist. As a matter of fact, Beekes' tenet of non-Indo-European survivals in the Aegean is entirely based on the linguistic analysis of the Lemnos stele as common among the adherents of the autochthonous thesis.

Autochthonous thesis

The statement by Dionysios of Halikarnassos that the Etruscans differed in customs and language from the Lydians is perfectly true for the period in which he lived, the 1st century BC. But, if a colonization of Etruria from Lydia had taken place, as Herodotos wants us to believe, then this event happened some 6 to 11 centuries in the past. During this period, we must believe that the customs and language had developed independently in Lydia and Etruria, which would explain the differences. It is of much greater importance, therefore, to know whether the Etruscan customs and language were more closely related to those of the Lydians when these first manifested themselves, in the late 8th and early 7th century BC.

At the same time, it is interesting to determine what exactly is Dionysios' drive to disconnect the Tyrrhenians, as the Etruscans are called by the Greeks, from the Pelasgians. In previous sources, like, for instance, Thucydides (5th century BC), these two population groups are persistently identified.²⁵⁹ The answer to this question is given by Dionysios himself in the introduction to his work: he wants to prove that the founding fathers of Rome were actually Greeks.²⁶⁰ Now, the Pelasgians, who played a role in the

earliest history of Rome, according to literary tradition originate from Greece. For Dionysios, this is reason to assume that they are in fact a Greek ethnos. In reality, however, the Pelasgians are a pre-Greek population group, already present in Greece before the Greeks came into being. As they are so different from the Greeks, Dionysios cannot use the Tyrrhenians to the same effect: to declare them Greeks would be preposterous. The unprecedented and rather forced distinction between Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians leads to absurd consequences, like, for instance, the assumption that the language of the inhabitants of Cortona, whom Dionysios considers to be Pelasgians, was distinct from that of the Tyrrhenians.²⁶¹ Dozens of inscriptions disprove this: the language of the inhabitants of Cortona was straightforwardly Etruscan.²⁶² Another question which arises from Dionysios' distinction between Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians is where the latter were living at the time that the Pelasgians are said to have occupied their country.²⁶³ Finally, the way in which Dionysios disposes of the Pelasgians in order to make room for the Tyrrhenians is extremely suspect: he simply, so to say, lets them evaporate into thin air!²⁶⁴ In short, the story on which the adherents of the autochthonous thesis base themselves suffers from many flaws.

Also the explanation of the relationship between Etruscan and Lemnian within the frame of the autochthonous thesis leads up to unsurmountable difficulties. The first option, according to which the Etruscans and Lemnians were both remnants of population groups surviving the onset of Indo-European immigrations, runs up against the fact that the two languages were so closely related that such a long period of independent development is highly inconceivable (the Indo-European invasions in the Aegean date back to at least *c.* 2300 BC, see section 3). The second option, according to which the north-Aegean region was colonized by Etruscans from Italy in the late 8th or early

²⁵⁹ *Peloponnesian War* IV, 109, 4.

²⁶⁰ *Roman Antiquities* I, 5, 1; cf. I, 17, 1; I, 60, 3. This point of view is common among Hellenistic poets, see Sakellariou 1977:

98, note 3.

²⁶¹ *Roman Antiquities* I, 29, 3; this view, based on a misreading of †Crotoniats for Crestoniats in the manuscript of Herodotos' text, is followed, amongst others, by Briquel 1984: 101-140 (esp. 126 ff.) and Beekes 2002: 221, in the latter case without realizing the consequence. For further literature, see Sakellariou 1977: 88, note 6.

²⁶² Rix 1991: 301-4; Agostiniani & Nicosia 2000; cf. Briquel 1984: 133.

²⁶³ *Roman Antiquities* I, 20, 5.

²⁶⁴ *Roman Antiquities* I, 24, 4; 26. 1

7th century BC, is, considering the slight dialectal differences, a priori possible, but lacks a proper archaeological and historical basis.

Colonization at the end of the Bronze Age

If the autochthonous thesis turns out to be flawed, what about the thesis of oriental origins? As we have seen, one group of orientalist situates the colonization of Etruria from Asia Minor at the end of the Bronze Age. These scholars base themselves on the chronology of Herodotos, who places the rulers descending from Atys' son Lydos prior to those of the Heraklids. The reign of the latter, Herodotos continues, lasted as many as 22 generations or 505 years in sum before the last representative, Kandaules, was set aside by Gyges, the first ruler of the Mermnades, at the beginning of the 7th century BC.²⁶⁵ Accordingly, it follows that the descendants of Atys' son Lydos were in power before the beginning of the 12th century BC. Herodotos, however, amplifies this information with the remark that the population of Sardis and its surroundings were called Lydians after Lydos, whereas prior to his rule they were known as Maeonians. Now, Maeonians is the form of address for the Lydians in the epic songs of Homeros, which, as we have seen in section 2, primarily reflects Late Bronze Age history. Hence the name Lydians can only be surmised to have come into currency in the Early Iron Age. Ergo: Herodotos' chronology is flawed.




Fig. 13. Distribution of biconical urns in the Urnfield world (from Hencken 1968: 441, fig. 452).

²⁶⁵ *Histories* I, 7.

Also from an archaeological perspective the colonization of Etruria at the end of the Bronze Age is highly unlikely. It is true that at this time Italy is characterized by the introduction of a new culture, the so-called proto-Villanovan (= an earlier phase of Villanovan),²⁶⁶ but, as demonstrated convincingly by Hugh Hencken, the latter shows close affinities with the European Urnfields. Thus the typical biconical urns relate to counterparts primarily discovered in the region of Oltenia and the Banat, Hungary (see Fig. 13).²⁶⁷ Furthermore, the house urns, which are so well-known a feature of the Latial variant of (proto-)Villanovan, find their closest parallels in northern Germany (see Fig. 14).²⁶⁸ In line with these observations, it seems reasonable to assume that new population groups have entered Italy, as Hencken does, only not from the Aegean, but from Europe. These new population groups can plausibly be identified as the forefathers of the historical Italic peoples of the Umbrians, Oscans,²⁶⁹ Latins, and Faliscans, whose languages show the closest affinity to Celtic and Germanic. At any rate, the Umbrians have the same name as the German tribe of the Ambrones (Jutland in Denmark),²⁷⁰ branches of which can, on the basis of related place and river names, be traced as far afield as France, Spain, and even northern Italy,²⁷¹ whereas that of the Oscans or Ausones is obviously related to the Celtic ethnonyms Ausci (near Auch in southern France) and Ausetani (in Ausa-Vich, Catalonia).²⁷² (As demonstrated by Hans Krahe, both ethnonyms are rooted in his Old European river names, the first being based on **emb^h-*, **omb^h-* "moist, water" and the second on **av-*, **au-*

²⁶⁶ Note that Hencken 1968 wrongly applies the term pre-Villanovan instead; cf. Fugazzola Delpino 1979; Ridgway 1988: 628 ff.

²⁶⁷ Hencken 1968: 441, fig. 452.

²⁶⁸ Behn 1924: 90-1; Tafel 6, d-e; note, however, that the north German house urns postdate the Latial ones.

²⁶⁹ Note in this connection that the introduction of proto-Villanovan in Lipari and at Milazzo in Sicily is attributed to the Ausones (= variant form of Osci) who according to Diodoros of Sicily, *Library of History* V, 7, invaded Lipari and Sicily from the Italian peninsula, see Hencken 1955: 31.

²⁷⁰ Altheim 1950: 56-7.

²⁷¹ Schmoll 1959: 83; 119, note 1.

²⁷² Bosch-Gimpera 1939: 40.

“source, stream”).²⁷³



Fig. 14. Distribution of house urns (from Bouzek 1997: fig. 49). The distinction between open and closed map symbols is immaterial in the present connection

This reconstruction of Italian prehistory at the end of the Bronze Age, which assumes a relation between Urn-field culture and the historical peoples of the Umbrians, Oscans, Latins, and Faliscans, collides with the view of the foremost representant of the autochthonous thesis, Massimo Pallottino. The latter put much effort in an attempt to disconnect the Italic Indo-European languages from the (proto-)Villanovan culture, the bearers of which he considers to be the forebears of the Etruscans. To this end he presents a map showing the distribution of archaeological cultures of Italy in the 9th and 8th centuries BC, which he compares with the distribution of the various languages as attested in about the 5th century BC.²⁷⁴ This is a danger-

ous procedure. In the first place, it leaves out the proto-Villanovan phase, which cannot be dissociated from Villanovan and which spread far to the south, reaching Apulia, the Lipari islands and even northern Sicily – regions where later evidence of Italic languages are found (see Fig. 15).²⁷⁵ Secondly, the use of the distinction between cremation and inhumation burial rites as an ethnic marker is, as far as the 8th century BC is concerned, an oversimplification. After the introduction of proto-Villanovan at the end of the Bronze Age, there is a revival of the rite of inhumation spreading from the south of Italy to the north, reaching Caere in the 9th and 8th centuries BC. Similarly, the Etruscans are also acquainted with both rites – be it that their cremation burials are clearly distinct from the Villanovan ones (see further below). Hence, the distinction is rather Villanovan style cremations and inhumations versus Etruscan style cremations and inhumations – a line of approach actually applied by Ingrid Pohl in her publication of the Iron Age cemetery of Caere.²⁷⁶ Finally, the identification of the bearers of Villanovan culture in Etruria with the forebears of the Etruscans disregards the historical evidence according to which the Etruscans colonized the land of the Umbrians and drove them out of their original habitat.²⁷⁷ As a matter of fact, there are numerous reminiscences of the Umbrians originally inhabiting the region later called Etruria, like the river name *Umbro*, the region called *tractus Umbriae*, the association of the Umbrian tribes of the *Camertes* and *Sarsinates* with the inland towns Clusium and Perugia, and the identification of Cortona as an Umbrian town.²⁷⁸ At any rate, the sites which have yielded Umbrian inscriptions mostly lie along the eastern fringe of the Villanovan style cremation area,²⁷⁹ and there even have been found Umbrian type inscriptions in Picenum on the other side of the Appenines, whereas literary sources speak of Umbrians in Ancona, Ariminum, Ravenna, and Spina to the north²⁸⁰ – regions where

²⁷³ Krahe 1964: 90-1; 43-4.

²⁷⁴ Pallottino 1988: 68; Abb. 1-2.

²⁷⁵ For Ausones (= Oscans) on the Lipari islands and in Milazzo, see Diodoros of Sicily, *The Library of History* V, 7.

²⁷⁶ Pohl 1972.

²⁷⁷ Plinius, *Natural History* III, 14, 112.

²⁷⁸ Altheim 1950: 22-3.

²⁷⁹ Poultney 1959: 3.

²⁸⁰ Pseudo-Skylaks, *Periplus* 16; Strabo, *Geography* V, 1, 11; V, 2, 1; Justinus, *Epitoma historiarum philippicarum Pompei Trogi* XX, 1, 11; cf. Briquel 1984: 33; 51; 88; Salmon 1988: 701.

(proto-)Villanovan is attested (cf. Fig. 15).



Fig. 15. Distribution of (a) proto-Villanovan and (b) Villanovan sites (after Hencken 1968: fig. 466).

The repercussions of the Urnfield migrations into Italy are archaeologically traceable to well into the Aegean region. Thus Urnfield material of Italian or European type is attested for the islands Crete, Kos, and Euboia as well as for various locations on the Greek mainland.²⁸¹ Apparently, some population groups in Italy were displaced at the time, or some of the European immigrants, whose maritime nature has already been extrapolated by Hencken,²⁸² went straight on to the Aegean. This is exactly the situation recorded by the Egyptian sources on the so-called Sea Peoples, which inform us about raids by the Shekelesh, Sherden, and Weshesh, in which we can recognize the Italic peoples of the Sicilians, Sardinians, and Oscans (see section 14 below).²⁸³ These western raiders

²⁸¹ Popham 2001.

²⁸² Hencken 1968: 634.

²⁸³ For the identification of the Weshesh as Oscans, see Chabas

made common cause with colleagues from the east-Mediterranean basin, like the Ekweh or Akhaians from the Greek mainland, Peleset or Pelasgians from the Aegean, Tjeker or Teukrians from the Troas, and Lukka or Lycians from western Asia Minor. The importance of bearers of the Urnfield culture, like we have suggested for the Oscans, among these Sea Peoples is stressed by the fact that their boat(s) as depicted in Ramesses III's memorial at Medinet Habu are characterized by bird-head devices at both the bow and the stern – as convincingly shown by Shelley Wachsmann a typical Urnfield feature.²⁸⁴ Furthermore, this element among the Sea Peoples can even be shown to have settled in the Levant at Hamath, where Urnfield cemeteries with more than 1000 urns have been dug up.²⁸⁵ Within the frame of the autochthonous thesis, the Teresh or Tyrsenians (= Tyrrhenians) are, on the analogy of the Sicilians and Sardinians, likewise supposed to have come from Italy, but considering their Aegean location in early Greek literary sources this is unlikely (see section 12). At any rate, the direction of the migrations at the end of the Bronze Age is clearly from west to east, and not the other way round. Therefore, the colonization by the Etruscans of Italy from Asia Minor as recorded by Herodotos does not fit into the period of the Sea Peoples.

Colonization in the Early Iron Age

The question which remains to be answered is whether the colonization by the Etruscans of Italy from Asia Minor as recorded by Herodotos does fit into the period of the Early Iron Age. This is the period of exploration and colonization of the west-Mediterranean basin by Phoenicians and Greeks. Was there among these explorers and colonists of the far west a third party, namely Luwians from western Anatolia?

First of all, it is important to note that only from c. 700 BC onwards Etruria is characterized by an archaeological culture that with certainty can be identified as

1872: 299; cf. Reinach 1910: 36, note 3; Macalister 1913: 25; see further section 14 below.

²⁸⁴ Wachsmann 1998: 178 (with reference to de Boer 1991 who, with due reference to Hencken 1968 [in turn going back to Kimmig 1964: 223-4, Abb. 1], already noted the connection); Wachsmann 2000: 122.

²⁸⁵ Wachsmann 2000: 123; Drews 1993: 201, note 104 stipulates that a substantial number of the European Naue type II sword, mostly of iron, were found in these cremation graves.

Etruscan, because from that date onwards inscriptions conducted in the Etruscan language are found.²⁸⁶ One of the most outstanding features of this Etruscan culture is formed by the chamber tomb under tumulus for multiple burials. The burial rites may consist of inhumation or a special form of cremation, according to which the remains of the pyre are collected in a gold or silver container which, wrapped in a purple linen cloth, is placed in a loculus of the grave. The closest parallels for such elite-cremations are found in Anatolian style chamber tombs under tumulus at Salamis on Cyprus.²⁸⁷ The rite in question is meticulously described by Homeros in connection with the burial of Patroklos, for which reason one often speaks of an Homeric burial. As far as mainland Greece is concerned, similar elite-cremations are attested for the hero of Lefkandi and the burials at the west gate of Eretria. The element which is missing here, however, is the characteristic chamber tomb under tumulus (the hero of Lefkandi is discovered in an apsidal building secondarily used as a grave and covered by a tumulus).²⁸⁸

Chamber tombs under tumulus for multiple burials are a typical Mycenaean feature. During the Late Bronze Age this type of burial is disseminated by Mycenaean colonists from mainland Greece to western Asia Minor, where it is subsequently taken over by indigenous population groups like the Carians, Lycians, Lydians, and ultimately the Phrygians. The earliest indigenous examples are pseudocupolas in Caria, dated to the period of c. 1000 to 800 BC. These graves are characterized by a rectangular ground-plan and a concentrically vaulted roof. The problem of the dome resting on a square is solved by the so-called pendentive. This very same construction is typical of chamber tombs in Populonia during the 7th century BC.²⁸⁹ Similarly, in Lydia a chamber tomb has been found with a roof vaulting lengthwise in the same way as for example the famous Regolini-Galassi tomb at Caere, dating to the 7th century BC. Furthermore, Mysia has produced a cham-

ber tomb which is entirely hewn out of the soft tufa with mock roof beams in place as if it were a wooden construction. The same technique is so common for Etruria that if the photos of the Mysian example would have had no caption one could easily be mistaken to be dealing with an Etruscan grave.²⁹⁰ Unfortunately, the Anatolian examples in the last mentioned two cases were so thoroughly robbed that they cannot be properly dated. Next, it deserves our attention that Lycia from the 6th century BC onwards is typified by façade graves hewn out of the natural rock, which bring to mind the façade graves hewn out of the natural rock of Norchia and its immediate surroundings to which a similar date is assigned as the Lycian counterparts.²⁹¹ Like the Mysian tomb mentioned above, the façade graves imitate wooden constructions. Hence, it is interesting to note that actual wooden constructions have been dug up in Phrygia. Here large wooden boxes dating to the late 8th and early 7th centuries BC serve as a replacement of the stone built chamber tomb in like manner as in Vetulonia during the 7th century BC. Finally, mention should be made of a Lycian chamber tomb from the 5th century BC with paintings which bear a strong resemblance to the Etruscan ones in Tarquinia – be it that the Lycian paintings, in contrast to their Etruscan counterparts, show Persian motifs.²⁹²

In summary, on the basis of the preceding survey of relations in funeral architecture one gains the impression that Etruria was in close contact with various regions of western Anatolia during the Early Orientalizing period and beyond.²⁹³ Possibly, a crucial role was played by Mysia, the Aeolian coast, and the offshore islands like Lesbos, because here the typical local pottery, just like in Etruria from the 7th century BC onwards, consists of bucchero.²⁹⁴

The inference that colonists from various regions of western Asia Minor migrated to Etruria may receive further emphasis if we take a look at the script. As mentioned in the above the earliest inscriptions in the Etruscan language date from c. 700 BC onwards. In general, it is as-

²⁸⁶ Hencken 1968: 631.

²⁸⁷ D'Agostino 1977: 57-8; note that the Etruscan nature of the elite-cremations at Pontecagnano is deducible from the fact that the earliest inscriptions from this site are conducted in the Etruscan language, see Rix 1991: Cm 2.2, Cm 2.7, and Cm 2.19, all of 6th century BC date.

²⁸⁸ Bérard 1970; Popham, Touloupa & Sackett 1982.

²⁸⁹ Schachermeyr 1929: 89-91; 100-1; cf. Demus-Quatember 1958: 63.

²⁹⁰ Kaspar 1970: 71-83.

²⁹¹ *Contra* Åkerström 1934: 104-7.

²⁹² Mellink 1972: 263 ff.

²⁹³ This contact needs to be distinguished from and can at the same time be underlined by Etruscan post-colonial trade with the Aegean as attested by the presence of Etruscan bucchero at, amongst other sites, Smyrna and Pitane, see Briquel 1991: 80.

²⁹⁴ Pfuhl 1923: 153 f.

sumed that the Etruscans have borrowed their alphabet from the Greeks, in particular from the Euboeians at Pithecussae and Cumae. This view, however, runs up against serious difficulties, since the local Etruscan alphabets are characterized by signs and sign-forms unparalleled for Greek inscriptions. In the first place we have to consider in this connection the sign for the expression of the value [f] as attested for an early 7th century BC inscription from Vetulonia (Vn 1.1) in north-Etruria, which consists of a vertical stroke with a small circle on either top. As time goes by, this sign develops into the well-known figure-of-eight [f], which spreads from the north of Etruria to the south ultimately to replace the digraph of *wau* and *ēta* (< *hēta*) for the same sound in the south-Etruscan alphabets. The origin of this sign can be traced back to the Lydian alphabet, where during the same time it knows exactly the same development! Next, a late 7th century BC inscription from Caere (Cr 9.1) in south-Etruria bears testimony of a variant of the *tsade* which is closer in form to the Phoenician original than the Greek *san*. The closest parallel for this sign can be discovered in the local script of Side in Pamphylia. On the basis of these observations it lies at hand to infer that various groups of colonists from various regions in western Asia Minor, ranging from Lydia in the north to Side in the south, simply have taken (features of) their script with them.²⁹⁵

The colonists not only introduced their own type of grave and their own type of alphabet, they also settled themselves, just like the Phoenicians and Greeks, in urban centres founded according to neatly circumscribed rituals.²⁹⁶ An often heard argument in favor of the continuity between the Villanovan and Etruscan Orientalizing periods is that the Etruscan cities are founded on locations where in the previous period Villanovan villages are situated.²⁹⁷ It should be realized, however, that the Greek colony in Cumae is also preceded by an indigenous Italic settlement and that there is ample evidence for intermingling between the original inhabitants and the new arrivals.²⁹⁸ The same

²⁹⁵ Woudhuizen 1982-3: 97; for the Sidetic *tsade*, see Woudhuizen 1984-5b: 117, fig. 5.

²⁹⁶ Woudhuizen 1998: 178-9.

²⁹⁷ Hencken 1968: 636.

²⁹⁸ Müller-Karpe 1959: 36-9; note that there are also Etruscans among the new settlers as indicated by the Etruscan nature of an elite-cremation in the so-called fondo Artiaco dated c. 700 BC, see Strøm 1971: 146 and Strøm 1990, and an Etruscan inscription da-

model is applicable to the Etruscan colonization, as suggested by the large number of Italic names in Etruscan inscriptions dating from the 7th and 6th centuries BC onwards. To give some examples, one might point to: *Cventi*, *Eknate*, *Venelus*, *Vete*, *Vipie*, *Kavie*, *Kaisie*, *Mamerce*, *Numesie*, *Petrus*, *Punpu*, *Pupaia*, *Puplie*, *Spurie*, *Flavie*, and tribal names like *Latinie*, *Sapina*, and *Sarsina*.²⁹⁹ As a matter of fact, the colonists from western Asia Minor constitute an elite, who impose their superior culture on the by far more numerous indigenous Italic population. A vital component of the colonial culture is formed by their language.

A first hint at the nature of the language can be derived from the name of some of the newly founded cities. Thus Tarquinia (= Etruscan *Tarχna*-) is, on the analogy of Greek colonial names like Posidonia, Apollonia, and Herakleia, which are also based on a divine name, named after the Luwian storm-god *Tarhunt*.³⁰⁰ In addition, a number of Etruscan personal names, like *Arnθ*, *Mezentie*, *Muxsie*, *Θifarie* or *Θefarie*, can be traced back to Luwian counterparts (*Arnuwanta*-, *Mukasa*-) or Luwian onomastic elements (*masana*- “god”, *Tiwata*- or *Tiwara*- “sun-god”); the same applies to family names like *Camitlna* (< Luwian *hanta*- “in front of”) and *Velavešna* (< Luwian *walwa*- “lion”), be it that the diagnostic element *-na-*— though originating from Luwian hieroglyphic *ná*- “son”³⁰¹— is an Etruscan innovation unparalleled for Anatolian onomastics. Furthermore, Etruscan vocabulary shows many correspondences with Luwian, like for instance the very common verb *muluvane-* or *muluvani-* “to offer as a vow”, the root of which is related to Luwian *maluwa*- “thank-offering”. Of a more profound nature are similarities in morphology (adjectival suffixes *-s-* and *-l-*), the system of

ted c. 700-675 BC which is not included in the corpus Rix 1991, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 158-61.

²⁹⁹ Cf. Vetter 1953.

³⁰⁰ Evidence for a *Tarhunt*-cult in western Anatolia is provided by Lycian *Trqqñt-* or *Trqqas* (Houwink ten Cate 1961: 126), whereas the remains of such a cult are indicated by the demos *Tarkundara* at Mylasa in Caria (Woudhuizen 1992a: 7, note 28a), the epiklesis *Targuēnos* of Zeus in Lydia (Woudhuizen 1990: 101), and the heroic name *Tarkhōn* as reported for Mysia by Lykophron, *Aleksandra* 1248. The attempts by Briquel 1984: 181 ff. (who does not even refer to the long standing [since Herbig 1914: 20-1] and well-known equation of Etruscan *Tarχna-* to Luwian *Tarhunt-* in a note) to dissociate Mysian *Tarkhōn* from its proper Anatolian background are altogether futile.

³⁰¹ Woudhuizen 2005: 19-20.

(pro)nominal declension (genitive-dative singular in *-s* or *-l*, ablative-locative in *-ḡ(i)* or *-r(i)*, nominative plural in *-i*, genitive plural in *-ai > -e*) and verbal conjugation (3rd person singular of the present-future in *-ḡ(i)*), the use of sentence introductory particles (*va-*, *nac*, *nu-*), enclitic conjunctions (*-c* or *-χ*, *-m*), negative adverbs (*nes* or *nis*), etc. On the basis of these features, Etruscan can be classified as most closely related to Luwian hieroglyphic of the Early Iron Age (adjectival suffixes *-asi-* and *-ali-*, sentence introductory particle *wa-*, negative adverb *nas*), but in certain aspects already showing developments characteristic of Lycian (genitive plural in *-āi > -e₁*) and Lydian (dative singular in *-l₁*, loss of closing vowel in the ablative-locative ending, sentence introductory particle *nak*, enclitic conjunction *-k*) of the Classical period. Finally, Etruscan shows a number of deviations from Luwian which it shares with Lemnian, like the 3rd person singular ending of the past tense in *-ce*, *-ke* or *-χe*, the vocabulary word *avi(l)* “year”, and the enclitic conjunction *-m* “and”. Considering the fact that the Lemnos stele contains a dating-formula bearing reference to a certain Holoie from Phokaia, who is specified as king (*vanacasial* < Greek (*v*)*anaks*) over the Myrinians and Seronians, the places of which, on the analogy of Phokaia, are likely to be situated in Aiolia, these deviations may plausibly be ascribed to the dialect of the indigenous population of Mysia.³⁰² If so, the linguistic evidence coincides remarkably with the results from our archaeological investigation according to which we were already able to posit a crucial role for Mysia in the colonization process. Notwithstanding his mistaken chronology, Herodotos, while not telling the whole story in all its nuances, has certainly transmitted a tradition which in its nucleus may safely be considered historically correct!

We still have to answer the following question: why did Luwian population groups from western Asia Minor take the boat and sail to Italy in order to settle in the country of the Umbrians? In an attempt to address this question, it is important to note that the excavations at the island of Pithecussae, alongside Phoenician (to be more specific Aramaic)³⁰³ and Greek inscriptions, have produced what should be called proto-Etruscan ones dating to the period of c. 750 to 700 BC.³⁰⁴ Apparently, the Luwians of west-

³⁰² Best & Woudhuizen 1989; Woudhuizen 1992b; Woudhuizen 1998; Woudhuizen 2001a. See further appendix II.

³⁰³ Buchner 1982: 293.

³⁰⁴ Woudhuizen 1992b: 154 ff. *Contra* Johnston 1983: 63, who

ern Asia Minor were involved in trade with the indigenous population of Italy for the same reasons as the Phoenicians (to be more specific: Aramaeans)³⁰⁵ and Greeks: the metalliferous (especially iron) nature of the regions of the Tolfa hills near Tarquinia, Elba, and Populonia. This situation of precolonial offshore trade in Italy is described by one of our earliest sources with respect to the Tyrsenians, namely Hesiodos. In his *Theogony*, which dates from the 8th century BC, he informs us that the indigenous kings Agrios and Latinos ruled over the famous Tyrsenians who live very far off *mukhōi nēsōn hieraōn* “in a recess of the holy islands”!³⁰⁶ The motivation to let these trade contacts culminate into actual colonization comes from domestic difficulties: at the end of the 8th century BC Anatolia suffered heavily from the Kimmerian invasion, which overthrew the Phrygian realm of king Midas and terrorized the Lydian realm of the tyrant Gyges.³⁰⁷ If you were living along the coast and were acquainted with the route to more peaceful regions, this was the time to pick up your belongings, board on a ship and settle in the metalliferous zone of Italy, where, from a military point of view, the indigenous population was by far inferior!

Additional note: The Indo-Europeanization of Tuscany

There is archaeological and linguistic evidence for a still earlier layer in the process of Indo-Europeanization of Tuscany than the ones discussed above.

Thus in the early 3rd millennium BC, Tuscany is characterized by the Rinaldone culture. Typical for this culture is the Tomb of the Widow at Porte San Pietro, which consisted of a single chambered stone-cut catacomb

tries to get rid of the un-Greek features by reading the combination of *sigma* and *san* in one inscription as *sigma* and four stroked unstemmed *mu* and by emending the sequence *Jmi maion* in another inscription as *ei]mi + MN* [in the genitive, but the four stroked unstemmed *mu* occurs only in inscriptions of later date (as in the maker-formula *Jinos m'epoiese* from c. 700-675 BC) and the verbal form *e(i)mi*, in all of its occurrences in Jeffery 1998, turns up after the personal name it is associated with. Similar criticism also applies to Bartoněk & Buchner 1995.

³⁰⁵ Bernal 1991: 192 (with reference to Homeros, *Iliad* II, 783).

For the distinction of Phoenicians at Pithecussae by their burial rites, see now Docter 2000.

³⁰⁶ *Theogony* 1011-6.

³⁰⁷ Sauter 2000.

grave of North Pontic steppe type, in which a man was buried with his wife. The skeleton of the man was associated with a stone battle-axe, copper daggers, an arrowhead, and a pot. Skull injuries attested for the skeleton of the woman suggest that she was dispatched on the death of her husband to accompany him in the afterlife according to the likewise North Pontic rite of suttee. Other Rinaldone tombs produced horse remains – a feature pointing once again in the direction of the North Pontic steppe where the animal in question was not only abundantly found but also suggested to have been already domesticated from the 4th millennium BC onwards.³⁰⁸

From a linguistic point of view, it has been observed by Hans Krahe that Tuscany, with names like *Alma*, *Armenta*, *Aventia*, *Albinia*, *Arnus*, *Elsa*, *Auser*, *Ausenna*, and *Visentios*, is included in the distribution of his Old European river names.³⁰⁹ These names, which are based on well-attested Proto-Indo-European roots, may well be rooted in the 3rd millennium BC, as their overall distribution, as rightly stressed by Peter Kitson, coincides remarkably with that of the Bell Beaker culture.³¹⁰ Accordingly, the bearers of the Rinaldone culture are likely to be held responsible for the given layer of Old European river names in Tuscany.

All in all, then, there can be distinguished at least three different layers in the process of Indo-Europeanization of Tuscany: (1) the bearers of the Rinaldone culture of North Pontic steppe affiliations (3rd millennium BC onwards), (2) the Osco-Umbrians and Latin-Faliscans, which we have held responsible for the introduction of the European Urnfield culture in Italy (12th century BC onwards), and (3) Luwian population groups originating from the

north-Aegean and southwest Anatolia, introducing the Orientalizing culture (c. 700 BC onwards). And all this in a region which Massimo Pallottino in a lifelong effort would have us believe (and succeeded in making his fellow Etruscologists believe) to be the home of a pre-Indo-European rest group!

Postscriptum

In an article about Etruscan origins which appeared in *BABesch* 79 (2004) 51-7, the Etruscologist Bauke van der Meer speaks out in favor of the orientalist thesis, but he does not choose between the two variant models of colonization as presented here, viz. at the end of the Bronze Age or during an advanced stage of the Early Iron Age: in fact, he posits three waves of colonization in sum, namely one c. 1100 BC, a second c. 900 BC, and the third c. 700 BC (p. 55).

³⁰⁸ Mallory 1989: 93-4; 198-201; in my opinion Drews 2004: 15-9 goes too far in discrediting the Dereivka bone cheekpieces as evidence for horse control.

³⁰⁹ Krahe 1962: 304; note that *Auser* and *Ausenna* may have been introduced later by the Ausones or Oscans, just like the *Ombrone* is likely to be named by the Umbrians. The *Tiber* is the Etruscan and hence latest name of the foremost river in Tuscany (< Luwian *Tiwat/ra-* “sun-god”), which used to be called *Albula* (< PIE **alb^h-* “white”) in an earlier period, see Krahe 1964: 53.

³¹⁰ Kitson 1997: 204-5; cf. Tovar 1977: maps 1-6 with Harrison 1988: 12, map 1. Note that Tuscany is not included in the distribution of the Bell Beaker culture, but the inclusion of the region of Palermo, where a twin catacomb grave from the Aeneolithic Conca d’Oro culture has been found (see de Vries 1976: 210-11), may suggest a connection between the Bell Beaker culture on the one hand and the catacomb culture on the other.

11. THE AENEAS' SAGA: ETRUSCAN ORIGINS *IN PARVO*

If we are right in our conclusion that Luwian population groups from western Asia Minor colonized Etruria in the late 8th or early 7th century BC, there may also well be a kernel of truth in the colonization by Trojans of the coastal region of Latium as transmitted to us by the famous Aeneas' saga.

According to Vergilius' version of this myth, the Trojans set out with 20 ships from Antandros, which lies at the northern side of the same bay that also harbors Smyrna – the starting point, as we have seen, of the Lydians in their colonization of Etruria according to Herodotos. From here, they first go to the Thracian coast, where they build a city called Aeneadae after their leader Aeneas (in Hellanikos' version this first stopping place is specified as Pallene in Khalkidike).³¹¹ Next, the journey proceeds via Delos to Crete, where again the Trojans build a city, this time called Pergamea after Pergama – an alternative name of their hometown Troy. After this intermezzo, they move on to the realm of Hellenus in Chaonia, Epirus, which is inhabited by kinsmen who likewise escaped from Troy after the fall of the city at the end of the Trojan war.³¹² Sailing along the eastern coast of Italy and Sicily, their next major stopping place is the realm of Acestes in the region of Eryx and Segesta, northwest Sicily, where, just like in Chaonia, the population consists of kinsmen from Troy. As a matter of fact, in the part of the trip between Crete and Sicily the main concern of the expedition is to avoid the hostile Greek settlements along the shores and on the islands of the Ionian sea. After their stay with Acestes, Aeneas and his companions are driven by a storm to the coast of Africa, where they visit Carthago, the town newly founded by Phoenicians from Tyre under the leadership of queen Dido.³¹³ From here, they return to the realm of Acestes in Sicily, where games are held in honor of Aeneas' father Anchises, who had died there during their first stay.³¹⁴ Finally, after a visit of the underworld in the region of the

Euboeian colony Cumae,³¹⁵ Aeneas and his Trojan colonists reach their final destination, Latium at the mouth of the Tiber.³¹⁶

Having pitched their camp in Latium, there evolves a war with the local population, who want to get rid of the intruders. The war entails a truly epic coalition of forces. On the side of the Latins fight the Caeretan king Mezentius with his son Lausus, who had been driven out of their hometown and had taken refuge with the Rutulians, Aventinus with followers from the Aventine hill, Catillus and Corus with followers from Tibur, Caeculus with followers from Praeneste, Messapus with Faliscan Aequi, Clausus with Sabins, Halaesus with Osci from the region of Cales and the Voltumnus, Oebalus with Teleboans from Capri, Ufens with Aequiculi, Umbro from the Marsian hills, Virbius from Egeria's woods, Camilla with Volsci, Volcens with Latins, and Turnus with his Rutulians.³¹⁷ The help of the Greek hero Diomedes (Aeneas' foe in the Trojan war), residing at Arpi, is called upon, but he refuses to join in. On the side of the Trojans fight Evander with his Arcadians, declared enemies of the Latins, Tarchon with an Etruscan army of undetermined origin, Massicus with followers from Clusium and Cosae, Abas with men from Populonia and Elba, Asilas with men from Pisae, Astyr with followers from Caere, Pyrgi and Graviscae, Cinyrus with Ligurians, and Ocnus and Aulestis with an army from Mantua. In sum, this basically Etruscan coalition is reported to comprise 30 ships.³¹⁸ The war ends with the death of the leader of the Italic coalition, Turnus, by the hand of the Trojan leader, Aeneas. (In the version by Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Aeneas – who is married with Latinus' daughter Lavinia and rules both the Trojans and the Latins at the time of the war with the Rutulians and Mezentius – simply disappears, and the Latins subsequently build a hero-shrine for him.)³¹⁹ In the course of the following peace, precluded to in Vergilius' version of the myth, the native Latins will not change their name into

³¹¹ *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 4 F 31; cf. Galinsky 1969: 111-2.

³¹² Vergilius, *Aeneid* III.

³¹³ Vergilius, *Aeneid* I; IV.

³¹⁴ Vergilius, *Aeneid* V.

³¹⁵ Vergilius, *Aeneid* VI.

³¹⁶ Vergilius, *Aeneid* VII.

³¹⁷ Vergilius, *Aeneid* VII, 647-817; IX, 367-70.

³¹⁸ Vergilius, *Aeneid* X, 146-214.

³¹⁹ *Roman Antiquities* I, 64.

Trojans, nor will they change their language and alter their attire and customs, but the Trojans will sink down and merge in the mass, leaving them only the introduction of some new religious rites.³²⁰

Some of the elements of the Aeneas' saga as summarized above can be corroborated by archaeological, epigraphical or historical data. Thus, the reported sojourn of Aeneas with his Trojans on the Thracian coast, according to Hellanikos in Pallene on the Khalkidike, is reflected in the archaeological record by tetradrachms from the nearby city of Aineia, dated to the period before 525 BC, which depict the flight of Aeneas and his wife Creusa from Troy.³²¹ Next, their stay at the court of Dido in the newly founded city of Carthago can only be dated to the period after 814/3 or 813/2 BC – the historical foundation date of the city according to Timaios.³²² As the fact that, according to Homeros' *Iliad*, Aeneas already fought in the Trojan war, which may well be assigned to c. 1280 BC, is incompatible with a visit by the same person of Carthago in the late 9th or early 8th century BC, i.e. some 5 centuries later, Dionysios of Halikarnassos, whose focus is on chronology, quite consistently rejected the historical validity of this event.³²³ It should be realized, however, that we are dealing with myth and that in this category of evidence episodes from various periods can be telescoped into a single lifetime. Furthermore, the historical validity of one of the adversaries of the Trojans in their war with the Latins is greatly enhanced by the discovery of an Etruscan inscription from Caere, dated to c. 680/675-650/640 BC, reading

mi Laucies Mezenties

“I (am) of Lucius Mezentius”.³²⁴

Again, this evidence points to a date in the Early Iron Age of the vicissitudes of Aeneas and his Trojans in the west. Finally, in Lavinium, 100 metres southeast of the 13 altars of the Latin League, a heroon has been found dated to the 4th century BC, which has been identified as the heroon of Aeneas reported by Dionysios of Halikarnassos

in his version of the myth. Now, this heroon is connected with a grave from c. 675-650 BC, containing a few fragments of bone, some 60 vases of impasto and bucchero sottile, and the remnants of a chariot (see Fig. 16).³²⁵ Clearly, it was believed that the person commemorated by means of the heroon had been buried in the grave underlying the monument, which once again points to a date in the Early Iron Age of Aeneas' arrival in Latium.




Fig. 16. The Heroon of Aeneas at Lavinium (from Somella 1974: Taf. VII).

More in general, the alliance of Aeneas with the Etruscans finds its expression in the archaeological record in a scarab³²⁶ and a large number of vases from Etruria with scenes from the Aeneas legend, dated to the late 6th and/or early 5th century BC.³²⁷ The Etruscan town of Veii even produced cult statues depicting Aeneas carrying his father Anchises, dated to the early or mid 5th century BC.³²⁸ As it seems, then, the Etruscans considered the Aeneas saga as part of their cultural heritage. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the poet who fashioned the legend into its most famous form, Publius Vergilius Maro from Mantua, ultimately originates from an Etruscan background, his family name being derived from Etruscan *Ver-cna*.³²⁹ Yet, the aforesaid heroon at Lavinium should warn us against the oversimplified conclusion of Karl Galinsky, written, it must be admitted, before this sensational find, that “when Aeneas appeared in Italy, (...) he be-

³²⁰ Vergilius, *Aeneid* XII, 819-43.

³²¹ Galinsky 1969: 111-2, Fig. 87.

³²² Der Neue Pauly, s.v. *Karthago*; cf. Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 74,1.

³²³ Loeb edition, p.160-1, note 1.

³²⁴ Heurgon 1992: 24. Note that this name corresponds with Lausus, the son of Mezentius, in the literary tradition.

³²⁵ Somella 1974; Ross Holloway 1994: 135-8.

³²⁶ Galinsky 1969: 60; 103; Fig. 44.

³²⁷ Galinsky 1969: 122-3.

³²⁸ Galinsky 1969: 125; 133; Fig. 111.

³²⁹ Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Vergilius*; Schulze 1966: 101; 379; cf. Rix 1991: s.v. (esp. Perugia).

longed to the Etruscans.”³³⁰ Rather, we are dealing with a genuinely Latial tradition, which radiated to south Etruria.

The earliest historical source connecting Aeneas with the west is provided by the work of Stesikhoros (early 6th century BC) as preserved for the *Tabula Iliaca*, which shows Aeneas with his father Anchises (holding the *cista sacra*) and son Ascanius boarding a ship *eis tēn Hesperian*.³³¹ Next, Hellanikos of Lesbos holds that Aeneas came to Italy from the land of the Molossians, either with Odysseus or after him, and founded the city of Rome, which he named after a Trojan woman called *Rōmē*.³³² When the date of the foundation of Rome became fixed at 753 BC, however, chronographers and historians faced the problem that one person could not possibly be staged as a combattant in the Trojan war and at the same time be held responsible for the foundation of Rome some five centuries later. Hence, authors from the 4th century BC onwards prefer to attribute the foundation of Rome to a descendant of Aeneas (or of a woman from his Trojan followers),³³³ culminating into Dionysios of Halikarnassos’ calculation that Romulus is the 17th in descent from Aeneas!³³⁴ This process of filling up the time between the Late Bronze Age and an advanced stage of the Early Iron Age is of doubtful historical value: the Italic people had, for instance, no recollection at all of the arrival of the ancestors of the Umbrians and Oscans in Italy *c.* 1200 BC. Rather, therefore, we should face the fact that, as noted above, Aeneas as a hero and saint became associated in myth with widely separated historical episodes.

Considering the aforesaid hero-shrine, the association of Aeneas with Lavinium seems prior to the one with Rome. According to the inscription reported by Dionysios of Halikarnassos to belong to this hero-shrine, Aeneas was worshipped here as a god.³³⁵ Further evidence for an Aeneas cult is provided by a cippus from Tor Tignosa, 5 miles inland from Lavinium, dated to the late 4th or early

³³⁰ Galinsky 1969: 131.

³³¹ Galinsky 1969: 106-7; Figs. 85-6.

³³² Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 72, 2; cf. Galinski 1969: 103.

³³³ Galinsky 1969: 142-3; cf. Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 72, 5.

³³⁴ Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 45, 3; see for the discussion of the intervening kings *ibid.* I, 71 and cf. Livius, *History of Rome* I, 3, 6-11: all very shadowy figures, indeed.

³³⁵ *Roman Antiquities* I, 64, 5.

3rd century BC, which carries the legend

Lare Aineia d(onum)

“Dedication to Lar Aineias”.³³⁶

One of the outstanding deeds with which Aeneas is credited concerns his introduction of the cult of the ancestral Trojan gods, the Penates.³³⁷ According to the imagery, he is responsible for saving the *sacra* of the Penates, carried either by his father Anchises in a *cista*³³⁸ or by his wife Creusa in a *doliolum*,³³⁹ from destruction at the time of the fall of Troy. Now, Timaios (early 3rd century BC) informs us that the holy objects of the sanctuary at Lavinium were kept in a *keramos Trōikos* “a Trojan earthen jar”.³⁴⁰ Rightly, Galinsky connected this information with Livius’ account that during the Gallic invasion in 390 BC the *sacra* of the Roman Penates were placed in two *doliola*, earthen jars.³⁴¹ That the sanctuary of the Latin League at Lavinium with its 13 altars, which, as we have noted above, lies at a 100 metre distance of Aeneas’ heroon, was indeed dedicated (at least partly) to the cult of the Penates is confirmed by a 6th century BC inscription associated with altar no. 8, reading

Castorei Podlouquei-que quirois

“to the kouroi Castor and Pollux”,³⁴²

the Greek Dioskouroi, namely, were identified in literary tradition with the Penates.³⁴³ In Etruria, these were also venerated as testified by an early 5th century BC inscription from Tarquinia, reading

itun turuce Venel Atelinas Tinas cliniaras

³³⁶ Galinsky 1969: 158.

³³⁷ See Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 69, 4 for their identification with the *Kabeiroi* or *Megaloi Theoi* of Samothrace.

³³⁸ See note 326 above.

³³⁹ Galinsky 1969: Fig. 45.

³⁴⁰ *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 566 F 59; cf. Galinsky 1969: 155.

³⁴¹ *History of Rome* V, 40, 7-8.

³⁴² Gordon 1983: 76-7; cf. Galinsky 1969: 151; 154.

