



<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

THE PHILISTINES AND THEIR AEGEAN CONNEXIONS

The traditional evidence and the bearing on the question
in Greek Literary records as well as in Josephus' and
Manetho's writings; the non-conventional evidence from
the biblical narratives.

by

Steven Vogazianos-Roy

M.Litt. thesis submitted to the University of Glasgow,
Department of Biblical Studies, Faculty of Arts

March 1995

ProQuest Number: 10391128

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10391128

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Thesis
10111
Copy 2



This work is dedicated to the loving memory of my uncle,

E.P. Papanoutsos,

former member of the Greek Academy of Letters and Science,
a mentor to me in moral quests and intellectual pursuits

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	7
SUMMARY.	10
ABBREVIATIONS.	12
INTRODUCTION.	16
CHAPTER ONE.	34
THE LATE BRONZE AGE IN THE AEGEAN-MINOANS AND MYCENAEANS	
A. The Minoans - their Cultural Impression on the Archaeological and Literary Record - Introduction.	
	34
The Background to the Late Minoan Age- A Summary.	
	34
The Late Minoan Age.	
	37
An Outline of the Main Events.	
	37
Overseas Connexions.	
	39
The Impressions of Late Minoan Culture on the Archaeological Record.	
	46
B. The Mycenaeans - The Expression of their Culture in the Archaeological Record - Introduction.	
	55
The Origin of the Mycenaeans.	
	56
The Land - Marks of the Mycenaean Era.	
	61
The Evidence for Mycenaean Connexions.	
	69
The Major Features of the Mycenaean Culture.	
	79
The Linear B Script.	
	84
Notes on Chapter One.	86

CHAPTER TWO.	105
THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT OF PHILISTINES' HISTORICAL EVOLUTION IN PALESTINE - THE PELESET OF THE EGYPTIAN RECORDS AND EVIDENCE OF THEIR ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT IN PALESTINE - INTRODUCTION.	105
The Old Testament account of Philistine History.	107
Egypt and the "Northern" allies	
a) The Invasions at the time of Merneptah and Ramesses III.	113
b) Evidence for the Original Peleset Settlement in Palestine.	115
Notes on the 2nd Chapter.	119
CHAPTER THREE.	125
PART I. THE HITHERTO ATTESTED ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORD AND THE TRADITIONAL LITERARY EVIDENCE REGARDING THE PHILISTINES AND THEIR CULTURE. INTRODUCTION.	125
A. The Archaeological Record.	128
B. The Traditional Literary Evidence.	156
a) The Biblical Narratives.	156
b) The Ramessidic Records.	163
c) The Hittite and Ugaritic Records.	176
d) The Egyptian Representations of People from "Keftiu".	191
PART II.; THE MAIN SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT AND THEORIES ON THE PHILISTINE QUESTION.	194

Notes on the Third Chapter.	208
CHAPTER FOUR.	232
THE BEARING IN THE ANCIENT GREEK SOURCES AND IN THE BIBLICAL ONES ON THE PHILISTINE QUESTION IN ITS VARIOUS RAMIFICATIONS - THE EVIDENCE ON THE OVERALL MATTER IN JOSEPHUS' AND MANETHO'S WORKS - INTRODUCTION.	232
Part 1: The Evidence on the Various Movements of Aegean Tribes or Heroes to Levantine Areas.	238
A. The Evidence from the Greek sources.	238
A1. The Evidence on the Dorian Connexion.	238
Notes on Part 1, A1.	283
A2: The Evidence on the Minoan and Achæan connexion.	296
Notes on A2.	328
Part Two: The Evidence on Aegean Peoples' activities in the Levent and on Levantine Tribes' or/and Heroes' patterns of activities in the Aegean at roughly the Sea Peoples' times and after the Decline of Mycenaean sovereignty.	335
A: The Evidence From The Greek Sources.	335
Notes on Part Two, A.	352

Part Two, B: The Evidence from Manetho and Josephus	358
Notes on Part Two, B.....	367
Part Three, A: The Evidence Suggesting Aegean Connexions in Cultural Matters, Daily life Practices, Appellations and Various Attitudes of the Philistines	373
A. The Evidence from the Greek sources.....	373
Notes on the Part Three, A.....	383
Part Three, B: The Evidence from Manetho and Josephus.....	387
Notes on Part Three, B.....	400
Part Three, C: The Evidence from Biblical Sources.....	406
Notes on Part Three, C.....	421
Appendix I.	426
Appendix II.	433
Appendix III.	440
Appendix IV.	460
Appendix V.	474
Appendix VI.	476

Acknowledgements

When treating such a wide-ranging and complicated subject as the Philistines and their connexion with Aegean cultures, a subject, that is, which calls for a knowledge range stretching over a " wide. Mediterranean " horizon, assistance and consultation of various types is absolutely vital, although the nature of this research has time and again proved getting the right piece of advice to have been a tall order. In any case the author of this treatise has intermittently sought expert advice on the matter and, although he has very often drawn upon it in the course of studying the overall issue, the responsibility for the views expressed in this study remains wholly his own. Following is a list of persons whose help has in various ways contributed to the task of smoothing over many difficulties and complications which cropped up during treatment of the subject:

First and foremost my gratitude is here recorded to late Prof. John Macdonald who gave me the opportunity to work on the postgraduate level and who has always been exceedingly generous with his time, valuable advice and indeed all kinds of help to me throughout the course of my working on the project. I am also grateful to Dr. R. Carroll whose help and encouragement in all respects have

greatly conduced to the smooth development and completion of the overall project. Next comes Dr. R. Gordon who has always been as helpful in matters of scholarly expertise as he has been friendly. I am also greatly indebted to Dr. B. Cutler for his valuable help in Ugaritic language and history matters; I must also thank especially Dr. N. Wyatt for his penetrating views and judgements which have many times helped me redress the balance between diverse aspects of the problems under examination; his overall stand towards my cause I rate very highly; I'm also grateful to Mr. M. Jones, Dr. Peltenburgh, Prof. Roy, Dr. Slater, Miss N. K. Sanders, R. D. Bennett, Dr. T. Dothan, Prof. Kirsten, Prof. N. Platon, Dr. Hurmuziadis, Prof. C. Dumas, Dr. Zois, Prof. J. Sakellarakis, Prof. Bulchotz, Dr. Mazar, Dr. Yalouris, Prof. G. Korres, Dr. Skilardi, Dr. V. Karageorghis, Dr. F. Vorros, Dr. A. Dimitriou, Prof. Karouzou and Dr. Aravantinos

I should also like to offer my special thanks to Mr. R. Macdonald, clerk of the Faculty of Arts, whose constant support and affability in all stages of my study will never be forgotten; and of course I should also like to express my gratitude to my parents and especially my mother but for whose unfailing financial and moral support this work would have never been accomplished; I am also grateful to the staff of Holmes McDougal publishing company who took so good

care of the binding and last but not least I should like to thank Mrs. E. Mcateer, Miss Kim, Mrs. Voyatzi and Mrs. A. Angel who typed the text. It is to be noticed that the latter's scrupulousness as well as keenness helped smooth over many technical difficulties.