³⁴³ Cassius Hemina frg. 6 = Servius *ad Aeneid* I, 378; cf. Galinsky 1969: 154; Fig. 119 (Dioscuri) = Fig. 120 (Penates).

“Venel Atelinas has given this to the sons of Tin”.³⁴⁴

It is therefore no contradiction that the inscription of the Dioskouroi is Greek inspired, whereas the altars of the sanctuary are of Etruscan type.³⁴⁵ On the contrary, this threefold identification facilitates us to further explain the popularity of the Aeneas’ saga in southern Etruria.

In our summary of Vergilius’ *Aeneid*, we have seen that as a corollary to the peace between the Trojan colonists and the native Latins, there will, with the exception of some new religious rites, be no change of the name of the inhabitants of Latium, nor in their language, customs, and dress. Evidently, the Trojan colonists, in contrast to their Lydian colleagues in Etruria, were not numerous enough to cause a language shift: at any rate the epigraphical evidence shows decisively that the current language remained Latin, not to say that there is not a trace of the language of the Trojan colonists left. What could it have been? To answer this question, it is interesting to note that the name “Trojans” is used to indicate a motley crowd from various regions. Most explicit is the distinction of Lycians, whose ships are stipulated to be under the command of Orontes.³⁴⁶ But there are also names of Lydian (Atys, Gyges, Palmus)³⁴⁷ and Thracian (Ismarus [of a Maeonian = Lydian], Tereus, Thamyrys)³⁴⁸ type. Both latter elements may be expected in the Troad, as the region was overrun by Thracio-Phrygians from the Balkans at the end of the Bronze Age³⁴⁹ and under the control of the Lydians at the time of Gyges.³⁵⁰ The only hard evidence comes from another direction: Elymian. In this language, once spoken by

the, according to literary tradition, related population of Eryx and Segesta in northwest Sicily, some inscriptions have been found, among which coin legends. One of these coin legends consists of a bilingual, according to which Elymian *Erukazie* corresponds to Greek *Erukinōn* “of the Erycinians”; the other, *Segestazie*, shows exactly the same formation, but then for the town Segesta.³⁵¹ Now, these Elymian legends are characterized by the Lycian ethnic formation in *-z(i)-* (*Sppartazi* “Spartans”; *Atānazi* “Athenians”) and likewise Lycian ending of the genitive plural *-e₁* (*Pttaraze₁* “of the Patarians”)³⁵² – a combination which is also attested for Etruscan *Karθazie* “of the Carthaginians”.³⁵³ Apparently, therefore, the language of these particular Trojans, and hence probably of followers of Aeneas related to them as well, was closely related to Lycian, i.e. of Luwian type. This inference coincides with the fact that the place name *Roma* is based on the same root as that of the Lycian heroic name *Romos*, being likewise derived from the Luwian name for the stag-god, *Rum/nt-*.³⁵⁴

To conclude, the main contribution of the Trojan colonists is the introduction of the cult of their ancestral gods, the Penates. Furthermore, there may be a grain of truth in the tradition that leading families of Rome traced their origin back to a Trojan follower of Aeneas, like the *Atii* from Atys,³⁵⁵ *Sergii* from Sergestus³⁵⁶ – a Phrygian or Lydian name³⁵⁷ –, and the *Cluentii* from Cloanthus,³⁵⁸ though the identification of Aeneas’ son Ascanius with Iulus, the ancestor of the *Iulii*, seems, on the basis of the double naming, a little bit forced.³⁵⁹

³⁴⁴ Rix 1991: Ta 3.2 (= TLE 156); note in this connection that according to Myrsilos of Lesbos (3rd century BC) F 8 the Kabeiroi of Samothrace are considered Tyrrhenian gods, see Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 102.

³⁴⁵ Alföldi 1963: 266; Pl. XVI; cf. Woudhuizen 1992a: 194, note 104.

³⁴⁶ Vergilius, *Aeneid*, I, 113; VI, 334; cf. X, 751; XII, 516.

³⁴⁷ Vergilius, *Aeneid* V, 568; IX, 762; X, 697, 699; cf. Gusmani 1964, s.v. (note that †q = p).

³⁴⁸ Vergilius, *Aeneid* X, 139; XI, 675; XII, 341; cf. Detschew 1976, s.v.

³⁴⁹ For the Balkan affinities of the Trojan “Buckel” ceramic (= Troy VIIIb2), see Rutter 1975.

³⁵⁰ Strabo, *Geography* XIII, 22, 1; cf. Pedley 1972: 19 (Milesians asking for permission from Gyges to colonize Abydos on the Hellespont); note also with Briquel 1991: 83 that Daskyleion in the Troad is called after the father of Gyges, Daskylos.

³⁵¹ Lejeune 1969.

³⁵² Kinch 1888: 193-4; cf. Melchert 1993, s.v.

³⁵³ Rix 1991: Carthago Af 3.1 (= TLE 724); Woudhuizen 1992b: 83; 90; 95.

³⁵⁴ Herbig 1914: 28; Houwink ten Cate 1961: 128-31.

³⁵⁵ Vergilius, *Aeneid* V, 568-9; cf. Briquel 1991: 471-6.

³⁵⁶ Vergilius, *Aeneid* V, 121.

³⁵⁷ Beekes 2002: 214, with reference to Phrygian *Surgastoy*, see Brixhe & Lejeune 1984: Dd-102, and Lydian *Srkstu-*, see Gusmani 1964, s.v. For the related Thracian *Sergesteus*, see Detschew 1976, s.v.

³⁵⁸ Vergilius, *Aeneid* V, 122-3.

³⁵⁹ Vergilius, *Aeneid* I, 267, etc.

Additional note 1: Aeneas' realm in the Troad

In the preceding section, we have observed that Aeneas and his Trojan followers boarded their ships in Antandros, which is situated on the southern coast of the Troad, just south of mount Ida, looking out over the Aiolian gulf. Now, Aeneas is particularly linked up with the region of mount Ida in the southern Troad, as this is the spot where he is reported to have been conceived by Ankhises and Aphrodite.³⁶⁰ However, if we want to be more specific, it is interesting to observe that according to a passage in Homeros' *Iliad* Aeneas is said at a time before the Trojan war to have been driven from the Ida, where he guarded the cattle herd, by Akhilleus, who next plundered Lyrnessos and Pedasos in the plain of Adramytion – an attack from which Aeneas is saved by the protection of Zeus.³⁶¹ This passage, then, seems to suggest an association of Aeneas, not only with the region of mount Ida itself, but also with the river valley to the south of it.

This very same region south of mount Ida with which Aeneas seems to be associated, is also reported to be inhabited by Leleges and/or Kilikes. Thus according to one passage, Altes, the king of the Leleges, is stated to have his residence in Pedasos along the river Satnioeis,³⁶² whereas according to another Eëtion, king of the Kilikes, once lived in Thebes at the foot of the wooded Plakos, where he was killed by Akhilleus during the latter's afore-mentioned raid in the region.³⁶³ Both the ethnonyms Leleges and Kilikes are indicative of Luwian speaking population groups – the Kilikes for their origin from Cilicia and the Leleges for their being identified with Carians.³⁶⁴ The latter inference receives further confirmation from the fact that the region south of mount Ida is characterized by place names in *-ss-*

³⁶⁰ Homeros, *Iliad* II, 819-21.

³⁶¹ Homeros, *Iliad* XX, 89-93; 188-194. This ties in with an earlier section of the *Iliad*, in which Akhilleus is stated to have captured Briseïs in Lyrnessos and to have demolished the walls of Thebes in the same plain, killing the local leaders Mynes and Epistrophos, the sons of Euenos, Homeros, *Iliad* II, 688-93.

³⁶² Homeros, *Iliad* XXI, 86-7.

³⁶³ Homeros, *Iliad* VI, 396-7; 415-6.

³⁶⁴ Herodotos, *Histories* I, 171.

(Lyrnessos) and *-nth-* (Sminthe).³⁶⁵ Evidently, we are dealing here with settlers from Luwian speaking areas to the south and southeast, who moved across the language border as determined by Dainis (< Luwian *tāini-* “oily”) being the indigenous name of later Greek Elaia (= harbor of Pergamon)³⁶⁶ into a presumably Thraco-Phrygian milieu.³⁶⁷

If our association of Aeneas with a Luwian speaking region south of mount Ida is correct, the information from the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite that the Trojan language as spoken by Aeneas' father Ankhises is other than Phrygian need not be representative for the entire Troad.³⁶⁸ Furthermore, his later relationship to the Etruscans in Italy receives a meaningful explanation as being one of a kinship nature!

Additional note 2: Dardanians: a form of Etruscan self-designation

Confirmation of our inference that the Etruscans considered the Aeneas' saga as part of their cultural heritage is provided by a set of eight identical Etruscan inscriptions on three boundary stones from Smindja in the territory of Carthago. These inscribed boundary stones were set up by the followers of the democratic consul Gn. Papirius Carbone from the Etruscan city of Chiusi who fled from their hometown to Africa in 82 BC after having sided with Marius in the civil war between the latter and the ultimately victorious Sulla.³⁶⁹

The inscriptions run in retrograde direction and read

³⁶⁵ Woudhuizen 1989: 194, Fig. 2; 197. See also section 7, note 140 above.

³⁶⁶ Starke 1997: 457; Högemann 2000: 10.

³⁶⁷ For the Thraco-Phrygian nature of the Trojan language, see Gindin 1999 and section 13, note 520 below. For another Luwian speaking enclave in the Troas, cf. the Lycians under the leadership of Pandaros along the Aisepos and in Zeleia, see Homeros, *Iliad* II, 824-7; IV, 88; 103; 121; for the Lycian nature of Pandaros, see Homeros, *Iliad* V, 105 (*Lukiēthen*) and cf. Strabo, *Geography* XIV, 3, 5 reporting his temenos at Pinara in the Xanthos valley; furthermore, his name corresponds to Lycian **Pñtra-* (Melchert 1993, s.v. *Pñtreñne/i-*). Both Luwian speaking areas are already acknowledged by Gindin 1999: 261.

³⁶⁸ Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 111-5.

³⁶⁹ Heurgon 1969: 286; Colonna 1980: 4.

as follows:³⁷⁰

1. *M(arce)* “Marcus Unata Zutas
Vnata
2. *Zvtas tvl(ar)* (dedicated) the boundaries (of
3. *Dardanivm* the territory) of the Dardanians
4. *Tins* to Dionysos,
5. *F* 1000 (paces).”

In this text, then, the Etruscan settlers in question call themselves *Dardanians* (*Dardanivm*, characterized by the Latin genitive plural *-om* in Etruscan disguise),³⁷¹ after *Dardanos*, the mythical ancestor of Aeneas.³⁷² Now, in form of *Drdny* the latter ethnonym is first recorded as an indication of the allies of the Hittites from the Troad in the Egyptian memorial of the battle at Kadesh (1274 BC).³⁷³ Furthermore, Dardanians is synonymous with Trojans in Homeros’ *Iliad*,³⁷⁴ and more in specific used here for the followers of Aeneas.³⁷⁵ The ultimate homeland of their mythical ancestor Dardanos is reported by the literary sources to be situated in Arkadia in the Greek Peloponnese – which coincides with our assumption that the inhabitants of the Troad were kinsmen of the Thracian-Phrygian or Pelasgian population groups of Middle Helladic Greece.³⁷⁶ Whatever the extent of this latter deduction, there can be little doubt that Vergilius’ location of Dardanos’ ultimate homeland in Italy results from a secondary intervention to stage Aeneas’ peregrination as a return to his ancestral lands.³⁷⁷

³⁷⁰ Rix 1991: Africa 8.1-8.8.

³⁷¹ Colonna 1980: 3; cf. Leuhmann 1977: 428; note also the *ad hoc* device for the distinction of the un-Etruscan sound [d] from regular [t]. For the identification of *Tins* as Dionysos, see Woudhuizen 1998: 26, note 56, but note that a mixing-up between *Tins* (= Dionysos) and *Tinia* (= Zeus) – the latter being the protector of the territorium according to the *corpus of gromatici veteres* (see Camporeale 2003: 203) – in this late period is altogether possible; for the interpretation of the symbol *F* as 1000 *passuum*, see Heurgon 1969: 285 and cf. Bonfante & Bonfante 2002: 184-5.

³⁷² *Der Neue Pauly*, s.v. *Dardanidae*.

³⁷³ See section 13 below.

³⁷⁴ *Iliad* III, 456; VII, 348.

³⁷⁵ *Iliad* II, 819 ff.

³⁷⁶ See section 13 below.

³⁷⁷ *Aeneid* III, 167-71; VII, 205-11.

12. PHILISTINES AND PELASGIANS

One of the most significant groups among the Sea Peoples who attacked Egypt in the fifth and eighth year of Ramesses III (= 1179 and 1176 BC) is the *Peleset*. This ethnonym, which has no earlier occurrence in the Egyptian sources, has been identified with the Biblical *Philistines* by Jean-François Champollion soon after his decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphic – an identification which goes unchallenged up to the present day.³⁷⁸ Now, the Philistines are generally considered newcomers in the Levant, settling in their pentapolis consisting of the towns Asdod, Askelon, Gaza, Ekron, and Gath at the time of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. Thus the Bible informs us that they originated from *Kaphtor*,³⁷⁹ which on the basis of its correspondence to Akkadian *Kaptara* and Egyptian *Keftiu* is plausibly identified as the island Crete; or they are even straightforwardly addressed here as Cretans.³⁸⁰ Moreover, they are considered an alien race for the fact that, in contrast to the local Semites, they do not abide to the rite of circumcision.³⁸¹ Finally, the Philistines are reported by the Bible to have replaced the ancient Canaanite population of the Avvim in their original habitat.³⁸²

This information from the literary sources can be backed up by evidence from archaeology. It occurs, namely, that the archaeological culture of Philistia shows signs of discontinuity in the transitional period from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age. Asdod, its harbor Tel Mor, and Askelon are characterized by destruction layers,³⁸³ and Ekron by at least some local destruction at the time.³⁸⁴ The level after the destruction at these sites (with the exception of Tel Mor) contains locally produced Mycenaean IIIC1b pottery – the hallmark of the settlement of Sea Peoples – , which subsequently develops without a break into the so-called Philistine ware.³⁸⁵ Moreover, the

Egyptian influence which typifies the Canaanite material culture from before the break does not recur. As it appears, then, conquerors from the Aegean region (including Cyprus), where Mycenaean IIIC1b is “en vogue” at the time, have wasted existing Canaanite sites, driven out most of the original inhabitants and settled themselves instead. Considering this close correspondence between literary and archaeological data, the projection of the Philistines back in time to the period of the patriarchs probably constitutes an anachronism.³⁸⁶

In the Papyrus Harris, Ramesses III claims to have settled the vanquished Sea Peoples, among which our Peleset or Philistines, in strongholds bound in his name. This has induced scholars like Albrecht Alt and William Foxwell Albright to assume that the settlement of the Philistines in Canaan took place under Egyptian supervision.³⁸⁷ Rightly, Manfred Bietak pointed out that the absence of Egyptian influence in the material culture after the break indicates otherwise. Nevertheless, the continuity of Egyptian influence in the hinterland of the Philistine pentapolis might suggest to us that the Egyptian pharaoh maintained a nominal claim on the land conquered by the Philistines and considered them as vassals guarding his frontiers in like manner as the Frankish kings did with the Normans in the European Middle Ages (see Fig. 17)!³⁸⁸

As duly stressed by Ed Noort, the break between the Canaanite Late Bronze Age and Philistine Early Iron Age in the region under discussion is not an absolute one: the continuity of Canaanite pottery in the Philistine sites indicates that to a certain extent the newcomers from the Aegean mixed with the local Avvim population.³⁸⁹ To this comes that four of the five place names of the Philistine pentapolis, viz. Gaza, Askelon, Asdod, and Gath, are already recorded for Egyptian sources from the El-Amarna period.³⁹⁰

³⁷⁸ Champollion 1836: 180; cf. Gardiner 1947: 201.

³⁷⁹ Amos 9, 7; Jeremiah 47, 4.

³⁸⁰ Ezekiel 25, 16; Zephaniah 2, 5.

³⁸¹ Gardiner 1947: 201; Machinist 2000: 63.

³⁸² Deuteronomium 2, 23.

³⁸³ Dothan 1982: 36; 43; 35.

³⁸⁴ Bietak 1993: 300.

³⁸⁵ Bietak 1993: 297-8.

³⁸⁶ Genesis 21, 22-34; cf. Machinist 2000: 54-5; *contra* Gordon 1956: 22 and others.

³⁸⁷ Alt 1944; Albright 1975: 509; cf. Singer 1985.

³⁸⁸ Bietak 1993; esp. 295, Fig. 4.

³⁸⁹ Noort 1994.

³⁹⁰ Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Philister*.




Fig. 17. Settlement of the Sea Peoples in the Levant and the remains of the Egyptian sphere of influence (from Bietak 1993: 295, Fig. 4).

After their settlement in Palestine, the Philistines rose to a position of power in the region owing to their military superiority over the local population, as exemplified by the famous engagement between David and Goliath – which the first mentioned miraculously won against all odds. This military superiority of the Philistines was based on their monopoly of iron production in the region as recorded by the Bible.³⁹¹ In the end, however, they were outmatched by a coalition between the Hebrews and the Phoenicians, and became subject to a rapid process of assimilation. There is little information about the Philistine language – we only know that the cities of their pentapolis were

³⁹¹ I Samuel 13, 19-23. For the distribution of iron objects in the eastern Mediterranean largely neglecting Anatolia, see Buchholz 1999: 710-11, Abb. 109-10.

headed by a local magistrate called *seren* and that *kōba* was their word for “helmet”, which is usually compared to Hittite *kupaḫi-* for the same meaning³⁹² – , whereas the deities they are reported to have worshipped, *Dagon*, *Astarte*, and *Ba'al Zebūl*, appear to be of a local Canaanite nature.³⁹³ What remains, apart from their characteristic pottery, are only small hints to their Aegean origin: figurines for house-cults as discovered in Asdod, recalling Mycenaean counterparts (Fig. 18);³⁹⁴ hearths as unearthed in Ekron, reminiscent of Mycenaean and Cyprian examples;³⁹⁵ chamber tombs at Tell Fara modelled after Mycenaean prototypes (Fig. 19);³⁹⁶ altars with horns of consecration from Ekron, again, suggestive of the Minoan type;³⁹⁷ the headdress with which the Peleset are depicted in the Egyptian memorial at Medinet Habu, which bears a striking resemblance to that of glyph D 02 of the discus of Phaistos, Crete;³⁹⁸ royal names like *Yamani* “the Ionian” for a king of Asdod³⁹⁹ and *'kyš*, related to either *Akhaios* or *Ankhises*, for a king of Ekron;⁴⁰⁰ and, finally, the identification of Gaza as *Minoa*, which is substantiated by evidence from coins, and of its local god *Marna* (= Aramaic “our Lord”) as Crete-born.⁴⁰¹

The question remains: is the Cretan origin of the Philistines as related by the Bible historically valid? In order

³⁹² Bonfante 1946: 258; Machinist 2000: 63-4.

³⁹³ Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Philister*; Barnett 1969: 17; Machinist 2000: 59-61; 64.

³⁹⁴ Barnett 1969: 17; Sandars 1980: 165, fig. 116 (with intermediary form from Cyprus); cf. Noort 1994: 134-7.

³⁹⁵ Noort 1994: 146; for Cyprus, see Karageorghis 1992: 81 (new element during Late Cypriote IIIC).

³⁹⁶ Waldbaum 1966.

³⁹⁷ Gitin 1993: 249-50; for Cyprus see Louloupis 1973 and Karageorghis 1992: 81 (new element during Late Cypriote IIIC).


³⁹⁸ Reinach 1910; Hall 1926: 278; Gardiner 1947: 202; Bérard 1951: 138; Mertens 1960: 83; Redford 1992: 252. A representation of the feathered headdress has recently been found on sherds from Askelon, see Stager 1998: 164, ill. A, a reference I owe to Romey 2003: 68.

³⁹⁹ Gitin, Dothan & Naveh 1997: 11; note with Weidner 1939: 932-3 that the ethnic *Jaman* “Ionian” on the basis of the onomastic evidence may include reference to Lycians.


⁴⁰⁰ Gitin, Dothan & Naveh 1997: 11; Byrne 2002: 11-2.

⁴⁰¹ Stephanos of Byzantium, *Ethnica*, s.v. *Gaza*; cf. Macalister 1913: 15; Gardiner 1947: 202; Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Philister*; Strobel 1976: 160.


to answer this question it needs to be determined



a b c
Fig. 18. Figurines from (a) Asdod, (b) Cyprus, and (c) Mycenae (from Sandars 1980: 165, afb. 116).



(a)



(b)

Fig. 19. Comparison of (a) Philistine chamber tombs from Tell Fara with (b) Mycenaean prototypes (from Waldbaum 1966: 332, Ill. 1; 336, Ills. 11-14).

whether Philistines can be traced on Crete. The answer to the latter question is no. The only way in which we can account for a migration of the Biblical Philistines from Crete is when the latter are identical to the *Pelasgians* from Greek literary sources – a view first ventilated by Etienne Fourmont in 1747 and since then defended by a substantial number of scholars.⁴⁰² The Pelasgians, namely, are recorded among the population groups on Crete since the time of Homeros, who, as we have seen in section 2, in many respects reflects Late Bronze Age history.⁴⁰³ Now, the Pelasgians are a population group which inhabited mainland Greece prior to the first Greeks, and were driven by them first to Thessaly and later to the Aegean islands and the western coast of Asia Minor. As far as the evidence goes, the Pelasgians came to Crete under the leadership of Teutamios (corrupted into †Tektamos in most manuscripts), who married the daughter of the Cretan king Kretheus and with her begat Asterios, the father of the later kings Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Sarpedon.⁴⁰⁴ As king Minos epitomizes the period of the Cretan thalassocracy, the Pelasgian colonization of Crete must hence have occurred before c. 1600-1450 BC. This emigration from Thessaly to Crete can be backed up by toponymic evidence, since the region of Gortyn in the Mesara plain is characterized by a number of place names, like *Lethaios*, *Boibe*, *Magnesia*, *Phalanna*, and *Phaistos*, which are also recorded for Thessaly, whereas an alternative name of Gortyn is *Larisa* – a typical Pelasgian place name.⁴⁰⁵ Moreover, Gortyn itself is based on the same root as Thes-

⁴⁰² Fourmont 1747: 254; Hitzig 1845; Chabas 1872: 296; Lichtenberger 1911: 28; Macalister 1913: 2; Meyer 1928: 562; Georgiev 1950-1: 137; Bérard 1951; Wainwright 1962: 151; Kitchen 1973: 56; Albright 1975: 512; Strobel 1976: 159; Singer 1988: 241-2; for further literature, see Sakellariou 1977: 102, note 8.

⁴⁰³ *Odyssey* XIX, 177; note that, as argued in section 2, the mention of the Dorians in this passage probably constitutes a later interpolation.

⁴⁰⁴ Andron of Halikarnassos in Strabo, *Geography* X, 4, 6; Diodoros of Sicily, *The Library of History* IV, 60, 2; cf. *ibid.* V, 80, 1.

⁴⁰⁵ Fick 1905: 13-15; cf. Sakellariou 1977: 212; 137 (addition of *Pylōros* and *Bēnē*); for other instances of the place name *Larisa* connected with Pelasgians – to which may be added *Larision pedion* in the territory of Hierapytna on Crete (Fick 1905: 11) – , see Strabo, *Geography* IX, 5, 6 and XIII, 3, 2 f.; cf. Sakellariou 1977: 133-4.

salian *Gyrtonē*.⁴⁰⁶ On the basis of this evidence, the Pelasgians referred to by Homeros are likely to be considered as (a component of) the Late Bronze Age population of the Mesara plain – a region, by the way, which like the rest of Crete is characterized by Mycenaean IIIC1b ware in the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples (Fig. 20).⁴⁰⁷


Another advantage of the identification of the Biblical Philistines with the Pelasgians from Greek literary sources is that we can account for the alternative tradition as recorded for the Lydian historian Xanthos according to which the Philistines originated from Lydia.⁴⁰⁸ This tradition has come down to us in two forms, both of which focus on the Philistine town Askelon. First, Athenaios remarks that according to Xanthos the Lydian Mopsos captured Atargatis and sunk her with her son Ikhtys in the lake of Askelon.⁴⁰⁹ Secondly, Stephanos of Byzantion notes with respect to Askelon that according to Xanthos this town was founded by Askelos, the son of Hymenaios and brother of Tantalos, in the reign of the Lydian king Akiamos.⁴¹⁰

Now, these traditions only make sense if we realize that the Pelasgians which in Homeros' *Iliad* II, 840-3 sided with the Trojans are plausibly situated by Strabo in the region of Larisa Phrikonis along the Hermos river – far


enough from Troy to justify the use of the word *tēle* “far away (from his home town Larisa)” in connection with the death of the Pelasgian leader Hippothoos.⁴¹¹



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 20. Late Helladic IIIC1b ware with “antithetic horns” and “bird looking backwards”: (a) Crete, (b) Cyprus, and (c) Philistia (after Schachermeyr 1979: 160, Abb. 41a; Noort 1994: 122, Abb. 36; 115, Abb. 38).

From an archaeological point of view, it is worth mentioning in this connection that the region of Larisa

⁴⁰⁶ *In casu* Proto-Indo-European (= PIE) *g^hordʰ- “town”, which is also present in the Italian TN’s, reportedly diffused by the Pelasgians, *Croton* and *Cortona*, Phrygian *Gordion*, Slavonic *grad-*, etc., see Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 647; Phoenician *qrt-* as in *Carthago* (< *qrthdšt* “New Town”), see Eisler 1939.

⁴⁰⁷ Schachermeyr 1979: 122-3 so-called “Nobelware” with “antithetic horns” and “bird looking backwards” motifs attested for Hagia Triada, Phaistos, and Gortyn; for Mycenaean IIIC1b examples of “antithetic horns” from Sinda, Cyprus, and Askelon, Philistia, see Noort 1994: 122, Abb. 36 and 114, Abb. 37; of “bird looking backwards” from Geser, Philistia, see Noort 1994: 115, Abb. 38.

⁴⁰⁸ Albright 1975: 512.

⁴⁰⁹ *Deipnosophistai* VIII, 346e. Note that the personal name *Mopsos*, which on the basis of the related geographical name *Mopsopia* originates from **Mopsops*, belongs to the same type as Phrygian *Pelops*, *Phainops*, and *Merops*, all showing as second element a reflex of PIE **h₃ekʷ-* “to see”. Hence, the Phrygian place name *Moxoupolis* and the ethnonym *Moxolanoi*, with the breakdown of the original labiovelar [kʷ] (cf. Linear B *Moqoso*) into velar [k] like in Luwian hieroglyphic *Muksas* instead of into labial [p] like in Greek *Mopsos* and Phoenician *Mpš*. For attestations of *Mopsos* in the intermediary regions of Pamphylia and Cilicia, see Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 316-22.

⁴¹⁰ *Ethnica*, s.v. *Askelōn*.

⁴¹¹ Strabo, *Geography* XIII, 3, 2; Homeros, *Iliad* XVII, 301.

Phrikonis (*in casu* Pitane and Larisa itself) produced some Mycenaean IIC1b ware (as we have noted above the hallmark of the settlement of Sea Peoples in the Levant), reported to be connected with the foundation of Emborio on Chios⁴¹² – likewise inhabited by Pelasgians at the time!⁴¹³ As such, then, it is certainly possible that the Pelasgians, either from Crete and/or the west coast of Lydia (especially for Askelon), are responsible for the introduction of Mycenaean IIC1b ware in Philistia.

If our identification of the Biblical Philistines with the Pelasgians from Greek literary sources applies, we enlarge our basis for linguistic analysis considerably. According to Herodotos, the Pelasgians of Kreston, who originated from Thessaly, speak the same language as their tribesmen in Plakia and Skylake on the Hellespont, who once lived with the Athenians.⁴¹⁴ Thucydides adds to this information that the Pelasgians of Akte, who are of origin Tyrrhenians once living in Lemnos and Attica, are bilingual and speak Greek next to their own language.⁴¹⁵ Now, as the Pelasgians in mainland Greece appear to be ancestral to their kinsmen in the north-Aegean region (and western Anatolia), it seems advisable to have a look at them first. An interesting tradition in this respect is formed by the story of the Pelasgian king of Argos,⁴¹⁶ Akrisios, son of Abas and brother of Proitos, who in fear of his grandson Perseus flees from his hometown to Larisa in Thessaly under the rule of the likewise Pelasgian king Teutamias.⁴¹⁷ Here we encounter at least one clearly Indo-European name, *Teutamias*, which is based on the PIE stem **teutā-* “society, folk, people”.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹² Mee 1978: 148; cf. Hope Simpson 1981: 206, who distinguishes as many as three building phases in Mycenaean IIC1b for Emborio.

⁴¹³ Strabo, *Geography* XIII, 3, 3; Dionysios Pieregetes as presented by Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 59.

⁴¹⁴ *Histories* I, 57.

⁴¹⁵ *Peloponnesian War* IV, 109.

⁴¹⁶ Since the expression *Pelasgikon Argos* is used both for the Thessalian (Homeros, *Iliad* II, 682) and Argive (Sakellariou 1977: 205, note 4) town of this name, Argos (< PIE **h₂erg-* “bright white”) may well be considered a Pelasgian place name, which would add further substance to the Indo-European nature of this people.

⁴¹⁷ Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 3 (Pherekydes of Athens, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 3 F 12); 4 (Hellanikos of Lesbos F 91); 29-30 (Apollodoros of Athens); cf. 23 (Kallimachos); 160 (general discussion).

⁴¹⁸ Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 151-3; Sakellariou 1977: 132-3;

The same root is also attested for the name of the leader of the Thessalian Pelasgians in their journey to Crete, *Teutamos*, referred to above,⁴¹⁹ and that of the grandfather of the Pelasgian leaders in the Trojan war, *Teutamidēs*, probably a patronymic.⁴²⁰ It is particularly relevant to our purposes to note that this root occurs in the New Phrygian form *teutous* and in the Thracian man’s name (= MN) *Tautomedes*, etc.⁴²¹ Furthermore, *Abas* is the heros eponym of the *Abantes*, a Thracian tribe.⁴²² Finally, *Akrisios* and *Proitos* have closely related Phrygian counterparts in the divine name *Akrisias*⁴²³ and the root of the magistracy *proitavos*,⁴²⁴ respectively. The impression we gain from these examples, is that Pelasgian, insofar as onomastics is significant in this respect, may well be an Indo-European language of Thraco-Phrygian type. Further instances can be adduced to emphasize this point, like *Adrastos*,⁴²⁵ corresponding to the Phrygian MN *Adrastos*,⁴²⁶ and *Arkas*,⁴²⁷ related to the root of the Phrygian patronymic *Arkiaevas*.⁴²⁸

The situation is different with the Pelasgians in western Anatolia. Thus, it is reported by Strabo that at the time

Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 33; 652; 835; *pace* Beekes 1998.

⁴¹⁹ See note 404 above.

⁴²⁰ Homeros, *Iliad* II, 840-3. Note that the Late Bronze Age date of this onomastic element is emphasized by its presence in Linear B *te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro*, see Chantraine 1958: 127.

⁴²¹ Haas 1966: 95; Detschew 1976, s.v.

⁴²² Homeros, *Iliad* II, 536-45; Strabo, *Geography* X, 1, 3; cf. Woudhuizen 1989: 196.

⁴²³ Diakonoff & Neroznak 1985: 91; based on the PIE root **akr-* “high”, see Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 160-1 and cf. Sakellariou 1980: 207-10, or **aker-*, see Haas 1966: 145, 213 and cf. Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 96.

⁴²⁴ Brixhe & Lejeune 1984: M-01b; Woudhuizen 1993b; based on the PIE roots **pro* “before” and **ei-* “to go” (cf. Sakellariou 1980: 207-10). For other instances of magistracies used as personal names, cf. Hittite *Labarnas* < *labarna-* “king”, Lydian *Kandaules* < Luwian *hantawat-* “king”, Etruscan *Porsenna* < *puršne* “prytanos”, Etruscan *Camitlna* < *camthi* (title), Etruscan *Macstrna* < Latin *magister* “magistrate”, Latin *Lucius* < Etruscan *lucumo* “king”, Phoenician *Malchus* < *mlk-* “king”, and, from Homeros, *Palmus* < Lydian *pal|ml|u-* “kingship” and *Prutanis* < *prutanos*, again.

⁴²⁵ Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 13 (Euripides).

⁴²⁶ Herodotos, *Histories* I, 34-5; Woudhuizen 1993b. Cf. Lydian *Atrašta-*, see Gusmani 1964, s.v.

⁴²⁷ Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 68 (Hesychius Alexandrinus).

⁴²⁸ Brixhe & Lejeune 1984: M-01a; Woudhuizen 1993b.

of their foundation of Kume, the Aiolian Greeks have to cope with the resistance of the local Pelasgians under the leadership of *Piasos*.⁴²⁹ The latter personal name is clearly based on the root of Luwian *piya-* “to give” as present in Luwian names of the type *Piyamaradus* and *Natrbije,mi-* (= the Lycian equivalent of Greek Apollodoros or Apollodotos).⁴³⁰ An Anatolian background seems also plausible for the Pelasgians who according to Hellanikos of Lesbos under the leadership of Nanas, son of Teutamides, are reported to have colonized Cortona in Italy.⁴³¹ At any rate, the personal name *Nanas*, which is paralleled for Lydian, Lycian, and Cilician sources, ultimately originates from the Luwian kinship term *nani-* “brother” – a typical Luwian reflex of PIE **n-génh₁-*.⁴³² Finally, it deserves attention in this connection that the king of the Pelasgians at Lemnos at the time of the invasion by the Athenian Miltiades (c. 510 BC) is called *Hermōn*⁴³³ – a name paralleled for a Lydian king⁴³⁴ and likely to be based upon the Luwian onomastic element *Arma-*.⁴³⁵ If we confine ourselves to this latter class of evidence, the Pelasgian language might well come into consideration as an Indo-European vernacular of Luwian type.

Is it feasible to assume that the Pelasgians from Greece, who at the outset spoke a Thracio-Phrygian language, with the change of their habitat to western Anatolia also went over to speak a Luwian dialect? We can go into this matter a little further if we realize that the distinction of the Pelasgians from the Tyrrhenians is a futile one: for almost every location where Tyrrhenians are attested,⁴³⁶

one finds evidence for Pelasgians as well.⁴³⁷ Apparently, Thucydides is right in considering the Tyrrhenians a subgroup of the Pelasgians – who after all have a wider distribution over the Aegean. In line with this deduction, the Lemnos stele (c. 600 BC), which is generally agreed to be conducted in the Tyrrhenian language, may inform us about Pelasgian just as well. At any rate, the two versions of the dating formula inform us that the monument was erected during the reign of the Phokaian *Holaie* (= Pelasgian *Holaias!*),⁴³⁸ who is specified as king over the Myriniens and Seronians in the Aiolian coastal zone of Mysia – i.e. precisely the region where we situate the Pelasgian allies of the Trojans at the time of the Trojan war (see above).⁴³⁹ Now, the language of the Lemnos stele shows some features, like the titular expression **vanaca-* “king” and the 3rd person singular of the past tense in *-ke*, which are unparalleled for Luwian and rather point to a relationship with Phrygian (dating formula *midai lavagtaei vanaktei* “during the military leadership and kingship of Midas”) and/or Greek (Mycenaean *wa-na-ka*, Homeric *anaks* “king”; kappa-perfectum).⁴⁴¹ This relation of the Tyrrhenian or Pelasgian language with (pre-)Greek can be further illustrated by pointing to the correspondence of Etruscan *huθ* “4”, *netšvis* or *netsvis* “haruspex”, *puia* “wife”, *purθne* or *purtsna* “prytanis”, *turan* (form of ad-

⁴²⁹ *Geography* XIII, 3, 3.

⁴³⁰ Laroche 1966, s.v. *Piyamaradu-*; Carruba 2002: 76-7; 81-2.

⁴³¹ As preserved by Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 28, 3.

⁴³² Neumann 1991: 65; Woudhuizen 1998-9; *contra* Beekes 2002: 222 (“Lallname”).

⁴³³ Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 61 (Zenobius Paroemiographus 3, 85).

⁴³⁴ Strabo, *Geography* XIII, 1, 65; Beekes 2002: 214.

⁴³⁵ Houwink ten Cate 1961: 131-4.

⁴³⁶ Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War* IV, 109 (Attica, Lemnos, Akte), Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnica*, s.v. *Metaon* = town named after the Tyrrhenian Metas (Lesbos), Philogoros, frg. 5 (Imbros), Neanthes, frg. 30: the brother of Pythagoras is called *Turrēnos* (Samos), Suidas, s.v. *Termeria kaka* (Termerion on the coast of Caria), Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnica*, s.v. *Elymia* (coast of Macedonia), Lycophron, *Alexandra* 1245-9 (Mysia), He-

rodotos, *Histories* I, 94 (Lydia), and Konon, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 26 F 1 (Kyzikos), cf. Schachermeyr 1929: 262-76, Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Tyrrhener*, and Beekes 2002: 226-7.

⁴³⁷ Herodotos, *Histories* I, 137-40 (Attica, Lemnos), *ibid.* I, 57 (Kreston in Akte), Diodoros of Sicily, *The Library of History* 5, 2, 4 (Lesbos), Herodotos, *Histories* V, 26, Antikleides of Athens in Strabo, *Geography* V, 2, 4 (Imbros), Dionysios Periegetes (Samos), Menekrates of Elaia (Mykale in Caria), Strabo, *Geography* XIII, 3, 2-3 (Larisa Phrikonis), Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Adramyttion), Konon, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 26 F 1 (Antandros, Kyzikos), cf. Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960, *passim*.

⁴³⁸ Fick 1905: 104.

⁴³⁹ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 139-53; Woudhuizen 1998: 109-11. For the settlement of Lemnos by Pelasgians from the east, *in casu* Tenedos, see Hellanikos of Lesbos *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 4, 71 (not in Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960). Probably, this took place in the late 8th or early 7th century BC – the foundation date of Hephaistia, see Beschi 1994; cf. Beekes 2001: 362.

⁴⁴⁰ Brixhe & Lejeune 1984: M-01; Woudhuizen 1993a: 2.

⁴⁴¹ Charsekin 1963: 28; 48; 65 compares Etruscan *turuce* to Greek *dedōreke* (< *dōrein* “to give”); for code-mixing in a bilingual environment, see Adams, Janse & Swain 2002.

dress of Aphrodite), to (pre-)Greek *Huttēnia* “Tetrapolis”, *nēdus* “entrails”, *opuiō* “to take as wife”, *prutanis* “ruler”, and *turannos* “tyrant”, respectively.⁴⁴² On the basis of this evidence, then, it may safely be concluded that the Tyrrhenian or Pelasgian ancestors of the later Etruscans, although basically speaking a Luwian vernacular at least since the time of their move to western Anatolia,⁴⁴³ had a long history of contact with (pre-)Greek, which can only be accounted for if the literary tradition about the original habitat of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians in Attica is historically valid.⁴⁴⁴

What remains to be discussed is the language of the Pelasgians whom we have seen reason to identify as (a component of) the Late Bronze Age population of the Mesara plain in Crete. Now, there are three types of script recorded for Crete: hieroglyphic, Linear A, and Linear B. Of these, Linear B is either introduced from the Greek mainland or developed at Knossos after the period of the disastrous Santorini-eruption at the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC), which marks the end of the Minoan thalassocracy and presents the Mycenaean Greeks the opportunity to take over control of the weakened island. It is found mainly in the palace of Knossos, but also at Khania.⁴⁴⁵ Since its decipherment by the British architect Michael Ventris in 1952, we know that it is used to write an early form of the Greek language, the so-called Mycenaean Greek.⁴⁴⁶ Simultaneously with the Linear B archives at Knossos, which date to the period of Late Minoan II to Late Minoan IIIA1/2 (c. 1450-1350 BC), modest Linear A archives of about 150 tablets in sum are found in Hagia Triada – the harbor town of the palace of Phaistos in the Mesara.⁴⁴⁷ This latter script is recorded for Phaistos from the Middle Minoan II period (c. 1800-1700 BC) on-

⁴⁴² Schachermeyr 1929: 248; van der Meer 1992: 68; see further appendix II.

⁴⁴³ See section 10 on Etruscan origins above.

⁴⁴⁴ Note that if the story of the building of the wall on the Athenian acropolis by the Pelasgians (Herodotos, *Histories* VI, 137-40) is correct, their presence in Attica can even be dated archaeologically to the period of the 15th to 13th century BC, see Broneer 1956: 12-3.

⁴⁴⁵ Hallager 1992.

⁴⁴⁶ Ventris & Chadwick 1973.

⁴⁴⁷ Best 1981b: 37-45; Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004, section 3. For the Hagia Triada tablets, see Meijer 1982.

wards,⁴⁴⁸ but in the course of time spread all over the island and, in the time of the Minoan thalassocracy, even beyond to the islands in the Aegean, Ayios Stephanos in mainland Greece, and Miletos and Troy in western Asia Minor.⁴⁴⁹ As first suggested by Cyrus Gordon, Linear A is used to write a Semitic language. Thus, Gordon pointed out that the Linear A equivalent in the Hagia Triada (= HT) corpus of Linear B *to-so* “total”, in his reading with Linear B values *ku-ro*, corresponds to Hebrew *kull* “all”. Furthermore, he convincingly identified pot names, which appear in direct association with their image on tablet HT 31, with Semitic counterparts.⁴⁵⁰ This work was supplemented by Jan Best, who, amongst others, showed that the Linear A equivalents in the HT corpus of Linear B *a-pu-do-si* “delivery” and *o-pe-ro* “deficit” read, with their original Linear A values, *te-lū* and *ki-lū*, which forms recall Akkadian *tēlū* “Einkünfte, Ertrag” and *kalū(m)* as in *eqla kalū(m)* “Pachtabgabe schuldig bleiben”, respectively.⁴⁵¹ In addition to this, he compared the transaction term *pu-kū* in HT 31 to Akkadian *pūḫu* “exchange” and the element *pū-tū*, which is used in association with *ku-lū* on the back side of tablet HT 122 in a similar way as Linear B *pa* with *to-so* for *to-so-pa* “grand total”, to Akkadian *pūtu* “front side”, leading to the interpretation of *pū-tu-ku-lū* as “total with the front side included”.⁴⁵² Definite proof, however, of the west-Semitic nature of the language of Linear A came with Best’s unravelling of the libation formula frequently attested for wash-hand stone-basins from peak-sanctuaries destroyed at the end of Middle Minoan III (c. 1600 BC), which presents a full phrase and reads

(y)a-ta-nū-tī wa/u-ya (y)a-dī ḫi-ṭe-te (y)a-sa-sa-ra-ma/e

“I have given (Ugaritic *ytn/’tn*, -t) and (Ugaritic *w/u*, -y) my hand (Ugaritic *yd/d*, -ṭ) has made an expiatory offering (Ugaritic *ḫṭ*, -t), Oh Assara (Hebrew GN

⁴⁴⁸ Vandenaabee 1985: 18.

⁴⁴⁹ Vandenaabee 1985: 18 (Kea, Melos, Thera, Kythera); Nie-meier 1996 (Miletos); Godart 1994 and Faure 1996 (Troy).

⁴⁵⁰ Gordon 1957; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 1-7.

⁴⁵¹ Best 1973: 54-5.

⁴⁵² Best 2000: 29, note 8. For the identification of the transaction on HT 31 as an exchange of tens of vessels for silver and hundreds and thousands of vessels for gold, respectively, see Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 1-7.

Asherah, Ugaritic *y-, -m*)!”,⁴⁵³

As a final example, it deserves our attention that even the typical Semitic dative by the prefix *l* is attested for Linear A in form of *a-re* as occurring in the phrase

a-ta-nu-tī de-ka a-re ma-re-na ti-ti-ku

“I, Titikos, have given this to our guild-master”

on a pithos from Epáno Zakro, usually assigned to the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC).⁴⁵⁴

However, the fact that Linear A records a west-Semitic language is not the end of our inquiry into the languages of Crete. We still need to discuss the hieroglyphic script. This is found from the beginning of the Old Palace phase in the Early Minoan III/Middle Minoan IA transitional period (c. 2000 BC) onwards both in the regions of Knossos and Malia in the north and the Mesara plain in the south.⁴⁵⁵ Hieroglyphic archives are attested for the palaces of Knossos and Malia in the Middle Minoan II (c. 1800-1700 BC) period, when the script is even exported to Samothrace in the north-Aegean.⁴⁵⁶ Most of the seals with an hieroglyphic legend consist of chance finds, and are therefore not archaeologically datable. But from the fact that some of the hieroglyphic signs are taken over by the Cyprians at the time they devised the Cypro-Minoan script (= c. 1525-1425 BC), it can be deduced that the use of the script continued into the Late Minoan I period (c. 1550-1450 BC).⁴⁵⁷ Finally, the double-axe of Arkalokhori and the famous discus of Phaistos, which bear hieroglyphic inscriptions of unusual length, can positively be assigned to the period of Late Minoan II to Late Minoan IIIA1/2 (c. 1450-1350 BC).⁴⁵⁸ After this period, the tradition of writ-

ing in hieroglyphs, like that of Linear A, is discontinued – having succumbed to the Mycenaean *koinē*.