Summary

This thesis is divided into four major parts. The first furnishes an account of the Mycenaean and Minoan cultures, the two predominant Aegean Late Bronze Age cultures, that is. The second chapter deals with the historical evolution of the Philistines in Palestine starting with their original settlement there. The third chapter sets out the traditional evidence on the Philistines and their Aegean connexions as well as the main theories on their origin and provenance. The final chapter furnishes so-far-unattested evidence from such literary records as Later Greek historians' writings and Josephus and Manetho's works. It also provides new evidence from, non-scrutinized (with respect to the Philistines)

biblical quotes. All this evidence regards the Aegean connexions of the Philistines. The overall survey is by far a literary one and it covers Greek, Jewish, Egyptian, Ugaritic, Hittite and Latin (the latter in a very minor, only supplementary scale) literary records, the archaeological evidence only furnishing the hitherto traditional knowledge of the Aegean-looking Philistine culture. This study discloses, for the first time, any aspect in Greek historians as well as Manetho's and Josephus' writings, pointing to a possible connexion of the Aegean Late Bronze Age cultures with the Philistines and there is, also for the first time, a suggestion that a possible Dorian connexion is to be detected in that biblical tribe. The method of comparative investigation is employed through various juxtapositions, whenever possible. This treatise argues for the Philistines having come from the Aegean area and for a strong tribal connexion between them and Aegean Late Bronze Age cultures. It also argues that they may well have come from Crete but not necessarily originated there. It proposes an Aegean route of the Philistines to the Levant, suggesting an

island-hopping course, and finally a possible setting up of a league of the Aegean-borne contingent with another following an inland southward course, through Near-eastern states, having started off from Anatolia.

Abbreviations

AA	Archäologischer Anzeiger (until 1961 published as part of J D A I ; from 1962 published separately)
AAA	Athens Annals of Archaeology
AAA(L)	Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology (Liverpool)
AAS	Annals Archeologiques de Syrie
AB	The Art Bulletin
(A)BSA	(The Annual of the) British School at Athens
AC	L' Antiquité Classique
AD	Archaeologikon Deltion
AE	Archaeologiki Ephemeris
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJP	American Journal of Philology
AK	Antike Kunst
AL	Acta Linguistica
AM	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Athenische Abteilung)
AMAT	Atti e Memorie dell' Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere " La Colombaria "
ANE	The Aegean and the Near East, Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman, ed. S.S Weinberg, New York, 1956.

ANET Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old
 Testament ed. J.B. Pritchard ., 3rd edn.
 Princeton 1969

Ant Surv. Antiquity and Survival

APA Acta Prehistorica et Archaeologica

AS Anatolian Studies

BA Biblical Archaeologist

BAMA Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean ed. R.A.
 Crossland and Ann Birchall, London, 1973

BCH Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique

BICS Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies

BRGK Berichte der Römisch - Germanischen Kommission
 des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts

ES Balkan Studies

CAH The Cambridge Ancient History

CJ The Classical Journal

CMic Atti e Memorie del 1°Congresso Internazionale
 di Micenologia, Rome, 1968

CMS Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel,
 vol. 1 : Die Minoischen und Mykenischen
 Siegel des National Museums in Athen, ed.
 Agnes Sakellariou, Berlin, 1964

CL Colston Papers (Bristol)

CQ The Classical Quarterly

EAE To Ergon tis Archaeologikis Etaireias

GRBS Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies.

IBK	Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
ILN	Illustrated London News.
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JCI	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JDAI	Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts.
JEA	The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.
JHS	The Journal of Hellenic Studies.
JKF	Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatistische Forschung.
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies.
JRGZM	Jahrbuch des Römisch - Germanischen Zentral - museums Meins.
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazkoi
MDOG	Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient- Gesellschaft Zu Berlin
OA	Opuscula Archæologica
OAth	Opuscula Atheniensiæ
PAAH	Praktikē tis en Athinais Archæologikis Etsirias.
PCPS	Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society
PPS	Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society
PRU	Palais Royal d' Ugarit
QDAP	The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine.

QSPEF Quarterly Statement of the Palestine
 Exploration Fund
 RA Revue Archéologique
 RB Revue Biblique
 RDAC Report of the Department of Antiquities.
 Cyprus
 RP Revue de Philologie
 RSA Rivista Storica dell' Antichità
 SM Studia Mycenæes : Proceedings of the Mycenæean
 Symposium, ed. A. Bartonek, Brno, 1968.
 SMEA Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici
 UF Ugarit-Forschungen.
 VT Vetus Testamentum..
 ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen
 Gesellschaft
 ZRG Zeitschrift für Religions - und Geistes -
 geschichte

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The present work attempts to reconstruct the sequence of events associated with the climactic upheavals in the Aegean and the Levant in the closing stages of the Bronze and the opening ones of the Iron Age with a view to forming a link between movements of tribes in the Aegean basin and the appearance and activities of the Philistines, one of the so-called "Sea-Peoples", in the Levantine areas.

Three important points should be made clear at the outset to help one achieve a better understanding of what follows in the main body of this essay.

Firstly, the multi-natured evidence that relates to the subject concerned - as a result of its many facets and the problems it is fraught with - as well as the vast, often fragmentary and vague material involved in its study, renders virtually impossible the summing up in one project of all the extant information from every source of evidence even though sometimes one and only aspect of the overall issue is to be singled out for investigation. One therefore has to make one's choice and concentrate on this or that kind of evidence or particular pieces of different kinds of evidence, leaving the rest out.

Accordingly it will be the literary evidence from both Aegean and Levantine sources that will be mainly drawn upon in this work in an attempt to provide, through appropriate combinations, a portrayal of that disturbed and "catalytic" era which witnessed profound historical changes in the late stages of the second millenium B.C. In doing so, such often-scattered and diverse fragments of evidence will be principally sought and fitted together as are likely, through the right collation and treatment, to ascribe to the overall sequence of developments any possible degree of homogeneity. The evidence of archaeology will also be sought and employed, yet on a definitely smaller scale than that the literary record will be employed upon. The latter records will virtually exclusively be drawn upon to provide what fresh, authentic evidence and general information the Greek, biblical, and Manethos' as well as Josephus sources have to offer on the matter of the overall Aegean connexions of the Philistines. Regarding the hitherto well-attested knowledge on the question both archaeological and literary sources will be employed, although it is to be hoped that, regarding the evidence of the Ugeritic sources from the time of the Philistines' (and other Sea-Peoples') raids in the Levant, there is fresh knowledge to be gained through the treatment they receive and the suggestions put forward here, though these sources are listed and examined

in the chapter dealing with the hitherto attested knowledge of the matter on the grounds of their being rather well-known as documentary material. All considered, the role of archaeology will be of a minor key as opposed to that of the literary sources. Save very sporadic and scanty occasions, no other kind of evidence will be utilized.

Speaking now in terms of the second point which is worth bearing in mind for a better understanding of certain attitudes peculiar to this study, the identification of what the archaeologists and historians have agreed to call "Sea peoples" and, therefore, Philistines is one of the most complex problems which literature, linguistics, archaeology and the other fields of scholarly endeavour associated with such matters have ever attempted to resolve. It is still now very much of a tantalizing issue and the difficulties it is fraught with, due either to vagueness or deficiency or even complete lack, many times, of the appropriate sources - particularly the archaeological ones - make it inevitable that the notions expressed by researchers - as to the various aspects of this far - ranging problem - belong, to a good or even great degree, to the realms of conjecture. This work is not an exception to this rule.

Going now on to the third important point paving the way for a better handling of the overall treatment of the material set out in the main body of this essay, it should be noted that the names with which the various tribal entities are "labelled" in this study by no means correspond to the precise ethnic make-up of the tribes concerned, and that the writer in employing them only endorses the traditional nomenclature which has been honoured by generations of scholars to date. It is for example very likely that what the Old Testament (abbreviated to O.T. henceforward) Israelites meant by "Philistines" comprised not only what the ancient Egyptians had given the ethnic appellation Plst or Prst (vocalized as "Peleset" henceforward) but also other tribal divisions of the ethnic confederation that menaced Remesses III's kingdom at the eighth year of his reign. And it is certain that what we intend by speaking of "Mycenaeans" were not only the inhabitants of ancient Mycenae in Peloponnese on the Greek Mainland but also those that lived at all the sites in ancient Greece which have yielded material evidence of the characteristic uniform type which is typical of the predominant culture of Late Bronze Age (c.1600 B.C. - 1050 B.C.) Greek mainland as well as of most of the Aegean islands - its appearance also having been recorded in many other overseas areas, such as Tarsus and Troy in Asia Minor and

the island of Cyprus - and which has been labelled "Mycenaean" by archaeologists; nor are the people we call "Minoans" only those that lived in ancient Crete at the time of the legendary king Minos, either the first or the second (grandson of the first), or both, but the inhabitants of this island - and of what other areas have yielded enough "Minoan" culture evidence to justify the theory of settlement, such as in the case with the Cycladic island of Santorini - throughout the age of the brilliant Minoan civilisation (c.3000 B.C. - 1050 B.C.).

What also is important in this context and therefore worth pointing out is that whenever references are made to Philistines and Sea Peoples in a broad sense both concepts are employed with a certain degree of overlap on a number of occasions; more specifically, whenever mentioning or discussing them outside the context of the Egyptian (Remessidic) records which make explicit mention of other Sea-Peoples also by name, a certain involvement of other Sea-Peoples should always be suspected, whether in terms of co-existence or mere influence, this situation springing mainly from the tribal amalgamation which is almost certain to have taken place in Palestine following the Sea-Peoples' settlement there and which must have involved a good deal, maybe all, of the ethnic spectrum of these newcomers. Thus, in those cases, names pertaining

to such ethnic entities have only been adopted for the sake of convenience and time-sanctioned usage, although of course it is mostly the very entities that come under the respective names which are meant whenever these names are employed, rather than any others.

Regarding now the Philistines as such, the chronological framework in which they are envisaged as having carried out their activities up to the time of their virtual disappearance from the historical scene, their historical evolution and their Aegean connexions, that is, matters which are examined in this dissertation, a brief outline of the events in question may well be in order as a means to pave the way for a broad familiarization of the reader with the matters treated in the main body of this essay.

In the eightieth year (c. 1186) of Egyptian Pharaoh Ramesses III his scribes record a massive southward thrust of a motley horde of peoples cutting a swath of destruction thorough various Levantine areas starting with the Kingdom of the Hittites and finishing off with that of Amurru, if we are to follow the order of the overran areas as it is furnished in the aforementioned Pharaoh's year

eight; -inscription at the Great temple at Medinet Habu. The foreign confederation is said in ibid to have comprised such tribes as the Peleset, Tjeker, Shekelesh, Denyen and Weshesh. They are what modern scholarly literature has broadly termed "Sea-Peoples". The confederacy attempted to invade Egypt, but Ramesses III, weathering the storm, beat them off and recorded his victory as a great triumph in the aforementioned inscription. He afterwards settled these tribes in Palestine as garrison troops and there, the Egyptian records hardly bothering about those peoples' fates thereafter, the O.T. narratives informs us of the harshly-fought war of the Israelites against the Philistines over hotly-disputed Canaan, [the O.T. Philistines being unanimously looked upon as none other than the Egyptian Peleset]. The Israelites eventually prevail and the Philistine power rapidly wanes only to be finally swept into total insignificance and eventual fusion with the predominant Semitic population after it is dealt repeated blows in the form of successive conquests by Egyptians (Pharaoh Siemun of the 21st Dynasty), Assyrians (Tiglath Pileser III, Sargon II, Sennacherib, Ashurbanibal), Egyptians again (Psammetichus I) and finally the coup de grace by Babylonians (Nebuchadnezzar II) at c. 604 whereupon Philistia as such drifts into historical limbo.

This work gives, in the first chapter, an account of the Minoan and Mycenaean civilisation which are the ones that the Philistines are akin to more than to any other and proceeds by furnishing, in the second chapter, an account of the historical appearance and evolution of the Philistines in Palestine. In the third chapter the traditional archaeological and literary evidence on the Aegean connexions of the Philistines are set out, as well as the main schools of thought on the tantalizing aspects of the Philistine issue. The fourth and final chapter furnishes fresh, authentic evidence from Greek and O.T. sources as well as from Josephus and Manethos' writings on the Aegean connexions of the Philistines thereby arguing for this tribe's further ties and affinities with Aegean peoples, more specifically the Minoans, the Mycenaean and the Dorians.