Among the earliest hieroglyphic seals, there is a small group with the so-called libation formula – one example stemming from the Mesara plain – , which is connected with the later Linear A formula discussed above and consists of hieroglyphic forerunners of Linear A signs from its final section, reading with the Linear A values *a-sa-sa-ra-me* “Oh Assara!”. On the basis of the presence of a corresponding form of the Ugaritic emphatic particle *-m*, the language of this text may be identified as Semitic.⁴⁵⁹ For our understanding of the hieroglyphic inscriptions more in general, however, it is important to realize that the signary is basically related to that of Luwian hieroglyphic from primarily southern Asia Minor and North Syria, which is already attested from the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age (c. 2000 BC) onwards.⁴⁶⁰ On Crete, the signs of Luwian hieroglyphic origin were supplemented by loans from Egyptian hieroglyphic, like the bee- and “trowel”-signs,⁴⁶¹ and, from Middle Minoan II (c. 1800-1700) onwards, by hieroglyphically drawn signs from Linear A.⁴⁶² This being the case, we should rather apply the term “Luwianizing” for this class of Cretan documents. At any rate, if we fill in the Luwian values for their Cretan counterparts, we are confronted with three categories of evidence on the seals with what I have called profane formulas: (1) titles, (2) names of places and countries, and (3) personal names. Confining ourselves to the evidence with a bearing on the Mesara, two seals are of importance to our purposes. In the first place # 271 from Malia, which dates to the earliest phase of the script (no signs from Linear A!) and reads:

1. *SASA UTNA*/, 2. */sà-ḥur-wa/* 3. *la+PÁRANA TARKU-MUWA*

“seal (with respect to) the land (of) Skheria, king Tarkumuwas”.

As Skheria can be identified as the ancient name of Hagia Triada, the seal, although found in Malia, nonethe-

⁴⁵³ Best 1981a; Best 1981b: 17-20; Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 26; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 25; cf. Hiller 1985: 125-7.

⁴⁵⁴ Best 1982-3a; for yet another Linear A inscription with *a-re*, see the gold ring from Mavro Spelio (= Best 1982-3b: 22-5).

⁴⁵⁵ Grumach 1968: 9; cf. Poursat in Olivier & Godart 1996: 31 who dates from Middle Minoan IA onwards.

⁴⁵⁶ Poursat in Olivier & Godart 1996: 29-30.

⁴⁵⁷ Woudhuizen 2001b: 610.

⁴⁵⁸ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 137-8; Woudhuizen 1992c: 201; Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004, section 3. As the double-axe from Arkalokhori is dedicated by a ruler of the hinterland of Phaistos from the time of the father of the sender of the letter on the Phaistos disc, it antedates the latter by one genera-

tion.

⁴⁵⁹ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 25-6; Woudhuizen 2001b: 608-9.

⁴⁶⁰ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 30-89; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 65-137; Woudhuizen 1990-1; Woudhuizen 1992c: pl. 26; Woudhuizen 2004a : 112-20; 129-43; Woudhuizen *forthc.* 1.

⁴⁶¹ Woudhuizen 1997; Woudhuizen 2002b.

⁴⁶² Woudhuizen 1992c: pl. 24; Woudhuizen *forthc.* 1.

less informs us about the situation in the Mesara.⁴⁶³ The second seal is # 296 of undetermined findspot, which for the use of three Linear A signs may be assigned to the period after c. 1800 BC and reads:

1. *SASA UTNA SARU*, 2. *PÁRA-tá-rú*, 3. *pi-ni*, 4. *pa₃-ya-ki*
 “seal (with respect to) the land (and) official(s) (of) the Phaiakians, representative Bartaras”.

Here Hagia Triada is referred to by the ethnonym Phaiakians (= Homeric *Phaiakes*), the root of which is also present in the name of nearby Phaistos.⁴⁶⁴ From a linguistic point of view, it is interesting to note that the personal names are Luwian, the first corresponding to Luwian *Tarkimōs* or *Tarkomōs*,⁴⁶⁵ and the second to Lydian *Bartaras*.⁴⁶⁶ Furthermore, the title in the first instance is likewise Anatolian, being identical to Hittite *labarna-*,⁴⁶⁷ whereas the second seal is characterized by a Semitic title, recalling Ugaritic *bn* in expressions like *bn lky* “representative of the Lycians”, etc.⁴⁶⁸ The impression we gain from this evidence is that the region of Hagia Triada and Phaistos in the Old Palace phase is inhabited by Luwians, who adopted the Semitic language in religious and official matters in order to adapt to the international standards of the time.

The foregoing conclusion can be further underlined if we take a look at the evidence from the Late Minoan IIIA1 period. As noted above, the corpus of Hagia Triada texts is conducted in the Semitic language. From slips of the pen, however, it is deducible that the primary language of the scribes happens to be Luwian. Thus, in the sequence *te-lū da-ku-se-ne-ti* “delivery to Taku-šenni” from HT 104 the dative singular is expressed by the ending *-ti*, which recalls the Luwian hieroglyphic pronominal ending of the dative

singular – used in the realm of the noun as well in the related Cyprian dialect (*te-lu sa-ne-me-ti* “delivery to Sane-mas”).⁴⁶⁹ Furthermore, in HT 28 and 117 mention is made of *u-mi-na-si*, which appears to be an adjectival derivative of the Luwian hieroglyphic root *umina-* “town”.⁴⁷⁰ Finally, the functionary in the heading of HT 31 is designated as *mi-ti-sa* – an honorific title paralleled for Luwian hieroglyphic texts.⁴⁷¹ The Luwian nature of the primary language of the inhabitants of the Mesara plain is further exemplified by the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the double-axe from Arkalokhori and the Phaistos disc, especially the latter of which bears testimony of a local Luwian dialect (*a-tu* instead of *à-tá* “in”, *u-pa* instead of *APA-à* “after, behind”).⁴⁷² Now the Phaistos disc, which, as we have seen in section 8, according to the reading and interpretation recently put forward by a Dutch group of scholars (cf. note 472) consists of a letter to the Akhaian king Nestor by an Anatolian great king likely to be identified as Tarḫundaradus of Arzawa, is particularly of interest to our purposes as it informs us that the king of Phaistos is called *Kunawa*. This name, which in the form *ku-ne-u* is also attested for the Linear B tablets from Knossos,⁴⁷³ bears a close resemblance to *Gouneus*, the leader of the Peraibians and the people from Dodona and the Peneios region in Thessaly at the time of the Trojan war.⁴⁷⁴ To all probability, then, we are dealing here with a Pelasgian personal name, thus confirming that there are Pelasgians among the

⁴⁶³ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 115-8; Woudhuizen 2004a: 139-43; Woudhuizen *forthc.* 1.

⁴⁶⁴ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126; Best 2000: 29; Woudhuizen *forthc.* 2; see further appendix I.

⁴⁶⁵ Houwink ten Cate 1961: 127.

⁴⁶⁶ Gusmani 1964, s.v. *Bartara-* (Lyd. no. 40).

⁴⁶⁷ Laroche 1960a: *277; as a personal name, this title is used for the first king of the Hittites, *Labarnas* (1680-1650 BC); in variant form of *labarsa-* it is already attested for the Kültepe-Kanesh phase (c. 1910-1780 BC), see Woudhuizen 1990-1: 146.

⁴⁶⁸ Gordon 1955: glossary, s.v. *bn*; Astour 1964: 194. On Cretan hieroglyphic, see further appendix I.

⁴⁶⁹ Meijer 1982: 60; Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 123; Woudhuizen 1992a: 96. See also section 5, note 90, above.

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. Laroche 1960a: *228; Woudhuizen 1994-5: 183; Woudhuizen 2004a: 41.

⁴⁷¹ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 4. For Luwian hieroglyphic, see Karkamis A6, phrase 7; Kululu I, phrase 1; Sultanhan, phrases 1 and 13; Karatepe, phrase 1; Bulgarmaden, phrase 1, as presented in Hawkins 2000; in the light of the Luwian hieroglyphic evidence, the final syllable *-sa* is the communal nominative singular ending. On the topic of code-switching in a bilingual environment, see Adams, Janse & Swain 2002.

⁴⁷² Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 97-104; Woudhuizen 1992a: 11-41. For an extensive treatment of the Phaistos disc, see Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004.

⁴⁷³ Ventris & Chadwick 1973: glossary, s.v.

⁴⁷⁴ Homeros, *Iliad* II, 748-55; Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 76; 83. According to Simonides (= Strabo, *Geography* IX, 5, 20) the Peraibians (= Homeric Peraibians) are Pelasgiotes. Note that the Dodona in question must be the one near Skotussa in Pelasgiotis, see Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960: 42. For further evidence on Pelasgian presence in Crete, see appendix IV.

inhabitants of the Mesara plain at the time!

To recapitulate our evidence on the language of the Pelasgians, we have experienced the following. First, at the time that the Pelasgians formed part of the earliest recorded inhabitants of Greece, they probably spoke a Thracophrygian language. Second, when – driven out by the Greeks – they migrated to western Anatolia, the Pelasgians adapted to the local language and went over to speak a Luwian vernacular, which, however, still bore testimony of a long history with (pre-)Greek. Third, those Pelasgians which went to the Mesara plain in Crete likewise adapted to the local linguistic situation, using Luwian as their primary language and Semitic in religious and official matters in order to keep up with the international standards at the time. Evidently, the migrations of the Pelasgians were not massive enough to alter the existing linguistic situation in the new homeland. The latter conclusion ties in with the fact that the Pelasgians in western Anatolia were not so important as to enter into the Hittite records as a distinct population group. As a closing remark to this section, it may be of interest to note that all three linguistic layers discussed are demonstrable for the Philistines in their new home in the Levant: Thracophrygian in the place name *Ekron*, which bears witness of the PIE root **akr-* or **aker-* “high”, Luwian in the personal name *Goliath*, which recalls Lydian names of the type *Alyattes*, *Sadyattes*, etc.,⁴⁷⁵ and Semitic in the divine name *ʾšrt* “Asherah (with Phoenician feminine ending *-t*)” as recorded for Ekron.⁴⁷⁶ As it seems, then, the Pelasgian ancestors of the Philistines preserved their ethnic identity during the period of the Mycenaean *koinē* (c. 1350-1200 BC)!

Additional note 1: Pelasgians in Italy

Pelasgian population groups are not only recorded for the Aegean, but also for Italy.⁴⁷⁷ Of the latter, it is absolutely clear that they ultimately originated from the Aegean, and hence bear testimony of migration from east to west. When did such a migration take place? In order to answer this

⁴⁷⁵ Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. *Philister*; Dothan 1982: 22; Machinist 2000: 63-4; Indo-European more in general is the genitive in *-š* as recorded for the patronyms in a Philistine inscription from Tell Gemme, dated to the 7th century BC, see Garbini 1997: 244.

⁴⁷⁶ Gitin 1993: 250-2, with note 37; cf. Merlo 1998.

⁴⁷⁷ For an overview, see Briquel 1984.

question it is relevant to note that Pelasgians colonizing the north of Italy were confronted with Umbrians,⁴⁷⁸ whereas their colleagues preferring the south had to drive out Auronissi (= variant form of Aurunci, a Latin indication of Oscans).⁴⁷⁹ Accordingly, the migration in question can only be situated after the arrival of the Urnfield ancestors of the Oscans and Umbrians in Italy at the end of the Bronze Age (see section 10), which means in the course of the Early Iron Age. In southern Etruria and Latium, the Pelasgians are reported to have stumbled upon Sicels,⁴⁸⁰ which is more problematic to situate in the Early Iron Age, because the latter were already kicked out of this environment by the Umbrians and the Opicans (= Greek indication of the Oscans) apparently at the turn of the Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age.⁴⁸¹ Their presence in central Italy at the arrival of the Pelasgians may therefore well be due to an anachronism of our source, Dionysios of Halikarnassos, basing himself on antiquarian relics.⁴⁸²

As we have seen in the above, there is reason to believe that the Pelasgians in the Aegean region are actually identical with the Tyrrhenians recorded for the same area. This identification by and large holds good for their kinsmen in Italy as well, but not in every case. Thus, the Pelasgian presence at Caere is clearly distinct from the subsequent one of the Tyrrhenians, identified as Lydians. At the time of the Pelasgians, the site is called Agylla. When the Lydians attacked the site, so the story goes, one of them asked how it is called. A Pelasgian, not understanding the question, saluted him in Greek: *khaire*. As a consequence, the Lydians believed the site to be called like

⁴⁷⁸ Justinus, *Epitoma historiarum philippicarum Pompei Trogi* XX, 1, 11 (Spina); Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 20, 4 (Cortona); II, 49, 1 (ager Reatinus).

⁴⁷⁹ Dionysios of Halikarnasso, *Roman Antiquities* I, 21, 3.

⁴⁸⁰ Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 20, 4-5; cf. Briquel 1984: 175, note 31 (Caere); 298-9 (Pisa, Saturnia, Alisium); Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 21; cf. Briquel 1984: 351-2 (ager Faliscus); Briquel 1984: 361, note 14 (various locations in Latium).

⁴⁸¹ Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 22, 4-5.

⁴⁸² Cf. Briquel 1984: 300-1. Note in this connection the Sicel nature ascribed to Saturnus at Cutiliae in the text of an oracle once given to the Pelasgians about their future homeland and recorded on a tripod from their sanctuary at Dodona (Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 19), whereas, as we have seen in note 478 above, the population of the *ager Reatinus*, to which Cutiliae belongs, in effect consisted of Umbrians at the time of its actual colonization by Pelasgians.

this and rebaptized it Caere.⁴⁸³ Similarly, the Arkadians at Rome headed by Evander, who are likely to be identified with the Pelasgians reported for the same site,⁴⁸⁴ are clearly distinct from the Tyrrhenians to the north at the time of the arrival of Aeneas and his Trojan companions (see section 11). As a final example of relevance here, it may be put forward that the Pelasgians at Pisa, called *Teutones*, *Teutoni* or *Teutae*, are considered to be Greek speaking, whereas at a later time the dominant language here became Lydian.⁴⁸⁵

If we realize that the name of the leader of the Pelasgians at Rome, Evander, constitutes a Greek formation, being a compound of *eu* “good” with *anēr* (*G andros*) “man”, the distinctive feature of these Pelasgian groups as opposed to the Tyrrhenians appears to be their Greek or Greek-like language. In the present section, however, we have experienced that language is not a defining “criterium” for Pelasgians in the Aegean during the Late Bronze Age, as they may speak either Greek-like Thracio-Phrygian when in an European environment or Luwian when in an Anatolian environment, or even Semitic as a secondary language when in a Cretan environment to keep up with the international standards of the time. As such, the distinction between Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians in the given Italian situations results from secondary interference by later historians. Nevertheless, it allows us to assume that the homeland of some Pelasgians must be sought in those sections of the Aegean where Greek or Greek-like Thracio-Phrygian was spoken at the time of departure, whereas that of others in sections of the Aegean where Luwian or Luwian-like then predominated. Finally, it deserves our attention that the Greek-like language of some of the Pelasgians in Italy for the presence of the roots **h₂nēr-* “man, strength”, **sal-* or **seh₂-* “salt” (as in the TN Alsiurn), and **teutā-* “society, folk, people” may further underline its overall Indo-European nature.

⁴⁸³ Strabo, *Geography* V, 2, 3.

⁴⁸⁴ Eustathius in his commentary on Dionysios Periegetes 347; cf. Briquel 1984: 456, esp. note 83. Note that according to Strabo, *Geography* V, 2, 4 an Arkadian origin is already attributed to the Pelasgians by Hesiodos.

⁴⁸⁵ Briquel 1984: 304-5.

Additional note 2: The inventor of the trumpet: Tyrrhenian, Pelasgian, or Lydian?

In his *Geography*, Strabo informs us about Regisvilla – the harbor of Vulci – that it once used to be the seat of the palace of *Maleos*, a Pelasgian king. After having reigned here, this king is said to have moved with his Pelasgian following to Athens.⁴⁸⁶ In line with the latter reference, it is interesting to note that a Tyrrhenian *Maleos* or *Maleotēs* is actually recorded for Attica in connection with the feast of Aiora.⁴⁸⁷ Now, the Tyrrhenians who once lived with the Athenians were notorious for their piracy,⁴⁸⁸ and it hence comes as no surprise that an excellent site for piratical raids like cape Malea is reported to have been named after their leader *Maleos*. This very same *Maleos*, then, is also credited with the invention of the trumpet – a handy instrument for the coordination of military and/or piratical action.⁴⁸⁹ (The dedication of a stone in the harbor of Phais-tos to Poseidon is also ascribed to a certain *Maleos*, but we do not know whether this refers to one and the same person.⁴⁹⁰ Note in this connection that in form of *Marewa* or *Marewo* (genitive) or *Mareu* the name in question is already attested for Linear B inscriptions from Malia and Pylos, respectively.⁴⁹¹)

The invention of the trumpet, however, is not only ascribed to the Pelasgian or Tyrrhenian *Maleos*, but also to the Tyrrhenian *Pisaio*s⁴⁹² or Tyrrhenos or his son – which evidently keeps us in the sphere of influence of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgians⁴⁹³ – or the Lydian *Mēlas*, a son of Herakles and Omphale.⁴⁹⁴ The latter name cannot be dis-

⁴⁸⁶ Strabo, *Geography* V, 2, 8.

⁴⁸⁷ Hesykhios, s.v. *Aiōra*; *Etymologicum Magnum*, s.v. *Alētis*; cf. Briquel 1984: 264-5.

⁴⁸⁸ Hesykhios, s.v. *Tyrrhēnoi desmoi* and *desmoi Tyrrhēnikoi*; cf. Müller & Deecke 1877, I: 79, note 31.

⁴⁸⁹ Scholiast ad Statius, *Thebaid* IV, 224; VII, 16; VI, 382; cf. Briquel 1984: 266.

⁴⁹⁰ *Soudas*, s.v. *Maleos*; cf. Briquel 1984: 266.

⁴⁹¹ Best 1996-7: 123 (who less likely connects *Mareus*, etc.).

⁴⁹² Photios, s.v. *lēistosalpigtas*; cf. Briquel 1991: 365, note 92.

⁴⁹³ Hyginus, *Fabulae* 274; Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* II, 21, 3; cf. Briquel 1991: 322.

⁴⁹⁴ Scholiast ad Homeros, *Iliad* XVIII, 219; cf. Briquel 1991: 332, note 53.

sociated from that of *Mēlēś*, a predecessor of the Lydian king Kandaules (= the one murdered by the first ruler of the Mermnads, Gyges) who ruled in the second half of the 8th century BC.⁴⁹⁵ The Lydian nature of this name is further emphasized by the attestation in an epichoric Lydian inscription of *Meḷḷali-*, an adjectival derivative in *-li-* of *Meḷḷaś*.⁴⁹⁶

Given the relationship of the name Maleos to Lydian Melas or Meles, the Tyrrheno-Pelasgian and Lydian traditions about the inventor of the trumpet appear to be not competitive in nature, but mere variants of one and the same story. Evidently, this story must be assigned to the period in which Lydia was not yet a landlocked power, as in the time of the reign of king Kroisos (559-547 BC),⁴⁹⁷ but still actively involved in maritime trade – with the Pontic region as indicated by the Lydian supremacy over Abydos and Daskyleion in the northern Troad recorded for the reign of Gyges (687-649 BC),⁴⁹⁸ and with on the one hand Al Mina in North Syria in the southeast (via Smyrna) and on the other hand the island of Pithecussae in the southwest as indicated by archaeological and epigraphical evidence from the late 8th century BC.⁴⁹⁹

Anyhow, whatever the merits of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgian or Lydian claims, one thing seems clear, namely that the priority of the use of the trumpet lies with the Egyptians, as in the reliefs of Medinet Habu we see an Egyptian trompeteer coordinating the movements of a contingent of foreign (*in casu* Sherden and other Sea Peoples?) mercenaries (see Fig. 22b)!

⁴⁹⁵ Radet 1892: 76-9; Pedley 1972: 14; cf. Briquel 1984: 267; Briquel 1991: 332-3.

⁴⁹⁶ Gusmani 1964, s.v.; cf. Briquel 1991: 333, note 58. According to Gusmani, loc. cit., Lydian *Meḷḷaś* (and hence the related Tyrrheno-Pelasgian *Maleos* or *Meleos* [Briquel 1984: 268]) derives from Luwian *Mala-* as in *Malazitis*, see Laroche 1966, s.v.

⁴⁹⁷ Herodotos, *Histories* I, 27; cf. Briquel 1991: 85.

⁴⁹⁸ Strabo, *Geography* 22, 1; Pedley 1972: 19; Briquel 1991: 82-3 and note 285.

⁴⁹⁹ Woudhuizen 1982-3: 99-100, Fig. 7a-c (distinct type of meander); Woudhuizen 1992a: 155-7, Fig. 2 (inscription *mi Maion*).

13. TEUKROI, AKAMAS, AND TROJAN GREY WARE

The *Tjeker* of the Egyptian sources, who are mentioned among the Sea Peoples attacking Egypt in the fifth and eighth year of Ramesses III (= 1179 and 1176 BC), and are later recorded in the Wen Amon story (1076-1074 BC) as inhabitants of the region of Dor in the Levant, have been identified with the *Teukroi* of Greek literary tradition by Lauth in 1867.⁵⁰⁰ This identification was subsequently taken over by François Chabas,⁵⁰¹ and after him, the majority of the authors on the topic.⁵⁰² As a minority view, however, it has been proposed by H.R. Hall to identify the *Tjeker* rather with the *Sikeloi* of Greek literary tradition.⁵⁰³ The latter view received new impetus by Elmar Edel's argument that Egyptian [t] as a rule corresponds with the Hebrew *samekh*.⁵⁰⁴ However, a serious disadvantage of the latter line of approach is that the *Shekelesh* would remain without proper identification. Moreover, the equation of *Tjeker* with the *Teukroi* receives further emphasis from archaeological as well as historical evidence (see below), whereas the one with the *Sikeloi* does not, for which reason in the following we will stick to the majority view.

The *Teukroi* and their heros eponym *Teukros* are definitely at home in the Troad. According to Herodotos, remnants of the ancient *Teukroi* are, under the name of *Gergithai*, still traceable for the Troad at the beginning of the 5th century BC.⁵⁰⁵ A problem is posed, however, by the fact that the *Teukroi* are not straightforwardly associated with the Troad in our Late Bronze Age sources. Thus,⁵⁰⁶ in the Egyptian list of the Hittite allies at the battle of Kadesh (1274 BC) troops from the region of the Troad are referred to as *Drdny* "Dardanians". It is, of

course, possible that, like in the case of the Mycenaean Greeks being called *Tanayu* "Danaoi" by the Egyptians but *Aḫḫiyawa* "Akhaians" by the Hittites, the Egyptians preferred a different ethnonym from the Hittites, but because of the silence in the Hittite sources on this point we do not know for sure. What the Hittite sources do tell us is that in the reign of the Hittite great king Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC) the region of *Wilusa* (= Greek Ilios) is reigned by a certain *Alaksandus*, whose name recalls the Homeric *Alexandros* alias *Paris*.⁵⁰⁷ Now, in Herodotos' version of the story of the abduction of *Helena*, according to which an unfavorable wind brings *Paris* and his company to Egypt, *Paris* is called of *Teukrian birth*.⁵⁰⁸ In this manner, then, a direct link between *Alaksandus* of *Wilusa* from the Hittite sources and the *Teukroi* from the Greek ones can be established.

As far as the ultimate origins of the *Teukroi* are concerned, there are three different versions of myth. In the first place, we have the autochthonous version according to which the heros eponym *Teukros* is the son of the river-god *Skamandros* and a nymph of mount *Ida*; in this version his daughter *Bateia* married with *Dardanos*, the heros eponym of the *Dardanians* – as we have seen the Egyptian denomination of the inhabitants of the Troad.⁵⁰⁹ Secondly, we have the Cretan version which holds that the *Teukroi* were colonists from *Crete* who settled in *Hamaxitos*⁵¹⁰ and introduced the cult of the goddess *Kybele*.⁵¹¹ In archaeological terms, this version of the myth might be linked up with the radiation of Minoan influence to nearby *Samothrace* as deducible from the discovery of Cretan hieroglyphic sealings of the "libation formula"-type, dated to the end of Middle Minoan II or to Middle Minoan III,⁵¹² and even to *Troy* itself in form of Linear A inscriptions

⁵⁰⁰ Wainwright 1961: 75.

⁵⁰¹ Chabas 1872: 296.

⁵⁰² Hall 1901-2: 184; von Lichtenberg 1911: 18; Wainwright 1961: 75; Barnett 1969: 19; Albright 1975: 508; Strobel 1976: 54; Mégalomitis 1991: 811; Redford 1992: 252; cf. Gardiner 1947: 199-200 (undecided).

⁵⁰³ Hall 1922: 301; cf. Gardiner 1947: 199-200 (undecided).

⁵⁰⁴ Edel 1984; cf. Lehmann 1985: 34-5 (critical, but undecided). Edel's view is now backed up by Drews 2000: 178-80, who here-with withdraws his earlier (1993: 52, note 13) objection.

⁵⁰⁵ Herodotos, *Histories* V, 122; VII, 43.

⁵⁰⁶ Barnett 1969: 4.

⁵⁰⁷ Gurney 1990: 46.

⁵⁰⁸ Herodotos, *Histories* II, 114.

⁵⁰⁹ Apollodoros, *Library* III, 12, 1; Diodoros of Sicily, *Library of History* IV, 75, 1; cf. Strobel 1976: 50.

⁵¹⁰ Strabo, *Geography* XIII, 1, 48; Strobel 1976: 50-1.

⁵¹¹ Vergilius, *Aeneid* III, 104 ff.; Vürtheim 1913: 4-8; Strobel 1976: 50.

⁵¹² Olivier & Godart 1996: 30 (# 135-7); cf. Matsas 1991: 168.

found here.⁵¹³ It is interesting to note in this connection that Phrygian Kybele is attested in Luwian form Kupapa for a magic spell to conjure the Asiatic pox in the language of the Keftiu (= Cretans) as preserved in an Egyptian medical papyrus presumably from the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) or one of his forerunners.⁵¹⁴ Thirdly, there is the Athenian version according to which Teukros ultimately originates from the Attic deme Xytepê⁵¹⁵ or is staged as the son of Telamon, king of Salamis in Greece.⁵¹⁶ As duly noted by Einar Gjerstad, this last mentioned form of the myth may have received emphasis from the Athenian policy vis-à-vis Cyprus in the 5th century BC.⁵¹⁷ At any rate, from an archaeological point of view the mythical relation between the Troad and southern Greece might be reflected in the formal resemblance of the so-called Minyan ware, characteristic of mainland Greece for the Early Helladic III and Middle Helladic periods, with Trojan grey ware (from the beginning of Troy VI onwards)⁵¹⁸ – a relation which in fact is so close that numerous archaeologists used the term Minyan ware for the latter as well.⁵¹⁹ This would lead us to the assumption that the inhabitants of the Troad from c. 1800 BC onwards are kinsmen of the Thraco-Phrygian population groups of Middle Helladic Greece – a thesis materialized to some extent by Leonid Gindin.⁵²⁰ Note in this connection that in

section 7 above on the ethnogenesis of the Greeks we have seen reason for Thraco-Phrygian population groups of Middle Helladic Greece who wanted to stay free to seek new homes among their kinsmen to the north and northeast as a result of the arrival of foreign conquerors from the beginning of Late Helladic I (c. 1600 BC) onwards.⁵²¹ Which of these three scenarios applies, cannot be determined in the present state of the evidence. Therefore, it may suffice for our present purposes to observe that according to Greek literary sources “Teukroi” is the oldest designation of the population of the Troad, followed by “Dardanians” (after Dardanos) and “Trojans” (after Tros).⁵²²

The literary tradition on Teukros also contains a number of what appear to be dim reflections of the Tjeker’s partaking in the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. Thus, it is related that Teukros, after the sack of Troy and the banishment from Salamis in Greece by his father Telamon, visited Egypt where he received an oracle about his ultimate destination, Salamis in Cyprus.⁵²³ Next, the story goes that Teukros visited Sidon on his way to Cyprus and received help from its king Belos (< Semitic *Ba’al* “lord”) in the colonization of Salamis.⁵²⁴ Finally, tradition has it that Teukros takes Gergines from the Troad and Mysia with him as prisoners of war during the colonization of Salamis in Cyprus.⁵²⁵ Considering the fact that Gergines is an ancient form of Gergithae,⁵²⁶ under which name, as we

⁵¹³ Godart 1994; Faure 1996.

⁵¹⁴ Woudhuizen 1992a: 1-10; see also appendix III below.

⁵¹⁵ Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 61; Strabo, *Geography* XIII, 1, 48; Vürtheim 1913: 8-11; Strobel 1976: 50.

⁵¹⁶ Euripides, *Helen* 87-8.

⁵¹⁷ Gjerstad 1944: 119; cf. Strobel 1976: 52.

⁵¹⁸ Blegen 1963: 111 who attributes the introduction of grey Minyan to the arrival of a new population.

⁵¹⁹ Heuck Allen 1994: 39 with reference, amongst others, to Schliemann, Blegen, Caskey.

⁵²⁰ Gindin 1999: 57-8 (*Skaiai* gates); 62-4 (*Kebrionēs*); 263 (*Laomedōn ho Phrux*, and his wife *Strumō*), to which may be added the Thracian nature of the personal name *Paris*, cf. Detschew 1976, s.v., and the Phrygian descent of Priamos’ wife *Hekabē* (*Iliad* XVI, 718). Note that the analysis of *Priamos* < Luwian *Pa-riya-muwas* by Watkins 1986: 54 is dubious and that the first element of this personal name is rather linked up with that of local place names like *Priapos*, *Priēnē* and Phrygian *Prietas* as stipulated by Kullmann 1999: 197 and Neumann 1999: 16, note 3, and/or the root of the New Phrygian vocabulary word *prieis* “carae” as per Haas 1966: 225, the latter from the PIE root **priyá-*“(be)love(d)”, cf. Mayrhofer 1974: 18-9.

⁵²¹ The expansion of the Mycenaean civilization to the north and northeast coincides with population pressure in the direction of northwest Anatolia. Thus, according to Homeros, *Iliad* III, 184-7, Phrygian forces originating from the European continent had already mustered along the banks of the Sangarios about a generation before the Trojan war (c. 1280 BC). Furthermore, the Kassians, who are characterized by a Thracian type of onomastics (see Woudhuizen 1993b: *passim*), became a growing threat to the Hittites from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom period (= early in the 15th century BC), onwards, see von Schuler 1965: 27. Finally, Phrygian penetration into the province of Azzi-Ḫayasa to the northeast of the Hittite capital Boğazköy/Ḫattusa in the times of Tudḫalias II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC) is personified by Mita of Paḫḫuwa, see section 7, esp. note 146, above.

⁵²² Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* IV, 75, 1; cf. Apollodoros, *Library* III, 12, 1.

⁵²³ Euripides, *Helen* 87 ff.

⁵²⁴ Vergilius, *Aeneid* I, 619 ff.

⁵²⁵ Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* VI, 68, 256b.

⁵²⁶ Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* VI, 68, 256c.

have seen, the Teukroi were living in the Troad at the beginning of the 5th century BC, their being taken as prisoners of war probably results from a rationalization which tries to cope with the situation that Teukros, although being at home in the Troad, fights on the Greek side in the Iliad.

Like the Philistines and Danaoi, a part of the Teukroi evidently founded themselves new homes in the coastal zone of the Levant. At least, in the Wen Amon story from the first half of the 11th century BC, we are confronted with Tjeker settled at Dor. According to Wen Amon's vivid testimony, they still were a maritime force to reckon with at that time, since eleven Tjeker ships were blocking his way from the harbor of Byblos when, having accomplished his mission, he wanted to return to Egypt.⁵²⁷

The maritime adventures of the Teukroi presumably dating to the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples call to mind the career of the Trojan hero Akamas as recorded in Cypro-Minoan texts from Enkomi and Ras Shamra/Ugarit dated to the final phase of the Late Bronze Age.⁵²⁸ Here we encounter Akamas at first in Linear C texts as a representative of what appears to be the Trojan town Malos (between Palaescepsis and Achaeium, opposite the island of Tenedos) and of Ephesos engaged in maritime trade, receiving goods at Enkomi⁵²⁹ and delivering goods at Ras Shamra/Ugarit.⁵³⁰ Next, he turns up in the more evolved Linear D texts as *Akamu Ilu* "the Ilian Akamas"⁵³¹ and *Akamu Eleki nukar -ura* "Akamas of Ilion, the great enemy", who in the latter instance is recorded to have defeated (*tupata* "he smote") the principal

of the text (*-mu* "me") in what from the context appears to be a naval battle.⁵³² This last mentioned passage strikingly correlates to the information from the correspondence between the king of Ugarit and his superior, the king of Cyprus-Alasiya, as unearthed in Ras Shamra/Ugarit, according to which the Ugaritic fleet is stationed in the coastal region of Lycia, but enemy ships nonetheless have broken through the defense line and are now threatening the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean.⁵³³ Anyhow, it is clear that Akamas from Ilion in the course of events had grasped the opportunity and turned his maritime profession from trader into raider – a common change in the history of Mediterranean shipping.⁵³⁴

The expansion of the Trojans, first by means of trade to Cyprus and Ras Shamra/Ugarit, and subsequently by actual colonization to Cyprus, again, and the Levant, is archaeologically traceable in the distribution of Trojan grey ware – not a widely desired export product, but evidence of real presence of Trojan traders and/or settlers. This ware is found in concentrations on Cyprus, especially at Kition and Hala Sultan Tekke, in Ras Shamra/Ugarit, and Tell Abu Hawam (= Haifa) in the neighborhood of the Tjeker town Dor, in a variety dated to the late 13th or early 12th century BC (see Fig. 21).⁵³⁵ The impetus for the Trojans to find new homes abroad is formed by the invasion of their territory by new settlers from the European continent, causing the destruction of Troy VIIa (c. 1180 BC)⁵³⁶ and the subsequent (in Troy VIIb1-2) introduction of buckle ceramic.⁵³⁷ Unfortunately, the Tjeker town Dor is not well excavated: at least it seems clear that the site was destroyed in the Late Bronze Age and subsequently characterized by Philistine ware.⁵³⁸ As opposed to this, the nearby Tell Abu Hawam has been better explored and shows, next to a destruction layer at

⁵²⁷ Pritchard 1969: 25-9; see section 5 above.

⁵²⁸ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 108; 116-7; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 53-4; 59; 62; 64.

⁵²⁹ Cylinder seal Inv. no. 19.10, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 110 ff.; 115, lines 15-7; cf. section 5 above. Like that of Alexandros (< Greek *alexō* "to ward off, protect" and *anēr* "man"), the name of Akamas is of Greek type, being derived from Greek *akamas* "untiring", see LSJ, s.v. This cannot be attributed to poetic license of Homeros, as these names, next to in the Homeric epics, appear in contemporary texts. Apparently, therefore, representatives of the Trojan nobility had intermarried with Greek colleagues as early as the Late Bronze Age – be it on a voluntary basis or involuntarily as exemplified by Alexandros/Paris' rape of Helena.

⁵³⁰ Tablet RS 20.25, see Woudhuizen 1994: 519; 530, lines 1-2; 15; cf. section 5 above. For *Malos* in the Troad, see Cramer 1971: 88. In line with a suggestion by Jan Best, the element *ati* in *atipini* is interpreted as a reflex of PIE **éti* "and" as represented in Greek *eti*, Phrygian *eti-* and Latin *et*, see Frisk 1973, s.v., as well as Celtic *eti*, see Delamarre 2003, s.v.

⁵³¹ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 104 (Tablet Inv. no. 1193, line 3).

⁵³² Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 105 (Tablet Inv. no. 1687, line 15); cf. section 5 above.

⁵³³ Hoftijzer & van Soldt 1998: 343-4, RS L 1, RS 20.238, and RS 20.18; cf. section 5 above.

⁵³⁴ Ormerod 1924; cf. Woudhuizen 1992a: 117-8.

⁵³⁵ Buchholz 1973: 179-84; Heuck Allen 1994: 42.

⁵³⁶ For the twofold destruction of Troy, first at the end of VIIh (c. 1280 BC) by the Mycenaean Greeks and then in the time of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples at the end of VIIa (c. 1180 BC), see Schachermeyr 1980: 460; Schachermeyr 1982: 106.

⁵³⁷ Rutter 1975, who likewise attributes the presence of this ware in southern Greece at the beginning of Late Helladic IIIC to Balkan invaders.

⁵³⁸ Dothan 1982: 69.




Fig. 21. Distribution of Trojan grey ware (from Heuck Allen 1994).

the end of the Late Bronze Age, some, no doubt subsequent, Late Helladic III C1b ware – the hallmark of the settlement of Sea Peoples.⁵³⁹ If I understand Susan Heuck Allen correctly in that the Trojan grey ware arrived in Tell Abu Hawam already before the aforesaid destruction layer,⁵⁴⁰ the Trojans

evidently prospected the site in the period of their trade connections with the Levant and hence very well knew where to go to find themselves a better place to stay!

⁵³⁹ Sandars 1980: 161; 165.

⁵⁴⁰ Heuck Allen 1994: 40; and note 8: Trojan grey ware is not found in association with Late Helladic III C1b.

14. THE CENTRAL MEDITERRANEAN CONTRIBUTION

Sherden

The Sherden⁵⁴¹ are first mentioned in the correspondence of the king of Byblos, Rib-addi, with the Egyptian pharaoh, presumably Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC), as preserved for the El-Amarna archive. Thus a *Shirdan*-man is staged in the context of a futile assault on Rib-addi, possibly as the latter's body-guard.⁵⁴² Furthermore, Rib-addi complains that people of Sutu – a contingent of mercenaries of the Egyptian pharaoh – have killed men of *Sherdan*.⁵⁴³ The use of Sherden for their fighting skill in the Levant can be further illustrated by texts from Ras Shamra/Ugarit, roughly dated to the 14th or 13th century BC, where in alphabetic form *ʔrtnm* they occur in the context of *ʔnnm* “hand-to-hand fighters or skirmishers”, *mrjnm* “chariot fighters” and *mdrglm* “guardians”.⁵⁴⁴ Interesting detail is that when specified by name, as in case of *Amar-Addu*, son of *Mutba'al*, the Sherden can be shown to be fully acculturated to their new Semitic milieu.⁵⁴⁵

After the El-Amarna interlude, the Sherden appear as seaborne raiders of Egyptian territory in the reign of Ramesses II (1279-1213 BC), who in the Tanis stele speaks of “the rebellious-hearted Sherden” “in their warships from the midst of the sea”, “none [being] able to stand before them”.⁵⁴⁶ This information coincides with the text of a stele from Assuwan, dated to the second year of Ramesses II (= 1277 BC), in which the pharaoh claims to have “destroyed warriors of the Great Green (= the Mediterranean sea)” so that “Lower Egypt spends the night sleeping (peacefully)”.⁵⁴⁷ As it seems, then, Ramesses II had to deal with piratical raids by the Sherden early in his reign. Having defeated them, he next enlisted the survivors

as mercenaries in his army, for in the memorial of the battle of Kadesh, which took place in the fifth year of his reign (= 1274 BC), Ramesses II reports that a contingent of Sherden fought on his side (“His Majesty had made ready his infantry and his chariotry, and the Sherden of His Majesty's capturing whom he had brought back by victory of his strong arm”).⁵⁴⁸ On the basis of close scrutiny of the Egyptian reliefs from the reigns of Ramesses II to Ramesses III, Robert Drews attributed the introduction in the orient of innovations in infantry warfare, like the round shield, the javelins, and the long slashing sword, which, when deployed in sufficient numbers, could outmatch the up to that moment unchallenged chariotry, to the Sherden, identifiable as such by their characteristic horned helmet (see Fig. 22).⁵⁴⁹




Fig. 22. Sherden in the Egyptian reliefs from the reigns of Ramesses II and Ramesses III with (a) long slashing swords and round shields, and (b) javelins (from Sandars 1980: 29, afb. 12 and 32, afb. 14).

⁵⁴¹ Gardiner 1947: 194-7; Strobel 1976: 190-4; Lehmann 1979: 485; 488; 493-4, note 49; Lehmann 1983: 80-5; Drews 1993a: 152-5.

⁵⁴² Moran 1992: 150 (EA 81: 16); Mercer 1939: EA no. 81.

⁵⁴³ Moran 1992: 201-2 (EA 122: 35; 123: 15); Mercer 1939: EA nos. 122-3.

⁵⁴⁴ Loretz 1995: 128-32; cf. Drews 1993a: 155 (RS 15.103).

⁵⁴⁵ Drews 1993a: 155.

⁵⁴⁶ Gardiner 1961: 259; Drews 1993a: 153; cf. Breasted 1927: Vol. IV, no. 491.

⁵⁴⁷ Gardiner 1947: 195.

⁵⁴⁸ Gardiner 1960: P25-30; Drews 1993a: 131; cf. Breasted 1927: Vol. III, no. 307.

⁵⁴⁹ Drews 1993: 178-9; 184 (with reference to Sandars 1980: 32, afb. 14); 199 (with reference to Sandars 1980: 29, afb. 12).

The story continues with the Sherden fighting, like the Shekelesh, Ekwesh, Lukka, and Teresh, as allies or mercenaries on the side of the Libyans, who, under the leadership of their king Meryey, made an attempt to invade the Egyptian delta in order to settle there in the fifth year of the reign of Merneptah (= 1208 BC).⁵⁵⁰ Subsequently, in the memorial of the invasion of the Sea Peoples in year eight of Ramesses III (= 1176 BC) at Medinet Habu, we encounter the Sherden both as attackers and as mercenaries on the Egyptian side.⁵⁵¹ The service of Sherden in the Egyptian army can be shown to continue into the reign of Ramesses V (1147-1143 BC), when members of this ethnic group are staged as proprietors of land granted to them by the pharaoh. As in the case of their kinsmen in the Levant, the Sherden in Egypt by then had acculturated to the extent that they all bore Egyptian names.⁵⁵²

The final mention of Sherden in the Near East is provided by the Onomasticon of Amenope, which reflects the political situation in the 11th century BC. Here the Sherden occur in an enumeration followed by the Tjeker and Peleset. From this enumeration one has deduced that there were Sherden living to the north of the Tjeker at Dor and the Peleset in their Philistine pentapolis at the time, in a location plausibly identified with Akko.⁵⁵³ In archaeological terms, their settlement here may well be reflected in Late Helladic IIIC1b pottery⁵⁵⁴ – as we have noted before, the hallmark of settlement of Sea Peoples in the Levant.

Having reviewed the history of Sherden in the Near East, the question remains to be answered: where did they come from? As we have seen, the Egyptian sources inform us that they came overseas. Now, two propositions have been put forward as to the origin of the Sherden: the island of Sardinia in the central Mediterranean and the region of Sardis in western Anatolia. The first option was proposed by Emmanuel de Rougé already in 1867.⁵⁵⁵ Some years later, in 1873, his view was challenged by Gaston Mas-

pero. The latter argued that, on the analogy of the fact that the original homeland of the Tyrsenians is traced back to Lydia by ancient authors, the Sherden are more likely to originate from western Anatolia as well, where the name of the capital of the Lydians, Sardis, and related toponyms like mount Sardena and the Sardanion plain and an ethnonym like Sardonians would be reminiscent of their presence.⁵⁵⁶ Accordingly, the Sherden were considered to be on their way from their original home in Lydia to their later home in Sardinia at the time of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples.⁵⁵⁷ The revised view of Maspero has been particularly influential. Thus a cautious scholar like the Egyptologist Alan Gardiner concluded: “Provisionally it seems plausible to accept the identification of the name Sherden with that of Sardinia, and the identification of the name Tursha with that of the Tyrsēnoi, but to regard Sardinia and Etruria as much later homes of the peoples in question.”⁵⁵⁸ Similarly, Margaret Guido in her book on Sardinia, after weighing the pro’s and con’s, is inclined to an eastern origin of the Sherden.⁵⁵⁹ As we have seen in section 10 above, there is considerable evidence that Maspero’s eastern origin of the Tyrsenians is correct. In the case of the Sherden, however, the literary evidence from ancient authors to back up their eastern origin is absent: here Maspero’s thesis rests upon nothing more than a likeness in names, which might be spurious. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that de Rougé’s identification of the Sherden as Sardinians can still count on some supporters up to the present day, like Richard D. Barnett in his contribution to the third edition of the Cambridge Ancient History⁵⁶⁰ and Drews in his book on the end of the Bronze Age.⁵⁶¹

As it comes to the actual facts, it must be admitted that these are meagre, indeed. The often referred to mention of *Šrdn* “Sardinia” in a Phoenician inscription on a stele from Nora, dated to the 9th century BC, can only provide us with a *terminus a quo* for the name of the is-

⁵⁵⁰ Breasted 1927: Vol. III, no. 574; Drews 1993a: 49.

⁵⁵¹ Strobel 1976: 18; Sandars 1980: 106-7,afb. 68. For their presence on the Egyptian side, see Helck 1971: 226, note 10, and Drews 1993a: 153 citing from Edgerton & Wilson 1936: plate 29.

⁵⁵² Gardiner 1947: 195; for a full survey of the references to Sherden in Egyptian texts, see Kahl 1995.

⁵⁵³ Moshe Dothan 1986; Bikai 1992: 133.

⁵⁵⁴ Bietak 1993: 297-8.

⁵⁵⁵ De Rougé 1867: 39.

⁵⁵⁶ Maspero 1873: 84-6; Maspero 1875: 195; Maspero 1910: 360, note 2; cf. Burn 1930: 12-3; Gardiner 1947: 197-8; Redford 1992: 243, note 13; 246.

⁵⁵⁷ Hall 1926: 282.

⁵⁵⁸ Gardiner 1947: 198.

⁵⁵⁹ Guido 1963: 187-91.

⁵⁶⁰ Barnett 1969: 12.

⁵⁶¹ Drews 1993a: 53-61; 70-2.

land.⁵⁶² More revealing is the archaeological evidence presented by Roger Grosjean. He drew our attention to similarities of the depictions of Sherden at Medinet with statue-menhirs from southern Corsica,⁵⁶³ depicting so-called Torre-builders, who are identical with the Nuraghe-builders from Sardinia.⁵⁶⁴ These entail: (1) the helmet with horns, the latter element of which can be reconstructed for some statue-menhirs on the basis of shallow holes once holding another material;⁵⁶⁵ (2) the corselet with five ribs;⁵⁶⁶ and (3) the long sword (see Fig. 23).⁵⁶⁷




Fig. 23. Statue-menhirs from Corsica: (a) Cauria (with horns reconstructed on the helmets), (b) Scalsa Murta (from Grosjean 1966b, Fig. 5; Sandars 1980: 99, afb. 60).

The statue-menhirs in question are assigned on the

⁵⁶² Donner & Röllig 1964: 63, nr. 46; cf. Dupont Sommer 1948 & 1974.

⁵⁶³ Grosjean 1966a: 70-1.

⁵⁶⁴ Grosjean 1966b: 194.

⁵⁶⁵ Grosjean 1966a: pls. 44-6.

⁵⁶⁶ Grosjean 1966a: pl. 46.

⁵⁶⁷ Grosjean 1966a: pls. 35-6; 40-1.

basis of C¹⁴ datings to the period between 1400 and 1000 BC, with a margin of error of 200 years.⁵⁶⁸ They give the impression of a society of which the members are proud of their martial qualities and hence excellently fit for service as mercenaries, in which capacity we encountered the Sherden in the Egyptian and Levantine sources.

Remaining archaeological evidence is of a circumstantial nature. As shown by Birgitta Pålsson Hallager, contacts between Sardinia and the eastern Mediterranean, especially Crete, can be detected for the later Bronze Age in the form of Mycenaean III B and C (including Late Helladic III C1b) material discovered foremostly in the nuraghe Antigori in the south of Sardinia,⁵⁶⁹ and, as later distinguished by Joseph Shaw, Italian or Sardinian pottery from Late Minoan IIIA2-B contexts unearthed in Kommos, a harbor town in southern Crete.⁵⁷⁰ Particularly tantalizing are the oxhide ingots with Cypro-Minoan signs from the nuraghi Serra Ilixi and Sant'Antioco in Sardinia, which are variously dated between the 15th and 11th century BC.⁵⁷¹ According to Guido, one of such Sardinian type of oxhide ingot was found in Crete, where, in her words, it may belong to the thirteenth-twelfth centuries BC.⁵⁷² As it seems, then, Sardinia was a source of raw materials (copper) for the international market (the Cypro-Minoan signs have only meaningful use as markers for the handling of the oxhide ingots in the eastern Mediterranean!).⁵⁷³ Finally, it deserves our attention that Sardinia constitutes a backward area – note in this connection that a Bronze Age culture lingered into the Roman period – ,⁵⁷⁴ comparable to a third world country in our present era, which is likely to provide the more developed eastern Mediterranean with mercenaries and raw materials.

⁵⁶⁸ Grosjean 1966a: 90; cf. Grosjean 1966b: 190 (from c. 1500 BC onwards).

⁵⁶⁹ Pålsson Hallager 1985; Dothan & Dothan 1992: 214.

⁵⁷⁰ Shaw 1998: 15; cf. Vagnetti 2000: 317; 2001: 88 who is more outspoken about the Sardinian nature of the dark burnished ware at Kommos.

⁵⁷¹ Guido 1963: 110; cf. Muhly, Maddin & Stech 1988: 283, who consider the association of oxhide ingots with Mycenaean pottery likely, even though it is not straightforwardly attested. Note, however, that Buchholz 1999: 222 variously dates the oxhide ingots to the period of 1200 to 700 BC.

⁵⁷² Guido 1963: 110-1; cf. Pålsson Hallager 1985: 304.

⁵⁷³ So also Buchholz 1999: 229.

⁵⁷⁴ Guido 1963: 156.

On the basis of the combined evidence from Corsica and Sardinia, the one presenting the closest parallels for Sherden as depicted in the Egyptian memorial at Medinet Habu and the other furnishing evidence for contacts with the eastern Mediterranean during the later Bronze Age, it seems viable to conclude that the Sherden originated from this part of the Central Mediterranean.

Shekelesh⁵⁷⁵

The earliest attestation of the Shekelesh concerns their partaking as allies or mercenaries in the Lybian campaign against Egypt as recorded for the fifth year of Merneptah (= 1208 BC).⁵⁷⁶ In the count of the dead bodies after the battle, the Shekelesh – together with the Ekwesh, Teresh, and Sherden, and in contrast to the Peleset from the time of Ramesses III – , are specified as being circumcised.⁵⁷⁷

Next, a representative of the Shekelesh turns up in maritime trade as recorded by Cypro-Minoan cylinder seals from Kalavassos (K-AD 389) and Enkomi (Inv. no. 19.10), which we have seen reason in section 8 above to assign to the period of the Hittite domination of Cyprus/Alasiya during the reign of Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC).⁵⁷⁸ The man in question, Sanemas, singles himself out as the author of the Kalavassos seal, and hence can be shown to master the Luwian language.

This peaceful episode is followed by one of maritime aggression. A first indication of this is formed by a letter from the destruction layer of Ras Shamra/Ugarit (RS 34.129), in which the Hittite great king, who must be identified as Suppiluliumas II, urgently requests information about the *Šikalāyū* “who live in boats” and about their homeland *Šikila* from a certain Lunadusu or Ibadusu who had been taken prisoner by them.⁵⁷⁹ (Note in this connection that *Sikalayu* and *Sikela* are variant forms of Shekelesh without the additional suffix *-sh* also attested for Ekwesh and Weshesh,⁵⁸⁰ and that we have seen reason not to follow Elmar Edel in his proposal to identify *Sikela* with

Tjeker.)⁵⁸¹ Little later, we encounter the Shekelesh among the Sea Peoples who invaded Egypt in the eighth year of Ramesses III (= 1176 BC).⁵⁸² In the memorial for Ramesses III’s victory at Medinet Habu, the Shekelesh are distinguished by a special headdress, the “nach hinten gebogene Mutze”.⁵⁸³

As to the origin of the Shekelesh, two suggestions have been put forward. In the first place, de Rougé proposed to identify them as inhabitants of the island of Sicily.⁵⁸⁴ As opposed to this, Maspero rather connected the name of the Shekelesh with the place name Sagalassos in Pisidia – a region in between the Hittite province Tarḫuntassa and the Lukka lands in southern Anatolia.⁵⁸⁵ Like in the case of the Sherden, the Shekelesh were assumed according to this view to be on their way from their original home to their later home Sicily at the time of the Sea Peoples. Maspero’s Anatolian thesis was enthusiastically received by H.R. Hall, who wrote: “The next tribe, the Shekelesha, are undoubtedly, as Maspero concluded twenty years ago, the Sagalassians of Pisidia. (...) The identification absolutely hits the nail on the head. (...) And the Sagalassians are not too far off, as de Rougé’s Sicels were.”⁵⁸⁶ It echoes on into recent literature, as in, for example, Ronald Redford’s monograph on Egypt’s relations with the Levant.⁵⁸⁷ The problem with Maspero’s Anatolian thesis, however, is that, as we have seen above, the Hittite great king Suppiluliumas II happens to be unacquainted with the *Sikalayu* or Shekelesh, whereas, as we have seen earlier (see section 8), he is in full control of western Asia Minor. In other words: if the Shekelesh were Sagalassians, the Hittite great king would have known them. Consequently, it seems preferable to opt for de Rougé’s solution and identify the Shekelesh with the inhabitants of Sicily in the central Mediterranean.

Now, Sicily was in contact with the Mycenaean world during the Late Bronze Age, as Mycenaean pottery has been found in Sicilian sites. As argued by Pålsson Hal-

⁵⁷⁵ Lehmann 1979: 492-4.

⁵⁷⁶ See note 551 above.

⁵⁷⁷ Widmer 1975: 71, note 23.

⁵⁷⁸ Woudhuizen 1992a: 94-145; Woudhuizen 1994: 524-6.

⁵⁷⁹ Dietrich & Loretz 1978; Hoftijzer & van Soldt 1998: 343.

⁵⁸⁰ Wainwright 1961: 72; see section 8, note 212 above.

⁵⁸¹ Edel 1984; see section 13 above.

⁵⁸² Pritchard 1969: 262-3; cf. Breasted 1927: Vol. IV, no. 64; Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 53; Strobel 1976: 14; Drews 1993: 51.

⁵⁸³ Widmer 1973: 73-4.

⁵⁸⁴ See note 555 above.

⁵⁸⁵ Maspero 1873: 84-6; Maspero 1910: 432, note 2.

⁵⁸⁶ Hall 1901-2: 181.

⁵⁸⁷ Redford 1992: 246.

lager, these contacts may have been especially close with Crete in view of the amount of Minoan pottery discovered in Thapsos. Vice versa, Khania, Knossos, and Kommos in Crete have produced Italian (no distinction is made for Sicily) ware during the later phase of the Late Bronze Age (Late Minoan IIIA2-B for Kommos and Late Minoan IIIB-C for Khania).⁵⁸⁸ To this comes that the Sicilians are known to the Homeric world (which, as we have seen in section 2 above, mainly reflects Late Bronze Age politico-historical conditions) as sturdy traders, specialized in the slave trade.⁵⁸⁹

In our literary sources, the Sicilians or Sicels are assumed to have once inhabited the mainland of Italy, up to Latium and southern Etruria, and to have crossed over to Sicily either some time before the Trojan war⁵⁹⁰ or 300 years before the arrival of the first Greeks, which means in the 11th century BC.⁵⁹¹ They are specified to have been driven out of their original habitat by either Umbrians (together with Pelasgians) or Opicans (= Greek indication of the Oscans), who, as we have seen in section 10 and will further elaborate below, both make their entrance in the Italian peninsula from Urnfield Europe at the end of the Bronze Age. Therefore, Minoan and Mycenaean ware found in the Italian mainland may also be indicative of contacts of the Aegean region with the Sicels, or vice versa.⁵⁹² According to inscriptions from the Archaic period, the language of the Sicels was closely related to Oscan at the time.⁵⁹³

Weshesh

The Weshesh figure only in the attack launched by the Sea

⁵⁸⁸ Pålsson Hallager 1985; Shaw 1998: 15. For Cyprian material at Thapsos, see van Wijngaarden 1999: 362, note 48; note that Drews 1993a: 218, basing himself upon Ross Holloway 1981: 87, identifies Thapsos during the 13th century BC as a Cyprian trading post.

⁵⁸⁹ Homeros, *Odyssey* XX, 382-3.

⁵⁹⁰ Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 9; 16; 20 ff.

⁵⁹¹ Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War* VI, 2, 5; cf. Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* I, 22, 5.

⁵⁹² For the distribution of Mycenaean ware in Italy, see Buchholz 1999: 83, Abb. 23.

⁵⁹³ Vetter 1953: 359-60, no. 514 (Centuripa vase, 5th century BC): *bratome*; cf. Oscan *brat* or *bratom* (= Latin *gratum* “pleasant, grateful”), see Pulgram 1978: 72-3; 151.

Peoples in the eighth year of Ramesses III (= 1176 BC).⁵⁹⁴ According to a proposition by François Chabas, they have been identified as Oscans.⁵⁹⁵ In order to fully grasp the validity of this suggestion, it is important to note that the final *-sh* of Weshesh constitutes a suffix, also present, as we have seen, in Ekwesh (< Akhaia) and Shekelesh (< Sikela), and that the root hence consists of *Wesh-*.⁵⁹⁶ Furthermore, in spite of its general derivation from earlier **Opisci*,⁵⁹⁷ the root of the Italic ethnonym Oscans consists of *Os-* as exemplified by its variant form *Aus-* or rhotacized *Aur-* in *Ausones* or *Aurunci*, respectively. This root, then, is used in combination with the typically Italic suffix for the formation of ethnics, *-ci* (cf. *Aurunci*, *Etrusci*, *Falisci*, *Graeci*, *Umbri*, *Volsci*, etc.). Alternatively, inspired by Maspero’s pan-Anatolianism with respect to the homeland of the Sea Peoples, which led him to associate the ethnonym Weshesh with the place name Wassos in Caria, it has been suggested by Hall to compare the root of this same ethnonym to that of the place name Waksos in Crete.⁵⁹⁸

The identification of the Weshesh with the Italic Oscans can be bolstered by archaeological evidence. As we have seen in section 10 above, the Italic peninsula is characterized at the end of the Late Bronze Age by a new material culture called proto-Villanovan, which, as convincingly demonstrated by Hugh Hencken, shows close affinities with Urnfield Europe and, as we have argued, is likely to be introduced by the ancestors of the historical Umbrians, Oscan, Latins, and Faliscans, whose languages are most intimately related to Celtic and Germanic. Now, as pointed out most recently by Shelley Wachsmann, the fact that the boat(s) of the Sea Peoples as depicted in Ramesses III’s memorial at Medinet Habu is(/are) characterized by bird-head devices at both the bow and the stern constitutes a typical Urnfield feature.⁵⁹⁹ As it seems, then, there were bearers of the Urnfield culture among the Sea Peoples, which conclusion only applies if we are right in

⁵⁹⁴ See note 582 above.

⁵⁹⁵ Chabas 1872: 299; cf. Reinach 1910: 36, note 3; Macalister 1913: 25.

⁵⁹⁶ See note 580 above.

⁵⁹⁷ As based on Greek *Opikoi* and Ennius’ *Opiscus*.

⁵⁹⁸ Hall 1901-2: 184; cf. Reinach 1910: 36; Albright 1975: 508; Redford 1992: 246.

⁵⁹⁹ Wachsmann 1998: 178; Wachsmann 2000: 122; cf. Kimmig 1964: 223-4, Abb. 1; de Boer 1991.

our identification of the Weshesh with the Italic Oscans.

The connection thus achieved with the developments in Urnfield Europe at the time, also go a long way in providing us with a model to explain the resurrections of the Sea Peoples. The invasion of Italy by bearers of the Urnfield culture – a true mass migration – caused great disruption of peoples living in the area, as the displacement of the Sicels living in Latium and southern Etruria mentioned in the above, who in turn were forced to displace other population groups in their search for new homes. Moreover, the finds of handmade barbarian ware either linked up with Italy or Urnfield Europe in various locations of the Aegean at the end of the Late Bronze Age⁶⁰⁰ and the growing popularity of the rite of cremation from that time onwards,⁶⁰¹ suggest that some of the invaders, like we posited for the Oscans, made common cause with population groups they displaced and went with them straight on to the eastern Mediterranean, with which the original population of Italy and the central Mediterranean islands, as we have seen, had been in contact. This resulted in a domino-effect. First, the region of Pylos in Greece was attacked with devastating results, ultimately causing Akhaians to join the eastern move and look for new homes in Cyprus and the Cilician plain. Next, the Hittite fleet stationed along the coast of Lycia to ward off the entrance of the Sea Peoples from the Aegean into the eastern Mediterranean waters was utterly defeated and the island of Cyprus/Alasiya, the southern Anatolian coast, and that of the Levant lay undefended as an easy prey for looting and plunder, and eventually settlement. Finally, as we know by now, an attempt was made to invade the richest country in the Near East, Egypt, with appetizing prospects for plunder and settlement (see Fig. 24). Only this last stage in the upheavals of the Sea Peoples failed....

I am not suggesting that the foregoing model explains everything. It is highly unlikely that the Sea Peoples are responsible for, to name but two examples, the devastations in Thessaly and the fall of the Hittite capital Boğazköy/Ḫattusa. The upheavals of the Sea Peoples ultimately caused by the movement of bearers of the Urnfield culture into Italy works as a catalyst to set in motion other devel-

opments. Thus the devastations in Thessaly are likely to be ascribed to warlike Balkan tribes bordering to the north of the Mycenaean realm, always looking for an opportunity to plunder their much richer neighbor. Furthermore, the sackers of the Hittite capital Boğazköy/Ḫattusa are likely to be identified as Kaskans and Phrygians, who, when the smoke-screen had disappeared, turned up in great numbers along the Assyrian border at the time of Tiglathpileser I (1115-1070 BC).⁶⁰² As an historical parallel for these developments one could point to the fact that when Dionysios I of Syracuse wanted to attack the Etruscans of Caere, he made a common cause with the Celts in their hinterland, who, just like the northern neighbors of the Greeks and the Kaskans and Phrygians in Anatolia, were only waiting for the opportunity to plunder the lands of their hated oppressor.




Fig. 24. Distribution of Urnfield culture and the route of the Sea Peoples; (a) c. 1180 BC; (b) 12th-10th century BC (after Kimmig 1964: 269-70, Abb. 17-8).

⁶⁰⁰ Rutter 1975; Deger-Jalkotzy 1983; Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 233-42, carte 8; Popham 2001; for barbarian ware in Cyprus, see Karageorghis 1986 and Pilides 1994; for further literature on the topic, see Eder 1998, 20, esp. note 25.

⁶⁰¹ Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 191-6, carte 7.

⁶⁰² Lehmann 1970: 34; Diakonoff 1984: 123; see also section 7, esp. note 147.

15. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Having reached the end of our quest into the vicissitudes of the Sea Peoples, it seems worthwhile to summarize the results with respect to their ethnicity.

As far as the Lukka are concerned, there can be little doubt that they originate from the lower Xanthos valley in later Lycia. This area looks out onto the Mediterranean sea in the south, but is otherwise separated from the surrounding regions by a spur of the formidable Taurus mountains. From this geographical situation alone it seems permissible to assume that the Lukka formed a close knit ethnic community. At any rate, this is the case with their Early Iron Age descendants, who call themselves Termilai and write in a distinct dialect of Luwian, the so-called Lycian A. From an archaeological point of view, however, our inference about the ethnic coherence of the Lukka cannot be backed up by a distinct material culture because archaeological data from the lower Xanthos valley are thus far lacking for the Late Bronze Age period.

The Ekweš and Denye(n) are alternative indications for the Late Bronze Age Greeks, corresponding to Homeric Akhaians and Danaoi. Of these indications, the one, in form of Aḫḫiyawa, is preferred by the Hittites, while the other, in form of Tanayu, is most of the time preferred by the Egyptians. In archaeological terms, the ethnic coherence of the Late Bronze Age Greeks is strongly indicated by the so-called Mycenaean *koinē* of Late Helladic IIIB – a cultural unity unparalleled for Greece until the Hellenistic period. The latter archaeological culture cannot be dissociated from the records in Linear B, which are conducted in a distinct Greek dialect most closely related to Arcado-Cyprian of later date. That the Late Bronze Age Greeks indeed considered themselves as Akhaians may be further illustrated by an episode in Herodotos' *Histories* (V, 72), according to which the Spartan king Kleomenes, being refused entrance into the temple on the acropolis of Athens by the priestess on the ground that he was considered a Dorian, replied that he was not a Dorian, but an Akhaian – a point of view which tallies with the fact that the Dorians from central Greece, when taking possession of the Peloponnesos at the end of the Submycenaean and beginning of the Protogeometric periods, are led by Heraklid kings with a legitimate claim on the Mycenaean throne as descendants of Perseus, who *return* to their ancestral lands. The cultural and linguistic unity of Late Bronze Age Greece should not

induce us, however, to exclude a certain amount of ethnic diversity, as Linear B texts, next to the geographic name *Akawija* (KN) “Akhaia”, already bear testimony of the ethnonyms *Rakedamonijo* (TH) “Lacedaimonian”, *Ijawone* (KN) “Ionians”, and the personal name related to an ethnonym *Dorijewe* (PY) “Dorieus (dative)”.⁶⁰³ After the fall of their palatial civilization, some of the Mycenaean Greeks took the boat and looked for new homes in the eastern Mediterranean, one group under the name of *Ḫiāwa* “Akhaians” colonizing the Cilician plain in Anatolia, and another group under the name of *Dan* “Danaoi” colonizing various locations in the Levant. These migrations were not numerous enough, however, to plant the Greek language in the given regions, the Akhaians in the Cilician plain going over to Luwian and the Danaoi in the Levant resorting to Semitic. This being the case, the Greeks in question may safely be assumed to have mixed to a significant extent with the indigenous population.

If the literary traditions about the Philistines originating from Crete and/or Lydia in western Asia Minor are correct, this particular people is likely to be identified with the Pelasgians of Greek sources. The latter were one of the various population groups living in mainland Greece before the Greek ethnos came into being, and hence at least partly responsible for the Middle Helladic culture with its characteristic Minyan ware. As far as can be determined from the evidence of place and personal names, the Pelasgians were of Indo-European tongue, to be more specific of a Thracio-Phrygian type. When southern and central Greece were conquered by foreign invaders from Egypt and the Levant, Pelasgian population groups who wanted to preserve their independence fled to the north into Thessaly, which remained predominantly Minyan up till Late Helladic IIIA, and to the region of Larisa Phrikonis in the Mysian-Lyidian borderland of western Asia Minor. On the basis of the evidence from personal names, again, the latter group was not numerous enough to cause a language shift, but went over to the local Luwian dialect. As opposed to their kinsmen who had fled, Pelasgian population groups which stayed in southern and central Greece became thoroughly Mycenaeanized and in this process, as Herodotos

⁶⁰³ Ventris & Chadwick 1973: glossary, s.v.; Shelmerdine 1997: 564; cf. Driessen 1998-9 and Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 361.

(*Histories* I, 57) reports, adopted the Greek language – which, considering our view that Greek is a split from Thracio-Phrygian under foreign influences, is only a small step. The exact date of the migration of Pelasgians to Crete as recorded in the literary sources and backed up by place, divine, and personal names eludes us, but, at any rate it is clear that these latter became fully Minoanized and, like their fellow Cretans, used a Luwian dialect as their first language and a Semitic one for religious and administrative purposes in order to keep up with the current international standards. At the time of their migration to the Levant and settling down in the Philistine pentapolis, the Pelasgians of Crete were in close contact with their kinsmen of western Anatolia, both producing Late Helladic III C1b pottery – as we have seen, the hallmark of the settlement of Sea Peoples in the Levant. This may be a sign of their ethnic coherence, though it must be admitted that the same material culture is shared with the Mycenaean Greeks. It goes without saying that the Pelasgians during their colonization of the Philistine pentapolis mixed with the local population and went over to the local Semitic dialect – with which the Cretan branch was already familiar anyway.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Teresh and Peleset are explicitly distinguished in one Egyptian text, it seems highly attractive to consider the related ethnonyms of the Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians from Greek literary sources, on the analogy of Akhaians and Danaoi being alternative means to refer to the Mycenaean Greeks, as competing forms of address of one and the same population group.⁶⁰⁴ Under the related name of Etruscans, the Tyrrhenians are especially known to us as an archaeologically, epigraphically, and linguistically traceable entity from c. 700 BC in Italy. In all these aspects, however, their homeland can be traced back to the Aegean region and western Anatolia. A crown witness of their early history is formed by their language, which, although basically of Luwian nature, shows clear signs of a long early history with Greek – a linguistic deep layer explicable only if the literary traditions of the Tyrrhenians once living in Attica are correct. *Mutatis mutandis*, the evidence of the Etruscan language also goes a

⁶⁰⁴ As we have stipulated in section 10 above, Herodotos, *Histories* I, 57, distinguishes the language of the Pelasgians from that of the Tyrrhenians, but, as we have seen in section 12, language is not a defining “criterium” for Pelasgians, so that Greek-like and Luwian-like speaking representatives may all belong to one and the same ethnic entity.

long way in backing up our reconstruction of Pelasgians originally speaking a Thracio-Phrygian vernacular, but going over to Luwian with their migration from mainland Greece to western Anatolia. A distinct branch of migrants from western Anatolia to Italy is formed by the Trojan followers of Aeneas. As these are likely originating from the region south of mount Ida, where to all probability a Luwian dialect was spoken, we are seemingly dealing here with kinsmen of the Tyrrhenians. However, contrary to the situation in Etruria, the Trojan followers of Aeneas, for mere lack of numbers, did not plant their name, language, culture, and customs in Latium, but were only held responsible for the introduction of the cult of the Penates here.

Tjekker or Teukroi is an indication of the population of the Troad, which alternatively can be addressed as *Drdny* or Dardanians. To all probability this people spoke a Thracio-Phrygian language, and hence they likely were kinsmen of the pre-Greek population groups of Greece like the Phrygians, Thracians, and Pelasgians. The latter inference gains weight from the fact that the characteristic Trojan grey ware is closely related to the so-called Minyan ware of Middle Helladic Greece. At the end of the Late Bronze Age, this grey ware, attested from the beginning of Troy VI onwards, is distributed to Cyprus and the Levant, thus enabling us to trace the epigraphically and historically recorded trade contacts and migrations of the Teukroi archaeologically. All in all, the Teukroi form a clear case of a coherent ethnic entity according to our protohistoric criteria.

The homeland of the Sherden is likely to be located in Sardinia in the central Mediterranean, as we find statuettes in this region (*in casu* nearby Corsica) depicting the same type of warriors as the Egyptian reliefs associated with this ethnonym. The specificity of the outfit of the Sardinian warriors seems to indicate a strong ethnic bond. On the analogy of the fact that an Hittite princess betrothed to Ramesses II is rebaptized with an Egyptian name on the event of her marriage,⁶⁰⁵ the Semitic and Egyptian names for individual Sherden mentioned in the Akkadian cuneiform and Egyptian texts bear testimony only of their acculturation in their new homelands, and tell us nothing of the Sardinian language, about which, for the lack of epichoric texts or even glosses in Greek or Latin, we are totally ignorant.

⁶⁰⁵ Bryce 1998: 312; compare Greeks in Hellenistic Egypt taking Egyptian names, on which see Goudriaan 1988.

About the origin of the Shekelesh we have only circumstantial evidence that their homeland is unlikely to be situated in Anatolia, as the last of the Hittite great kings, Suppiluliumas II, is unfamiliar with them. As opposed to this negative evidence, an association with Sicily in the central Mediterranean can be underlined by the fact that the latter island was in contact with Greece, Crete, and Cyprus during the Late Bronze Age. A representative of the Shekelesh involved in trade with Cyprus and the eastern Mediterranean singles himself out as mastering the Cypro-Minoan script and the Luwian language, but this does not help us very much in determining his native Sicilian language about which we only know that in the archaic period it was closely related to Oscan. For the question whether the Sicilians had a pronounced idea about their ethnicity we can only draw back to the fact that the Egyptians depicted them with a special type of headdress, the “nach hinten gebogene Mutze”, which, to say the least, is meagre evidence.

The identification of the Weshesh with the Oscans is crucial for our understanding of the catastrophic events at the end of the Bronze Age. The invasion of Italy by bearers of the European Urnfield culture, which we have seen reason to identify with the speakers of the Italic dialects or languages Osco-Umbrian and Latin-Faliscan, entails a true mass migration which caused serious disruption of peoples living in the region, whose displacement in turn formed the “prime mover” for what we call the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. Even though the Oscans may have been numerically a relatively small party among the coalition of the Sea Peoples, they nonetheless may be considered like the leaven in the Biblical bread. Thus the ships of the Sea Peoples with bird-head devices at both the bow and the stern of a typically Urnfield type, the spread of handmade barbarian ware of proto-Villanovan Italian or European Urnfield backgrounds, and the growing popularity of the rite of cremation during and after the catastrophic events may be attributed to the influence of our Oscan participants. Considering their highly specific cultural and linguistic traits, the Oscans are likely to be considered a coherent ethnic entity according to our protohistoric criteria.

By means of conclusion, we seem to be confronted with various ethnic groups, each having their own specific material culture – though Late Helladic III C1b appears to be a combining factor, being attested for the homeland of almost every Sea People, from western Anatolia (Pitane

and Larisa Phrikonis) in the east to Sardinia (nuraghe Antigori) in the west – and language. That these ethnic groups were indeed *cohesive* entities appears from the fact that, after their abortive attempt to conquer Egypt, they settled *separately* in various locations in the Levant: the Peleset or Philistines in their pentapolis, the Tjeker or Teukroi in Dor, the Sherden or Sardinians in Akko, Denye(n) or Dan in Joppa and later in Laish, European Urnfielders likely to be identified with the Weshesh or Oscans in Hamath, and Ekwhesh or Akhaians in the Cilician plain. Nevertheless, this conglomerate of cultures and languages was able to work together very effectively for some time, as the downfall of palatial empires caused by them may illustrate. In order to demonstrate that a multi-lingual coalition is *a priori* possible, one may point to the fact that the Trojan side in Homeros’ Iliad consisted of a multi-lingual coalition as well.⁶⁰⁶

In his *Ethnicity in eastern Mediterranean proto-history: Reflections on theory and method* (forthc.), chapter 6, Wim van Binsbergen formulates three hypotheses which are of relevance to our subject.

HYPOTHESIS 1. In the Late Bronze Age, by the time of the appearance of the Sea Peoples, the geographical space of the eastern Mediterranean was ethnically structured in this sense, that an overall system of ethnic classification was generally known and generally subscribed to.

The validity of this hypothesis can be underlined by the fact that some of the groups of the Sea Peoples are referred to by the same ethnonym in various sources, like the *Ekwhesh* as *Aḫḫiyawa* in Hittite and *Shekelesh* as *Šikalāyū* in Ugaritic and as *Sikeri-* in Cypro-Minoan: this proves that we are not dealing with the whim of an individual Egyptian scribe, but a classificatory system with a wider geographical range shared by the Egyptians with the Hittites, Ugaritians, and Cyprians. Even the fact that there are competing indications for the same ethnic group, like in case of the Egyptian preference of *Tanayu* or *Denye(n)* “Danaoi” over *Ekwhesh* “Akhaians”, or their indication of the Trojans as *Drdny* alongside *Tjeker* does not undermine such a conclusion, as it rather signals the sophistication of this classificatory system. As to the origin of the different ethnonyms, it is interesting to note that *Sherden* and *Sheke-*

⁶⁰⁶ *Iliad* II, 804; IV, 437-8. Note that in this respect the title of my book *The Language of the Sea Peoples* is oversimplifying the reality.

lesh are geographically based, being derived from the names of the islands Sardinia and Sicily, respectively, whereas for example *Weshesh* “Ausones” or “Osci” and *Tanayu* or *Denye(n)* are ultimately rooted in the hydronymy of Europe and the North Pontic steppe (PIE **av-* or **au-* “source, stream” and **dānu-* “river”) and hence may safely be assumed to have been introduced by the people in question themselves from that region into their new homeland.⁶⁰⁷

HYPOTHESIS 2A. The mobilization process that led to the emergence and exploits of the Sea Peoples was a process of only partial ethnogenesis; it was not in origin an ethnically-driven process, in the sense that no role was played, in this mobilization process, by any prior ethnic identification between the various constituent peripheral groups that ultimately coalesced, albeit never completely, into the Sea Peoples.

Given the fact that, as we have noted above, various groups of the Sea Peoples settled separately in various locations of the Levant, and that they have distinct names and features in the Egyptian sources, this negative hypothesis appears to come nearer to the truth than the positive hypothesis 2B below. As a consequence, we may conclude that to a certain extent a process of ethnogenesis took place (= the emergence of the Sea Peoples as a distinct phenomenon), but was not followed by ethnicization (i.e. that prospective Sea Peoples, each in their own corner of the Mediterranean, took ideological consciousness of the fact that they had so much in common with the other eight groups that they could adopt a common destiny).

HYPOTHESIS 2B. The mobilization process bringing the nine groups to ultimately constitute the Sea Peoples, was in part based on some pre-existing basis for mutual ethnic identification between these nine groups already prior to the beginning of the Sea Peoples’ mobilization and exploits.

An argument in favor of hypothesis 2B, which we consider less likely than hypothesis 2A, might be provided by the fact that the boats of the Sea Peoples are of a common type with a bird head at bow and stern, which, as we have noted, is a typical Urnfield feature. It should be noted in this context, however, that Shelley Wachsmann suggested that the Egyptian artist who drew the boats of the Sea Peoples took one example as the norm, so that the apparent unity in type of ship may be illusory. At any rate, an Urnfield ideology would be secondary to all groups of the

Sea Peoples with the exception of the *Weshesh* if our identification of the latter with the Ausones or Oscans applies. Another unifying element may have been formed by the fact that all members of the Sea Peoples might ultimately be of Indo-European stock. But this is by no means sure for the Sherden and the Shekelesh, and, if these might turn out to be Indo-Europeans after all, the differences between the various groups are already too pronounced to allow for the perception of a common heritage as a binding factor.

Finally, there is the question of how to classify the post-conflict ethnic situation of the various constituent Sea Peoples in the various regions of the Levant where they ended up after their unsuccessful sea- and land battles against Ramesses III. When we scan the range of possible models which van Binsbergen derived from general ethnic theory for specific application to the Sea Peoples case, it is striking that no one specific model seems to fit the bill once and for all.

One might be tempted to classify the post-conflict local accommodation between Sea People settlers and their host groups with the *melting pot* model (no. 6 in our section 1), with this proviso that the colonists, contrary to the situation in the modern Americas, merge with the indigenous population to the extent that they ultimately become extinct as a separate ethnic group (= ethnothanasia).⁶⁰⁸ However, even if locally, in the Levant, all sense of a distinct Sea Peoples identity was ultimately lost, there are indications that yet some knowledge of distant Central Mediterranean origins lingered on, laying the foundations for the subsequent Phoenician exploration and colonization of the Central Mediterranean in the Early Iron Age. Perhaps their knowledge of the central Mediterranean waters stimulated the Phoenicians to explore these regions and beyond in the course of the Early Iron Age.

In the Levant itself, however, total local accommoda-

⁶⁰⁸ Of the remaining cases of colonization assumed in the preceding sections, the Pelasgian ones from presumably *c.* 1600 BC onwards to western Asia Minor and Crete and the one by the Trojan followers of Aeneas to Italy in the Early Iron Age seem closest to the *immigrant* model (no. 2 in our section 1), with the noted adjustment that the former emigrate to higher developed societies, whereas the latter arrive in a lower developed one. As opposed to this, the coming of chariot-riding Hyksos elements to Greece *c.* 1600 BC and that of the Tyrsenians to Tuscany from *c.* 700 BC onwards rather adhere to the *conquest* model (no. 3 in our section 1), with the noted adjustment that the Hyksos elements, in contrast to the Tyrsenians, do not plant their own language(s), but adapt to that of the indigenous Thracian-Phrygian population groups.

⁶⁰⁷ Cf. Rosenkranz 1966: 136; Brown 1985: 131-2.

tion of the immigrant Sea Peoples groups could only have been the ultimate outcome of a prolonged process that, typically, would traverse some of the other types in our range of models:

- a. immediately after local settlement, the most likely model would be that of *conquest* (model 3), which, as a result of progressive subsequent political and social accommodation, would soon give way to
- b. the immigrant model (model 2) – to end, in most cases, with
- c. a quasi-melting pot situation (model 6) where most specific Sea People cultural and nomenclatural traits would have been shed, in preparation of the total eclipse of any reminiscence of a Sea Peoples past, among the incorporated vestiges of a formerly Sea People population in the Levant.

APPENDIX I: ON THE DECIPHERMENT OF CRETAN HIEROGLYPHIC

As there are only two other hieroglyphic writing systems current in the region, from a comparative point of view the Cretan hieroglyphic (= CH) script may be assumed to be related to either Egyptian hieroglyphic (= Eg.) to the southeast of Crete or Luwian hieroglyphic (= LH) from Anatolia to the northeast of Crete. Both these two possible lines of approach have been put into practice in the past. Thus Arthur Evans, the discoverer of the script, started to compare Cretan hieroglyphic signs to Luwian counterparts,⁶⁰⁹ whereas at a later stage he rather preferred to look for correspondences with Egyptian.⁶¹⁰ Next, three of the pioneers in the deciphering process of Luwian hieroglyphic, Ignace Gelb,⁶¹¹ Helmuth Bossert,⁶¹² and Piero Meriggi,⁶¹³ pointed out numerous relationships of Cretan hieroglyphic with the script they were engaged with. Since then, Turkish scholars like Sedat Alp⁶¹⁴ and Nimet Özgüç, who were involved in the earliest manifestations of the Luwian hieroglyphic script during the Middle Bronze Age, showed an awareness of Cretan connections.

The whole matter received renewed attention at the time that Jan Best definitely succeeded to place the famous discus of Phaistos in an Anatolian context, first by demonstrating the relationship of signs D 11 and D 39 to the Luwian symbols of royalty, winged sun-disc (LH *190), and of lightning (LH *199),⁶¹⁵ and later by embedding the Luwian connection in a network of internal evidence in the form of a doublet and triplets and a vowel analysis.⁶¹⁶ Working out this relationship, it turned out that of the total amount of 47 signs on the discus, 29 can convincingly be

linked up with a Luwian hieroglyphic counterpart.⁶¹⁷ However, as soon realized, the script of the discus is not an isolated phenomenon on Crete, but further attested for a double-axe from Arkalokhori and an altar-stone from Malia.⁶¹⁸ As a matter of fact, as indicated by the 14 correspondences in sum listed in table 4 below, it is nothing but a manifestation – be it on the largest extant scale – of Cretan hieroglyphic itself.⁶¹⁹ *Mutatis mutandis*, the possible relationship of the latter script with Luwian hieroglyphic comes to the fore again.

This relationship is a viable one, as I hope to show in my table 4 below. In this table I present a list of correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Luwian hieroglyphic for signs which occur in a reasonably clear context. This list, which is an elaboration of earlier efforts,⁶²⁰ includes signs from the discus of Phaistos and the aforesaid double-axe from Arkalokhori, which texts, for reasons beyond my comprehension, are omitted from the recent corpus of Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions (= CHIC).⁶²¹ In order to overcome this omission, I have assigned to these two texts a number adding up to the last one recorded for CHIC, thus the double-axe of Arkalokhori becomes # 332 and the discus of Phaistos # 333. I further present the numbering of the signs according to Evans' original publication (1909) next to that of CHIC, because in a number of instances he distinguishes a sign which is not recognized as such by CHIC. Finally, for brevity's sake I refer to standard formulas by an abbreviation, thus the libation formula is referred to as LF and the profane formulas as PF 1-7.⁶²²

⁶⁰⁹ Evans 1895: 33 ff.

⁶¹⁰ Evans 1909.

⁶¹¹ Gelb 1931: 79 ff.

⁶¹² Bossert 1932: 5 ff.

⁶¹³ *Vergessene Städte am Indus, Frühe Kulturen in Pakistan vom 8. bis 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Mainz am Rhein, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1987, p. 204, Abb. 177.

⁶¹⁴ Alp 1968: 276.

⁶¹⁵ Best 1981b: 49-56; numbering of the Luwian hieroglyphic signs according to Laroche 1960a.

⁶¹⁶ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 30-53.

⁶¹⁷ Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004, section 4.

⁶¹⁸ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 87, fig. 1b; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 74, fig. 1b; 77, fig. 2c.

⁶¹⁹ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 86-9; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 73-7; 97-128.

⁶²⁰ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 87, fig. 3; Woudhuizen 1992c: Pl. XXVI.

⁶²¹ Olivier & Godart 1996.

⁶²² Woudhuizen 2001b: 608-12 (= LF & PF 1-6); Woudhuizen 2002a: 124 (= PF 7).

	Evans	CHIC	LH	value	attestation
1.	2	001	1	<i>AMU</i>	# 310
2.	–	–	10	<i>ḤARMAḤI, [ḥar]</i>	# 332, ⁶²³ # 333
3a.	73	018	13	<i>PÁRA</i>	# 255, # 296, # 314, #332
3b.			14	<i>PÁRANA</i>	# 271
4.	–	–	15	<i>mí₄</i>	# 333
5.	3	002 ⁶²⁴	19	<i>á</i>	# 332, # 333
6.	16	007 ⁶²⁵	29	<i>tá</i>	# 296, # 314
7.	7	006	31	<i>ḤISHIA, [ḥi]</i>	# 246, # 333
8.	58	040	35	<i>na</i>	# 309, # 333 ⁶²⁶
9.	10	095	41	<i>tà</i>	# 332
10.	–	–	56-7	<i>KATA, kà</i>	# 333
11.	9	009	66	<i>PIA, pi</i>	# 003γ, # 139
12.	27	057	80-1	<i>SARU</i>	PF 7 (8x), # 333
13.	11	010	82	<i>ta₆</i>	PF 5 (41x), # 258
14.	–	–	85	<i>l(a)</i>	# 332
15.	–	–	90	<i>TIWA, ti</i>	# 333
16.	–	–	97	<i>WALWA, ú</i>	# 333
17.	65	016	101	<i>TARKU</i>	# 193, # 271, # 310
18.	99	028	102-3	<i>KURUNT, rú⁶²⁷</i>	# 255, # 296
19.	63	011	104	<i>sà</i>	# 271
20.	62	012	107	<i>MUWA, mu</i>	# 253, # 271
21.	–	–	108	<i>SURNA, sú</i>	# 333
22.	64	013	109	<i>MALIA, ma₆</i>	# 139, # 312
23.	67	–	110	<i>ma</i>	# 333
24.	–	–	111	<i>ḤAWA, ḥa₄</i>	# 328
25.	77	–	125	<i>lí</i>	# 333
26.	82	–	128	<i>TINTAPU, tí₅</i>	# 314, # 333
27.	80	–	130-3	<i>ARA, ra</i>	LF (7x), # 333
28.	59	–	138	<i>[wa]</i>	# 333
29.	92	031	153	<i>nú</i>	PF 5 (25x), PF 6 (11x)
30.	–	–	160	<i>WIANA, wi</i>	# 333
31.	–	–	167	<i>[PARNA, pa]</i>	# 333
32.	96	–	175	<i>LALA, la</i>	# 271 ⁶²⁸
33.	–	–	181	<i>TURPI, [tu]</i>	# 333
34.	–	–	189	<i>WASU, [wa₁]</i>	# 333
35.	–	–	190	<i>sol suus</i>	# 333

⁶²³ Note that the sign is rendered in this text “en face” instead of “en profile” as is usually the case.

⁶²⁴ Note that both Evans and CHIC present only the xoanon sign, not the man’s head itself.

⁶²⁵ Note that this particular form of the arm sign is represented without the dagger, as it occurs in # 314.

⁶²⁶ Note that the ship sign appears both with and without a mast as well as in form of an hippocamp.