There is a very wide literature on the Philistines, either treating them alone or along with other "Sea Peoples". Even as early as 1913, R.A.S. Macalister wrote his memorable work The Philistines, their History and Civilization and paved the way for a great many other scholars who have provided us with brilliant specimens of scholarly expertise in their attempts to negotiate the various problems relating to that enigmatic tribe. A. Burn's Minoans, Philistines and Greeks (1930) further

stimulated scholarly endeavour to speculate about the Aegean connexions of the Philistines and may be seen to be a work of some special merit. W.F. Albright's works in 1950 and 1951 and T. Dothan's inspired article in 1957 may also be envisaged as breaking fresh ground in the multi-faceted effort to solve the puzzle posed by the Philistine question. The same may be maintained about the latter's comprehensive work The Philistines and Their Material Culture (1967) while B. Mazar's study about the Philistines and the rise of Israel and Tyre in 1964 further amplified our knowledge about the historical evolution of Philistines and the impact on it of important developments in the adjacent Semitic milieu. R.D. Barnett's article in CAH in 1969 also enhanced our views of the matter and N.K. Sanders' Sea Peoples (1978) brilliantly summed up the most prevalent views and theories on the overall question. These are some of the major landmarks of scholarly endeavour on the matter; let us now consider what major problems have so far engaged modern research with respect to the Philistine question. The most tantalizing problem regarding the Philistines - as well as the other Sea Peoples - is that of their origin, and although most scholars admit that this tribe seems to have been of Aegean extraction - their overall material culture having strong Mycenaean affinities in the first place and some Minoan ones in the second - there also has been a

confined but quite persistent school of thought favouring an Anatolian derivation for the Philistines. The chief exponent for this latter theory has been G.A. Wainright who propounded his views in a series of interesting studies which are eloquently summed up in his JEA article (1961). Notwithstanding this author's expertly argued thesis the greatest part of scholarly expertise has adhered to the theory of the Aegean beginnings of the Philistines. W.F. Albright study in CAH II (rev. ed.), (1966), favouring an Aegean - Pelasgian origin, stands out as of some special importance among the studies of the Aegean origin-favouring scholars.

So does J. Vercoutter's L'Égypte et le Monde Égéen Préhellénique (1956) which virtually identifies O.T. "Caphtor" - whence the Philistines came - and cuneiform documents "Kaptara" with Egyptian Keftiu which is more or less identifiable with Minoan Crete. Also K. A. Kitchen favours an Aegean origin in D. J. Wiseman [ed. (1973)] as also does H. R. Hall in S. Casson [ed. (1927)], to mention but a few of the scholars who support the theory of an Aegean origin of the Philistines.

With respect to the attitude which this study adopts towards the overall Philistine question, it is one that lists the present work with those reflecting the school of

thought that favours an Aegean extraction of the Philistines, one of the prominent - perhaps the most prominent - tribes in the Sea Peoples' confederation. The Aegean route is also argued for in this essay as the likeliest that the Philistines and perhaps other groups of the Sea Peoples could have followed on their way to the Levant. An island-hopping pattern is suggested as the one involved in this movement and the island of Cyprus is marked out as a major land-mark in this journey and in the overall activities of the Philistine (and, in all probability, other Aegean-extracted Sea Peoples) contingent, as well as the final stepping-stone to Syria-Palestine. This study also suggests that a strong Mycenaean element is traceable in the Philistine tribe and biblical references to Philistines are examined in search of evidence attesting to an Aegean and in particular Mycenaean " modus vivendi " amidst, and underneath, the Egyptian (or " Egyptianized ") and Semitic veneer of cultural influence. Finally this study suggests something of a Dorian connexion in the Philistines and, in doing so, is the first of its kind to propound such a concept. It can also hold the same ambition with respect to the evidence from Greek sources, such as Strabo, Pausanias, Homer, Diodorus, Appolodorus, that from Manethos' and Josephus' writings and that from hitherto not-scrutinized biblical quotes. The evidence of the literary records,

being of particularly high importance to this study, should be divided into two major categories. The first comprises all of what may be reasonably called "primary sources" and in this class rank all those records which either refer explicitly to Philistines as such, that is, by name, and are unmistakably and indisputably concerned with them or speak of developments in which tribal entities with which the Philistines are closely associated or belong to, play a major role. These sources both belong to the literary repertoire of the peoples who were involved directly with the Philistines (and whose areas became the theatre of the events associated with Philistines' activities) and also are, at least many of them, roughly contemporary with the era spanned by Philistine history and examined in this study (c. 1200 - 600 B. C.) Such records as can be legitimately ranked in this category and have been deemed worth treating in this study are at times quite helpful yet in certain occasions of no decisive help. Namely they are: the Egyptian records of the reign of Pharaoh Ramesses III (c. 1194 - 1162 E. C.), the most significant of them being the inscriptions in his great temple at Medinet Habu, dating from the eighth year of his Kingship; the Egyptian Wenamon's report (11th cent. B. C.) which is nevertheless treated not separately but in conjunction with the fresh evidence set out in the last chapter as it

is in this wise that it can be of more clarifying value than if it were to be treated otherwise; the royal correspondence involving the Kingdoms of Alashiya and Ugarit as well as pieces of evidence from Hittite texts (end of 13th cent., beginning of the 12th); the biblical narratives in which the earliest reference to Philistines dates from the eighth cent. B.C. and comes in the book of Amos; the Egyptian monuments speaking of - and representing - people from " Keftiu ", that is, Kaphtor (whence came the Philistines) and dating from, mainly, the 15th cent B. C. ; finally the Egyptian records from Merneptah's time, concerned with the first major foreign confederacy incursion on Egypt and dating from c. 1220 B.C.

The second group of literary material set out in this essay stems from what may be reasonably considered to be "secondary sources"; these sources either do not have nominal references to Philistines or they are separated from the times of Philistine activities by a considerable chronological gap. However they furnish, on many an occasion, quite interesting information which may well serve as trigger to further research into traditional or totally new directions. The sources of this class which are treated in this work are: the bearing on the overall problem in various Greek sources, such as Homer,

Hesiod, Herodotus, Pausanias, Strabo e.t.c.; the bearing on the matter in Manetho's and Josephus' writings and some evidence from Latin sources which are by no means exhaustively treated though, as this is by no means the purpose of this treatise which only lists such Latin evidence as may, very occasionally, help integrate or clarify a view. This is why the Latin evidence, being very scanty in the text, is not treated separately but in conjunction with other classes of evidence and as a means of furthering their significance. Regarding the dates of these secondary sources, the Greek records range from 9th or 8th cent. B. C. (Homer) to c. 200 A. D. (Atheneus), Josephus' writings date from the first century A.D., Manetho's ones from the third century B. C., Justin's works from the third cent. A.D.