⁶²⁷ Value attested already for seals or sealings from the Late Bronze Age period, see Herbordt 1998: 313; 317, fig. 4, 3-4.

⁶²⁸ Note that the sign is rendered here in a lengthened and extremely slim way so that it is almost not recognizable anymore as a tongue, but the three knobs on the top side are decisive for its identification.

36.	5	005	191	<i>TIWATA</i> , [ti]	PF 2 (35x), PF 3 (4x)
37.	–	–	199	<i>TARḤUNT</i> , ḥà	# 333
38.	115	061/069	212	<i>ḤAPA</i> , ná	# 196, # 333
39.	–	–	223	<i>s</i> ₆	# 333
40.	114	034	228	<i>UTNA</i> , tu ₅	PF 7 (10x), # 333
41.	41	041	267	<i>WANA</i> , [wa ₆]	# 246, # 271, # 309
42.	–	032	268	<i>scalprum</i>	# 328
43.	17	–	278	<i>li</i>	# 333
44.	12	043	283-4	<i>custos</i>	# 314, # 333
	Evans	CHIC	LH	value	attestation
45.			300	<i>gens</i>	# 277
46.	15	051	312-3	<i>ZITI</i> , zi	# 328
47.	24	056	327	<i>SASA</i> , sa ₅	PF 7 (10x), # 193, # 255, # 328
48.	–	–	369	<i>vita</i>	(= Cretan knot), cf. Bossert 1932: 12-3
49.	–	–	370	<i>ASU</i> , as, su	# 333
50.	14	050	383, 1	(determ. of PN)	# 310, # 314, # 333
51.	–	–	383, 2	[+ta/i], +ra/i	# 332, # 333
52.	122	077	415	<i>sa</i>	# 003γ, # 139
53.	–	–	419	<i>mà</i> , mī	LF (1x)
54.	138	–	438	<i>magistratus</i>	# 193
55.	–	–	451	<i>hur</i>	# 271
56.	19	036	488	<i>ta</i> ₅	PF 6 (17x), # 255

Table 4. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Luwian hieroglyphic (values in square brackets attested for Cretan hieroglyphic only).

	Evans	CHIC	Eg.	value	attestation
1.	2	001	A 1	<i>AMU</i>	# 310
12.	27	057	A 21	<i>SARU</i>	PF 7 (8x)
13.	11	010	D 56	<i>ta</i> ₆	PF 5 (41x)
57.	85-6	020-1	L 2	<i>bi'ty</i>	# 003γ, # 018, # 039, # 139, # 310
58.	–	–	M 23	<i>nswt</i>	# 018, # 039
59.	116	*156	M 43	<i>WAINU</i> , wa	# 274, # 314
60.	109	–	N 5	<i>sol</i>	# 310
40.	114	034	N 26	<i>UTNA</i> , tu ₅	PF 7 (10x), # 333
41.	41	041	O 11	<i>WANA</i> , wa ₆	# 246, # 271, # 309
48.	–	–	S 34	<i>vita</i>	(= Cretan knot)
61.	21	046	U 21	<i>tī</i>	PF 4 (7x)
62.	18	044	X 8	<i>pi</i> (<PIA)	PF 1 (72x), PF 2 (35x), PF 3 (4x), PF 4 (7x), # 255
63.	31	076	Y 3	<i>TUPA<LA></i> , du	# 312
35.	–	–	–	<i>sol suus</i>	# 333

Table 5. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Egyptian hieroglyphic (values as attested for Cretan hieroglyphic).

Notwithstanding the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic is basically related to Luwian hieroglyphic, there are a number of cases in which Egyptian hieroglyphic provides the closest comparative evidence. This concerns first of all the bee-sign, which – apart from a singular occurrence – goes unrepresented among the Luwian hieroglyphic repertoire. Like in Egyptian, the latter sign turns up in combination with a floral motif, to indicate the king of Lower and Upper Egypt. This royal title is also attested for Middle Bronze Age inscriptions from Byblos, which was subject to strong Egyptian influences at the time.⁶²⁹ In Crete, the bee-sign undergoes a typical local treatment in the sense that, apart from its regular depiction from the side (CHIC no. 20), it also tends to be represented from the top (CHIC no. 21).⁶³⁰ Besides the bee-sign, the symbol of royalty in form of a winged sun-disc, mentioned among the Luwian correspondences, ultimately originates from Egyptian hieroglyphic as well, but its ductus in Crete betrays Anatolian influences in the fact that the sun-disc is represented as a rosette. The same holds good for the *ankh*-sign, which, like it is the case in Anatolia, in Crete is characterized by two side stems (note, however, that in Anatolia the central stem is lost, whereas in Crete this is preserved). Apparently, these two signs, belonging to the oldest layer of Luwian hieroglyphic during the Middle Bronze Age,⁶³¹ reached Crete via an Anatolian intermediary.

The indirect route for signs originating from Egyptian hieroglyphic may further be illustrated by the trowel-sign (CHIC no. 040). In ductus this is closest to a Byblian parallel; it also receives a value based on the translation of its Egyptian meaning, *di* “to give”, into Luwian, hence *pi* as acrophonically derived from *piya*- “to give”.⁶³² A similar adaptation of the value can be observed for the wine ideogram (CHIC *156), representing Semitic *wainu* instead of Egyptian *irp*, the tablet-sign (Evans no. 31),⁶³³ rendering the syllabic value *du* as acrophonically derived from Se-

mitic *tuppu* “tablet”,⁶³⁴ and the palace-sign (CHIC no. 41), of which the acrophonic value *wa₆* can only be explained in terms of a mixing-up with its Luwian hieroglyphic look-alike *wana* “stele, altar” (LH *267). Although direct contact between Egypt and Crete cannot be excluded, the given evidence is conducive to the conclusion that Egyptian signs reached Crete through the intermediary of the Levant and/or Anatolia. Or, at the very least, the handling of this category of signs in Crete is “more loose” than the one received by the category of signs originating from Luwian hieroglyphic.

In table 5 I present a list of correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Egyptian hieroglyphic for signs which occur in a reasonably clear context.⁶³⁵

A third source for signs from Cretan hieroglyphic is formed by Cretan Linear A (= CL). It is a general misconception that Cretan hieroglyphic constitutes a forerunner of Linear A: this is particularly true in case of the libation formula, which develops in the course of time into its Linear A descendant as attested for wash-hand stone-basins from peak-sanctuaries the destruction of which is usually assigned to the Middle Minoan III/Late Minoan I transitional period (c. 1600 BC).⁶³⁶ In most other instances, however, the representation of Linear A signs among Cretan hieroglyphic results from a merger between the two scripts, which started from the time of the earliest attestation of Linear A in Middle Minoan II (c. 1800-1700 BC) onwards, thus providing us with a *terminus post quem* for seals showing Linear A influences other than the libation formula.⁶³⁷

Table 6 below presents correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Cretan Linear (A) for signs which occur in a reasonably clear context.⁶³⁸

⁶²⁹ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 8, fig. 7.

⁶³⁰ Woudhuizen 1997.

⁶³¹ Woudhuizen, *forthc.* 2.

⁶³² Woudhuizen 2002b.

⁶³³ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 8, fig. 8; 13, fig. 17; 15-6.

⁶³⁴ Friedrich 1946: Wörterverzeichnisse III, s.v.

⁶³⁵ Numbering of the Egyptian hieroglyphic signs according to Gardiner 1994.

⁶³⁶ Woudhuizen 2001b: 608.

⁶³⁷ Vandenaabeele 1985: 18.

⁶³⁸ Cf. Woudhuizen 1992c: Pl. XXIV; numbering of the Linear A signs according to Meijer 1982: 38-47.

	Evans	CHIC	CL	value	attestation
64.	46	039	L 1	<i>pa</i> ₃	# 296
65.	112	070	L 22	<i>lū</i>	# 310 (note that this seal presents a variant of the sign in question catalogued separately by Evans as his no. 91), # 328
20.	62	012	L 27	<i>mu</i>	# 253, # 271
66.	101	029	L 30	<i>da</i>	# 328
67.	60	019	L 31	<i>sa</i>	LF (14x), # 193, # 196, # 277
68.	44	038	L 32	<i>ya</i>	PF 5 (41 x), # 258, # 296, # 310, # 328
69.	36	042	L 52	<i>a</i>	LF (14x), # 255, # 309, # 310
27.	80	–	L 53	<i>ra</i>	LF (7x), # 333
70.	30	092	L 55	<i>ru</i>	PF 6 (17x)
57.	85	021	L 56	<i>pi</i> (< <i>bi'ty</i>)	# 310
71.	103	024	L 60	<i>NIKULEON</i> , <i>ni</i>	# 122
72.	40	052	[L 61]	<i>me</i>	LF (6x)
73.	–	–	L 78	<i>ti</i>	# 328
59.	116	*156	L 82	<i>WAINU</i> , <i>wa</i>	# 274, # 314 (note that this seal presents a variant of the sign in question catalogued separately by Evans as his no. 4)
61.	21	046	L 88	<i>tī</i>	PF 4 (7x)
74.	97	025	L 92	<i>te</i>	# 328
63.	31	076	L 93	<i>du</i>	# 312
75.	74	–	L 95	<i>ma</i>	# 196, # 257, # 309
76.	47	053	L 103	<i>ki</i>	# 296, # 309

Table 6. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Cretan Linear.

The relationship of Cretan hieroglyphic with Cypro-Minoan (= CM) has no bearing on the origins of Cretan hieroglyphic, but only on the date of its continuation, proving that it still flourished at the time of the earliest attestations of Cypro-Minoan in the late 16th or early 15th

century BC (Woudhuizen 1992a: 87-90; Woudhuizen 2001b: 610).

The Cretan hieroglyphic contribution to Cypro-Minoan entails the following signs:

	Evans	CHIC	CM	value	attestation
77.	13	049	28	<i>ni</i>	PF 1 (72x), PF 3 (4x), # 255, # 312
62.	18	044	51	<i>pi</i>	PF 1 (72x), PF 2 (35x), PF 3 (4x), PF 4 (7x)
78.	54	047	76	<i>le</i>	# 258, # 310, # 312
36.	5	005	116	<i>ti</i>	PF 2 (35x), PF 3 (4x)

Table 7. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic with Cypro-Minoan.

In his attempt⁶³⁹ to present a model for the origins of the Cretan hieroglyphic script, Wim van Binsbergen took the analysis of Jan Best as his starting point. Best maintains that Egyptian hieroglyphic contributed as many as 35 signs to Cretan hieroglyphic, Luwian hieroglyphic only 30 signs, and the Byblos script 10 signs. He did not back up this analysis, however, by a further specification. As shown above, our analysis of the situation is different, with Luwian hieroglyphic providing the bulk of the material (56 signs), and Egyptian hieroglyphic (14 signs, of which 7 go without attestation in Luwian hieroglyphic) and Cretan Linear A (19 signs, of which 13 do not originate from ei-

ther Luwian hieroglyphic or Egyptian hieroglyphic) rendering supplementary services only. This does not diminish the usability of van Binsbergen's models as an aid to develop our own – slightly adapted – version, according to which a large arrow from Cappadocia and/or North Syria represents the Luwian hieroglyphic contribution, and small arrows from Egypt directly to Crete and from Egypt via Byblos to Crete represent the subsidiary Egyptian contribution (see Fig. 25).⁶⁴⁰

⁶³⁹ Van Binsbergen 1996-7: 134-42.

⁶⁴⁰ I am not going into the problem of the origins of Cretan Linear A, but, as we have seen, this certainly contains signs originating from Luwian hieroglyphic and from Egyptian hieroglyphic.




Fig. 25. Origins of the Cretan hieroglyphic script. (a) Luwian hieroglyphic (56 signs); (b) Egyptian hieroglyphic (14 signs).⁶⁴¹

1 Egypt; 2 Byblos; 3 Cyprus; 4 Asia Minor; 5 Crete; 6 mainland Greece

As to the linguistic context of the signs discussed above, this has been dealt with elsewhere as far as the discuss of Phaistos (# 333),⁶⁴² the double-axe from Arkalokhori (# 332), the altar-stone from Malia (# 328), the seals from Zyro (# 193, # 277), Malia (# 271), Neapolis (# 314),⁶⁴³ and Sitia (# 310),⁶⁴⁴ and the recurrent formulas are concerned. It therefore may suffice here, as an example of what the analysis of the signs may lead up to in the field of linguistics, to present an overview of seals recording the categories (1) “man’s name” (= MN) and (2) “title” or (1) “MN”, (2) “title”, and (3) “place or country name” (see table 8 and Fig. 26) – categories to be expected on seals in the light of the parallels: compare, for example, the Luwian hieroglyphic part of the Tarkondemos seal, bearing the legend *TARKU-tí+mi HANTAWAT mi+r(a)-á^{UTNA}* “Tarkondemos, king (of) the land Mira”,⁶⁴⁵ or that of the seal of Kuzitesup from Lidarhöyük, reading *ku-zi^l-TESUP-pa HANTAWAT ká+r-ka-mi-sà TAL-mi-tesup-pa HANTAWAT ká+r-ka-mi-sà (...) infans* “Kuzitesup, king of Karkamis,

⁶⁴¹ Diagram drawn by Wim van Binsbergen.

⁶⁴² Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 30-84; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 65-97; Woudhuizen 1992a: 11-41; Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004.

⁶⁴³ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 97-128.

⁶⁴⁴ Woudhuizen 2002a.

⁶⁴⁵ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 108-111; cf. Hawkins 2003: 144, Fig. 1a and Woudhuizen 2005: appendix I.

son of Talmitesup, king of Karkamis, (...)”.⁶⁴⁶

Most of the MNs are of Luwian type: *Muwas* (cf. Hittite *Muwatallis*),⁶⁴⁷ *Partarus* (= Lydian *Bartaraš*),⁶⁴⁸ *Nuwas* (cf. Cappadocian reduplicated *Nuwanuwas*),⁶⁴⁹ *Taparas* (= Lycian *Daparas*),⁶⁵⁰ *Tarkus*, *Tarkumuwas* (= Cilician *Tarkomōs*),⁶⁵¹ and possibly *Manas* (= Lydian *Manes*).⁶⁵² Next, one is of Kaskan type: *Pitaparas* (= Kaskan *Pittaparas*),⁶⁵³ whereas the first element of *Ankiwas* seems to recall that of Trojan *Ankhises*.⁶⁵⁴ Furthermore, under consideration of the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic [l] may also express [r], *Yatale* corresponds to Ugaritic *Ytr* as in *Bnytr* (*Bin-ia-ta-ri*), *Ytrhd* (*Yatar-addu*), *Ytršp* (*Ia-tar-rašap*), etc.⁶⁵⁵ Finally, under consideration of the aforesaid interchangeability of [l] with [r] and on the analogy of Luwian hieroglyphic *Mur<si>lis* and *Ḫa<tusi>lis*,⁶⁵⁶ *Manile* may⁶⁵⁷ be analyzed as an abridged form of Egyptian *Men<-kheper>-r’*.

Of the titles, *laparnas* (= Hittite *labarnas*)⁶⁵⁸, *PÁRA-custos* “viceroy” (cf. titles like Latin *pro-consul*), and *tupa<la>-* “scribe”⁶⁵⁹ are of Anatolian type. Next, *pini* corresponds to Semitic *bn* as in Ugaritic *bn Lky* “representative of the Lycians”.⁶⁶⁰ Finally, *bi’ty* or *pitī* or *piti* is

⁶⁴⁶ Hawkins 2000: 574-5; cf. Hawkins 2003, 144, Fig. 1c.

⁶⁴⁷ Hawkins 2003: 144, Fig. 1b.

⁶⁴⁸ Gusmani, 1964: 264, no. 40, 2; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126; Woudhuizen *forthc.* 2.

⁶⁴⁹ Laroche 1966, s.v.; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126.

⁶⁵⁰ Friedrich 1932: 55, TL 6, 1; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126.

⁶⁵¹ Houwink ten Cate 1961: 127.

⁶⁵² Gusmani 1964: 250, no. 1, 3; 252, no. 4a, 1 and no. 4b, 1; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126. I cannot resist the temptation to suggest that we may actually be dealing here with the Cretan royal name Minos; note in this connection that # 257 is the most beautiful seal, used by Evans for the cover of his book on the topic!

⁶⁵³ Von Schuler 1965: Indices, 2. Personennamen, s.v.

⁶⁵⁴ Homeros, *Iliad* II, 820, etc.

⁶⁵⁵ Gröndahl 1967, s.v. *ytr*.

⁶⁵⁶ Beran 1967: nos. 180 (*um+r<-si>-li*) and 186 (*ḫá<-tu-si>+li*).

⁶⁵⁷ Ranke 1935, s.v. *mn-ḫpr-r’*.

⁶⁵⁸ Friedrich 1991, s.v.; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 117-8.

⁶⁵⁹ Laroche 1960a: *326.

⁶⁶⁰ Gordon 1955: glossary, s.v.; Astour 1964: 194; Woudhuizen

identical to Egyptian *bi'ty* “king of Lower Egypt”,⁶⁶¹ so that *pinipiti* actually constitutes a Semito-Egyptian calque of Luwian hieroglyphic *infans* + *HANTAWAT*- “prince”.⁶⁶²

The geographic name *Saḥurwa* is attested in writing variant *Saḥarwa* for other Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions, and occurs, in adjectival derivative, in Linear B as *Sakarijo* or *Saqarejo*. It has been plausibly identified with Homeric *Skheria*, which in turn appears to be the ancient name of Hagia Triada in the western part of the Mesara.⁶⁶³ Next, the frequent *Tarunu* is, considering the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic [r] may also express [l] and, as we have just seen, vice versa, and on the analogy of *Titarma* being the Luwian hieroglyphic form of Hittite *Attarima*, likely to be read *Atlunu* – which resembles Plato’s mythical *Atlantis* too much to be dismissed as accidental. On the basis of the distribution of the seals with this geographic name, it probably refers to the northern zone of Crete from Knossos to Kato Zakro.⁶⁶⁴ Furthermore, *Ayalū*, which turns up in variant form *Ayalu* in Linear A, is for its association with Semitic *ajalu* “stag”, ingeniously explained by Best as the Semitic designation of modern Malia, otherwise indicated in Cretan hieroglyphic by a deer with prominent antlers or, as a *pars pro toto*, by the antlers themselves (028). As the deer or antlers render the value *ri*, an abbreviation of Linear B *Rukito* “Lyktos” lies at hand, which name is mentioned in the itinerary of Aegean place names from Amenhotep III’s (1390-1352 BC) temple tomb at Kom el-Hetan (Thebes) in between Amnisos and Sitia – i.e. exactly where we would expect⁶⁶⁵ the mention of the ancient name of Malia. Finally, for its striking resemblance to Homeric *Phaiakes*, the form *Payaki* is likely to be considered an ethnonym referring to the inhabitants of Skheria – the ancient name, as we have just suggested, of Hagia Triada.⁶⁶⁶

If for the sake of completeness we add that *anu* in the legend of seal # 255 is a Cretan dialectal variant of Luwian hieroglyphic *anan* “under”, characterized by *a/u*-vowel

1994: 512.

⁶⁶¹ Gardiner 1957: L 2; cf. Best 1996-7: 118-9; Woudhuizen 1997: 107.

⁶⁶² Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 123-4; Woudhuizen 1992b: 197-8; Woudhuizen 1997: 107; Woudhuizen 2001b: 611; cf. Laroche 1960a: *46.

⁶⁶³ Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 118; Woudhuizen 1992a: 32-3.

⁶⁶⁴ Woudhuizen 1992a: 78-9; Woudhuizen 2001b: 612-3.

⁶⁶⁵ Best 1996-7: 116; Woudhuizen 2002a: 126-7.

⁶⁶⁶ Best 2000: 29; see section 12 above.

shift,⁶⁶⁷ that *Taruni* in the same legend bears testimony of the dative singular in *-i* of *Tarunu* “Atlunu” as paralleled for Luwian hieroglyphic,⁶⁶⁸ that *yatanu* in the legend of seals # 257, # 312, and # 314 corresponds to Ugaritic *ytn* “he as given”,⁶⁶⁹ and that *pititi* in the legend of seal # 314 shows the dative singular in *-ti* as attested for Linear A (*telū Dakuseneti* “delivery to Taku-šenni”) and Cypro-Minoan (*telu Sanemeti* “delivery to Sanemas”),⁶⁷⁰ we arrive in sum at the following transliteration and interpretation of the legends of our 10 Minoan seals (cf. Fig. 26).

Remaining seals or sealings used in our discussion of the signs are # 003γ and # 139 from Knossos, which read *bi'ty ma₆-sa PIA* “the king has given to the god(s)”, with *masa* representing either D sg. in *-a* or D pl. in *-ai* of Luwian hieroglyphic *masa(na)*- “god”, # 196, presenting the personal name *sa-ná-ma*, and # 246 from Kritsa, which reads *pi-ti ḥi-a-wa₆* “king (of) Akhaia”, thus presenting⁶⁷¹ the earliest recorded reference to the Greek mainland.

⁶⁶⁷ Laroche 1960a: *57, 2; cf. *atu* “in”, corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic *ata*, and *upa* “behind”, corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic *apa*, from the text of the Phaistos disc, see Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 79-82.

⁶⁶⁸ See section 5, note 88 above.

⁶⁶⁹ Gordon 1955: 70; Segert 1984: 44; 74; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 127; Woudhuizen 2001b: 612. Note that this element is paralleled by the presence of “the hand that gives” *pia* (Laroche 1960a: *66) in the legends of Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic seals, see Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 135-6; Woudhuizen 2001b: 612; Woudhuizen 2004a: 119-20.


⁶⁷⁰ Woudhuizen 1992a: 96. The ending in *-ti* originates from the Luwian hieroglyphic dative singular of the pronoun, see Meriggi 1980: 322-3. For another instance of a Luwian hieroglyphic case ending in the legend of a Minoan seal, cf. the dative singular in *-i* mentioned above and the genitive singular in *-sa* as attested for # 193 from Zyro, reading *SASA magistratus TARKU-sa* “seal of the magistrate Tarkus” (Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 113-5, esp. note 88). These endings indicate that the legend of the seal in question, notwithstanding the use of Egyptianisms and Semitisms, is conducted in the Luwian language.

⁶⁷¹ Note that this legend strikingly recalls “to the gods of the Greeks” in inscriptions on pottery from the Hellenion at Naukratis dating from the Archaic period, see Boardman 1994: 142; cf. section 2 above.


	CHIC	MN	title	place/country
1.	# 253	<i>muwa</i>	<i>pi-ni-pi-ti</i>	
2.	# 255	<i>pi-ta₅-PÁRA</i>	<i>pi-tī</i>	<i>ta₅-rú-ni</i>
3.	# 257	<i>ma-ná?</i> (if the “snake” (Evans no. 84) may be identified with “coiling water” (Evans no. 115, CHIC 069))	<i>pi-tī</i>	<i>ta₅-ru-nú</i>
4.	# 258	<i>'ya-ta₆-le</i>	<i>pi-ni</i>	<i>ta₅-ru-nú</i>
5.	# 271	<i>TARKU-MUWA</i>	<i>la+PÁRANA</i>	<i>sâ-ḥur-wa₆</i>
6.	# 296	<i>PÁRA-tá-rú</i>	<i>pi-ni</i>	<i>pa₃-ya-ki</i>
7.	# 309	<i>a-na-ki-wa₆</i>	<i>pi-ti</i>	<i>ta₅-ru-nú</i>
8.	# 310	<i>'TARKU</i>	<i>bi'ty/pi-tī</i>	<i>a-ya-lū</i>
9.	# 312	<i>ma₆-ni-le</i>	<i>TUPA<LA></i>	<i>ta₅-ru-nú</i>
10.	# 314	<i>'tá-PÁRA pi-ni 'nú-wa</i>	<i>PÁRA-custos pi-ni<-pi>-ti</i>	<i>ta₅-ru-nú</i>

Table 8. Seals with the categories “man’s name”, “title”, and “place or country name”.

Seal no. Text (the numbers indicate the various sides of the seal)



1. *MUWA ya-ta₆<-nú>* 2. *pi-ni-* 3. *pi-ti* “prince Muwas has granted”




1. *a-nú SASA ta₅-rú-ni* 2. *pi-ta₅-PÁRA* 3. *pi-tī* “under the seal with respect to Atlunu, king Pittapasas”




1. *ma-ná ya-ta₆-nú* 2. *pi-tī* 3. *ta₅-ru-nú* “Manes has granted, king (of) Atlunu”


258



1



2



3

1. *'ya-ta₆-le* 2. *pi-ni* 3. *ta₅-ru-nú* "Yatar, representative (of) Atlunu"

271



1



2



3

1. *SASA UTNA* 2. *sà-ḫur-wa₆* 3. *la+PÁRANA TARKU-MUWA* "seal (with respect to) the land (of) Skheria (= Hagia Triada), king Tarkumuwas"

296



1



2



3



4

1. *SASA UTNA SARU* 2. *PÁRA-tá-rú* 3. *pi-ni* 4. *pa₃-ya-ki* "seal (with respect to) the land (and) official(s) (of) the Phaiakians, representative Bartaras"

309

1



2



3



4



1. *a-na-ki-wa₆* 2. *pi-ti ma* 3. *ta₅-ru-nú* 4. *ya-ta₆-nú* "Ankiwas, king (of) Atlunu, has granted"

1



2



310



3



4

1. *SASA UTNA le SARU* 2. *a-ya-lū* 3. *AMU 'TARKU sol* (3X) 4. *bi'ty/pi-tī* “seal (with respect to) the sun-blessed land (and) official(s) (of) Ayalu (= Malia), I (am) king Tarkus, (person) blessed by the sun-god”

1



2



312




3



4

1. *ma₆-ni-le* 2. *ma₆ TUPA<LA>* 3. *ta₅-ru-nú* 4. *ya-ta₆-nú* “Men<-kheper>-r’, scribe (of) Atlunu, has granted”

314



1. 'á-PÁRA 2. pi-ni 3. 'nú-wa 4. PÁRA-custos <pi>-ti- 5. pi-ni PÁRA-custos 6. ta₃-ru-nú 7. ya-ta₆-nú 8. pi-ti₃-tī
“Daparas, son of Nuwas, viceroy, prince, viceroy (of) Atlunu, has granted on behalf of the king”

Fig. 26. Cretan hieroglyphic seals with the categories “man’s name”, “title”, and “place or country name” (drawings from original publications, except in the case of # 309).

APPENDIX II: ON THE POSITION OF THE ETRUSCAN LANGUAGE

The following list of comparanda for the Etruscan language is based on Woudhuizen 1992b and Woudhuizen 1998 (with references to earlier literature), and supplemented by Steinbauer 1999 as discussed in Woudhuizen 2001a. For the comparisons with Greek and Latin I have made use of Charsekin 1963, especially 24-8, amplified, as far as Greek is concerned, by Schachermeyr 1929: 248, Fiesel 1931: 43; 51-2, and van der Meer 1992: 68. The meaning of the Etruscan words, elements and endings is in most instances secured by a comprehensive interpretation of the texts in which these appear.

	HITTITE	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary ⁶⁷²		
1.	<i>aku-, eku-</i> “to drink”	<i>acun-, ecun-</i>
2.	<i>ḫaštāi-</i> “bones”	<i>casḡia-</i>
3.	<i>ḫila-</i> “enclosure”	<i>cleva-</i>
4.	<i>Gulšeš</i> (divinities of fate)	<i>Culsans-</i>
5.	<i>gurta-</i> “citadel”	<i>Curtun-</i>
6.	<i>iya-</i> “to make”	<i>ia-</i>
7.	<i>-ma</i> “but, and”	<i>-m</i>
8.	<i>man</i> (optative particle)	<i>man</i>
9.	<i>maniyahḫ-</i> “to handle, administer”	<i>mena-, meni-</i>
10.	<i>neku-</i> “to diminish, become twilight”	<i>nace-, neḫ-</i>
11.	<i>newahḫ-</i> “to renew”	<i>nuca-</i> ⁶⁷³
12.	<i>nu-</i> (introductory particle)	<i>nu-</i>
13.	<i>parku-</i> “high”	<i>parḫi-</i>
14.	<i>purullia-</i> “new year’s feast”	<i>ril</i>
15.	<i>sannapi</i> “sporadic”	<i>snuiaφ</i>
16.	<i>walḫ-</i> “to strike, hit, smite”	<i>Velc-, Vely-</i>
17.	<i>weda-, wete-</i> “to build”	<i>vatie-</i>

⁶⁷² This category also includes onomastic material relevant to the subject, except for the subsections on the comparisons with Greek and Latin/Italic.

⁶⁷³ Note that the treatment of Hittite *-ḫḫ-* is not consistent in Etruscan, being omitted in *mena-, meni-* < Hittite *maniyahḫ-*, but represented by *-c-* in *nuca-* < Hittite *newahḫ-*.

	CUNEIFORM LUWIAN	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary		
18.	<i>ānna-</i> “under”	<i>ana, en-</i>
19.	<i>ānta-</i> “in”	<i>inte-</i>
20.	<i>āppan-</i> “behind; re-”	<i>apa, epn</i>
21.	<i>Aššiya-</i> “Assiya [GN]”	<i>Asi-</i>
22.	<i>awī-</i> “to come”	<i>av-, ev-, hev-</i>
23.	<i>-ḫa</i> “and; also”	<i>-c, -ḫ</i>
24.	<i>ḫandawat(i)-</i> “king”	<i>camḡi-, canḡ-</i>
25.	<i>ḫūḫḫa-</i> “grandfather”	<i>ceḫa-, ceḫi-</i>
26.	<i>ḫui(ya)-</i> “to run, march”	<i>cu(vu)-</i>
27.	<i>kattawatnalli-</i> “vindictive, revengeful”	<i>qutef-</i>
28.	<i>kui-</i> “who, what”	<i>-ḫva-</i>
29.	<i>maššani-</i> “god(dess)”	<i>masan-</i>
30.	<i>mawa-</i> “4”	<i>muva-</i>
31.	<i>nani-</i> “brother”	<i>Nana-</i>
32.	<i>niš</i> “not”	<i>nes, neš, nis</i>
33.	<i>-pa</i> “but, and”	<i>-pa</i>
34.	<i>parran, pari-</i> “before, pre-”	<i>per-</i>
35.	<i>pī(ya)-</i> “to give”	<i>p-</i>
36.	<i>sarlatta-</i> “libation-offering”	<i>sela-</i> (< * <i>serla-</i>)
37.	<i>samnai-, samniya-</i> “to found”	<i>hamai-, amei-</i>
38.	<i>Tarḫunt-</i> “Tarḫunt [GN]”	<i>Tarḫna-</i>
39.	<i>Tiwat-</i> “sun-god [GN]”	<i>tiur-</i>
40.	<i>dūp(a)i-</i> “to strike, hit”	<i>tupi</i>
41.	<i>tūwa-</i> “to place, put”	<i>tva-</i>
42.	<i>wa-</i> (introductory particle)	<i>va-, fa-</i>
43.	<i>walli(ya)-</i> “to elevate”	<i>fal(a)-</i>
44.	<i>walwa-</i> “lion”	<i>Velavešna-</i>
45.	<i>wanatt(i)-</i> “woman, mother”	<i>Uni-</i>
46.	<i>wini(ya)-</i> “vine, wine”	<i>vina-</i>
word formation		
47.	adjectival <i>-ašši-</i>	<i>-s-, -š-</i>
48.	adjectival <i>-alli-</i>	<i>-l-</i>
49.	ethnic <i>-wanni-</i>	<i>-ni-</i>
50.	factitive <i>-nu(wa)-</i>	<i>-nv-, -nu-</i>
51.	iterative <i>-š(š)-</i>	<i>-s-, -š-, -z-</i>

52.	“-ship” - <i>ḥi-</i>	- <i>c-</i> , - <i>χ-</i>
(pro)nominal declension & verbal conjugation		
53.	N(m/f) sg. - <i>š</i>	–, - <i>s</i> (gentilicium)
54.	A(m/f) sg. - <i>n</i>	–, - <i>n</i> (pronoun)
55.	D sg. - <i>i</i> , - <i>iya</i>	- <i>a</i> , - <i>i</i>
56.	Abl. sg. - <i>ti</i>	- <i>θ</i> , - <i>r(i)</i>
57.	N-A(n) pl. - <i>a</i>	- <i>a</i>
58.	3rd pers. sg. pres./fut. - <i>ti</i>	- <i>ḡ(i)</i>
59.	3rd pers. pl. pres./fut. - <i>nti</i>	- <i>nt</i>

	LUWIAN HIEROGLYPHIC	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary		
18.	<i>ANANNana</i> “under”	<i>ana</i> , <i>en-</i>
20.	<i>APana</i> “behind; re-”	<i>apa</i> , <i>epn</i>
60.	<i>àrma-</i> “altar”	<i>heram(v)-</i>
61.	<i>ARANu(wa)ta-</i> “Arnuwandas [MN]”	<i>Arn ḡ-</i>
62.	<i>ASA(NU)-</i> “to settle”	<i>heśn-</i>
21.	<i>ás(i)ṽ-</i> “to love”	<i>Asi-</i>
19.	<i>àⁿíá</i> “in”	<i>inte-</i>
22.	<i>áawa-</i> “to come”	<i>av-</i> , <i>ev-</i> , <i>hev-</i>
24.	<i>HANTAWAT-</i> “king”	<i>cam ḡi-</i> , <i>can ḡ-</i>
23.	- <i>ḥa(wa)</i> “and; also”	- <i>c</i> , - <i>χ</i>
25.	<i>HUḤAḥa-</i> “grandfather”	<i>ceḫa-</i>
63.	<i>HWA</i> “when; because”	- <i>cve</i>
28.	<i>HWA-</i> “who, what”	- <i>χva-</i>
26.	<i>HWÁ-</i> “to run, march”	<i>cu(vu)-</i>
64.	<i>HWAR</i> “when; because”	<i>cver</i>
65.	<i>īla-</i> “to (be) favor(ed)”	<i>ila-</i>
66.	<i>KATANA-</i> “bowl”	<i>qutum-</i> , <i>qutun-</i>
67.	<i>kutúpili-</i> “fire offering”	<i>Cauḥa-</i>
7.	- <i>ma</i> “but, and”	- <i>m</i>
68.	<i>maluwa-</i> “thank-offering”	<i>muluva-</i>
8.	<i>man</i> (optative particle)	<i>man</i>
29.	<i>MASANA-</i> “god(dess)”	<i>masan-</i>
30.	<i>MAUWA-</i> “4”	<i>muva-</i>
69.	* <i>mek-</i> “5”	<i>maḫ-</i>
70.	* <i>mek-</i> “numerous”	<i>meḫ-</i>
71.	<i>mi-</i> “my”	<i>mi-</i>
72.	<i>mukasa-</i> “Muksas [MN]”	<i>Muḫsie-</i>
31.	<i>nana-</i> “brother”	<i>Nana-</i>
32.	<i>na₄sa</i> “not”	<i>nes</i> , <i>neś</i> , <i>nis</i>
34.	<i>PÁRA</i> “before, pre-”	<i>per-</i>
33.	- <i>pa(wa)</i> “but, and; or”	- <i>pa</i>
35.	<i>PLA-</i> “to give”	<i>p-</i>

73.	<i>sa₃r-</i> “smoke offering”	<i>seril</i> (adjective) ⁶⁷⁴
36.	<i>SARLASa₃r₁lata₄-</i> “libation offering”	<i>sela-</i> (< * <i>serla-</i>)
74.	<i>SURA(R)sura/i-</i> “abundance”	<i>šuri-</i>
75.	<i>tàma-</i> “precinct”	<i>tmia-</i>
76.	<i>ta₄ma-</i> “to build”	<i>ḡamu-</i>
38.	<i>TARḤUNT-</i> “Tarḥunt [GN]”	<i>Tarḫna-</i>
77.	<i>TARḤUNT+UMINA-</i> “Tarḥuntassa [TN]”	<i>Tarḫumenaia-</i>
78.	<i>tàša-</i> “stele; grave”	<i>tesi-</i>
39.	<i>TIWATA-</i> “sun-god”	<i>tiur-</i>
79.	<i>tiwat/ra-</i> (onomastic element)	<i>Ḥefarie-</i>
40.	<i>tupi-</i> “to strike, hit”	<i>tupi</i>
41.	<i>TUWA-</i> “to place, put”	<i>tva-</i>
80.	<i>tuwa-</i> “2”	<i>ḡu-</i> , <i>tu-</i>
42.	<i>wa-</i> (introductory particle)	<i>va-</i> , <i>fá-</i>
43.	<i>wáliā-</i> “to elevate”	<i>fal(a)-</i>
44.	<i>WALWA</i> “lion”	<i>Velaveśna-</i>
45.	<i>WANATinati₄-</i> “mother; woman”	<i>Uni-</i>
81.	<i>warā-</i> “to help”	<i>vēr-</i> ⁶⁷⁵
82.	<i>wasas₃r(i)ti</i> “by the grace of”	<i>user</i>
83.	<i>WATA-</i> “water”	<i>utu-</i>
46.	<i>WLANAwaāna-</i> “vine”	<i>vina-</i>
word formation		
47.	adjectival - <i>sa-</i>	- <i>s-</i> , - <i>ś-</i>
48.	adjectival - <i>ali-</i>	- <i>l-</i>
49.	ethnic - <i>wana-</i>	- <i>ni-</i>
50.	factitive - <i>nu(wa)-</i>	- <i>nv-</i> , - <i>nu-</i>
51.	iterative - <i>s-</i>	- <i>s-</i> , - <i>ś-</i> , - <i>z-</i>
52.	“-ship” - <i>ḥi-</i>	- <i>c-</i> , - <i>χ-</i>
(pro)nominal declension & verbal conjugation		
53.	N(m/f) sg. - <i>sa</i>	–, - <i>s</i> (gentilicium)
54.	A(m/f) sg. - <i>na</i>	–, - <i>n</i> (pronoun)
55.	D sg. - <i>ā</i> , - <i>i</i>	- <i>a</i> , - <i>i</i>
84.	G sg. - <i>sa</i>	- <i>s</i> (D-G)
56.	Abl. sg. - <i>ti</i> , - <i>ri</i>	- <i>ḡ</i> , - <i>r(i)</i>
85.	N(m/f) pl. - <i>i</i>	- <i>i</i>
57.	N-A(n) pl. - <i>a</i>	- <i>a</i>

⁶⁷⁴ Not yet in Woudhuizen 1998.

⁶⁷⁵ Agostiniani & Nicosia 2000: 54 (= Tabula Cortonensis, section II).

86.	D pl. <i>-āi</i>	<i>-e</i> (< * <i>-ai</i> [D-G])
58.	3rd pers. sg. pres./fut. <i>-ti</i>	<i>-θ(i)</i>
59.	3rd pers. pl. pres./fut. <i>-ⁿti</i>	<i>-nt</i>
	LYCIAN/SIDETIC	ETRUSCAN
Vocabulary		
20.	<i>epñ</i> “behind; re-”	<i>apa, epn</i>
18.	<i>e,ne₁</i> “under”	<i>ana, en-</i>
87.	<i>ese</i> “with”	<i>s-</i>
88.	<i>e,tri-</i> “lower, inferior”	<i>etera-</i>
37.	<i>hm₁me-, m₁mai-, m₁mei(ye)-</i> “to found”	<i>hamai-, amei-</i>
60.	<i>hrm₁ma-</i> “altar”	<i>heram(v)-</i>
6.	<i>iye-</i> “to make”	<i>ia-</i>
23.	<i>-ke</i> “and; also”	<i>-c, -χ</i>
68.	<i>malvam₁a-</i> “thank-offering”	<i>muluva-</i>
89.	<i>me-</i> (introductory particle)	<i>me-</i>
71.	<i>m₁i</i> “me”	<i>mi-</i>
31.	<i>neni-</i> “brother”	<i>Nana-</i>
32.	<i>ni</i> “not”	<i>nes, neś, nis</i>
19.	<i>ñte</i> “in”	<i>inte-</i>
35.	<i>piye-</i> “to give”	<i>p-</i>
3.	<i>qla-</i> “precinct”	<i>cleva-</i>
28.	<i>ti-</i> “who, what”	<i>-χva-</i>
90.	<i>tibe(i)</i> “or”	<i>tev<i></i>
91.	<i>tlli-</i> “to pay”	<i>tle-</i>
40.	<i>tub(e)i-</i> “to strike, hit”	<i>tupi</i>
word formation		
47.	adjectival <i>-hi-</i>	<i>-s-, -ś-</i>
48.	adjectival <i>-li-</i>	<i>-l-</i>
49.	ethnic <i>-(v)ñni-</i>	<i>-ni-</i>
92.	ethnic <i>-zi-</i>	<i>-ś-, -z-</i>
93.	ethnic <i>-de-</i>	<i>-ǵe-, -te-</i>
(pro)nominal declension & verbal conjugation		
53.	N(m/f) sg. <i>- , -s</i>	<i>- , -s</i> (gentilicium)
54.	A(m/f) sg. <i>- , -ñ</i>	<i>- , -n</i> (pronoun)
55.	D sg. <i>-a, -i</i>	<i>-a, -i</i>
84.	G sg. <i>-h</i>	<i>-s</i> (D-G)
56.	Abl. sg. <i>-di, -de</i>	<i>-ǵ -r(i)</i>
85.	N(m/f) pl. <i>-i</i>	<i>-i</i>
94.	A(m/f) pl. <i>-as, -is</i>	<i>-es, -is</i>
57.	N-A(n) <i>-ā, -e₁</i>	<i>-a</i>
86.	D pl. <i>-a, -e</i> (< * <i>-ai</i>)	<i>-e</i> (< * <i>-ai</i> [D-G])
95.	G pl. <i>-āi, -e₁</i>	<i>-ai</i>
58.	3rd pers. sg. pres./fut. <i>-ti, -di</i>	<i>-ǵ(i)</i>

59.	3rd pers. pl. pres./fut. <i>-ñti</i>	<i>-nt</i>
	LYDIAN	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary		
21.	<i>Asi₁i-</i> “Asia [GN]”	<i>Asi-</i>
96.	<i>Baki-</i> “Bakkhos [GN]”	<i>Paχie-</i>
14.	<i>borl-, forl-</i> “year”	<i>ril</i>
35.	<i>bi-</i> “to give”	<i>p-</i>
71.	<i>emi₁</i> “me”	<i>mi</i>
42.	<i>fa-</i> (introductory particle)	<i>va-, fa-</i>
97.	<i>isl-</i> “first”	<i>esl-, sal, zal</i>
23.	<i>-k</i> “and; also”	<i>-c, -χ</i>
24.	<i>Kandaules</i> “Kandaules [MN]”	<i>camθi-, canθ-</i>
7.	<i>-m</i> “but, and”	<i>-m</i>
68.	<i>ml₁ve₁nd-</i> “thank-offering”	<i>muluva-</i>
98.	<i>nak</i> (introductory particle)	<i>nac</i>
31.	<i>Nanna-</i> “Nanas [MN]”	<i>Nana-</i>
32.	<i>ni</i> “not”	<i>nes, neś, nis</i>
99.	<i>palmu-</i> “king”	<i>(toga) palmata</i> (Lat.)
28.	<i>pe-, pi-</i> “who, what”	<i>-χva-</i>
100.	<i>silu-</i> (magistracy)	<i>zila-</i>
75.	<i>tam-</i> “precinct”	<i>tmia-</i>
78.	<i>taše-</i> “stele; grave”	<i>tesi-</i>
79.	<i>Tivadali-</i> “Tivdalis [MN]”	<i>Θefarie-</i>
41.	<i>t₁uv(e)-</i> “to place, put”	<i>tva-</i>
40.	<i>ut₁ba-</i> “to strike, hit”	<i>tupi</i>
17.	<i>vit₁i₁-</i> “to build”	<i>vatie-</i>
word formation		
47.	adjectival <i>-si-</i>	<i>-s-, -ś-</i>
48.	adjectival <i>-li-</i>	<i>-l-</i>
101.	ethnic <i>-k</i>	<i>-χ</i>
52.	“-ship” <i>-k-</i>	<i>-c-, -χ-</i>
(pro)nominal declension & verbal conjugation		
53.	N(m/f) sg. <i>-s</i>	<i>- , -s</i> (gentilicium)
54.	A(m/f) sg. <i>-n</i>	<i>- , -n</i> (pronoun)
102.	D sg. <i>-l₁</i>	<i>-l</i> (D-G)
103.	G sg. <i>-l</i>	<i>-l</i> (D-G)
56.	Abl. sg. <i>-di₁, -d, -l₁</i>	<i>-ǵ, -r(i)</i>
85.	N(m/f) pl. <i>-i₁</i>	<i>-i</i>
57.	N-A(n) pl. <i>-a</i>	<i>-a</i>
86.	D pl. <i>-ai₁</i>	<i>-e</i> (< * <i>-ai</i> [D-G])
95.	G pl. <i>-ai₁</i>	<i>-ai</i>
58.	3rd pers. sg. pres./fut. <i>-d</i>	<i>-ǵ(i)</i>

59.	3rd pers. pl. pres./fut. -nt	-nt
-----	------------------------------	-----

	LEMNIAN	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary		
104.	<i>avi-</i> “year”	<i>avil-</i>
23.	-c “and”	-c, -χ
41.	<i>θo-</i> “to place, put”	<i>tva-</i>
7.	-m “but, and”	-m
69.	<i>mara-</i> “5”	<i>maχ-</i>
105.	<i>ναφο θ-</i> “grandson”	<i>neft-</i>
106.	<i>sia-</i> “6”	<i>śa-, śe-</i>
107.	<i>tavarśio, toveronarom</i> (magistracy)	<i>tevera θ</i>
108.	<i>vanaca-</i> “king”	<i>vanec-</i>
word formation		
47.	adjectival - <i>si-</i> , - <i>śi-</i>	-s-, -ś-
109.	- <i>lχvei-</i> (multiples of ten)	- <i>lχl-</i>
(pro)nominal declension & verbal conjugation		
55.	D sg. - <i>i</i>	-a, - <i>i</i>
84.	(D-)G sg. - <i>ś</i>	-s
102-103.	D-G sg. - <i>l</i>	-l
110.	Loc. sg. - <i>θ</i>	- <i>θ(i)</i>
85.	N(m/f) pl. - <i>i</i>	- <i>i</i>
86.	D pl. - <i>ai</i>	-e (< *-ai [D-G])
111.	3rd pers. sg. past tense - <i>ke</i>	-ce, - <i>χe</i>

	GREEK	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary		
104.	<i>a(v)elios</i> “sun”	<i>avil-</i> “year” ⁶⁷⁶
112.	<i>hals</i> , (G <i>halos</i>) “salt, sea”	<i>als-</i>
113.	<i>askos</i> “wineskin”	<i>aska</i> (vase name)
114.	<i>Aphrios</i> (month name)	<i>apiras-</i>
96.	<i>Bakkhos</i> “Bakkhos”	<i>Paxie-</i>
115.	<i>brontē</i> “roar, thunder”	<i>fronta</i> ⁶⁷⁷
116.	<i>deinos</i> “round vessel”	<i>θina</i> (vase name)
76.	<i>demō</i> “to built”	<i>θam (u)-</i>
117.	<i>dōreō</i> “to give”	<i>tur(u)-</i>
118.	<i>hekatombē</i> “sacrifice of hundred oxen”	<i>χim θm-</i>
119.	<i>elai(v)ā</i> “olive”	<i>eleiva-</i>

120.	<i>emmenai</i> “to be” (Aeolic)	<i>am-</i>
121.	<i>epiouro</i> s “guardian, watcher, ward”	<i>epiur-, epru-</i> ⁶⁷⁸
108.	(v) <i>anaks</i> “king”	<i>vanec-</i>
122.	<i>themeros</i> “holy”	<i>tameresc-</i> “holy gift”
123.	<i>themis</i> “law, custom, right”	<i>θemi-</i>
124.	<i>klōn</i> “twig, spray, slip”	<i>clan</i> “son”
125.	<i>kulikhnē</i> “small cup”	<i>culiχna, χuliχna</i> (vase name)
66.	<i>kōthōn</i> “drinking vessel”	<i>qutum</i> (vase name)
126.	<i>la(v)os</i> “host, people”	<i>lavt-</i> “freedman”
127.	<i>le(v)ōn</i> “lion”	<i>lev</i>
128.	<i>lēkuthos</i> “oil-flask”	<i>leχtumusa</i> (vase name)
129.	<i>brotos</i> (< * <i>mrtos</i>) “mortal”	<i>mur-</i> “to die”
10.	<i>nekus</i> “corps”	<i>nace-, neχ-</i> “diminishing”
105.	<i>nepous</i> , pl. <i>nepodes</i> “children”	<i>neft-</i> “grandson”
130.	<i>nēdus</i> “stomach, belly, womb”	<i>ne θ-, net-, ni θu-</i> “entrails”
131.	<i>opuiō</i> “to marry, take to wife”	<i>puia-</i> “wife”
132.	<i>polos</i> “pole-(star)”	<i>pulum-</i> “star(s)”
133.	<i>prokhous</i> “vessel for pouring out”	<i>pruχum</i> (vase name)
134.	<i>prutanis</i> “ruler, lord”	<i>pru θ-, pur θ-</i>
135.	<i>spondeion</i> “cup for pouring a drink-offering”	<i>spanti</i> “libation bowl, plate”
136.	<i>tauros</i> “bull”	<i>θevru</i>
137.	<i>tris</i> “thrice”	<i>trais-</i>
138.	<i>turannos</i> “tyrant”	<i>turan</i> (divine form of address) ⁶⁷⁹
139.	<i>hupnos</i> “sleep, slumber”	<i>hupnina</i> “tomb”
140.	<i>Huttēnia</i> (= <i>Tetrapolis</i>)	<i>huθ, hut</i> “4”
141.	<i>kharistērion</i> “thank-offering”	<i>χarste[r]iun</i>
142.	<i>khoros</i> “dance”	<i>χurvar</i> “month of the dances”
143.	<i>pharthenos</i> “girl, virgin” (Aeolic)	<i>far θna-</i>

⁶⁷⁶ Maresch 1957, who further points out that related words for “sun”, like Latin *sol*, are also used for “year”.

⁶⁷⁷ Note the preservation of the Greek [o] in the Etruscan form.

⁶⁷⁸ Correspondence used by Agostiniani & Nicosia 2000: 105 without due reference to the original source Charsekin 1963.

⁶⁷⁹ Possibly related with Luwian hieroglyphic *tarwana-* “law-giver”.

verbal conjugation		
111.	3rd pers. sg. perfect (or aorist) <i>-ke</i>	<i>-ce, -χe</i>

	LATIN/ITALIC	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary		
144.	<i>cipio</i> “to take (away)”	<i>capi-</i>
145.	<i>esuna-</i> “offering”	<i>aisna-</i>
146.	<i>idus</i> (middle of the month)	<i>etul-</i>
147.	<i>kletram</i> “bier”	<i>cletram</i>
127.	<i>leo</i> “lion”	<i>lev</i>
148.	<i>lustrum</i> “lustrum”	<i>lursϑ-</i>
149.	<i>magister</i> (magistracy)	<i>macstrev-</i>
150.	<i>maro-</i> (magistracy)	<i>maru-</i>
151.	<i>mundus</i> “bothros”	<i>munϑ-</i>
129.	<i>morior</i> “to die”	<i>mur-</i>
152.	<i>munus</i> “offering, tribute, duty”	<i>munist-</i>
105.	<i>nepos</i> “grandson”	<i>neft-</i>
153.	<i>patina</i> “plate”	<i>paϑna-</i>
154.	<i>pro-nepos</i> “great-grandson”	<i>prumt-</i>
155.	<i>ritus</i> “rite”	<i>rita-, riϑ(a)-</i>
135.	<i>spondeum</i> “cup for pouring a drink-offering”	<i>spanti</i> “libation bowl, plate”
156.	<i>subulu</i> “fluteplayer”	<i>suplu</i>
157.	<i>suus</i> (reflexive pronoun, 3rd pers.)	<i>sva-</i>
158.	<i>teneo</i> “to hold (a magistracy)”	<i>ϑen(u)-, ten(u)-</i>
159.	<i>touto-, tuta-</i> “people”	<i>ϑuta-, tuϑ-</i>
46.	<i>vinum</i> “wine”	<i>vina-</i>

The salient points from this list are the following:

- (1) Correspondences of Etruscan with Hittite have a bearing on vocabulary alone: hence Etruscan is not to be identified with Hittite, as Vladimir Georgiev wants to have it.
- (2) Considering the fact that the correspondences of Etruscan with Luwian hieroglyphic outmatch all other categories, Etruscan shows the closest affinity with Luwian hieroglyphic. Note especially that the shared use of the endings of the N(m/f) pl. in *-i* and D pl. in *-ai* exclude a particularly close relationship with cuneiform Luwian, which is characterized by N(m/f) pl. *-nzi* and D pl. *-nza*. Yet another feature which stresses the relationship of Etruscan with Luwian hieroglyphic is the phe-

verbal conjugation		
160.	3rd pers. pl. passive pres. <i>-ntur</i>	<i>-n(a)ϑur</i> (now also Agostiniani & Nicolsia 2000: 54 (= Tabula Cortonensis, section III))
161.	infinitive passive <i>-ri</i>	<i>-ri</i>

	PHOENICIAN/HEBREW	ETRUSCAN
vocabulary		
162.	<i>Asherah</i>	<i>Aisera</i> (note that this of old inherited form of the Phoenician divine name <i>Astarte</i> needs to be distinguished from <i>Astre-</i> in the inscriptions on the Pyrgi gold tablets, which is an <i>ad hoc</i> attempt to render <i>štrt</i> in the Phoenician version of the text)
142.	<i>krr</i> “month of the dances”	<i>χurvar, χurve, χuru</i>
163.	<i>mlh</i> “beautiful”	<i>mlax</i> (G <i>mlakas</i>)
164.	<i>slt-</i> “power”	<i>seleita-</i> “sultanate”

Etruscan with Luwian hieroglyphic is the phenomenon of rhotacism of the dental, as attested for the onomastic element *tiwat/ra-* and the ending of the Abl. sg. *-t/ri*.

- (3) Nevertheless, Etruscan is not to be identified as a dialect of Luwian hieroglyphic, as it shares the loss of the N(m/f) sg. *-s* and A(m/f) sg. *-n* in the realm of the noun with Lycian, which also provides comparative evidence for the A(m/f) pl. in *-es* or *-is*. To this comes that Etruscan shows some evidence of the typical Lycian phonetic development [s] > [h] in the case of the verb *hamai/amei-* “to found” < cuneiform Luwian *samnai-*. Another deviation from the Luwian hieroglyphic

pattern is formed by the G pl. in *-ai*, which Etruscan shares with Lycian and Lydian. Finally, Etruscan has in common with Lydian the use of the D-G sg. in *-l* and the dropping of the final vowel with respect to the endings of the Abl. sg. and the 3rd person sg. and pl. of the present/future tense. Obviously, this leads us to the conclusion that Etruscan is a Luwian dialect *sui generis*.

- (4) About the time that Etruscan separated from the related Luwian dialects it is relevant to note that, considering the form of the relative being *-χva-*, it has not participated in the labiovelar development which characterizes Lycian *ti-* and Lydian *pe-* or *pi-*. On the other hand, we have seen that Etruscan shows some evidence of the typical Lycian phonetic development [s] > [h]. Hence, the separation likely dates to after the 8th century BC, when Luwian hieroglyphic dies out, and before the first evidence of Lycian and Lydian in the late 7th century BC.
- (5) The large amount of correspondences with Greek, which cannot be explained in an Italian context, indicate an Aegean location of Etruscan when still in the Anatolian motherland. On the basis of the Aiolisms, this location may perhaps even be fine-tuned as in the neighborhood of Aiolia. Note that the influence of Greek on Etruscan, in view of the origin of the ending of the 3rd person sg. of the past tense in *-ce* or *-χe* from the Greek kappa-perfect (or -aorist), amounted to the level of code-mixing.⁶⁸⁰
- (6) The correspondences with Italic and Latin are easily explained by the Italian context of Etruscan from the 7th century BC onwards. Note that, in view of the 3rd person pl. of the passive of the present tense in *-n(a)ḡur* and the passive infinitive *-ri*, the interaction with the Italic also amounted to the level of code-mixing.
- (7) The correspondences with Phoenician indicate a direct contact of Etruscans with Phoenicians.

⁶⁸⁰ Adams, Janse & Swain 2002.

APPENDIX III: A LUWIAN TRIFUNCTIONAL DIVINE TRIAD RECORDED FOR CRETE

The Egyptian hieroglyphic text of a medical papyrus, probably stemming from the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC), preserves a magical spell against the Asiatic pox in the language of the Keftiu. In transliteration, this text reads:

sn̄tik3pwp̄y3yiȳm 'ntirk3k3r,

or, in the vocalized transliteration as adopted by Wolfgang Helck:

sa-n-ta-ka-pu-pi-wa-ya-'a-ya-ma-n-ta-ra-kú-ka-ra.

As argued at length in my contribution on the topic from 1992 (with references), the formula can be subdivided into six individual entities, four of which render three divine names in sum, viz. *Santas*, *Kupapa*, and *Tarku Kara*, and the remaining two of which consist of vocabulary words, viz. *waya* (*w3y*) and *'ayaman* (*iȳm'n*).⁶⁸¹ The three divine names are all of Luwian background,⁶⁸²

⁶⁸¹ Woudhuizen 1992a: 1-10; according to the expert Egyptologist J.F. Borghouts, the sign Gardiner 1994: N 31 “road” does not render a phonetic value in the present context.

⁶⁸² For Luwian hieroglyphic, see Savaş 1998: 41-2 (*Santas*); 17-29 (*Kupapa*); 47-63 (*Tarḫunt*); note that *Tarḫu(nt)* is represented as *Trqqñt-* or *Trqqas* in Lycian inscriptions, see Melchert 1993, s.v., and as Zeus *Targuēnos* in Lydia, see Woudhuizen 1990: 101; *Santas* and *Kupapa* are recorded in form of *Šānt-as* and *Kufad* in Lydian no. 4, see Gusmani 1964. Related onomastic elements of these three divine names together are attested for the archives of Tell Atchana/Alalakh (Goetze 1954: 74, 78; Laroche 1960b: 116) and Ras Shamra/Ugarit (Gordon 1965: glossary nos. 1186, 1777, 2607 and 2609) in North Syria (cf. Strange 1980: 132), i.e. precisely the region from where Luwian hieroglyphic disseminates in the beginning of the second millennium BC (Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 108-20; 128-37). At Karkamis in this very same region also a divine triad is venerated, this time consisting of *Tarḫu(nt)* (or its Hurritic equivalent *Tešup* or its Semitic counterpart *Adad*), *Kupapa* and the stag-god *Karḫuḫas*, see Laroche 1960b: 120; this latter divine triad is mentioned together in, amongst others, a Luwian hieroglyphic inscription on a stone bowl dedicated by the Phrygian king Midas and hence dating to the late 8th century BC, which was transported as a spolia from Karkamis to Babylon, see Hawkins 2000: 394-6 and Woudhuizen 2004b: 105-6 (= Babylon 2).

whereas the vocabulary words, in conformity with the situation in Cretan Linear A, are Semitic, *waya* corresponding to *wy* “and” as recorded for a Phoenician inscription from Cyprus and *'ayaman* to *'immanu* “with us” as in Biblical *'immanu'el* “with us god”, so that in its entirety the translation of the formula runs as follows: “*Santas*, *Kupapa*, and with us Carian *Tarḫu(nt)*”.

Of the three gods in question, *Tarḫu(nt)* is the storm- or weather-god, often depicted with the symbol of lightning in his hand. Next, *Kupapa*, who is likely to be identified with the Phrygian *Magna Mater*, *Kybele*, no doubt likewise represents agricultural richness and procreation. Finally, there is some evidence to consider *Santas* as a war-god, because (1) he is depicted armed with a bow, (2) in his capacity as chief god of Tarsus during the Classical period he is identified with the Greek war-hero *par excellence*, *Herakles*, and (3) in a Hittite text he is staged as dressed in bloodred cloths – red being the color of the warrior class.⁶⁸³ At this point, one cannot help to be reminded of Georges Dumézil’s epoch-making thesis of a trifunctional ideology of the Indo-Europeans, *Tarḫu(nt)* representing royal sovereignty (= F1), *Santas* standing as a protagonist for the class of warriors (= F2), and *Kupapa* acting as protectress of the class of agricultural producers (= F3). At any rate, the parallels from the pantheon of other Indo-European peoples like the Romans, the Indians, and the Germans for trifunctional divine triads are conspicuous:⁶⁸⁴

⁶⁸³ Melchert 2002: 241-2; Kammenhuber 1940: 193; cf. Dumézil 1958: 26.

⁶⁸⁴ Dumézil 1958: 48 f. (Roman); 34 (Indic); 58 (Germanic); according to Littleton 1973: 12 the Germanic evidence should rather be analysed as follows: F1 Othinn, F2 Thōrr, and F3 Freyr.

	LUWIAN	ROMAN	INDIC	GERMANIC
F1	Tarku Kara	Jupiter	Mitra-Varuna	Thor
F2	Santas	Mars	Indra	Wodan
F3	Kupapa	Quirinus	Nasatya-Aśvin	Freyr

Table 9. Trifunctional divine triads among various Indo-European speaking groups.

Now, the present Luwian divine triad is not the only evidence for trifunctionalism in Crete. Recently, Chris Lynn and Dean Miller argued that the cup with a man with a staff (= F1), the rhyton with a depiction of boxers and other sports (= F2), and the vase with a procession of farmers (= F3) from one and the same Late Minoan IB context at Hagia Triada present yet another instance of this typical Indo-European ideology.⁶⁸⁵ Contrary to the opinion of the latter authors, however, I would not attribute this example of trifunctionalism to the Mycenaean Greeks, who only gained possession of the island of Crete after the disastrous Santorini eruption at the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC), but to the Luwian population groups which presumably arrived with the Indo-European incursions in the east-Mediterranean region at the end of the Early Bronze Age II, c. 2300 BC.⁶⁸⁶

According to the late Edgar Polomé, there is no evidence of trifunctionalism among the Indo-European population groups of Anatolia, which would underline their aberrant position in the field of linguistics as exemplified by the unique preservation of a reflex of laryngeal [h₂].⁶⁸⁷ As shown in the above, however, this evidence is blatantly provided by the most southernly fringe of the Luwians, i.e. those inhabiting the island of Crete. Such a conclusion coincides markedly with the straightforwardly Indo-European nature of the Luwian language as attested for the hieroglyphic monuments, which, apart from some individual developments like the loss of the voiced velars, is particularly related to the conservative group among the Indo-European languages consisting, next to the other IE Anato-

lian languages Hittite and Palaic, of Celtic, Italic, and Tocharian.⁶⁸⁸ Hence, the preservation of a reflex of laryngeal [h₂] in IE Anatolian may safely be ascribed to the influence of the indigenous Anatolian languages like Hattic and Hurritic on that of the Indo-European intruders. No need, therefore, to saddle the Indo-Europeans of Anatolia up with 1700 years of fictitious history, as Robert Drews, in the wake of the linguists Thomas Gamkrelidze & Valerian Ivanov, does in his *Greater Anatolia!*⁶⁸⁹

⁶⁸⁵ Lynn & Miller 1999.

⁶⁸⁶ Mellaart 1971; Gimbutas 1973; Best 1981: 8-9; see section 3 above.

⁶⁸⁷ Polomé 1982b: 169 "(...) nothing reminds us of the trifunctional pattern in the traditions of the Luwians, Hittites, and other Indo-Europeans of the Old Kingdom, (...)". An exception to this statement is formed by the trifunctional colors (F1 white, F2 red, and F3 blue) enumerated in a Hittite ritual, see Littleton 1973: 95 and cf. note 683 above.

⁶⁸⁸ Woudhuizen 2004a: section 9.

⁶⁸⁹ Drews 2001.

APPENDIX IV: PELASGIAN DEMETER AND ZEUS

The earliest attestation of the divine name Demeter is on a stone laddle inscribed with the Linear A legend *da-ma-te* from a peak-sanctuary at Kythera, dated to the transition from Middle Minoan III to Late Minoan I, c. 1600 BC.⁶⁹⁰ According to Herodotos, the cult of Demeter originated from Egypt, and the rites were taught by the daughters of Danaos to Pelasgian women.⁶⁹¹ As the arrival in Greece of Danaos with his daughters from Egypt can be situated in the period of the shaft-graves at Mycenae c. 1600 BC, this tallies well with the afore-mentioned date of the earliest epigraphical evidence for the divine name Demeter. In the variant of the myth by Pausanias, however, Demeter is welcomed in his home by Pelasgos, the mythical ancestor of the Pelasgians who ruled the Argolid before the arrival of Danaos and his daughters and thus brings us back to sometime in the Middle Bronze Age.⁶⁹²

The name Demeter or Damater is variously analyzed by linguists, but all agree that the second element consists of a reflex of PIE **méh₂tēr* “mother”.⁶⁹³ Generally, this is taken for evidence of the Greek language, but the interpretation of Linear B *ma-ka* as *Ma Ga* “Mother Earth” militates against a Greek solution along the line of *da-* in *Damater* being a reflex of Greek *ga* or *gē* “earth”.⁶⁹⁴ To this comes that the Phrygian language, which, as we have seen in section 7 above, was presumably spoken by pre-Greek population groups of mainland Greece, is likewise characterized by a reflex of PIE **méh₂tēr* as exemplified by the Old Phrygian expression *matar Kubileya* or *matar Kubeleya* “mother Kybele”.⁶⁹⁵ Hence, the divine name *Demeter* may well date back to the time before the Greek language came into being and be of Pelasgian origin as Pausanias’ version of the myth suggests.⁶⁹⁶

⁶⁹⁰ Sakellarakis & Olivier 1994 (= KY Za 2); Duhoux 1994-5: 290-1; Suter 2002: 164.

⁶⁹¹ *Histories* II, 171.

⁶⁹² *Guide to Greece* 1, 14, 2.

⁶⁹³ Suter 2002: 160-1.

⁶⁹⁴ Aravantinos, Godart & Sacconi 2001: 184; 358; cf. Duhoux 1994-5: 290.

⁶⁹⁵ Brixhe & Lejeune 1984: W-04; B-01.

⁶⁹⁶ Cf. Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* 2, 22, 1: *Dēmētēr Pelasgis*

Another deity attributed with a Pelasgian origin is Zeus. Thus already in Homeros’ *Iliad*, which, as we have seen in section 2 above, basically reflects Late Bronze Age history, Zeus of Dodona – at that time still the one near Skotussa in Thessaly – is referred to by Akhilleus in a prayer as “Pelasgian” (*Zeu Dōdōnaie Pelasgique*).⁶⁹⁷ Now, the linguistic analysis of the divine name Zeus is undisputed, all specialists tracing it back to the PIE root **Dyēws* for the sky-god.⁶⁹⁸ If, then, Zeus’ mythical Pelasgian origin applies, we are confronted with a second pre-Greek divine name based on a PIE root.

The Pelasgian nature of Demeter and Zeus may well account for their incorporation in the Lydian pantheon as *Lametru-* and *Levś* or *Lefś*, respectively.⁶⁹⁹ As we have seen in section 12 above, namely, Pelasgians were living in the region of Larisa Phrikonis at the time of the Trojan war and for this reason may be assumed to have been in close contact with the ancestors of the historical Lydians, in which process they evidently radiated their cult of Demeter and Zeus.

The identification of Demeter and Zeus as Pelasgian gods does not exclude their ultimate Cretan origin as suggested by the Homeric hymn to Demeter⁷⁰⁰ and Hesiodos’ *Theogony*,⁷⁰¹ which squares with the earliest attestation of Demeter in a Linear A inscription from a Minoan peak-sanctuary at Kythera, and the myth of Zeus being born in the cave of Dikte.⁷⁰² as we have already noted with respect to Demeter, the cult of these gods may have radiated to the Greek mainland already in Middle Helladic times! From a

“Pelasgian Demeter”.

⁶⁹⁷ Homeros, *Iliad* XVI, 233; cf. Strabo, *Geography* V, 2, 4.

⁶⁹⁸ Sihler 1995: 58; cf. Beekes 1990: 96.

⁶⁹⁹ Gusmani 1964, s.v.

⁷⁰⁰ Homeric Hymn to Demeter 123; cf. Nilsson 1927: 506.

⁷⁰¹ *Theogony* 969-74, with *Iasiōn* as parhedros; for the Minyan nature of the root of the latter name, cf. the royal names *Iasos* as attested for Orkhomenos and *Iason* as reported for Iolkos, on which see Sakellariou 1977: 116-7.

⁷⁰² Apollonios of Rhodes, *Argonautika* I, 605-6; for the association of his birth with mount Ida, see *ibid.*, II, 1559-61; cf. Nilsson 1927: 393-4. Note in this connection that in Homeros’ *Iliad* Zeus is frequently associated with the Trojan mount Ida.

linguistic point of view, however, the names Demeter and Zeus should be assigned to a Pelasgian layer or group in Cretan society.

Additional note 1: Linear A *I-DA-MA-TE*

Two double-axes, one of gold and the other of silver, from the cave of Arkalokhori are inscribed with the Linear A legend L 100a-30-95-92, reading, with the values of their Linear B counterparts, *i-da-ma-te*.⁷⁰³ This legend has received various interpretations by the different authors. In the first place, the excavator of the find, Nikolaos Boufidis, suggested to consider it as the equivalent of Greek *Ida hē matēr* “The Idaian Mother”.⁷⁰⁴ Secondly, the editor princeps of the inscription on the gold axe, Maurice Pope, took it for a variant of the pre-Greek divine name *Dēmētēr* characterized by an enigmatic prefix *i-*.⁷⁰⁵ Thirdly, Franco Crevatin explained the second part of the legend as a reflex of the onomastic element *-martis* as attested for the pre-Greek Cretan divine name *Britomartis*.⁷⁰⁶ In the fourth place, finally, Paul Faure proposed to split up the second part of the legend in a theonym *Ma* and a reflex of the Greek vocabulary word *theos*.⁷⁰⁷

Of these interpretations, the last two have a bearing only on the second element *-ma-te*, which the authors in question try to disconnect from PIE **méh₂tēr* “mother”. In my view, these attempts are highly dubious (we would have expected *†-ma-ti* and *†-ma-te-o*, respectively) and at any rate unsuccessful in explaining the legend in full. The latter remark also holds good for Pope’s interpretation, which, although recognizing the plausible relation of *ma-te* with PIE **méh₂tēr*, saddles us up with an enigmatic prefix *i-*.⁷⁰⁸ This leaves us, by means of deduction, with the only

comprehensive elucidation by Boufidis as “Idaian Mother”. According to Elwira Kaczyńska, this runs up against the fact that the Cretan oronym *Ida* originates from **Wida*, and hence an initial digamma should be expected for the Linear A legend⁷⁰⁹ – an inference which even receives further support if the related Greek *idē* “timber-tree” (leading to the interpretation of *Ida* as “wooded hill”)⁷¹⁰ ultimately derives from PIE **uidhu-* “tree”.⁷¹¹ However, the man’s name *Idaios*, which, of course, cannot be disconnected from the mountain name *Ida*, appears in Linear B as *i-da-i-jo*, that is to say without an initial digamma.⁷¹² As it seems, then, the initial digamma has been dropped already in the 14th century BC, which, needless to say, seriously undermines Kaczyńska’s objection.

The validity of Boufidis’ interpretation can be further supported by circumstantial evidence. As indicated in the above, the legend is inscribed on double-axes. Now, the double-axe is the symbol *par excellence* of the foremost Cretan goddess, which according to her Semitic form of address is called *Assara*. This goddess, especially known from libation inscriptions on wash-hand stone-basins from peak-sanctuaries, is depicted on a seal with the double-axe on her head. Furthermore, her name is written with the double-axe sign for the expression of the initial vowel, which in one instance is placed between punctuation marks to stress its symbolic value as a totem for the goddess.⁷¹³ According to three Cretan hieroglyphic sealings with the

possible, would nonetheless collide with the PIE nature of the rest of the legend.

⁷⁰⁹ Kaczyńska 2002: 138.

⁷¹⁰ LSJ, s.v. Note in this connection that in Homeros, *Iliad* XXIII, 110-28 and in Dictys of Crete’s work on the Trojan war (III, 12 and IV, 13) the Trojan mount *Ida* is referred to as a source of wood for cremation burials.

⁷¹¹ Pokorny 1994: I, 1177; cf. Delamarre 2003: 319 for Celtic *uidu-* “tree, wood”.

⁷¹² Ventris & Chadwick 1973: glossary, s.v.; cf. also *i-da-me-na-ja*, the female counterpart of Homeric *Idomeneus*, which latter is plausibly interpreted by Kretschmer (Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v.) as “der Mann vom *Ida* gebirge” and hence likely bears testimony of the Hittite ethnic suffix *-umana-*, see Laroche 1960c: 171. Note that this linguistic analysis receives further emphasis by the fact that *Idomeneus*’ mother is called *Ida* according to literary tradition, see Gindin 1999: 90. For the loss of the *wau*, cf. Linear A *a-si-ja-ka* as compared to Linear B *a-si-wi-jo*, both forms bearing testimony of the Anatolian geographic name *Assuwa* “Asia”.

⁷¹³ Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 19-21, esp. figs. 19 and 20a.

⁷⁰³ Godart & Olivier 1982: 142-3, AR Zf 1-2; for the numbering of the Linear A signs, see Meijer 1982: 38-47.

⁷⁰⁴ Boufidis 1953-4.

⁷⁰⁵ Pope 1956.

⁷⁰⁶ Crevatin 1975.

⁷⁰⁷ Faure 2002: 78. Cf. Duhoux 1994-5: 289-90; Kaczyńska 2002: 138.

⁷⁰⁸ Duhoux 1994-5: 291-2 connects the supposed prefix *i-* with Linear *y-* as in *ya-sa-sa-ra-me* alongside *a-sa-sa-ra-me*, but, as we have noted in section 12 above, this concerns the Semitic vocative particle *y-* and, although hybrid formations are not altogether impossible, would nonetheless collide with the PIE nature of the

first part of the name of the goddess from Samothrace, her cult was exported to the north-Aegean region in the Middle Minoan II or III period.⁷¹⁴ If we realize, then, that for the Luwian population of Crete the form of address for this foremost Cretan goddess was *Kapupi*, a local dialectal variant of Luwian *Kupapa*,⁷¹⁵ it seems not farfetched to assume that the *Kybela* (= Phrygian form of Luwian *Kupapa*) cult at the Trojan mount Ida was introduced from Crete in this particular period. If so, our connection of the double-axe with the “Idaian Mother” is substantially enhanced.

The question remains to be answered to which linguistic layer on Crete Linear A *i-da-ma-te* “Idaian Mother” should be ascribed. To this aim, it is important to determine the date of the inscribed double-axes. This can be achieved by their association with pottery from the same cave, which according to Pierce Blegen runs on from Early Minoan to Late Minoan IA or perhaps even Late Minoan IB and Late Minoan II.⁷¹⁶ If the latest possible date applies, the two Linear A legends may well be assumed to have been produced in consignment of a Greek customer, because, as we have seen in section 8, the Mycenaean Greeks have earned themselves a foothold in Crete after the disastrous Santorini-eruption at the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC). If, however, the double-axes belong to an earlier period, an attribution to the Pelasgian layer or group in Cretan society, which we have just seen to be responsible for the divine name Demeter, seems preferable. At any rate, to suggest that for the presence of the divine name “Idaian Mother” in two Linear A inscriptions this script in its entirety notates an Indo-European language of the Greek or Thracian-Phrygian type bears testimony of a grave methodological error and a *reductio ad absurdum* of the complexities of Cretan society during the Middle and Late Bronze Age.⁷¹⁷

⁷¹⁴ Olivier & Godart 1996: 192, # 135-7.

⁷¹⁵ Woudhuizen 1992a: 4-5; see also appendix III.

⁷¹⁶ Vandenaebale 1985: 5 “and the decoration of the double axes belongs to the type which furnished the inspiration for the second period of the Palace Style pottery ca. 1450-1400 BC”.

⁷¹⁷ Owens 1996: 174-5; Owens 1999: 34; 49 (claims that Minoan [*in casu* Linear A] is the oldest example of Indo-European); Owens 2000: 249.

Additional note 2: *Poseidon* “consort of Da”

In his stimulating monograph on the Greek deity *Poseidon*, Fritz Schachermeyr followed the linguistic analysis of this divine name by Paul Kretschmer as a compound of Greek *potis* or *posis* “consort” of PIE nature (cf. Latin *potis*, Sanskrit *pátih*) with a form of address of mother earth, *Da*, hence leading to the interpretation of the entire form as “consort of Da”.⁷¹⁸ Now, the second element *da-*, which is also present in the divine name *Damatēr* or *Dēmētēr* (< *da-* + PIE **méh₂tēr*), may well come into consideration as the Pelasgian indication of “earth”, related to Greek *ga* or *gē* and originating from the common proto-form **gda-* as attested for the Phrygian place name *Gdanmaa*,⁷¹⁹ Demeter being the earth-mother *par excellence*. If so, the divine name *Poseidon*, just like Demeter, is likely to be attributed with Pelasgian antecedents.

The latter inference gains weight by the fact that according to literary tradition *Poseidon*, together with Demeter, was venerated in Arkadian Thelpusa and some other locations in *horse shape*⁷²⁰ – a feature which Schachermeyr plausibly explains as ultimately rooted in the time of the introduction of the horse in Greece,⁷²¹ which, as we have seen in section 7, took place in two distinct phases during the Early Helladic III (horse-like animal) and Middle Helladic (true horse) periods. Interesting to note in this connection is that the prominent position of the horse in Middle Helladic times clearly appears from the horse burial associated with a royal tumulus at Marathon.⁷²² Contrary to Schachermeyr, however, and in line with a suggestion by Joost Crouwel, I think it is unlikely that this prominent position of the horse in Middle Helladic times is solely based on its function as food provider (milk and

⁷¹⁸ Schachermeyr 1950: 13-4; cf. Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 26, etc.

⁷¹⁹ Haas 1966: 215 (ascribes this name to Pisidian influence, but unlikely so as Pisidian belongs to the Luwian language group).

⁷²⁰ Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* 8, 25, 5 f.

⁷²¹ Schachermeyr 1950: 64; 143.

⁷²² Marinaotos 1973: Pls. 13-4; Papadimitriou 2001: figs. 44-7. Doubts have been raised about the Middle Helladic date of this horse burial, and it is considered by some an intrusive element from the Turkish period, but it should be noted in this context that single horse burial is paralleled for the Middle Bronze Age at Lapithos in Cyprus, see Gjerstad 1926: 81 (Politiko tomb 3) and cf. Herscher 1978: 793.

meat) or as a sacred animal *per se*.⁷²³ it must have had already military significance in this early period and hence have been used for riding⁷²⁴ (note in this connection that the outcome of the sacred marriage between Poseidon and Demeter in horse shape at Thelpusa, the divine horse *Areion*, is reported to have been *mounted* by Adrastos, i.e. a king with a Phrygian name whose antecedents hence may likewise go back to Middle Helladic times, in the mythical war of the seven heroes from the Argolid against Thebes).⁷²⁵

The ultimately Pelasgian origins of Poseidon can be further underlined by other literary evidence. First of all, it is conspicuous that Poseidon is particularly worshipped in the regions where we have situated the local allies of the foreign invaders which arrived in Greece *c.* 1600 BC, viz. in Pylos (Nestor is sacrificing to Poseidon when Telemakhos visits him in the *Odyssey*),⁷²⁶ Attica (think of the contest between Athena and Poseidon, which the former won because of her gift of the olive tree),⁷²⁷ and Iolkos (as mythical father of Pelias and Neleus).⁷²⁸ Next, Poseidon is directly associated in myth with Phrygians (Pelops, at Olympia, and the nymph Mideia),⁷²⁹ or Thracians (Eumolpos, Kykheus, the Abantes and Aones, the Eteobutades),⁷³⁰ or pre-Greeks more in general (Pelasgos, Minyas).⁷³¹

In the light of the given associations with the horse

and with pre-Greek population groups in Greece, the connection of Poseidon with the chariot (Pelops at Olympia, Onkhestos, the two horses of Peleus named Xanthos and Balios)⁷³² – as we have seen in section 7, the military weapon newly introduced by the foreign invaders *c.* 1600 BC – and with the ones who are responsible for its introduction in Greece (Kadmos),⁷³³ appears to be of secondary nature.

Just like Demeter and Zeus, Poseidon is also attested for Crete. Thus, in the genitive form *po-se-da-o-ne* he occurs together with other deities on a Linear B tablet from Knossos (KN V 52).⁷³⁴ Furthermore, if our location of Skheria and the Phaiakians in the western part of the Messara valley holds good, it is noteworthy that Poseidon had a temple here and is considered to be the father of Nausithoös, the founding father of the Phaiakians.⁷³⁵ At any rate, this latter evidence ties in perfectly with our indications of Pelasgian presence in the very same region of Crete as presented in section 12 above!

⁷²³ Schachermeyr 1950: 53-4; 121.

⁷²⁴ Crouwel 1981: 46 “It is not impossible that some of the single horses buried [among which the one at Marathon – notwithstanding Crouwel’s second thoughts still considered Middle Helladic in Papadimitriou 2001, be it with doubts expressed in a note] were riding animals.” This does not collide with Drews’ recent thesis (2004) that riding became military effective in the form of cavalry units only after the Bronze Age. Note that this single horse burial from the Middle Helladic period contrasts with double horse burials as discovered at Dendra (Protonotariou-Deilaki 1990), which cannot be dissociated from the war-chariot and hence must be assigned to the period from *c.* 1600 BC onwards.

⁷²⁵ Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* 8, 25, 7-9; cf. Wiesner 1968: F. 111.

⁷²⁶ Homeros, *Odyssey* III, 1 ff.

⁷²⁷ Herodotos, *Histories* VIII, 55.

⁷²⁸ Schachermeyr 1950: 43.

⁷²⁹ Schachermeyr 1950: 22; 41.

⁷³⁰ Schachermeyr 1950: 36-7; 41; cf. Detschew 1976, s.v. *Boutēs* and *Kukhris*, and Woudhuizen 1989: 196.

⁷³¹ Schachermeyr 1950: 41; 43.

⁷³² Schachermeyr 1950: 22; 39; 42.

⁷³³ Schachermeyr 1950: 170.

⁷³⁴ Ventris & Chadwick 1973: 311-2.

⁷³⁵ Schachermeyr 1950: 172. Note in this connection that striking evidence for the cult of Poseidon in the region in question is provided by the remark in the *Souda*, s.v. *Maleos* that the latter had dedicated a stone at the entrance of the harbor of Phaistos to Poseidon, cf. Briquel 1984: 266.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achterberg, Winfried, Best, Jan, Enzler, Kees, Rietveld, Lia, & Woudhuizen, Fred, 2004, *The Phaistos Disc: A Luwian Letter to Nestor*. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 13. Amsterdam: Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society.
- Adams, J.N., Janse, Mark, & Swain, Simon, 2002, *Bilingualism in Ancient Society, Language Contact and the Written Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Agostiniani, Luciano, & Nicosia, Francesco, 2000, *Tabula Cortonensis*. Roma: «L'Erma» di Bretschneider.
- Agostino, Bruno d', 1977, *Tombe «Principesche» dell'orientalizzante antico da Pontecagnano*. Monumenti Antichi, Serie miscellanea Volume II, 1. Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Åkerström, Åke, 1934, *Studien über die Etruskischen Gräber, Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung des Kammergrabes*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Akurgal, Ekrem, 1992, 'L'Art Hatti'. In: *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, eds. Heinrich Otten, Hayri Ertem, Ekrem Akurgal & Aygül Süel. Pp. 1-5. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Albright, William Foxwell, 1932, *The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim in Palestine, I: The Pottery of the First Three Campaigns*. Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 12.
- , 1959, 'Dunand's new Byblos Volume: A Lycian at the Byblian court'. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 155. Pp. 31-34.
- , 1975, 'Syria, the Philistines, and Phoenicia'. In: *Cambridge Ancient History II, 2*, Chapter 33. Pp. 507-536. Cambridge: At the University Press (3rd edition).
- Alföldi, Andreas, 1963, *Early Rome and the Latins*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Alp, Sedat, 1968, *Zylinder- und Stempelsiegel aus Karahöyük bei Konya*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Alt, Albrecht, 1944, 'Ägyptische Tempel in Palästina und die Landnahme der Philister'. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 67. Pp. 1-20.
- Altheim, Franz, 1950, *Der Ursprung der Etrusker*. Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft.
- Aravantinos, Vassilis L., Godart, Louis, & Sacconi, Anna, 2001, *Thèbes, Fouilles de la Cadmée I, Les tablettes en linéaire B de la odos Pelopidou, Édition et commentaire*. Pisa-Roma: Istituti editoriale e poligrafici internazionali.
- Astour, Michael C., 1964, 'Greek Names in the Semitic World and Semitic Names in the Greek World'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 23. Pp. 193-201.
- , 1965a, 'New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 69. Pp. 253-258.
- , 1965b, *Hellenosemitica, An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- , 1972, 'Some Recent Works on Ancient Syria and the Sea People'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92. Pp. 447-459.
- Balkan, Kemal, 1954, *Kassitenstudien I: Die Sprache der Kassiten*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
- Barako, Tristan J., 2004, [Review of: Eliezer D. Oren, *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*]. *American Journal of Archaeology*, 108: 453-455.
- Barnett, Richard D., 1969, 'The Sea Peoples'. In: *Cambridge Ancient History II, 2*, Chapter 28. Pp. 3-21. Cambridge: At the University Press (3rd edition).
- , 1975, 'The Sea Peoples'. In: *Cambridge Ancient History II, 2*, Chapter 28. Pp. 359-378. Cambridge: At the University Press (3rd edition).
- Barth, Frederik, 1969, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Bergen-Oslo: Universitets Forlaget. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Bartoněk, Antonín, & Buchner, Georgio, 1995, 'Die ältesten griechischen Inschriften von Pithekoussai (2. Hälfte des VIII. bis 1. Hälfte des VII. Jh.)'. *Die Sprache, Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 37:2. Pp. 129-231.
- Bass, George, 1997, 'Beneath the Wine Dark Sea: Nautical Archaeology and the Phoenicians of the Odyssey'. In: *Greeks and Barbarians, Essays on the Interaction between Greeks and Non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences of Eurocentrism*, eds. John E. Coleman & Clark A. Walz. Pp. 71-101. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press.
- Beekes, Robert S.P., 1990, *Vergelijkende taalwetenschap, Tussen Sanskrit en Nederlands (= Aula Paperback 176)*. Utrecht: Uitgeverij Het Spectrum BV.
- , 1993, 'The Position of Etruscan'. In: *Indogermanica et Italica, Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*, Hrsg. Gerhard Meisner. Pp. 46-60. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- , 1998, 'The origin of Lat. *aqua*, and of **teutā* "people"'. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26. Pp. 459-466.
- , 2001, [Review of C. De Simone, *I Tirreni a Lemnos, Evidenza linguistica e tradizioni storiche*, Firenze, Olschki 1996]. *Mnemosyne* 54. Pp. 359-364.
- , 2002, 'The Prehistory of the Lydians, the Origin of the Etruscans, Troy and Aeneas'. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 59, 3/4 mei-augustus. Pp. 205-239.
- Beekes, Robert S.P., & Meer, L. Bauke van der, 1991, *De Etrusken Spreken*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.