This work in classifying the material bearing upon the overall Philistine question has listed virtually all the traditional literary and most of the respective archaeological evidence into one chapter (chapter three) and all the fresh, original evidence in the following one (chapter four). It deemed that this classification is quite helpful on the grounds that it informs the reader of what is the already known and, more or less, studied evidence on the matter and of what is the bearing on it in hitherto unstudied records. It is also helpful in the sense that it classifies, for the sake of

convenience, all the hitherto attested as well as original pieces of evidence on the matter in different unified line-ups, thereby presenting them to the reader as separate wholes and helping him or her, track down, from the respective sequence, what piece of information he or she may want.

What evidence this study holds to be traditional is that which has afforded us such knowledge as we consider to be "standard" and unambiguous, that is, evidence which has provided us with a rather familiar background knowledge on the matter. Such sources as furnish this evidence are the well-known biblical narratives on the Philistines, the Egyptian records of Ramesses III and Merneptah, the Ugaritic royal correspondence with Alashiya (Cyprus) and some Hittite archives bearing on the same events and, finally, the Egyptian records bearing representations of "Keftiu" people. In the chapter listing the traditional evidence, the well-attested archaeological records are also treated. The evidence which ranks as new comes from such records as have not so far been processed and therefore not yielded their bearing on the matter in question. The records falling in to this category and of course treated separately are the Greek writings of such authors as Homer, Pausanias, Strabo, Hesiod, Apollodorus Diodorus etc., the writings of

Manetho and Josephus, some evidence of Latin origin, the so-called Wenamon's report and finally those biblical quotes which are not the same as have afforded us the "traditional" knowledge on the matter, but those that have not as yet attracted much, if any, attention with respect to the Philistine question. As one may infer there is a great deal of overlap between the notions "Traditional" - "primary" and "Original" - "secondary", speaking in terms of literary sources, yet they do not identify with each other. As a conclusion, the reader must remember that this dissertation classifies and treats the evidence as "traditional" and "original" in different, as has been stated in chapters and makes no further reference to "primary" or "secondary". Regarding now the information furnished by the not-so-far scrutinized records, that is, regarding the fresh, original evidence, its value lies - so far as the Greek, Josephus and Manetho's writings are concerned - in that they unveil in their sometimes patchy, yet quite informative form - how the important, quite often dramatic developments in the Aegean and the Levant during the crucial era (c. 1200 - c. 1100 B. C.) are reflected in later folk-lore and in the past's knowledge of the people whose cultures the relevant records belong to. These sources also record what concepts the people they belong to had of the cultures, events, practices, situations and the overall historical framework pertaining

to peoples and developments that are of particular interest to this study. These sources are also representative of later cultures' approach to the events in question and of the attitudes of the times they are attached to. More specifically what knowledge can be gained through the study of these sources and always with respect to the matters examined in this study concerns the conception of kinship between the various Greek tribes at the time in question; the implications of the multiple tribal ties on developments and pedigrees that interest this study; the way the East Mediterranean and Aegean peoples interrelated their ethnic stocks, also what are the cultural connexions - to be found in the various strands of the numerous traditions - that form links between the tribes that interest this study, links that are sometimes brittle, sometimes solid, yet quite often conducive to further speculation. Finally this study, in dealing with fresh evidence, looks into biblical quotes which have not undergone the necessary scrutiny regarding the Philistines so far and thereby attempts to further enhance the Aegean connexions of that People.

Finally, it would perhaps make a fit conclusion for this introduction if it is stressed that, since this study, like so many others, draws upon material of suggestive

rather than conclusive evidence in order to make up its interpretational version of the issue in question, it consequently does not provide definite, final answers to the problems concerned, nor does it make sweeping points regarding aspects of the issue which have so far baffled research on a global scale; this study only suggests the likelihood of certain developments, the possibility of others, it tries to enhance the credibility of certain already put-forward suggestions, to shed more light on some obscure aspects of the problem and to trigger off consideration of and interest into new directions of scholarly endeavour. It is therefore as a stimulus to a new approach and to even further investigation into possibilities already considered or not adequately examined before that this work should be conceived and not as an attempt to provide final answers. However it is this work's hope that by providing fresh stimuli to further scholarly exertions it will contribute towards providing some answers on certain key-aspects of the overall issue.

CHAPTER ONE

THE LATE BRONZE AGE IN THE AEGEAN-MINOANS AND MYCENAEANS

A. The Minoans-Their Cultural Impression On the Archaeological and Literary Record

Introduction

It is the Late Bronze Age (LBA) in Aegean terms that provides the chronological framework of the phase of the Minoan culture which constitutes part of the subject of this chapter, and it may therefore very well contribute towards a better understanding of this period and its implications to give, first of all, an account of the background of the era concerned - an account, that is, of the Early and Middle Minoan times-so that there may be given an integrated and clear sequence of developments and a chance to view the overall Minoan age in its right perspective.

The Late Minoan Age, our main concern in this subject, corresponds to the Cretan civilisation during the period ranging from c.1550 (beginning of the Late Minoan I A -LMIA) down to c.1050 (end of Late Minoan III C - LMIIIC), a date which roughly marks the end of the Bronze Age in the Aegean, and the beginning of the so-called "Dark Ages" there, that is, the era that came in the wake of the widespread turmoil attested at the final stages of the Bronze Age (c.1200 - 1050 BC). But prior to dealing with the late Minoan times a brief summary of the early and middle Minoan civilisation may very well be pertinent so that, as indicated, the picture to be acquired of this culture will, hopefully, be completed.

The Background To The Late Minoan Age - A Summary

The Minoan civilisation, the first and one of the most sophisticated ever to have been recorded on European soil, sprang up on the island of Crete, the southernmost province of modern Greece, in c.3000 BC. At first it underwent a period of receiving multiple influxes of various populations from the Lands round the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, as a result of the tribal mobility induced by frequent warfare, and of the incursions of new population elements that affected those areas and drove out refugees during the

course of the third millenium BC. This is the period of the early Bronze Age in Crete, the so-called Early Minoan times (c.3000-2200 BC), sub-divided into Early Minoan I (EMI, c.3000-2600), Early Minoan II (EMII, c.2600-2300) and Early Minoan III (EMIII, c. 2300-2200), and which can be subdivided further.

It has been suggested by A. Evans, the founder of Minoan archaeology, that the conquests of Mena, the legendary founder of the first Dynasty in Egypt at c.3000 BC, resulted in the dislodgement of part of the population of the western area of the Delta region, which formed a refugee movement and fled overseas to Crete, thus inaugurating the Bronze Age in that island. What served as a stimulus for Evans to propose this theory was certain aspects of Minoan civilisation which he thought were suggestive of Libyan derivation¹. There are also indications that there might have been an influx of a Palestinian population into Crete at the outset of the Bronze Age in the island, the case being that there are various common features in the earliest Bronze Age pottery and in pottery that was attestedly used in Palestine before the conquests of Pharaoh Narmer of the First Egyptian Dynasty in the southern part of the country², a process which again might have resulted in refugees having been driven overseas and perhaps to Crete. Yet the evidence available cannot do more than suggest the possibility of a Palestinian population arrival in Crete, the pottery resemblances being of a not very strong, though unmistakable, character³, and such other evidence as would justify a settlement theory is noticeably lacking.