- Behn, Friedrich, 1924, *Hausurnen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Beran, Thomas, 1967, *Die Hethitische Glyptik von Boğazköy I*. Berlin: Verlag Gbr. Mann.
- Bérard, C., 1970, *Eretria, Fouilles et recherches, III L'Hérôon à la port de l'ouest*. Bern: Éditions Francke Berne.
- Bérard, Jean, 1951, 'Philistins et Préhellènes'. *Revue Archéologique* 37. Pp. 124-142.
- Bernal, Martin, 1991, *Black Athena, The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, II: The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence*. London: Free Association Books.
- Beschi, Luigi, 1994, 'I Tirreni di Lemno alla luce dei recenti dati di scavo'. *Magna Graeca, Etruschi, Fenici*. Pp. 23-56. Taranto.
- Best, Jan G.P., 1973, 'Six contributions to the decipherment of Linear A—I. The Semitic equivalents of Mycenaean *a-pu-dosi* and *o-pe-ro*'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 5. Pp. 53-59.
- , 1976, 'The Foreign Relations of the Apsis-House Culture in Palestine'. In: *Pulpudeva, Semaines philippopolitaines de l'histoire et de la culture thrace, Plovdiv, 4-19 octobre 1976*. Pp. 205-209.
- , 1981a, 'YAŠŠARAM!'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 13. Pp. 291-293.
- , 1981b, *Supplementum Epigraphicum Mediterraneum ad Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 13.
- , 1982-3a, 'The Zakro Pithos Inscription, Again'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 14-15. Pp. 9-15.
- , 1982-3b, 'Two Traditions in Spiral Inscriptions with Linear A Texts'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 14-15. Pp. 17-25.
- , 1992-3, 'Racism in Classical Archaeology'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 24-25. Pp. 7-10.
- , 1996-7, 'The Ancient Toponyms of Mallia: A post-Eurocentric reading of Egyptianising Bronze Age documents'. *Black Athena: Ten Years After, Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch, Archaeological and Historical Society* 28-29, ed. Wim M.J. van Binsbergen. Pp. 99-129.
- , 2000, 'The First Inscription in Punic, Vowel Differences between Linear A and B'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 32. Pp. 27-35.
- Best, Jan, & Woudhuizen, Fred, 1988, *Ancient Scripts from Crete and Cyprus*. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 9. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- , 1989, *Lost Languages from the Mediterranean*. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 10. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Best, Jan G.P., & Yadin, Yigael, 1973, *The Arrival of the Greeks*. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 1. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Betancourt, Philip P., 1976, 'The End of the Bronze Age'. *Antiquity* 50. Pp. 40-47.
- Bietak, Manfred, 1993, 'The Sea Peoples and the End of the Egyptian Administration in Canaan'. In: *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990, Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, June-July 1990*, eds. Avraham Biran & Joseph Aviram. Pp. 292-306. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- , 2000, "'Rich beyond the dreams of Avaris: Tell el-Dab'a and the Aegean World—A Guide for the Perplexed": a response to Eric H. Cline'. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 95. Pp. 185-205.
- Bikai, Patricia Maynor, 1992, 'The Phoenicians'. In: *The Crisis Years: The 12th century B.C. From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, eds. William A. Ward & Martha Sharp Joukowsky. Pp. 132-141. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Binsbergen, Wim M.J. van, 1996-7, 'Alternative Models of Intercontinental Interaction Towards the Earliest Cretan Script'. *Black Athena: Ten Years After, Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 28-29, ed. Wim M.J. van Binsbergen. Pp. 131-148.
- , 1999, "'Cultures do not exist', Exploding self-evidences in the investigation of Interculturality'. *Quest, An African Journal of Philosophy* XIII, no. 1-2, Special Issue: Language & Culture. Pp. 37-114.
- , *forthc.*, 'Ethnicity in eastern Mediterranean protohistory: Reflections on theory and method', in: Binsbergen, Wim M.J. van, & Woudhuizen, Fred C., *Ethnicity in Mediterranean Protohistory*, Oxford: BAR (British Archaeological Reports) International Series.
- Blegen, Carl W., 1963, *Troy and the Trojans*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Boardman, John, 1994, 'Settlement for Trade and Land in North Africa: problems of identity'. In: *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation, Essays dedicated to Sir John Boardman*, eds. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze & Franco De Angelis. Pp. 137-149. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- , 1999, *The Greeks Overseas, their early colonies and trade*. London: Thames and Hudson (Fourth edition).
- Boer, Jan de, 1991, 'A Double Figure-Headed Boat-Type in the Eastern Mediterranean and Central Europe during the Late Bronze Ages'. *Actes de Symposium Thracia Pontica IV, Sozopol, October 6-12, 1988*. Pp. 43-50. Sofia.
- Bonfante, Giuliano, 1946, 'Who were the Philistines?'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 50. Pp. 257-262.
- Bonfante, Giuliano, & Bonfante, Larissa, 2002, *The Etruscan Language, An Introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press (2nd edition).
- Bosch-Gimpera, Pedro, 1939, *Two Celtic Waves in Spain. The Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture, British Academy*. London: Humphrey Milford Amen House, E.C.
- Bossert, Helmuth, 1932, *Šantaš und Kupapa*. Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft VI, 3. Leipzig: Verlag von Otto

- Harrassowitz.
- Boufidis, Nikolaos Kr., 1953-4, 'Kritomikinaikai epigraphai eks Arkalokhōriou', *Arkhaiologiki Ephimeris* 2. Pp. 61-74.
- Bouzek, Jan, 1997, *Greece, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural Interrelations during the Early Iron Age*. Studies in Mediterranean Archeology CXXII. Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Breasted, James Henry, 1927, *Ancient Records of Egypt, Historical Documents from the earliest times to the Persian Conquest, collected, edited, and translated with commentary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (3rd impression).
- Briquel, Dominique, 1984, *Les Pélasges en Italie, Recherches sur l'histoire de la légende*. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- , 1991, *L'Origine Lydienne des Étrusques, Histoire de la doctrine dans l'Antiquité*. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Brixhe, Claude, & Lejeune, Michel, 1984, *Corpus des Inscriptions Paleo-Phrygiennes I-II*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Broneer, Oscar, 1956, 'Athens in the Late Bronze Age'. *Antiquity* 30. Pp. 9-18.
- Brown, Raymond A., 1985, *Evidence for Pre-Greek Speech on Crete from Greek Alphabetic Sources*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert-Publisher.
- Bryce, Trevor R., 1974, 'The Lukka Problem—and a possible solution'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33. Pp. 395-404.
- , 1986, *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- , 1989, 'Ahhiyawans and Mycenaeans—an Anatolian viewpoint'. *Journal of Oxford Archaeology* 8. Pp. 297-310.
- , 1992, 'Lukka Revisited'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 51. Pp. 121-130.
- , 1998, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- , 2003, *Letters of the Great Kings of the Ancient Near East, The Royal Correspondence of the Late Bronze Age*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Buchholz, Hans-Günter, 1973, 'Grey Trojan Ware in Cyprus and North Syria'. In: *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean: Archaeological and linguistic problems in Greek prehistory, Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory, Sheffield*, eds. R. A. Crossland & Ann Birchall. Pp. 179-187. London: Duckworth.
- , 1999, *Ugarit, Zypern und Ägäis, Kulturbeziehungen im zweiten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Buchner, Giorgio, 1982, 'Die Beziehungen zwischen der euböischen Kolonie Pithekoussai auf der Insel Ischia und dem nordwest semitischen Mittelmeerraum in der zweiten Hälfte des 8. Jhs. v. Chr.'. In: *Phönizier im Westen, Die Beiträge des Internationalen Symposiums über "Die phönizische Expansion im westlichem Mittelmeerraum" in Köln vom 24. bis 27. April 1979*, ed. Hans Georg Niemeyer. Pp. 277-306. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Burn, A.R., 1930, *Minoans, Philistines and Greeks, B.C. 1400-900*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.
- Byrne, Ryan, 2002, 'Philistine Semitics and Dynastic History at Ekron'. *Ugarit- Forschungen* 34. Pp. 1-23.
- Cabrera, Paloma, & Olmos, Ricardo, 1985, 'Die Griechen in Huelva, Zum Stand der Diskussion'. *Madrid Mitteilungen* 26. Pp. 63-74.
- Camporeale, Giovannangelo, 2003, *Die Etrusker, Geschichte und Kultur*. Düsseldorf-Zürich: Artemis & Winkler Verlag.
- Caruba, Onofrio, 2002, 'Cario Natri ed egizio ntr 'dio''. In: *Novalis Indogermanica, Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, Hrsg. Matthias Fritz & Susanna Zeilfelder. Pp. 75-84. Graz: Leykam.
- Caskey, John L., 1971, 'Greece, Crete, and the Aegean Islands in the Early Bronze Age'. *Cambridge Ancient History I, 2*. Pp. 771-807. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (3rd edition).
- , 1973, 'Greece and the Aegean Islands in the Middle Bronze Age'. *Cambridge Ancient History II, 1*. Pp. 117-140. Cambridge: At the University Press (3rd edition).
- Casson, Stanley, 1968, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria*. Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis N.V. Publishers.
- Catling, Hector, 1973, 'The Achaean Settlement of Cyprus'. In: *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean", Nicosia 27th March – 2nd April 1972*. Pp. 34-39. Nicosia: Zavallis Press Ltd.
- Caubet, Annie, 2000, 'Ras Shamra-Ugarit Before the Sea Peoples'. In: *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*, ed. Eliezer D. Oren. Pp. 35-51. Philadelphia: The University Museum.
- Chabas, François, 1872, *Études sur l'Antiquité Historique d'après les sources égyptiennes et les monuments réputés préhistorique*. Chalon-s-S.: Dejussien. Paris: Maissonneuve et Cie.
- , 1873, *Recherches pour servir à l'Histoire d'Égypte sous la XXe Dynastie*.
- Champollion, Jean-François, 1836, *Grammaire égyptienne, ou principes généraux de l'écriture sacrée Égyptienne appliquée à la représentation de la langue parlée*. Paris: Didot.
- Chantraine, Pierre, 1958, 'Mycénien Te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro'. In: *Minoica, Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Johannes Sundwall*, Hrsg. Ernst Grumach. Pp. 123-127. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Charsekin, A.I., 1963, *Zur Deutung etruskischer Sprachdenkmäler*. Untersuchungen zur Römischen Geschichte III. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
- Cifola, Barbara, 1991, 'The Terminology of Ramses III's Historical Records, with a Formal Analyses of the War Scenes'. *Orientalia* 60. Pp. 9- 57.
- Cline, Eric H., 1987, 'Amenhotep III and the Aegean: A Reassessment of Egypto-Aegean Relations in the Fourteenth Cen-

- ... tury B.C'. *Orientalia* 56. Pp. 1-36.
- , 1991, 'A Possible Hittite Embargo against the Mycenaean'. *Historia* 40. Pp. 1-9.
- , 2001, 'Amenhotep III, the Aegean, and Anatolia'. In: *Amenhotep III, Perspectives on His Reign*, eds. David O'Connor & Eric H. Cline. Pp. 236-250. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Cline, Eric H., & O'Connor, David, 2003, 'The Mystery of the "Sea Peoples"'. In: *Mysterious Lands*, eds. David O'Connor & Stephen Quirke. Pp. 107-138. University College London: Institute of Archaeology.
- Coleman, J.E., 2000, 'An Archaeological Scenario for the "Coming of the Greeks" ca. 3200 B.C.'. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 28. Pp. 101-153.
- Coles, J.M., & Harding, A.F., 1979, *The Bronze Age in Europe*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Colonna, Giovanni, 1980, 'Virgilio, Cortona e la leggenda etrusca di Dardano'. *Archeologia Classica* 32. Pp. 1-14.
- Cornell, Tim, 1997, 'Ethnicity as a factor in early Roman history'. In: *Gender & Ethnicity in ancient Italy*, Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy Vol. 6, eds. Tim Cornell & Kathryn Lomas. Pp. 9-21. University of London: Accordia Research Institute.
- Cramer, J.A., 1971, *A Geographical and Historical Description of Asia Minor*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert-Publisher (Reprint).
- Crevatin, Franco., 1975, 'La lingua «minoica»: metodi d'indagine e problemi'. In: *Studi Triestini di Antichità in onore di Luigia Achillea Stella*. Pp. 1-63. Trieste: Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia.
- Crossland, Ronald A., 1971, 'Immigrants from the North'. *Cambridge Ancient History I*, 2. Pp. 824-876. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (3rd edition).
- Crouwel, Joost H., 1981, *Chariots and other means of land transport in Bronze Age Greece*. Allard Pierson Series 3. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Series.
- Davies, Benedict G., 1997, *Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Nineteenth Dynasty*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms förlag.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, Sigrid, 1983, 'Das Problem der "Handmade Burnished Ware" von Myk. IIIC'. In: *Griechenland, Die Ägäis und die Levante während der "Dark Ages" vom 12. bis zum 9. Jh. v. Chr., Akten des Symposions von Stift Zwettl (NÖ), 11.-14. Oktober 1980*, Hrsg. Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy. Pp. 161-178. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Delamarre, Xavier, 2003, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise, Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*. Paris: Editions Errance (2^e édition revue et augmentée).
- Demoule, Jean-Paul, 1999, 'Ethnicity, culture and identity: French archaeologists and historians'. *Antiquity* 73. Pp. 190-198.
- Demus-Quatember, Margarete, 1958, *Etruskische Grabarchitektur, Typologie und Ursprungsfrage*. Baden-Baden: Bruno Grimm Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaften.
- Desborough, Vincent R. d'A., 1964, *The Last Mycenaean and their Successors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- , 1972, *The Greek Dark Ages*. London: Ernst Benn Limited.
- Detschew, Dimiter, 1976, *Die Thrakischen Sprachreste. 2. Auflage mit Bibliographie 1955-1974 von Zivka Velkova*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Diakonoff, Igor Mikhailovich, 1984, *The Prehistory of the Armenian people*. Delmar-New York: Caravan Books.
- Diakonoff, Igor Mikhailovich, & Neroznak, Vladimir Petrovich, 1985, *Phrygian*. Delmar-New York: Caravan Books.
- Dickinson, Oliver T.P.K., 1977, *The Origins of Mycenaean Civilization*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 49. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Diétrich, Manfred & Loretz, Oswald, 1978, 'Das "Seefahrende Volk" von Šikila (RS 34.129)'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 10. Pp. 53-56.
- , 1998, 'Amurru, Yaman und die ägäischen Inseln nach den ugaritischen Texten'. *Israel Oriental Studies* 18. Pp. 335-363.
- Dikaios, Porphyrios, 1971, *Enkomi, Excavations 1948-1958, II: Chronology, Summary and Conclusions, Catalogue, Appendices*. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Docter, Roald F., 2000, 'Pottery, Graves and Ritual I: Phoenicians of the First Generation in Pithekoussai'. In: *La ceramica fenicia di Sardegna, Dati, problematiche, confronti, Atti del Primo Congresso Internazionale Sulcitano, Sant'Antioco, 19-21 Settembre 1997*, eds. Piero Bartoloni & Lorenza Campanella. Pp. 135-149. Roma: Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche.
- Donner, H., & Röllig, W., 1964, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (3. Auflage).
- Dossin, G., 1970, 'La Route de l'étain en Mésopotamie au temps de Zimri-Lim'. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archeologie Orientale* 64. Pp. 97-106.
- Dothan, Moshe, 1986, 'Sardinia at Akko?'. In: *Studies in Sardinian Archaeology II, Sardinia in the Mediterranean*, ed. M.S. Balmuth. Pp. 105-115. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Dothan, Trude, 1982, *The Philistines and their Material Culture*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
- Dothan, Moshe, & Dothan, Trude, 1992, *People of the Sea, The Search for the Philistines*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Draws, Robert, 1988, *The Coming of the Greeks, Indo-European Conquests in the Aegean and Near East*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- , 1992, 'Herodotus 1.94, the Drought ca. 1200 BC, and the Origin of the Etruscans'. *Historia* 41. Pp. 14-39.
- , 1993a, *The End of the Bronze Age, Changes in warfare and the catastrophe ca. 1200 B.C.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- , 1993b, 'Myths of Midas and the Phrygian Migration from Europe'. *Klio* 75. Pp. 9-26.
- , 2000, 'Medinet Habu: Oxcart, Ships, and Migration Theories'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 59. Pp. 161-190.
- , 2001, 'Greater Anatolia, Proto-Anatolian, Proto-Indo-Hittite, and Beyond'. In: *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family, Papers Presented at a Colloquium Hosted by the University of Richmond, March 18-19, 2000*, ed. Robert Drews. Pp. 248-283. Washington D.C.: The Institute for the Study of Man.
- , 2004, *Early Riders, The Beginnings of Mounted Warfare in Asia and Europe*. New York-London: Routledge.
- Driessen, Jan, 1998-9, 'Kretes and Iawones, Some Observations on the Identity of Late Bronze Age Knossians'. *Minos* 33-34. Pp. 83-105.
- Driessen, Jan, & Macdonald, Colin F., 1997, *The Troubled Island, Minoan Crete before and after the Santorini Eruption*. Aegeum 17. Université de Liège.
- Duhoux, Yves, 1994-5, 'LA > B DA-MA-TE = Déméter? Sur la langue du linéaire A'. *Minos* 29-30. Pp. 289-294.
- , 2003, *Des Minoens en Égypte? «Keftiou» et «les îles aux milieux du Grand Vert»*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters Press.
- Dumézil, Georges, 1958, *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens*. Bruxelles: Latomus, Revue d'Études Latines.
- Dunbabin, T.J., 1999, *The Western Greeks, The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 B.C.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press (Sandpiper reprint).
- Dupont-Sommer, André, 1948, 'Nouvelle lecture d'une inscription phénicienne archaïque de Nora en Sardaigne (C.I.S. I, 144)'. *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 1948. Pp. 12-22.
- , 1974, 'Les Phéniciens à Chypre'. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*. Pp. 75-94.
- Edel, Elmar, 1966, *Die Ortsnamenliste aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III*. Bonn: Hanstein.
- , 1984, 'Die Sikeloï in den ägyptischen Seevölkertexten und in Keilschrifturkunden'. *Biblische Notizen* 23. Pp. 7-8.
- , 1988, 'Der Name di-q!j-j-s in der minoisch-mykenischen Liste ENli 8 gleich Thēbais?'. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 115, 1. Pp. 30-35.
- Eder, Birgitta, 1998, *Argolis, Lakonien, Messenien, Vom Ende der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur Einwanderung der Dorier*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Edgerton, William F., & Wilson, John A., 1936, *Historical Records of Ramses III, The Texts in Medinet Habu, Volumes I and II, Translated with explanatory notes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edwards, Ruth B., 1979, *Kadmos the Phoenician, A Study in Greek Legends and the Mycenaean Age*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert Publisher.
- Eisler, Robert, 1939, 'Loan-words in Semitic Languages meaning "Town"'. *Antiquity* 13. Pp. 449-455.
- Evans, Sir Arthur J., 1895, *Cretan Pictographs and Prae-Phoenician Script*. London: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- , 1909, *Scripta Minoa I*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Faure, Paul, 1996, 'Deux inscriptions en écriture Linéaire A découvertes à Troie par Schliemann'. *Cretan Studies* 5. Pp. 137-146.
- , 2002, 'Écritures préhelléniques dans dix cavernes de Crète'. *Cretan Studies* 7. Pp. 75-87.
- Fernandez, James W., 2000, 'Peripheral wisdom'. In: *Signifying Identities, Anthropological perspectives on boundaries and contested values*, ed. Anthony P. Cohen. Pp. 117-144. London-New York: Routledge.
- Fick, August, 1905, *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen als Quelle für die Vorgeschichte Griechenlands*. Göttingen.
- Fiesel, Eva, 1931, *Etruskisch*. In: *Grundriss der indogermanischen Sprach- und Altertumskunde*, Hrsgs. Albert Debrunner & Ferdinand Sommer (= Band 5, Lieferung 4). Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Forrer, Emil, 1924, 'Vorhomerische Griechen in den Keilschriften von Boghazköi'. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Oriental-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 63. Pp. 1-22.
- Forsdyke, John, 1957, *Greece before Homer, Ancient chronology and mythology*. London: Max Parrish (2nd impression).
- Fourmont, Etienne, 1747, *Réflexions critiques sur l'origine, l'histoire et la succession des anciens peuples chaldéens, hébreux, phéniciens, égyptiennes, grecs ... jusqu'au temps de Cyrus*. Paris.
- Friedrich, Johannes, 1932, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*. Berlin: Verlag von Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- , 1946, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch II*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- , 1991, *Kurzgefaßtes Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Frisk, Hjalmar, 1973, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Fugazzola Delpino, M.A., 1979, 'The Proto-Villanovan: A Survey'. In: *Italy Before the Romans, The Iron Age, Orientalizing and Etruscan periods*, eds. David & Francesca Ridgway. Pp. 31-51. London-New York-San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Galinsky, G. Karl, 1969, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gamkrelidze, Thomas V., & Ivanov, Vjačeslav V., 1995, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans, A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture, Part I: Text, Part II: Bibliography, Indexes*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Garbini, Giovanni, 1997, *I Filistei*. Milano: Rusconi.

- Gardiner, Alan H., 1947, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , 1960, *The Inscriptions of Ramesses II*. Oxford: Printed for the Griffith Institute at the University Press by Vivian Ridler.
- , 1961, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- , 1994, *Egyptian Grammar*. Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum (3rd edition).
- Garstang, John, 1929, *The Hittite Empire, being a survey of the history, geography and monuments of Hittite Asia Minor and Syria*. London: Constable and Company Ltd.
- Garstang, John, & Gurney, O.R., 1959, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*. London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara.
- Gehring, Augustus, 1901, *Index Homericus*. Lipsiae: In Aedibus B.G. Teubneri.
- Gelb, Ignace, 1931, *Hittite Hieroglyphs I*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Georgiev, Vladimir, 1950-1, 'Sur l'origine et la langue des Pélasges, des Philistins, des Danaens et des Achéens'. *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung* 1. Pp. 136-141.
- Gimbutas, Marija, 1973, 'The destruction of Aegean and East Mediterranean urban civilization around 2300 B.C.'. In: *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean, Archaeological and linguistic problems in Greek prehistory*, eds. R.A. Crossland & Ann Birchall. Pp. 129-139. London: Duckworth.
- Gindin, Leonid A., 1999, *Troja, Thrakien und die Völker Alt Kleinasiens, Versuch einer historisch-philologischen Untersuchung*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft.
- Gitin, Seymour, 1993, 'Seventh Century B.C.E. Cultic Elements at Ekron'. In: *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990, Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, June-July 1990*, eds. Avraham Biran & Joseph Aviram. Pp. 248-258. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Gitin, Seymore, Dothan, Trude, & Naveh, Joseph, 1997, 'A Royal Dedicatory Inscription from Ekron'. *Israel Exploration Journal* 47. Pp. 1-16.
- Gjerstad, Einar, 1926, *Studies on Prehistoric Cyprus*. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln.
- , 1944, 'The Colonization of Cyprus in Greek Legend'. *Opuscula Archaeologica* III. Pp. 107-123.
- Godart, Louis, 1994, 'La scrittura di Troia'. *Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei*, serie 9, vol. 5. Pp. 457-460.
- Godart, Louis, & Olivier, Jean-Pierre, 1982, *Recueil des Inscriptions en linéaire A, Volume 4: Autres Documents*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Goetze, Albrecht, 1954, 'The Linguistic Continuity of Anatolia as Shown by its Proper Names'. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 8. Pp. 74-81.
- Goldman, Hetty, 1956, *Excavations at Gözli Kule, Tarsus II, From the Neolithic through the Bronze Age*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gordon, Arthur E., 1983, *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles-London: University of California Press.
- Gordon, Cyrus Herzl, 1955, *Ugaritic Handbook, I: Grammar*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- , 1956, 'The Rôle of the Philistines'. *Antiquity* 30. Pp. 22-26.
- , 1957, 'Notes on Minoan Linear A'. *Antiquity* 31. Pp. 124-130.
- , 1965, *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Goudriaan, Koen, 1988, *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, Publisher.
- Gras, Michel, 1976, 'La piraterie tyrrhénienne en mer Egée: mythe ou réalité?'. In: *Mélanges offerts à J. Heurgon I*. Pp. 341-370. Rome.
- Gröndahl, Frauke, 1967, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Rom: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut.
- Grosjean, Roger, 1966a, *La Corse avant l'histoire*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- , 1966b, 'Recent Work in Corsica'. *Antiquity* 40. Pp. 190-198, Pls. 29-31.
- Grumach, Ernst, 1968, 'The Minoan Libation Formula—Again'. *Kadmos* 7. Pp. 7-26.
- , 1969, 'The Coming of the Greeks'. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 51. Manchester.
- Guido, Margaret, 1963, *Sardinia*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Gurney, Oliver R., 1990, *The Hittites*. London: Penguin Books.
- , 2002, 'The Authorship of the Tawagalawas Letter'. In: *Silva Anatolica, Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Piotr Taracha. Pp. 133-141. Warsaw: Agade.
- Gusmani, Roberto, 1964, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav, 1942, *Siegel aus Boğazköy II. Die Königssiegel von 1939 und die übrigen Hieroglyphensiegel*. Berlin: Im Selbstverlage des Herausgebers.
- , 1967, 'The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 26, 2. Pp. 73-81.
- , 1983, 'The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 1. The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 87. Pp. 133-138.
- , 1992, 'A new look at one Ahhiyawa text'. In: *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, eds. Heinrich Otten, Hayri Ertem, Ekrem Akurgal & Aygül Süel. Pp. 235-243. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Haas, Otto, 1966, *Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Linguistique

- Balkanique X. Sofia: Academie Bulgare des Sciences.
- Haas, Volkert, 2000, 'Hethitische Bestattungsbräuche'. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 27, 1. Pp. 52-67.
- Hall, Edith, 1989, *Inventing the Barbarian, Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hall, H.R., 1901-2, 'Keftiu and the Peoples of the Sea'. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 8. Pp. 157-189.
- , 1922, 'The Peoples of the Sea, A Chapter of the History of Egyptology'. In: *Recueil d'Études Égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion à l'occasion du centenaire de la lettre à M. Dacier relative à l'alphabet des hiéroglyphes phonétiques lue à l'accadémie des inscriptions et belles lettres le 27 septembre 1822*. Pp. 297-329. Paris: Librairie ancienne honoré Champion Édouard Champion.
- , 1926, 'The Keftians, Philistines and other Peoples of the Levant'. In: *Cambridge Ancient History II*, Chapter 12. Pp. 275-295. Cambridge: At the University Press.
- , 1929, 'The Caucasian Relations of the Peoples of the Sea'. *Klio* 22. Pp. 335-344.
- Hall, Jonathan M., 1997, *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge: University Press.
- , 2002, *Hellenicity, Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hallager, Erik, 1992, 'New Linear B Tablets from Chania'. *Kadmos* 31. Pp. 61-87.
- Harrison, Richard J., 1988, *The Beaker Folk, Copper Age archaeology in Western Europe*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Hawkins, John David, 1990, 'The New Inscription from the Südburg of Boğazköy-Hattusa'. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1990. Pp. 305-314.
- , 1995, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG), With an Archaeological Introduction by Peter Neve*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- , 2000, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Vol. I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age, Parts 1-3*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- , 2003, 'Scripts and Texts'. *The Luwians*, Handbook of Oriental Studies 68, ed. H. Craig Melchert. Pp. 128-169. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, Susanne, 1977, *Arzawa, Untersuchungen zu seiner Geschichte nach den hethitischen Quellen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- , 2003, 'Alḫiyawa—Land der homerischen Achäer im Krieg mit Wiluša?'. In: *Der neue Streit um Troia, Eine Bilanz*, Hrsg. Christoph Ulf. Pp. 193-214. München: C.H. Beck.
- Helck, Wolfgang, 1971, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz (2., verbesserte Auflage).
- , 1986, [Review of G.A. Lehmann, *Die mykenisch-frühgriechische Welt und der östliche Mittelmeerraum in der Zeit der 'Seevölker'-Invasionen um 1200 v. Chr.*]. *Gnomon* 58. Pp. 626-629.
- Helck, Wolfgang, & Otto, Eberhard, 1984, *Lexicon der Ägyptologie, Band V*, s.v. Seevölker. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hellbing, Lennart, 1979, *Alasia Problems*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 57. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Hencken, Hugh, 1955, *Indo-European Languages and Archaeology*. Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association 57, No. 84.
- , 1968, *Tarquinia, Villanovans and Early Etruscans*. Cambridge Massachusetts: The Peabody Museum.
- Henning, W.B., 1978, 'The First Indo-Europeans in History'. In: *Society and History, Essays in Honor of Karl August Wittfogel*, ed. G.L. Ulmen. Pp. 215-230. The Hague-Paris-New York: Mouton Publishers.
- Herbig, Gustav, 1914, 'Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen'. *Sitzungsberichte der bayrischen Akademie, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*. Pp. 3-39.
- Herbordt, Suzanne, 1998, 'Seals and Sealings of Hittite Officials from the Nişantepe Archive, Boğazköy'. In: *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16-22, 1996*, eds. Sedat Alp & Aygül Süel. Pp. 309-318. Ankara.
- Herscher, Ellen Carol, 1978, *The Bronze Age Cemetery at Lapithos, Vrysi tou Barba, Cyprus, Parts 1-2*. [No place:] University of Pennsylvania (PH.D.).
- Heuck Allen, Susan, 1994, 'Trojan Grey Ware at Tel Miqne-Ekron'. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 293. Pp. 39-51.
- Heurgon, Jacques, 1969, 'Les Dardaniens en Afrique'. *Revue des Études Latines* 47. Pp. 284-294.
- , 1992, 'Les Étrusques et l'Europe'. *Archeologia* 284. Pp. 19-24.
- Hiller, Stefan, 1985, [Review of Jan G.P. Best, *Supplementum Epigraphicum Mediterraneum ad Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 13 (1981)]. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 32. Pp. 125-127.
- , 1996, 'Knossos and Pylos, A Case of Special Relationship'. *Cretan Studies* 5. Pp. 73-83.
- Hitig, Ferdinand, 1845, *Urgeschichte und Mythologie der Philister*. Leipzig: Weidmann.
- Hoftijzer, J., & Soldt, W.H. van, 1998, 'Texts from Ugarit Pertaining to Seafaring'. In: *Seagoing Ships & Seamanship in the Bronze Age Levant*, ed. Shelley Wachsmann. Pp. 333-344. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Högemann, Peter, 2000, 'Der Iliasdichter, Anatolien und der griechische Adel'. *Klio* 82. Pp. 7-39.
- Hölbl, Günther, 1983, 'Die historischen Aussagen der Ägyptischen Seevölkerinschriften'. In: *Griechenland, Die*

- Ägäis und die Levante während der "Dark Ages" vom 12. bis zum 9. Jh. v. Chr., Akten des Symposions von Stift Zwettl (NÖ), 11.-14. Oktober 1980*, Hrsg. Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy. Pp. 121-143. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Holloway, R. Ross, 1981, *Italy and the Aegean 3000-700 B.C.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Collège Erasme.
- Hood, Sinclair, 1974, *The Home of the Heroes, The Aegean before the Greeks*. London: Thames and Hudson (reprinted version).
- Hope Simpson, Richard, 1981, *Mycenaean Greece*. New Jersey: Noyes Press.
- Hope Simpson, Richard, & Dickinson, Oliver T.K.P., 1979, *A Gazetteer of Aegean Civilisation in the Bronze Age I: The Mainland and islands*. Göteborg: Paul Åström Förlag.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo Hendrik Jan, 1961, *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Isaac, Benjamin, 2004, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton-Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Jeffery, Lilian H., 1998, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, A study of the origin of the Greek alphabet and its development from the eighth to the fifth centuries B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press (Revised edition with a supplement by Alan W. Johnston).
- Johnston, Alan W., 1983, 'The Extent and Use of Literacy; the Archaeological Evidence'. In: *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation, Proceedings of the Second International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1-5 June, 1981*, ed. Robin Hägg. Pp. 63-68. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Jones, Siân, 1997, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity, Constructing Identities in the past and present*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Kaczyńska, Elwira, 2002, 'Greek Ἰδᾶ "Battle, Fight, Combat": A Term of Minoan Origin?' *Kadmos* 41. Pp. 137-140.
- Kahl, Jochem, 1995, 'Les témoignages textuels sur les Shardana, Annexe à Oswald Loretz, Les Šerdanū et la fin d'Ougarit, À propos des documents d'Égypte, de Byblos et d'Ougarit relatifs aux Shardana'. In: *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C., Ras Shamra-Ougarit XI, Actes du Colloque International, Paris, 28 juin-1^{er} juillet 1993*, eds. Marguerite Yon, Maurice Szyner & Pierre Bordreuil. Pp. 137-140. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies, 1940, 'Marduk und Santa in der hethitischen Überlieferung des 2. Jts v. Chr.'. *Orientalia* 59. Pp. 188-195.
- Karageorghis, Vassos, 1986, "'Barbarian" Ware in Cyprus'. In: *Acts of the International Symposium "Cyprus between the Orient and Occident", Nicosia, 8-14 September 1985*, ed. V. Karageorghis. Pp. 246-258. Nicosia: Zavallis Press Ltd.
- , 1992, 'The Crisis Years: Cyprus'. In: *The Crisis Years, The 12th Century B.C. From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, eds. William A. Ward & Martha Sharp Joukowsky. Pp. 79-86. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Kaspar, S., 1970, 'Eine Nekropole Nordwestlich von Soma'. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Archäologischer Anzeiger* 85. Pp. 71-83.
- Katzenstein, H. Jacob, 1973, *The History of Tyre, From the Beginning of the Second Millennium B.C.E. until the Fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire in 538 B.C.E.* Jerusalem: The Schocken Institute for Jewish Research.
- Keen, Antony G., 1998, *Dynastic Lycia, A Political History of the Lycians & Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 BC*. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill.
- Kenna, Victor E.G., 1971, *Catalogue of the Cypriote Seals of the Bronze Age in the British Museum. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* XX, 3. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Kennedy, D.A., 1959, 'Sceaux hittites conservés à Paris'. *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 65. Pp. 147-172.
- Killebrew, A.E., Lehmann, G., & Artzy, M., in preparation, *Philistines and other "Sea Peoples": In Text and Archaeology*, Leiden: Brill.
- Kimmig, Wolfgang, 1964, 'Seevölkerbewegung und Urnenfelderkultur, Ein Archäologisch-Historischer Versuch'. In: *Studien aus Alteuropa I (= Festschrift K. Tackenberg)*. Pp. 220-283.
- Kinch, K.F., 1888, 'Die Sprache der sicilischen Elymer'. *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* 16. Pp. 187-207.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A., 1973, 'The Philistines'. In: *Peoples of Old Testament Times*, ed. D.J. Wiseman. Pp. 53-78. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- , 1983, *Ramesside Inscriptions V*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- , 1989, 'The Basics of Egyptian Chronology in Relation to the Bronze Age'. In: *High, Middle or Low, Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg, 20th-22nd August 1987*. Pp. 37-55. Gothenburg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Kitson, Peter R., 1997, 'Reconstruction, typology, and the "original homeland" of the Indo-Europeans'. In: *Linguistic Reconstruction and Typology*, ed. Jacek Fisiak. Pp. 183-239. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Krahe, Hans, 1962, 'Die Struktur der alteuropäischen Hydronymie'. *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jahrgang 1962, Nr. 5. Pp. 287-341.
- , 1964, *Unsere ältesten Flussnamen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kullmann, W., 1999, 'Homer und Kleinasien'. In: *Euphrosyne, Studies in Ancient Epic and Its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, Hrsg. J.N. Kazazis & A. Rengakos. Pp. 189-201. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Laroche, Emmanuel, 1957, 'Notes de Toponymie Anatolienne'. In:

- Mnēmis Charin, *Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer, 2. Mai 1866 – 9. März 1956*. Pp. 1-7. Wien: Bruder Hollinek; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- , 1958, 'Études sur les hiéroglyphes hittites'. *Syria* 35. Pp. 252-283.
- , 1960a, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites. Première partie: L'écriture*. Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique.
- , 1960b, 'Koubaba, déesse anatolienne, et le problème des origines de Cybèle'. In: *Éléments orientaux dans la religion Grecque ancienne, Colloque de Strasbourg, 22-24 mai 1958*. Pp. 113-128. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- , 1960c, 'Comparaison du Louvite et du Lycien II'. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 55. Pp. 155-185.
- , 1961a, 'Études de Toponymie Anatolienne'. *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 69. Pp. 57-91.
- , 1961b, 'Réflexions sur des problèmes de linguistique étrusque'. *Revue Études Latines* 38. Pp. 70-72.
- , 1966, *Les Noms des Hittites*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- , 1971, *Catalogue des Textes Hittites (= CTH)*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Latacz, Joachim, 2003, *Troia und Homer, Der Weg zur Lösung eines alten Rätsels*. München: Piper Verlag GmbH (Taschenbuchausgabe).
- Lehmann, Gustav Adolf, 1970, 'Der Untergang des hethitischen Grossreiches und die neuen Texte aus Ugarit'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 2. Pp. 29-73.
- , 1979, 'Die Šikalāyū—Ein neues Zeugnis zu den "Seevölker"-heerfahrten im späten 13. Jh. v. Chr. (RS 34.129)'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 11. Pp. 481-494.
- , 1983, 'Zum Auftreten von "Seevölker"-Gruppen im östlichen Mittelmeerraum—Eine Zwischenbilanz'. In: *Griechenland, Die Ägäis und die Levante während der "Dark Ages" vom 12. bis zum 9. Jh. v. Chr., Akten des Symposiums von Stift Zwettl (NÖ), 11.-14. Oktober 1980*, Hrsg. Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy. Pp. 79-97. Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- , 1985, *Die mykenisch-frühgriechische Welt und der östliche Mittelmeerraum in der Zeit der "Seevölker"-Invasionen um 1200 v. Chr.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- , 1996, 'Umbrüche und Zäsuren im östlichen Mittelmeerraum und Vorderasien zur Zeit der "Seevölker"-Invasionen um und nach 1200 v. Chr.'. *Historische Zeitschrift* 262, 1. Pp. 1-38.
- Lejeune, Michel, 1969, 'Observations sur l'épigraphie Élyme'. *Revue des Études Latines* 47. Pp. 133-183.
- Leonhard, Walther, 1911, *Hettiter und Amazonen, Die griechische Tradition über die "Chatti" und ein Versuch zu ihrer historischen Verwertung*. Leipzig-Berlin: Druck und Verlag von B.G. Teubner.
- Lepsius, Richard, 1900, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien III*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Leumann, Manu, 1977, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Lichtenberger, Reinhold Freiherrn von, 1911, *Einflüsse der ägäischen Kultur auf Ägypten und Palästina*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Liddell, Henri George, Scott, Robert, & Jones, Henry Stuart (= LSJ), *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Littauer, Mary A., & Crouwel, Joost H., 1979, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East*. Leiden-Köln: E.J. Brill.
- Littleton, C. Scott, 1973, *The New Comparative Mythology, An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil*. Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press (revised edition).
- Lochner-Hüttenbach, Fritz, 1960, *Die Pelasger*. Wien: Gerold & Co.
- Lomas, Kathryn, 1997, 'Introduction'. In: *Gender & Ethnicity in ancient Italy, Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy, Vol. 6*, eds. Tim Cornell & Kathryn Lomas. Pp. 1-8. University of London: Accordia Research Institute.
- Loretz, Oswald, 1995, 'Les Šerdanū et la fin d'Ougarit, Apropos des documents d'Égypte, de Byblos et d'Ougarit relatifs aux Shardana'. In: *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C., Ras Shamra-Ougarit XI, Actes du Colloque International, Paris, 28 juin-1^{er} juillet 1993*, eds. Marguerite Yon, Maurice Sznycer & Pierre Bordreuil. Pp. 125-136. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Lorimer, H.L., 1950, *Homer and the Monuments*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.
- Loulloupis, M., 1973, 'Mycenaean "Horns of Consecration" in Cyprus'. In: *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "The Mycenaean in the Eastern Mediterranean", Nicosia 27th March-2nd April 1972*. Pp. 225-244, Pls. XXVIII-XXIX. Nicosia: Zavallis Press Ltd.
- Lynn, Chris, & Miller, Dean, 1999, 'Three Carved Vases from the Minoan Villa at Aghia Triada, Crete: a Trifunctional Set?' *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 27, 3-4. Pp. 335-353.
- Macalister, R.A. Stewart, 1913, *The Philistines, Their History and Civilization*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Machinist, Peter, 2000, 'Biblical Traditions: The Philistines and Israelite History'. In: *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*, ed. Eliezer D. Oren. Pp. 53-83. Philadelphia: The University Museum.
- Malbran-Labat, Florence, 1991, 'Lettres'. In: *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville, Ras Shamra-Ougarit VII*, ed. Pierre Bordreuil. Pp. 27-64. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Mallory, James P., 1989, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans. Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Manning, Sturt W., 1999, *A Test of Time, The Volcano of Thera and the Chronology and History of the Aegean and east Medi-*

- terranean in the mid second millennium BC. Oxbow Books: Oxford and Oakville.
- Maresch, Gustav, 1957, 'Etruskisch *avil'*. In: *Mnēmis Charin, Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer, 2. Mai 1866—9. März 1956*. Pp. 27-8. Wien: Otto Harrassowitz Wiesbaden-Bruder Hollinek Wien.
- Marinatos, Spyridon, 1973, 'The first 'Mycenaeans' in Greece'. In: *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean, Archaeological and linguistic problems in Greek prehistory*, eds. R.A. Crossland & Ann Birchall. Pp. 107-113. London: Duckworth.
- Maspero, Gaston, 1873, [Review of Chabas' *Études*]. *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*. Pp. 81-86.
- , 1875, *Histoire Ancienne des peuples de l'orient classique*. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie.
- , 1878, [Review of de Rougé's *Inscriptions hiéroglyphique*]. *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*. Pp. 317-321.
- , 1881, 'Notes sur quelques points de Grammaire et d'Histoire'. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde* 19. Pp. 116-131.
- , 1910, *The Struggle of the Nations, Egypt, Syria and Assyria*. London: Society for promoting Christian knowledge.
- Masson, Olivier, 1983, *Les inscriptions Chypriotes syllabiques*. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
- Matsas, D., 1991, 'Samothece and the Northeastern Aegean: the Minoan Connection'. *Studia Troica* 1. Pp. 159-179.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1974, 'Die Arier im vorderen Orient—Ein Mythos?'. *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Sitzungsberichte*, Bd. 294, Abhandlung 3. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Mee, Christopher, 1978, 'Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium BC'. *Anatolian Studies* 28. Pp. 121-156.
- Meer, L. Bauke van der, 1992, 'The Stele of Lemnos and Etruscan Origins'. *Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden* 72. Pp. 61-71.
- Mégalomatis, Cosimo, 1996, 'Les peuples de la mer et la fin du monde mycénien, essai de synthèse historique'. *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma-Napoli, 14-20 ottobre*. Pp. 805-814. Roma: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale.
- Meid, Wolfgang, 1993, *Die erste Botorrita-Inschrift, Interpretation eines keltiberischen Sprachdenkmals*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- , 1996, *Kleinere keltiberische Sprachdenkmäler*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- , 2000, 'Forschungsbericht, Altkeltische Sprachen, 3. Keltiberisch'. *Kratylos* 45. Pp. 1-28.
- Melchert, H. Craig, 1993, *Lycian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill, N.C.
- , 2002, 'The God Sanda in Lycia?'. In: *Silva Anatolica, Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Piotr Taracha. Pp. 241-251. Warsaw: Agade.
- Mellaart, James, 1971, 'Anatolia c. 4000-2300 B.C.'. *Cambridge Ancient History I, 2*. Pp. 363-416. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (3rd edition).
- Mellink, Machteld J., 1972, 'Excavations at Karataş-Semayük and Elmali, Lycia, 1971'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 76. Pp. 257-269.
- , 1995, 'Homer, Lycia, and Lukka'. In: *The Ages of Homer, A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, eds. Jane B. Carter & Sarah P. Morris. Pp. 33-43. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Mercer, S.A.B., 1939, *The Tell El-Amarna Tablets I-II*. Toronto: Macmillan.
- Meriggi, Piero, 1937, 'Osservazioni sull'Etrusco'. *Studi Etruschi* 11. Pp. 129-201.
- , 1967, *Manuale di eteo geroglifico. Parte II: Testi-Ie serie, I testi neo-etei più o meno completi*. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- , 1980, *Schizzo grammaticale dell'Anatolico*. Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.
- Merlo, Paolo, 1998, *La dea Ašratum – Atiratu – Ašera. Un contributo allo storia della religione semitica del Nord*. Mursia: Pontificia Università Lateranense.
- Mertens, Paul, 1960, 'Les Peuples de la Mer'. *Chronique d'Égypte* 35. Pp. 65-88.
- Meijer, Louk C., 1982, *Eine strukturelle Analyse der Hagia Triada-Tafeln—Ein Beitrag zur Linear A-Forschung*. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 8. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner Publishing Co.
- Meyer, Eduard, 1928, *Geschichte des Altertums 2, 1.*, Stuttgart-Berlin: J.G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, Nachfolger.
- , 1968, *Geschichte des Koenigreichs Pontos*. Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., Publishers (Reprint of the Leipzig 1879 Edition).
- Monte, Giuseppe F. del, & Tischler, Johann, 1978, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 6. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Moran, William L., 1992, *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkin's University Press.
- Mühlestein, H., 1956, *Die oka-Tafeln von Pylos*. Basel: Selbstverlag.
- Muhly, J.D., 1979, [Review of: Sanders, N.K., *The Sea Peoples*]. *American Journal of Archaeology*, 83: 355-356.
- Muhly, J.D., Maddin, R., & Stech, T., 1988, 'Copper Ox-hide Ingots and the Bronze Age Metal Trade'. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*. Pp. 281- 298.
- Müller, Karl Otfried, & Deecke, Wilhelm, 1877, *Die Etrusker I-II*. Stuttgart: Verlag von Albert Heitz.

- Müller-Karpe, Hermann, 1959, *Beiträge zur Chronologie der Urnenfelderzeit Nördlich und Südlich der Alpen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Neumann, Günter, 1991, 'Hethitisch *negna-* 'Bruder''. *Historische Sprachforschung* 104. Pp. 63-66.
- , 1999, 'Wie haben die Troer im 13. Jahrhundert gesprochen?'. *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, Neue Folge 23. Pp. 15-23.
- Nibbi, Alexandra, 1975, *The Sea Peoples and Egypt*. Park Ridge, New Jersey: Noyes Press.
- Niemeier, Wolf-Dietrich, 1996, 'A Linear A Inscription from Miletos (MIL Zb 1)'. *Kadmos* 35. Pp. 87-99.
- , 1998a, 'The Mycenaean in Western Anatolia and the Problem of the Origins of the Sea Peoples'. *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition, Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries BCE, In honor of Professor Trude Dothan*, eds. Seymour Gitin, Amihai Mazar & Ephraim Stern. Pp. 17-65. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- , 1998b, 'Mycenaean and Hittites in War in Western Asia Minor'. In: *Polemos, Le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'âge du Bronze, Actes de la 7e Rencontre égéenne internationale, Université de Liège, 14-17 avril 1998*, ed. Robert Laffineur. Pp. 141-156. Eupen: Université de Liège-Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory, The University of Texas Austin.
- Nilsson, Martin Persson, 1927, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.
- , 1933, *Homer and Mycenae*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Noort, Ed, 1994, *Die Seevölker in Palästina*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- Nougayrol, Jean, 1968, 'Ugarit et Alašia'. *Ugaritica V*, ed. Claude F.A. Schaeffer. Pp. 83-89. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Olivier, Jean-Pierre, & Godart, Louis, 1996, *Corpus Hieroglyphicarum Inscriptionum Cretae*. Paris: De Boccard Édition-Diffusion.
- Onyshkevych, Lada, 2002, 'Interpreting the Berezan Bone Graf-fito'. In: *Oikistes, Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham*, eds. Vanessa B. Gorman & Eric W. Robinson. Pp. 161-179. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill.
- Oren, Eliezer, 1997, *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum.
- Ormerod, H.A., 1924, *Piracy in the Ancient World*. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool.
- Otten, Heinrich, 1988, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy, Ein Staatsvertrag Tudḫalijas IV*. Studien zur Boğazköy Texte, Beiheft 1, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- , 1989, 'Die hieroglyphen-luwische Inschrift, Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 1988'. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1989. Pp. 333-337.
- , 1993, 'Das Land Lukka in der hethitischen Topographie'. In: *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposiums*, eds. Jürgen Borchhardt & Gerhard Dobesch. Pp. 117-121. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Owens, Gareth Alun, 1996, 'New Evidence for Minoan 'Demeter''. *Kadmos* 35. Pp. 172-175.
- , 1999, 'The Structure of the Minoan Language'. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 27: 1&2, Spring/Summer. Pp. 15-49.
- , 2000, 'Pre-Hellenic Language(s) of Crete: Debate and Discussion, Comments on the Paper by Yves Duhoux in The Journal of Indo-European Studies Volume 26: 1-2, Spring/Summer 1998, 1-40'. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 28: 1-2, Spring/Summer. Pp. 237-253.
- Page, Denys L., 1959, *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Pallottino, Massimo, 1968, *Testimonia Linguae Etruscae (= TLE)*. Firenze: «La Nuova Italia» Editrice (2^a edizione).
- , 1988, *Etruskologie, Geschichte und Kultur der Etrusker*. Basel-Boston-Berlin: Birkhäuser Verlag.
- Palmer, Leonard Robert, 1956, 'Military Arrangements for the Defence of Pylos'. *Minos* 4. Pp. 120-145.
- , 1965, *Mycenaean and Minoans. Aegean Prehistory in the Light of the Linear B Tablets*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd (second edition).
- , 1998, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press (Sandpiper reprint).
- Papadimitriou, Nikolas, 2001, *Built Chamber Tombs of Middle and Late Bronze Age Date in Mainland Greece and the Islands*. BAR International Series 925. Oxford.
- Parker, Victor, 1999, 'Die Aktivitäten der Mykenäer in der Ostägäis im Lichte der Linear B Tafeln'. In: *Florent Studia Mycenaea, Akten des X. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.-5. Mai 1995*, Hrsg. Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy, Stefan Hiller & Oswald Panagl. Pp. 495-502. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Pålsson Hallager, Birgitta, 1985, 'Crete and Italy in the Late Bronze Age III Period'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 89. Pp. 293-305.
- Peden, A.J., 1994, *Egyptian Historical Inscriptions of the Twentieth Dynasty*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms förlag.
- Pedley, John Griffiths, 1972, *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Pfuhl, Ernst, 1923, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen I*. München: F. Bruchmann A.-G.
- Pilides, D., 1994, *Handmade Burnished Wares of the Late Bronze Age in Cyprus*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 105. Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Poetto, Massimo, 1993, *L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di Yalbur, Nuove acquisizioni relative alla geografia dell'anatolia sud-*

- occidentale*. Studia Mediterranea 8. Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore.
- Pohl, Ingrid, 1972, *The Iron Age Necropolis of Sorbo at Cerveteri*. Skrifter Utgivna Svenska Institutet i Rom, 4^o, 32. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Rom.
- Pokorny, Julius, 1994, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Tübingen-Basel: Francke Verlag (3. Auflage).
- Polomé, Edgar C., 1982a, 'Balkan Languages (Illyrian, Thracian and Daco-Moesian)'. *Cambridge Ancient History III, 1*. Pp. 866-888. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (3rd edition).
- , 1982b, 'Indo-European Culture, With Special Attention to Religion'. In: *The Indo-Europeans of the Fourth and Third Millennia*, ed. Edgar C. Polomé. Pp. 156-172. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc.
- Pope, Maurice, 1956, 'Cretan Axe-Heads with Linear A Inscriptions', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 51. Pp. 132-135.
- Popham, Mervyn, 2001, 'The Collapse of Aegean Civilization at the End of the Late Bronze Age'. In: *The Oxford Illustrated History of Prehistoric Europe*, ed. Barry Cunliffe. Pp. 277-303. Oxford: Oxford University Press (reissued paperback edition of 1997).
- Popham, Mervyn, Touloupa, E., & Sackett, L.H., 1982, 'The Hero of Lefkandi'. *Antiquity* 56. Pp. 169-174.
- Poultney, James Wilson, 1959, *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium*. Illinois: American Philological Association.
- Pritchard, James B., 1969, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (3rd edition).
- Protonotariou-Deilaki, Evangelia, 1990, 'The Tumuli of Mycenae and Dendra'. In: *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid, Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 11-13 June, 1988*, eds. Robin Hägg & Gallög C. Nordquist. Pp. 85-106. Stockholm: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Pugliese Carratelli, Giovanni, 1954, [Review of H. Mühlestein, *Olympia in Pylos*, Basel 1954]. *La Parola del Passato* 9. Pp. 468-471.
- Pulgram, Ernst, 1978, *Italic, Latin, Italian, 600 B.C. to A.D. 1260, Text and commentaries*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Radet, Georges, 1892, *La Lydie et le monde Grec au temps des Mermnades (687- 546)*. Paris: Thorin & Fils Éditeurs.
- Ranke, Hermann, 1935, *Die Ägyptischen Personennamen*. Glückstadt: Verlag von J.J. Augustin.
- Reden, Sibylle von, 1992, *Ugarit und seine Welt, Die Entdeckung einer der ältesten Handelsmetropolen am Mittelmeer*. Bergisch Gladbach: Gustav Lübbe Verlag.
- Redford, Donald B., 1992, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Reinach, A.J., 1910, 'Le disque de Phaistos et les Peuples de la mer'. *Revue Archéologique* 15. Pp. 1-65.
- Renfrew, Colin, 1987, *Archaeology and Language, The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Ridgway, David, 1988, 'Italy from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age'. *Cambridge Ancient History IV*. Pp. 623-633. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2nd edition).
- Riemschneider, Margarete, 1954, *Die Welt der Hethiter*. Zürich: Fretz & Wasmuth Verlag AG.
- Risch, Ernst, 1958, 'L'interprétation de la série des tablettes caractérisées par le mot o-ka (PY AN 519, 654, 656, 657, 661)'. *Athenaeum* 46. Pp. 334-359.
- Rix, Helmut, 1991, *Etruskische Texte, Editio minor. I: Einleitung, Konkordanz, Indices, II: Texte*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Romey, Kristin, 2003, 'The Vogelbarke of Medinet Habu', MA thesis, archaeology, Texas A&M University.
- Rosenkranz, Bernhard, 1966, 'Fluß- und Gewässername in Anatolien'. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung, neue Folge* 1. Pp. 124-144.
- Ross Holloway, R., 1994, *The Archaeology of Early Rome and Latium*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Rougé, Emmanuel de, 1861, *Oeuvres Diverses IV*.
- , 1867, 'Extraits d'un mémoire sur les attaques dirigées contre l'égypte par les peuples de la méditerranée'. *Revue Archéologique* 16. Pp. 35-45.
- Royen, René A. van, & Isaac, Benjamin H., 1979, *The Arrival of the Greeks, The Evidence from the Settlements*. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 5. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner Publishing Co.
- Rutter, Jeremy, 1975, 'Ceramic Evidence for Northern Intruders in Southern Greece at the Beginning of the Late Helladic IIIC Period'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 79. Pp. 17-32.
- Sakellarakis, Iannis, & Olivier, Jean-Pierre, 1994, 'Un vase en pierre avec inscription en linéaire A du sanctuaire de sommet minoen de Cythère'. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 118. Pp. 343-351.
- Sakellariou, Michel B., 1977, *Peuples préhelléniques d'origine indo-européenne*. Athens: Ekdotikè Athenon S.A.
- , 1980, *Les Proto-Grecs*. Athens: Ekdotikè Athenon S.A.
- Salmon, Edward Togo, 1988, 'The Iron Age: The Peoples of Italy'. *Cambridge Ancient History IV*. Pp. 676-719. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2nd edition).
- Sandars, Nancy K., 1978, *The Sea Peoples, Warriors of the ancient Mediterranean 1250-1150 BC*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.
- , 1980, *De Zeevolken, Egypte en Voor-Azië bedreigd, 1250-1150 v.C.* Haarlem: Fibula-Van Dishoeck.
- Sauter, Hermann, 2000, *Studien zum Kimmerierproblem*. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 72. Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH.

- Savaş, Özkan Savaş, 1998, *Divine, Personal and Geographical Names in the Anatolian (Hittite-Luwian) Hieroglyphic Inscriptions*. Istanbul.
- Schachermeyr, Fritz, 1929, *Etruskische Frühgeschichte*. Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- , 1950, *Poseidon und die Entstehung des griechischen Götterglaubens*. Bern: A. Francke AG. Verlag.
- , 1960, 'Das Keftiu-Problem und die Frage des ersten Auftretens einer griechischen Herrenschicht im minoischen Kreta'. *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes* 45. Pp. 44-68.
- , 1979, *Kreta zur Zeit der Wanderungen, vom Ausgang der minoischen Ära bis zur dorisierung der Insel*. Die Ägäische Frühzeit, 3. Band. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- , 1980, *Griechenland im Zeitalter der Wanderungen, Vom Ende der mykenischen Ära bis auf die Dorier*. Die Ägäische Frühzeit, 4. Band. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- , 1982, *Die Levante im Zeitalter der Wanderungen, Vom 13. bis zum 11. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Die Ägäische Frühzeit, 5. Band. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- , 1984, *Griechische Frühgeschichte, Ein Versuch, frühe Geschichte wenigstens in Umrissen verständlich zu machen*. Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Schmerhorn, R.A., 1970, *Comparative Ethnic Relations; A Framework for Theory and Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schmoll, Ulrich, 1959, *Die Sprachen der vorkeltischen Indogermanen Hispaniens und das Keltiberische*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Schnapp-Gourbeillon, Annie, 2002, *Aux origines de la Grèce (XIII^e-VIII^e siècles avant notre ère), La genèse du politique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Schuler, Einar von, 1965, *Die Kaškäer, Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des Alten Kleinasien*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schulman, Alan R., 1987, 'The Great Historical Inscription of Merneptah at Karnak: A Partial Reappraisal'. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 24. Pp. 21-34.
- Schulze, W., 1966, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Berlin-Zürich-Dublin: Weidmann (2. unveränderte Auflage).
- Seeger, Ulrich, n.d. [2002], 'Fonts apt to the transcription of Semitic texts', at: http://semitistik.uni-hd.de/seeger/english/fonts_e.htm#anfang
- Segert, Stanislav, 1984, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*. Berkeley, California.
- Seters, John van, 1966, *The Hyksos, A New Investigation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shaw, Joseph W., 1998, 'Kommos in Southern Crete: an Aegean Barometer for East-West Interconnections'. In: *Eastern Mediterranean, Cyprus-Dodecanese-Crete 16th-6th cent. B.C., Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymon - Crete in May 1997*, eds. V. Karageorghis & N. Chr. Stampolidis. Pp. 13-27. Athens: University of Crete-A. G. Leventis Foundation.
- Shefton, B.B., 1994, 'Massalia and Colonization in the North-Western Mediterranean'. In: *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation, Essays dedicated to Sir John Boardman*, ed. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze & Franco De Angelis. Pp. 61-86. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- Shelmerdine, Cynthia W., 1997, 'The Palatial Bronze Age of the Southern and Central Greek Mainland'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 101. Pp. 537-585.
- Sihler, Andrew L., 1995, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simone, Carlo de, 1996, *I Tirreni a Lemnos, Evidenza linguistica e tradizioni storiche*. Firenze: Leo Olschki Editore.
- Singer, Itamar, 1985, 'The Beginning of Philistine Settlement in Canaan and the Northern Boundary of Philistia'. *Tel Aviv* 12. Pp. 109-122.
- , 1988, 'The Origin of the Sea Peoples and their Settlement on the coast of Canaan'. In: *Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean (c. 1500-1000 B.C.)*, eds. M. Heltzer & E. Lipiński. Pp. 239-250. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters.
- Smit, Daniel W., 1989, 'Mycenaean Penetration into Northern Greece'. In: *Thracians and Mycenaean, Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Thracology, Rotterdam, 24-26 September 1984*, eds. Jan Best & Nanny de Vries. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 11. Pp. 174-180. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- , 1988-9, 'Achilles, Aeneas and the Hittites, A Hittite model for Iliad XX 191-194?'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 20-21. Pp. 53-64.
- , 1990-1, 'KUB XIV 3 and Hittite History, A Historical Approach to the Tawagalawa-letter'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 22-23. Pp. 79-111.
- Snodgrass, Anthony M., 1978, [Review of: Sanders, N.K., *The Sea Peoples*]. *Antiquity*, 52: 161.
- , 2000, *The Dark Age of Greece, An archaeological survey of the eleventh to eighth centuries BC*. Edinburgh: At the University Press (reprint of 1971 edition).
- Snowden, Jr., Frank, 1997, 'Greeks and Ethiopians'. In: *Greeks and Barbarians, Essays on the Interaction between Greeks and Non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism*, eds. John E. Coleman & Clark A. Waltz. Pp. 103-121. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press.
- Sollors, Werner, 1996, *Theories of Ethnicity, A Classical Reader*. New York: New York University Press.
- Somella, Paolo, 1974, 'Das Heroon des Aeneas und die Topographie des antiken Lavinium'. *Gymnasium* 81, 4. Pp. 273-297.

- Sommer, Ferdinand, 1932, *Die Aḥḥijavā-Urkunden*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Spencer, Nigel, 1995, 'Early Lesbos between East and West: A 'Grey Area' of Aegean Archaeology'. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 90. Pp. 269-306.
- Stadelmann, Rainer, 1969, 'Die Abwehr der Seevölker unter Ramses III'. *Saeculum* 19. Pp. 156-171.
- Stager, Larry, 1998, 'Forging an Identity: The Emergence of Ancient Israel.' In: *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*, ed. M.D. Coogan. Pp. 123-75. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Starke, Frank, 1981, 'Die Keilschrift-luwischen Wörter für Insel und Lampe'. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 95. Pp. 142-152.
- , 1997, 'Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen Umfeldes Kleinasien im 2. Jahrtausend'. *Studia Troica* 7. Pp. 447-487.
- Steinbauer, Dieter H., 1999, *Neues Handbuch des Etruskischen*. St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae.
- Steiner, Gerd, 1993, 'Die historische Rolle der "Lukkā"'. In: *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposions*, eds. Jürgen Borchhardt & Gerhard Dobesch. Pp. 123-137. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Strid, Ove, 1999, *Die Dryoper, Eine Untersuchung der Überlieferung*. Uppsala.
- Strange, John, 1980, *Kaphtor/Keftiu, A new investigation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Strobel, August, 1976, *Der spätbronzezeitliche Seevölkersturm, Ein Forschungsüberblick mit Folgerungen zur biblischen Exodusthematik*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Strøm, Ingrid, 1971, *Problems Concerning the Origin and Early Development of the Etruscan Orientalizing Style*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- , 1990, 'Relations between Etruria and Campania around 700 BC'. In: *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, ed. Jean-Paul Descoeudres. Pp. 87-97. Canberra: Humanities Research Centre. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stubbings, Frank H., 1973, 'The Rise of Mycenaean Civilization'. *Cambridge Ancient History II, 1*. Pp. 627-658. Cambridge: At the University Press (3rd edition).
- Suter, Ann, 2002, *The Narcissus and the Pomegranate, An Archaeology of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Symeonoglou, S., 1973, *Kadmeia I, Mycenaean Finds from Thebes, Greece, excavation at 14 Oedipusstreet*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 35. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Tekoğlu, Recai, & Lemaire, André, 2000, 'La bilingue royale Louvito-Phénicienne de Çineköy'. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 2000. Pp. 961-1006.
- Tovar, Antonio, 1977, *Krahes alteuropäische Hydronymie und die westindogermanischen Sprachen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Tsetsckhladze, Gocha R., 1994, 'Greek Penetration of the Black Sea'. In: *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation, Essays dedicated to Sir John Boardman*, ed. Gocha R. Tsetsckhladze & Franco De Angelis. Pp. 111-135. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- Vagnetti, Lucia, 2000, 'Western Mediterranean Overview: Peninsular Italy, Sicily and Sardinia at the Time of the Sea Peoples'. In: *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*, ed. Eliezer D. Oren. Pp. 305-326. Philadelphia: The University Museum.
- , 2001, 'Some Observations on Late Cypriot Pottery from the Central Mediterranean'. In: *Italy and Cyprus in Antiquity: 1550-450 BC, Proceedings of an International Symposium held at the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America at Columbia University, November 16-18, 2000*, eds. Larissa Bonfante & Vassos Karageorghis. Pp. 77-96. Nicosia: The Costakis and Leto Severis Foundation.
- Vandenabeele, Frieda, 1985, 'La chronologie des documents en Linéaire A'. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 109. Pp. 3-20.
- Vanschoonwinkel, Jacques, 1991, *L'Égée et la méditerranée orientale à la fin du II^e millénaire, Témoignages archéologiques et sources écrites*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain. Providence (Rhode Island): Brown University.
- Ventris, Michael, & Chadwick, John, 1973, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge: At the University Press (2nd edition).
- Vetter, Emile, 1953, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Vries, Nanny M.W. de, 1976, 'Three Twin Catacomb-graves'. In: *Pulpudeva, Semaines philippopolitaines de l'histoire et de la culture thrace, Plovdiv, 4-18 octobre 1976*. Pp. 210-214.
- Vürtheim, J.J.G., 1913, *Teukros und Teukrer, Untersuchung der Homerischen und der Nachhomerischen Ueberlieferung*. Rotterdam: Verlag W.L. & J. Brusse.
- Wachsmann, Shelley, 1998, *Seagoing Ships & Seamanship in the Bronze Age Levant*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- , 2000, 'To the Sea of the Philistines'. In: *The Sea Peoples and Their World: A Reassessment*, ed. Eliezer D. Oren. Pp. 103-143. Philadelphia: The University Museum.
- Wainwright, G.A., 1959, 'The Teresh, the Etruscans and Asia Minor'. *Anatolian Studies* 9. Pp. 197-213.
- , 1961, 'Some Sea-Peoples'. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 47. Pp. 71-90.
- , 1962, 'A Teucric at Salamis in Cyprus'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 83. Pp. 146-151.

- Waldbaum, Jane C., 1966, 'Philistine Tombs at Tell Fara and their Aegean Prototypes'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 70. Pp. 331-340.
- Warren, Peter, 1972, *Myrtos, An Early Bronze Age Settlement in Crete*. Oxford: Thames and Hudson, The British School of Archaeology at Athens.
- Warren, Peter, & Hankey, Vronwy, 1989, *Aegean Bronze Age Chronology*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Watkins, Calvert, 1986, 'The Language of the Trojans'. In: *Troy and the Trojan War, A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984*, ed. Machteld Mellink. Pp. 45-62. Bryn Mawr, P.A.: Bryn Mawr College.
- Webster, Thomas B.L., 1960, *From Mycenae to Homer*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. (2nd edition).
- Wees, Hans van, 1992, *Status Warriors, War Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, Publisher.
- Weidner, Ernst F., 1939, 'Joachim, König von Juda, in babylonischen Keilschrifttexten'. In: *Mélanges Syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud, Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique XXX*. Pp. 923-935. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Whatmough, Joshua, 1968, *The Pre-Italic Dialects of Italy*. Hildesheim: Georg-Olm Verlagsbuchhandlung (Reprograhischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Cambridge 1933).
- Widmer, W., 1975, 'Zur Darstellung der Seevölker am Großen Tempel von Medinet Habu'. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache* 102. Pp. 67-77.
- Wiesner, Joseph, 1968, *Fahren und Reiten, Archaeologia Homerica, Denkmäler und das frühgriechische Epos, Band I, Kapitel F*, Hrsg. Friedrich Matz & Hans-Günter Buchholz. Göttingen: Van den Hoeck & Ruprecht.
- Woudhuizen, Fred C., 1982-3, 'Etruscan Origins: The Epigraphic Evidence'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 14-15. Pp. 91-117.
- , 1984-5a, 'Lydian: Separated from Luwian by three signs'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 16-17. Pp. 91-113.
- , 1984-5b, 'Origins of the Sidetic Script'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 16-17. Pp. 115-127.
- , 1989, 'Thracians, Luwians and Greeks in Bronze Age Central Greece'. In: *Thracians and Mycenaeans, Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Thracology, Rotterdam, 24-26 September 1984*, eds. Jan Best & Nanny de Vries. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 11. Pp. 191-204. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- , 1990, 'The Sardis Bilingue Reconsidered'. *Orpheus, Journal of Indo-European, Palaeo-Balkan and Thracian Studies* 0. Pp. 90-106.
- , 1990-1, 'The Dawn of Indo-European Literacy'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 22-23. Pp. 139-149.
- , 1992a, *The Language of the Sea Peoples*. Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 12. Amsterdam: Najade Press bv.
- , 1992b, *Linguistica Tyrrhenica, A Compendium of Recent Results in Etruscan Linguistics*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, Publisher.
- , 1992c, 'Evidence of Bilingualism in Cretan Hieroglyphic'. *Cretan Studies* 3. Pp. 191-201; Pls. XXIV-XXVII.
- , 1992-3, 'On the Dating of Luwian Great Kings'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 24-25. Pp. 167-201.
- , 1993a, 'Old Phrygian: Some Texts and Relations'. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 21. Pp. 1-25.
- , 1993b, 'Historical Backgrounds to the Old Phrygian-Greek Linguistic Relationship'. In: *Atti del IV° Congresso Internazionale di Tracologia, Palma de Mallorca 24-28 March 1992*, ed. Alexander Fol. Pp. 377-394. Roma: Nagard.
- , 1994, 'Tablet RS 20.25 from Ugarit, Evidence of Maritime Trade in the Final Years of the Bronze Age'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 26. Pp. 509-538.
- , 1994-5, 'Luwian Hieroglyphic Monumental Rock and Stone Inscriptions from the Hittite Empire Period'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 26-27. Pp. 153-217.
- , 1997, 'The Bee-sign (Evans no. 86): An Instance of Egyptian Influence on Cretan Hieroglyphic'. *Kadmos* 36. Pp. 97-110.
- , 1998, *Linguistica Tyrrhenica II, The Etruscan Liturgical Calendar from Capua, Addenda et Corrigenda ad Volume I*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, Publisher.
- , 1998-9, 'Nanas, A Luwian Personal Name in the West'. *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 30-31. Pp. 175-179.
- , 2000-1, 'The Earliest Inscription from Thrace'. In: *The Black Sea Region in the Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Period*, eds. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze & Jan G. de Boer (= *Talanta, Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society* 32-33). Pp. 289-305.
- , 2001a, [Review of Dieter H. Steinbauer, *Neues Handbuch des Etruskischen*, Mercatorae, St. Katharinen 1999]. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 29. Pp. 499-508.
- , 2001b, 'Defining Atlantis in Space and Time'. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 33. Pp. 605-620.
- , 2002a, 'A Minoan Royal Seal Issued at Malia'. *Kadmos* 41. Pp. 123-128.
- , 2002b, 'The "Trowel"-Sign (Evans no. 18): Another instance of Egyptian influence on Cretan hieroglyphic'. *Kadmos* 41. Pp. 129-130.
- , 2004a, *Luwian Hieroglyphic Monumental Rock and Stone Inscriptions from the Hittite Empire Period*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft.

- , 2004b, Woudhuizen, Fred C., *Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts*, Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft.
- , 2005, Woudhuizen, Fred C., *Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts 2*, Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft.
- , *forthc.* 1, 'Middle Bronze Age Luwian Hieroglyphic and its Ramifications to Crete', *Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 2-8, 2002*, ed. Aygül Süel.
- , *forthc.* 2, 'Untying the Cretan Hieroglyphic Knot'. *Ancient West & East* 5.
- Wijngaarden, Gert Jan Maria van, 1999, *Use and Appreciation of Mycenaean Pottery outside Greece, Contexts of LHI-LHIIIB finds in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy*. Amsterdam (dissertation).
- Wyatt, William F., 1970, 'The Indo-Europeanization of Greece'. In: *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans, Papers Presented at the Third Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania*, eds. George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald & Alfred Senn. Pp. 89-111. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Yon, Marguerite, 1992, 'The End of the Kingdom of Ugarit'. In: *The Crisis Years: The 12th Century B.C. From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, eds. William A. Ward & Martha Sharp Joukowsky. Pp. 111-122. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Zgusta, Ladislav, 1984, *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING: DE ETNICITEIT VAN DE ZEEVOLKEN

De episode van de Zeevolken aan het eind van de Bronstijd leidt tot de val, dan wel de verzwakking, van de grote rijken in het Nabije Oosten zoals dat van de Hettieten en de Egyptenaren. Tevens betekent het een keerpunt in de historie, als gevolg waarvan het economische en politieke centrum uiteindelijk wordt verlegd van het Nabije Oosten naar de centraal Mediterrane regio.

De centrale vraag in het onderhavige onderzoek is in hoeverre de Zeevolken uit coherente etnische groepen bestaan. Alvorens deze vraag te kunnen beantwoorden, dienen we ons af te vragen: wat is etniciteit en wie waren de Zeevolken?

Voor het begrip etniciteit bestaan mooie moderne definities, maar de belangrijkste kenmerken worden in al hun eenvoud opgesomd in een passage uit Herodotos' *Historiën*. Daarin laat Herodotos de Atheners aan de vooravond van de Perzische inval in Griekenland van 480 voor Christus de Spartaanse gezanten, die bezorgd zijn voor een Atheens vergelijk met de Perzen, als volgt antwoorden:

“Dat de Lakedaimoniërs bang zijn, dat wij met de barbaren een overeenkomst sluiten, is volkomen begrijpelijk. Maar gij blijkt de gezindheid der Atheners wel bijzonder slecht te kennen, dat gij u daarover zorgen maakt, want nergens ter wereld bestaat er zoveel goud en er bestaat geen land, hoezeer het in schoonheid en voortreffelijkheid ook alle andere mag overtreffen, dat wij het zouden willen aannemen als prijs voor Perzische gezindheid en onderwerping van Griekenland. Er zijn immers vele belangrijke redenen, die ons, zelfs al wilden we het, daarvan zouden weerhouden: (...) de bloed- en taalverwantschap van het Griekse volk, de gemeenschappelijke heiligdommen der goden en offerplechtigheden en onze gelijksoortige zeden (...).” (Herodotos, *Historiën* VIII, 144, vertaling Onno Damsté)

De vier kenmerken van etniciteit die hier worden opgesomd zijn: verwantschap in bloed of gezamenlijke herkomst, verwantschap in taal, religie en zeden.

Het bepalen van een etnische identiteit aan de hand van deze vier indicia kan in de moderne tijd vrij gemakkelijk plaatsvinden, omdat er voldoende informatie is en wij in de meeste gevallen de mensen die het betreft ook zelf nog kunnen vragen wat ze er van vinden. Als we een teruggaan in de tijd, echter, valt deze laatste mogelijkheid al snel weg. In het geval van de Zeevolken, wier activiteiten voornamelijk aan het eind van de Bronstijd gesitueerd zijn (ca. 1200 voor Christus), wordt het bepalen van etnische identiteiten nog verder bemoeilijkt omdat we ons niet meer in de historische periode bevinden, maar in de *protohistorie*. Dit betekent dat er geen contemporaine geschiedwerken zijn overgeleverd, zoals dat van de vader van de geschiedenis, Herodotos, over de Perzische oorlogen of Thucydides over de Peloponnesische oorlog, maar dat wij ons moeten behelpen met literaire overleveringen uit de historische periode die lijken terug te verwijzen naar de Bronstijd. Voorzover er in deze periode al culturen bestaan die een vorm van schrift kennen, zoals Egypte met zijn hierogliefen en het Nabije Oosten met zijn cuneiform, kunnen we deze informatie aanvullen met die van de contemporaine inscripties, die echter vaak van propagandistische aard zijn. Tenslotte, beschikken we voor de protohistorische periode nog over de archeologische resten die door opgravingen aan het licht zijn gekomen en als het ware een gestold surrogaat voor ons historische begrip cultuur leveren, namelijk de materiële cultuur.

Om kort te gaan: voor de periode van de Late Bronstijd zullen we ons onderzoek naar etniciteit moeten verrichten met behulp van een aangepaste protohistorische methode, waarin informatie over gezamenlijke herkomst en verwantschap in taal, religie en zeden van de Zeevolken voor zover mogelijk wordt ontleend aan latere mythes en sagen, epigrafische bronnen en de resten van materiële culturen. Bij deze methode wordt aangenomen dat een etnische groep kan worden geïdentificeerd daar waar bijvoorbeeld een bepaalde taalgroep en een bepaalde materiële cultuur met elkaar overlappen (zie figuur 1b). Of dit juist is, kan nooit op waterdichte wijze worden bewezen: wij kunnen de betreffende mensen niet meer vragen of zij zich inderdaad allemaal als leden van een etnische identiteit beschouwen. In principe is het mogelijk dat er mensen zijn die tot dezelfde taalgroep behoren en dezelfde materiële cultuur hebben, maar zich toch tot een

hele andere etnische groep rekenen. Evenzeer is het mogelijk dat mensen met verschillende talen en materiële culturen zich toch tot dezelfde etnische groep rekenen.

Dit in ogenschouw nemend, dienen wij dan ook afstand te nemen van Gustav Kosinna's opvatting, die later door de Nazi's is misbruikt voor hun "Blut und Boden" theorie, dat iedere vastomlijnde archeologische cultuur precies samenvalt met het woongebied van een specifieke etnische bevolkingsgroep. Zoals we hebben gezien, is de werkelijkheid veel complexer. Maar om daartegenover te stellen dat het onderscheid van archeologische culturen in geen enkele relatie staat met dat van etnische groeperingen die in de betreffende regio gewoond hebben is eveneens onhoudbaar: op deze manier gooien we het kind weg met het badwater. Per geval zal met een open oog moeten worden bekeken in hoeverre onze protohistorische methode werkt.

De periode van de woelingen van de Zeevolken kent twee duidelijk onderscheiden fasen. De eerste fase bestaat uit een aanval van de Libische koning Meryey op de westelijke Nijl delta in het vijfde jaar van de Egyptische farao Merneptah, dat wil zeggen in 1208 voor Christus, waarin de Libische koning zich gesteund weet door huurlingen van de Zeevolken. Onder deze Zeevolken bevinden zich volgens Merneptah's verslag van de gebeurtenis te Karnak in Egyptische hoofdstad Thebe de *Sherden*, *Shekelesh*, *Ekwesh*, *Lukka* en *Teresh*. Uit de begeleidende tekst blijkt dat het doel van de Libische koning Meryey was om zich met zijn gevolg in Egypte te vestigen, maar helaas voor hem werd de aanval door Merneptah afgeslagen. De tweede fase wordt gekenmerkt door een aanval op de Nijl delta over zee en over land door de Zeevolken in het vijfde en achste jaar van de Egyptische farao Ramesses III, dat wil zeggen in 1179 en 1176 voor Christus. Uit de afbeeldingen van deze gecombineerde zee- en landslag van Ramesses III te Medinet Habu in de Egyptische hoofdstad Thebe (zie figuren 5 en 6) en de begeleidende tekst kunnen we afleiden dat de Zeevolken in kwestie, in navolging van de Libische koning Meryey, nu van plan waren zich te vestigen in het rijke Egypte. Ook in dit geval, echter, wordt de aanval afgeslagen door Ramesses III, en vestigen de Zeevolken zich in de regio van waaruit zij hun gecombineerde land- en zeeslag hadden georganiseerd, de Levant. De in deze fase betrokken Zeevolken waren de *Peleset*, *Tjeker*, *Shekelesh*, *Denye(n)* en *Weshesh*. Gegeven het feit dat de *Shekelesh* bij beide fasen van de woelingen van de Zeevolken betrokken waren, kunnen we concluderen dat er in de Egyptische bronnen

dus in totaal negen Zeevolken onderscheiden worden.

Alvorens we ons met de vraag kunnen bezighouden of de Zeevolken hetzij uit coherente etnische groepen bestonden hetzij uit bijeengeraapte piraten bendes, dienen we te bepalen waar zij vandaan kwamen. Vanaf het begin van de literatuur over de Zeevolken, die aanvangt met de ontcijfering van het Egyptisch hiëroglifisch door François Champollion, is hier verschillend over gedacht. De eerste onderzoekers, zoals Emmanuel de Rougé en François Chabas, dachten aan een coalitie van krachten uit zowel de centrale als oostelijke Mediterrane regio op basis van hun associatie van aan de ene kant de *Shekelesh*, *Sherden* en *Teresh* met Sicilië, Sardinië en Etrurië, en aan de andere kant de *Ekwesh* en *Lukka* met de Akhaïsche Grieken en de Lyciërs. Daartegenover stelde Gaston Maspero, aan wie we de term "Zeevolken" te danken hebben – een zeer terechte benaming als we bedenken dat deze tegenstanders volgens de teksten als Vikingen met schepen overzee van hun eilanden in de Mediterrane regio naar Egypte kwamen om aanvallen uit te voeren –, dat alle Zeevolken uit het oostelijke Mediterrane gebied afkomstig waren. Uitgangspunt voor dit idee was dat de *Tyrsenoi* of Etrusken volgens Herodotos uit westelijk Anatolië (= het huidige Turkije) afkomstig waren. In overeenstemming hiermee, associeerde Maspero de *Sherden* met de latere Lydische hoofdstad Sardis, de *Shekelesh* met Sagalassos in Pisidië en de *Weshesh* met Wassos in Karië. Na hun mislukte aanval op Egypte, zouden deze Anatolische Zeevolken naar hun uiteindelijke verblijfplaatsen in Sardinië, Sicilië en Etrurië geëmigreerd zijn.

Als we alle beschikbare gegevens met betrekking tot de oorsprong van de verschillende groepen van de Zeevolken op een rijtje zetten, dan blijkt dat Maspero's pan-oost-Mediterrane these niet houdbaar is. Het is zeker een feit dat een aantal van de Zeevolken uit westelijk Anatolië afkomstig is. Dit geldt voor de *Lukka*, die niet anders als als Lyciërs geïdentificeerd kunnen worden, en voor de *Tjeker*, waarin we de Trojaanse Teukriden kunnen herkennen. Voorts is het zeer aannemelijk dat *Ekwesh* en *Denye(n)* concurrerende benamingen voor de Myceense Grieken zijn, corresponderend met de Homerische variatie tussen Akhaïoi en Danaoi als aanduiding voor deze zelfde bevolkingsgroep (vergelijk in dit verband Germania, Allemagne en Deutschland voor onze oosterburen). Ten derde valt er veel voor te zeggen dat de *Peleset* of Filistijnen, die uit Lydië dan wel Kreta afkomstig zouden zijn, in de Griekse literaire overleveringen als Pelasgen aangeduid worden, een voor-Griekse bevolkingsgroep die

tijdens de verovering van het Griekse vasteland door de aartsvaders van de Grieken is uitgeweken naar de Egeïsche eilanden en westelijk Anatolië en ook voor Kreta geattesteerd is. Omdat het ethnonym Pelasgen in de vroegste Griekse literaire bronnen een concurrerende benaming voor de Tyrsenoi is, waarmee de *Teresh* in het algemeen geassocieerd worden, staat het buiten kijf dat Maspero de herkomst van laatstgenoemd Zeevolk terecht in het Egeïsche gebied traceert en aanneemt dat deze later, na de Bronstijd, naar Italië zijn verhuist. Maar dit alles laat onverlet dat er graviterende redenen zijn om met Maspero's tegenstanders van het eerste uur aan te nemen dat de *Sherden*, *Shekelesh* en *Weshesh* uit de centraal Mediterrane regio afkomstig zijn en gewoon refereren aan Sardiniërs, Siciliërs en Osken of Ausones. In deze zin is mijn oplossing voor het vraagstuk van de herkomst der Zeevolken een compromis tussen de these van de Rougé en Chabas en de antithese van Maspero: de laatste had gelijk in zijn idee over de oorsprong der Etrusken, die in de Egeïsch en Anatolië gesitueerd moet worden, maar gaat te ver wanneer hij vervolgens de centrale Mediterrane regio uitsluit als herkomst van sommige der Zeevolken en deze ook uit Anatolië laat komen.

Als ik gelijk heb in deze oplossing van het vraagstuk naar de herkomst van de verschillende groepen der Zeevolken, dan zijn wij ook dicht bij het antwoord naar de oorzaak van de woelingen van de Zeevolken periode. Het feit wil, namelijk, dat het Italische schiereiland aan het eind van de Bronstijd wordt gekenmerkt door een massale immigratie van dragers van de Europese urnenvelden-cultuur, waartoe de Osken of Ausones behoren. Deze nieuwkomers verdrijven deels de zittende bevolking, die op drift raakt, en gaan deels met deze op drift geraakte bevolkingsgroepen op zoek naar betere oorden, die in het veel rijkere oostelijke Mediterrane gebied gezocht worden, waar de oorspronkelijke bewoners van Italië, Sardinië en Sicilië onder andere door handel mee in contact stonden. Op hun drift naar het oosten wordt het paleis van Pylos in de westelijke Peloponnesos in de as gelegd en de lokale Myceense bevolking ten dele in de trek naar het oosten meegezogen. Vervolgens wordt de maritieme verdedigingslijn van het Hettitische rijk, die westelijk van de kust van Lycië gelegen was, doorbroken en is de vrije doortocht naar de Levant en uiteindelijk Egypte gegarandeerd (zie figuur 24). In het kielzog van dit gebeuren, worden wederom lokale bevolkingsgroepen in de trek naar het oosten meegezogen.

Nu komen wij tot de hamvraag: waren de Zeevolken

slechts diffuse piraten bendes of coherente ethnische groepen. Een eerste aanwijzing voor het antwoord dat wij wel degelijk met coherente ethnische groepen te maken hebben is gelegen in het feit dat zij door de Egyptenaren met onderscheiden *ethnonymen* worden aangeduid. Voorts worden zij in de afbeeldingen met fenotypische en culturele kenmerken afgebeeld. Zo dragen de *Sherden* een helm met horens, de *Shekelesh* een naar achteren gebogen muts en de *Peleset* een vederen hoofddeksel. Maar het belangrijkste argument is dat de verschillende groepen van de Zeevolken zich, na de afgeslagen aanval op de Nijl delta, *afzonderlijk* vestigen in bepaalde regio's van de Levant, te weten van zuid naar noord: de *Peleset* of Filistijnen in hun zogenaamde pentapolis in Palestina (Gaza, Askelon, Asdod, Ekron en Gath), de *Tjeker* of Teukriden in Dor, de *Sherden* of Sardiniërs in Akko, de *Denye(n)* of Danaoi in Joppa en later in Laish, de dragers van de Europese urnenvelden-cultuur, waaronder mogelijk de *Weshesh* of Osken in Hamath, en de *Ekwesh* of Akhaioi in de Cilicische vlakte (cf. figuur 17). Kennelijk wilden de onderscheiden groepen zich, ondanks hun gezamenlijke optreden tijdens de woelingen van de Zeevolken, niet mengen maar zich alleen temidden van hun eigen stamgenoten vestigen!

De woelingen van de Zeevolken aan het eind van de Bronstijd brengen niet alleen maar verwoestingen met zich mee, maar ook vernieuwingen. Zo introduceren de *Sherden* een nieuwe strijdwijze voor de infanterie, met ronde schilden en lange zwaarden, die, bij voldoende aantallen, opgewassen is tegen de strijdwagens van de oude Bronstijd rijken – de aanzet tot de latere Griekse falanx. Voorts zijn de *Peleset* of Filistijnen, volgens de overlevering van de Bijbel, gespecialiseerd in de bewerking van ijzer – *het* metaal van het nieuwe tijdperk, de IJzertijd. Tenslotte lijkt het waarschijnlijk dat de kennis van de Zeevolken uit de centrale Mediterrane regio met betrekking tot de wateren in dit gebied de Feniciërs in de vroege IJzertijd heeft gefaciliteerd bij hun fascinerende exploratie en kolonisatie van het west Mediterrane bekken.

CURRICULUM VITAE VAN FREDERIK CHRISTIAAN WOUDHUIZEN

Geboorteplaats	Zutphen (provincie Gelderland)
Geboortedag	13 februari 1959
Nationaliteit	Nederlandse
Adres	Het Hoekstuk 69, NL-1852 KX Heiloo
1977	Gymnasium B
1982	Kandidaatsexamen geschiedenis
1985	Doctoraalexamen oude geschiedenis (cum laude)
1990-1	Stipendium van het Institute for Thracology, in Sofia, Bulgarije
1991-2000	werkzaam in het bedrijfsleven
2000-	werkzaam als onafhankelijk onderzoeker op het gebied van de Mediterrane pre- en protohistorie
2002-2003	Promotiebeurs Erasmus Universiteit, Rotterdam

gepubliceerde boeken:

1988	coauteur van <i>Ancient Scripts from Crete and Cyprus</i> , Leiden: Brill
1989	coauteur van <i>Lost Languages of the Mediterranean</i> , Leiden: Brill
1992	<i>Linguistica Tyrrhenica, A Compendium of Recent Results in Etruscan Linguistics</i> , Amsterdam: Gieben
1992	<i>The Language of the Sea Peoples</i> , Amsterdam: Najade Press.
1998	<i>Linguistica Tyrrhenica II: The Etruscan Liturgical Calendar from Capua, Addenda et Corrigenda ad Volume I</i> , Amsterdam: Gieben.
2004	coauteur van <i>The Phaistos Disc: A Luwian Letter to Nestor</i> . Publications of the Henri Frankfort Foundation 13. Amsterdam: Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society.
2004	<i>Luwian Hieroglyphic Monumental Rock and Stone Inscriptions from the Hittite Empire Period</i> , Innsbruck: <i>Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts</i> , Innsbruck: <i>Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft</i> .
2004-2005	<i>Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts I-II</i> , Innsbruck: <i>Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft Selected Luwian Hieroglyphic Texts</i> , Innsbruck: <i>Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft</i> .

gepubliceerde artikelen:

de bibliografie bij het onderhavige proefschrift geeft een ruime selectie