During EMI and at c.2500 BC, Syrian refugees might have arrived in Crete, fleeing from their homeland after the latter was invaded by northern barbarous tribes. Certain features of EMI pottery appear on the Syrian pottery of the Amuq G phase, in the wake of which came the northern invasion; in addition Cretan Seals of EMI (the earliest Cretan Seals to have been recorded so far) seem to be reminiscent of Syrian seals⁴. Finally, in EMIII, other refugee movements might have found their way to Crete, when the Nile valley seems to have been invaded by Syrian or Palestinian tribes; the practice of writing might have taken

its first frail hold on Cretan culture by that time, though not necessarily as a result of any immigration from abroad⁵.

Intercourse seems to have existed also between Crete and Cycladic islands as well as the Greek Mainland in EM times, and there has been an interesting theory by the French anthropologist, R.P. Charles, that immigrants came to Crete during the third millenium, not from the East but from Peloponnese in the Greek Mainland and from Attica; yet this theory has not gained much international approval⁶.

During the Middle Minoan times (MM, c.2200-1550 BC) the great palaces at Knossos, Phaestos, Mallia and (probably) Zakro were built. The Middle Minoan period has been further divided into Middle Minoan I (MMI, c.2200-1900), Middle Minoan II (MMII, c.1900-1700) and Middle Minoan III (MMIII, c. 1700-1550), periods which have themselves been divided into spans of time whose limits have not - as is also the case with Early Minoan (EM) and Late Minoan (LM) subdivisions - yet been definitely and categorically defined. The erection of the great palaces already mentioned should, in all probability, reflect the then prosperous state of Minoan affairs and, in turn, a considerable cultural upturn. There is plenty of archaeological evidence to attest to tremendous technical advances and particularly high material production and sophistication in almost every field of artistic endeavour. The great so-called Kamares pottery (white and red paint on a dark-washed surface) is a typical product of this period, the lustrous dark background of many vases of this class being certainly a match even for the brilliant black surface (usually called the black-glaze) of Athenian pots of the classical area. Artistic activity is also well attested in plastic arts in the form of numerous terracotta, faience and ivory figurines, in addition to elaborate stone-carving, in ornamental weaponry, in jewellery, where certain pieces, such as the famous gold pendant from Mallia and a small gold toad from the Mesara plain, seem to have been processed by means of extremely laborious techniques (no less than embossing, filigree and granulation applied in the most skilful manner) and, finally, in seal-engraving, in which we have magnificent examples and such types in common use as three or four-sided prisms, signets, disks with flat or

convex surfaces, the so-called lentoid seals, the almond-shaped seals and the flattened cylinders⁷.

The great palaces are certain to have suffered exceedingly severe damage in c.1700, the cause usually being attributed to an earthquake. They were later rebuilt, thus inaugurating the so-called Neo-Palatial period (c.1700-1450, c.1400 for Knossos). There is a theory bringing Luwians to Crete from southern Anatolia after the destruction of the first Minoan palaces⁸. The palace of Beyecesultan, perhaps that of a Luwian ruler, has been said to have been the prototype for the later Cretan palaces; however, close similarities between the earlier and later versions suggest the derivation of the later Minoan palaces from the earliest ones⁹.

The last stages of the MM times (MMIIIA and B) witness overseas colonial activity by the Cretans, as a result perhaps of overpopulation problems. The archaeological record attests to Cretan colonies having been established on the volcanic island of Thera, on the island of Melos, and those of Kea and Rhodes. These colonies seem to have been planted between c.1650-1500¹⁰. The Cretan colony at Miletus on the south-western coast of Anatolia may date from that time¹¹. It is also very likely that the Greek mainland received Cretan settlers at that time. The findings in the royal shaft graves at Mycenae in Peloponnese reflect a considerable degree of Cretan influence and, although they date from c.1600-1500 (end of MM period, early stages of LM) may well allude to an earlier Cretan connexion which reached one of its peaks at the time of the Mycenaean royal shaft graves¹².

The Late Minoan Age

1. An Outline Of the Main Events

The Late Bronze Age in Minoan archaeology spans some five centuries (c.1500-1050). It has been divided into Late Minoan I (LMI, further subdivided into LMIA, c.1550-1500, and LMIB, c.1500-1450), Late Minoan II (LMII, c.1450-1400) and Late Minoan III (LMIII, subdivided into LMIIIA, c. 1400-1300 coinciding with the Amarna Age in Egypt, LMIIIB, c.1300-1230 and LMIIIC, c.1230-1050).

The Minoan civilisation seems to have undergone a severe downfall at about the middle of the 15th century BC, which

has been connected with the great eruptions of the volcanic island of Thera, to the north of Crete, although this theory has been challenged in recent years¹³. Most scholars take the view that after the eruption that wrought considerable havoc on the palaces of Phaestos, Zakro and Mallia, the Mycenaean inhabitants of Mainland Greece stormed the island and took over, establishing their main stronghold at Knossos. Yet there are certain archaeologists who suggest that it is the Mycenaeans themselves who are to be blamed for the destruction of certain Minoan centres at the end of LMIB (c.1450), or even a generation earlier rather than the Thera volcano¹⁴. Indeed, archaeological finds such as the largest of the new houses built at Gournia (c.1450)¹⁵, a palace that arose from the ruins of the old one at Aghia Triadha in the middle of the 15th century, new pottery shapes such as "the palace style" vases found at Knossos during LMII (c.1450-1400)¹⁶, as well as the underground tholos tomb for royal burials which was introduced to Crete at about the latter half of the 15th century¹⁷, all (along with other contemporary evidence) seem clearly to point to a Mainland origin and to support strongly a Mycenaean occupation. However, it may not be very safe to assign the massive LMIB destructions of Cretan sites to Mainland invaders, for if the Minoan civilisation had not been severely damaged by the Thera eruption and was still thriving, the Minoan fleet being the most powerful in the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean - a picture so clearly reflected in later Greek folklore - it would seem paradoxical to presume that the comparatively undeveloped -at that time (c.1500 - 1450) - Mycenaeans would have been capable of inflicting such a large -scale catastrophe upon the "Lords of the Seas". This thought, taken in conjunction with the "likelihood of an earthquake of intermediate focal depth centred north near the central coast of Crete and thus accounting for the survival of Knossos in the epicentral halo of minor intensity"¹⁸ could perhaps justify one attributing the destruction that struck Crete in the course of LMIB to the impact of the eruption, in all probability mainly manifested in earthquakes and great tidal waves (tsunamis). Cretan power having suffered a severe setback, the Mycenaeans would be naturally expected to look

upon the situation as the best occasion for them to invade Crete and to take over, a development that stands up to reason and has been endorsed by most scholars. After the destructions which ravaged so many places in Crete in C.1450 BC, we find a situation in which Knossos seems to dictate the norms of life all over the island. The palace there was evidently modified to adapt it to tastes more or less alien to Minoan ones. The Throne Room must be a fair reflection of propensities foreign to those of Minoan rulers and must have been added at the time of the Mycenaean rule at Knossos. There is a possibility that there were other palatial centres as well at the time, perhaps in the south where an imposing building - most probably a palace - was built at Aghia Triadha, and where also what seems, in all likelihood, to be a re-occupation is evident at Phaestos, and even perhaps in the west at Khania; yet, whatever the case, Knossos seems to have been the dominant city in Crete at that time (LMII), a situation betrayed by the ubiquitous, finely decorated, Knossian-style -reflecting pottery we find in Crete in LMIIIA (c.1400-1300).

After a period of Mycenaean rule at Knossos, which had, as is evident, an immediate impact on the rest of the island, the palace there was destroyed by fire and never rebuilt. The date of this catastrophe has been strongly disputed, but it looks as though it happened in the first half of the fourteenth century rather than any later. (On the question of the date of the final destruction of the palace at Knossos, see, among others, Palmer, L.R. and Boardman, J. On the Knossos Tablets, Oxford, (1963), Hood, S. "Last Palace" and "Reoccupation at Knossos", Kadmos 4, (1965), pp16-44; idem "The Last Palace at Knossos and the Date of its Destruction" Studi Micenei 2, (1967), pp. 63-70. The destruction, whatever the reason that occasioned it, seems to have been caused by a human factor, most probably by the Mycenaeans, who may well have overrun the whole of Crete and conquered it, establishing a firmer hold over the island than before. Mycenaean imperialism may also be blamed for the destruction of the so-called Palace of Kadmos at Thebes in the Greek Mainland, at about the same time.

II Overseas Connexions

The Minoan culture, throughout the Late Bronze Age, exhibits signs of decadence owing, in all probability, to the destructions of LMIB (Thera volcano), to the Mycenaean domination of the island which occurred thereafter (c.1450 - 1400), and to the final destruction of the palace at Knossos (which happened sometime, as we have indicated, between 1400 and 1350, in all probability, though Professor Palmer's school of thought argues for a late date between 1200 and 1150, since 1960, see Appendix in The Minoans, by Hood, S., (1971), pp. 149-150 for a discussion). However, this culture seems to retain its overseas connexions with certain areas, though, understandably, on a minor scale. The following is an account of the evidence suggesting or implying overseas connexions.

It is noticeable that in LMIB (c.1500 - 1450) the so-called Minoan Genii or Demons make their first appearance on seals, the only shapes of which are the elongated amygdaloid and the lentoid, and on which the designs tend to be more heraldic than before. The demons seem to have their origin in the Egyptian goddess Taurt, often portrayed as carrying a crocodile in a way strongly reminiscent of that employed by the Minoan demons in carrying such animals as bulls, stags, or lions¹⁹. Other figures for the first time on LMII seals hold lions at arm's length, reminding one of Gilgamesh in Babylonian representations²⁰. Although such types of evidence cannot be regarded as strong, it may very well be that what we are dealing with are Cretan imitations of Egyptian and Mesopotamian models, now attempted and attested in Crete for the first time (LM area). It is likely that either Minoan artists have seen the originals in the very place of their production or elsewhere, or that these foreign works of art had reached Crete by way of trade, or simply as valuables obtained somehow by natives, and that they were there imitated by Cretan artists. In any case, the probability of an overseas contact is by no means to be dismissed.

Relations with Egypt seem to have become closer during the early stages of the Late Bronze Age in Crete (LMIA and LMIB). The prince buried in the Isopata Royal Tomb on the north end of the Isopata ridge, north of the Bronze Age city of Knossos - most probably one of those built by the

Mycenaean invaders of Crete during LMII- was found along with a good many Egyptian alabaster vases, presumably his burial gifts²¹. The circular seal of Queen Ty, wife of Amenhotep III, recovered from a chamber tomb of Aghia Triadha²² along with LMIB pottery (which is contemporary with LMII at Knossos) is even more important. This is the latest datable object found in a stratum which precedes the final catastrophe of the palace at Knossos. If it is taken in conjunction with a scarab bearing the name of Queen Ty and being the earliest object to have been found in a Mycenaean III A (c. 1400 - 1300) pottery context, and with objects bearing the name of her husband Amenhotep III which were recovered from similar deposits on the Greek Mainland, it provides rather strong evidence that the final destruction of the palace at Knossos occurred during the reign of Amenhotep III, that is, between 1414 and 1378 BC.

Yet the most reliable evidence suggesting Minoan relations with Egypt comes from the latter country. On the tomb of Senmut-architect of Queen Hatshepsut of about 1500 BC, a procession of Minoan envoys bearing their tribute is portrayed. Part of their offering consists of typical LMIA metal vessels.²³ But it is during the reign of Thotmes III (1504 - 1450 BC) that evidence of this nature mostly turns up. On the tombs of User Amen, Rekhmara and Menkheperresenb at Thebes - high ranked officials at the time of Pharaoh Thotmes III during the earlier part of the XVIII dynasty - Aegean people are drawn, dressed in the Minoan manner and offering objects of Minoan type. These Minoans are referred to, on Rekhmara's tomb, as "Princes of the land Keftiu" which is, in all probability Crete - as will be argued further on - "and of the isles which are in the midst of the sea".²⁴ A typical LMIB collared rhyton is borne by one of these Keftians. The figures of the Minoan emissaries on Rekhmara's tomb had been wearing, originally, cod-pieces of the type which in Crete used to be worn with the short kilt, but this attire has been altered, as was noticed when the paintings were being cleaned, into the one involving the long, decorated kilt, which was much in vogue in Crete during LMIB - LMII (C.1500 - 1400)²⁵.

Late Minoan IB vases have been found in Egyptian tombs

of the time of Thotmes III and serve further to intensify the picture of the two-sided contact between the two countries²⁶. An alabaster jar inscribed with this Pharaoh's name was also recovered from a tomb of Katsamba beside the Bronze Age Harbour town of Knossos with burials which have been dated to early LMIIIA (c. 1400 - 1350)²⁷. There is also archaeological evidence for Minoan relations with Syria. The Minet el-Beida and Ras Shamra built tombs which resemble the royal tomb at Isopata in Crete and which suggest the three possible ways of vaulting this Minoan tomb have yielded finds of Minoan craftsmanship, the earlier of which must be contemporary with the end of LMI - II²⁸. Among the most interesting finds is a silver bowl inscribed with Linear B, recovered from the Library²⁹. Also, the long robes of the campstool fresco at Knossos, as well as the Minoan anygdaloid gems on which engraved figures carry axes of a Syrian type, may well suggest Syrian influence dating also from the same period (c. 1400 BC)³⁰. The same may be said of an alabaster rhyton from the harbour town of Knossos, showing what must be a pregnant woman in the process of kneeling³¹. Stone vases and lamps of Cretan type have been excavated at Atchana (Syria) and also vases of precious metal, which may very well be of Minoan manufacture, have been recorded in Syria - and in Egyptian sites as well.

There is also archaeological evidence attesting to extensive contacts with the Aegean islands. It is now established beyond any doubt that the art of the island of the Cycladic complex was inspired by that of Crete during the period spanning the first hundred years of the Late Bronze Age (c.1550-1450 BC). The pottery, for example, recorded from the Third City of Phylakopi on the island of Melos, has evidently been fashioned after that of Crete. The late Bronze Age settlement of Akrotiri on the island of Thera has yielded considerable amounts of LMIA pottery, recovered from the ruins of the settlement buried under the huge layer of pumice which spurted out during the great volcanic eruptions which took place on this island in the early fifteenth century³². There is also quite a number of frescoes at the same site in Thera, and at Phylakopi on Melos, that betray the typical characteristics of the late Cretan school of painting³³,

while life-size terracotta figures with very Cretan appearance, although of a workmanship unlike that of the Minoan school of statuary, have been found in what has been described as the earliest temple of Bronze Age Greece, at Aghia Irini on the island of Keos, and have been accorded a date in the fourteenth century BC (LMIIIA)³⁴. The island of Rhodes where traces of a Cretan colony dating from MMIIIB - LMIA have been recorded at Triandha in the north, the island of Kythera, where the Early Bronze Age Cretan colony at Karphi was active until the site was abandoned at the end of LMIB (c. 1450), and finally of Karpathos to the north east of Crete, are also islands in the Aegean that exhibit Minoan connexions during the Late Bronze Age³⁵. Regarding Asia Minor, Miletus is the site with strong Minoan connexions, owing to a Cretan colony which had been planted there (see note 11). There is also ample evidence to attest to considerable cultural intercourse between Crete and the Greek Mainland. Many of the treasures from the Mycenaean shaft graves and from later tombs on the Mainland are Minoan in style (see above and note 12). The contemporary occurrence in both Knossos and the Mainland in LMII or, in Mycenaean standards, in advanced Late Helladic II (c. 1450 - c.1400), of a new type of tomb carved deep in the rock and approached by a long narrow passage, the so-called "dromos", may very well be evidence of Minoan influence on the Mainland, since this type of tomb is first attested at Knossos and we may suppose that the despatch of captive architects and artists to the Mainland after the conquest of Crete accounts perhaps for the rapid spread of this type of tomb here³⁶. There are also many other indications of a regular cultural intercourse between the Mycenaean Mainland and the Minoan Crete, such as the tholos tomb, a probable Cretan contribution to Mycenaean architecture, though it is the latter that should take the credit for making these constructions monumental and worthy of ranking among the most massive single-span buildings of antiquity³⁷. The frescoes from the Mycenaean palaces at Thebes, Mycenae, Tiryns and Pylos on the Mainland also show clearly that technically and stylistically Mycenaean wall-painting owes a great deal to Minoan frescoes (see note 33). Early Mycenaean pottery (c. 1550-1450 BC) also exhibits a

formidable influence from Minoan ceramics and there is no doubt much influence and counter-influence to be seen on Mycenaean and Minoan wares in later stages too³⁸. In almost every aspect of artistic endeavour, the influence of Cretan art on the Mycenaean one is perceptible. In ivory-working, statuary, ornamental weaponry, gold and silver plating, stone vases modelling, jewellery and seal-engraving, one cannot miss the considerable, sometimes massive impact of Minoan artistic temperament on the Mycenaean production³⁹. Going on to further places betraying Minoan overseas activities, one has to mention Cyprus, where "the small, fragmentary material from Toumba tou Skourou is useful for demonstrating that Minoan trade existed here in Late Minoan IA⁴⁰ and where the adjacent site of Aghia Irini also yielded evidence suggesting Minoan connexions during the same period (c.1550-1500). The Lipari Islands, a small group of islands off the north coast of Sicily, also attest to Minoan activities. The precious "Liparite" stone, a material which was used by the artist-craftsmen of Crete, seems to have been traded for Minoan pottery since LMI deposits of Minoan wares have been recorded in those islands⁴¹. Finally, Marseilles is a place that can be credited with Minoan connexions owing to the LM pottery which has been recorded there.⁴²

Turning now to the evidence of the literary records concerning overseas Minoan connexions, one will notice many references to places which are in one way or the other associated with Minos and Minoan folk. Indeed, most of the Aegean area and a good part of the Levant proper are said in the various literary records to have had various connexions with Minoan Crete, some of them involving patterns of settlement or colonisation. Diodorus of Sicily calls attention to the wide distribution in the islands and on the Asiatic coast of the Aegean of the place-names "Minoa" and "Cretan Harbour". Minoa, which was the name of two ports on the north coast of Crete, turns up as a place-name at Siphnos, Paros, Amorgos, (all three are Cycladic islands), on the east coast of Laconia (South Mainland), on an inshore islet of the Saronic Gulf (very near Athens), at Delos, in Sicily, on the coasts of Syria, on the island of Corfu and in Arabia⁴³. It may well be that it was either the original

inhabitants or the Minoan traders who gave the appellation to the stations which were occupied by the latter⁴⁴. "Cretan Harbour" is not otherwise known to us. Perhaps no specific town ever bore that name, which was probably given only to various coves or bays at which Minoan ships used to moor in the course of their sea-faring activities. If so, this appellation seems to have been disregarded in the numerous extant late Greek geographies. The name of the island of Naxos in the Aegean, like that of Methymna, a city on the island of Lesbos, also in the Aegean, was also one by which a Cretan town had come to be known⁴⁵. Other information delivered by the oral tradition and comprising parts of various folk-lore recorded in later writings, states that Minos sent his brother Radamanthys abroad in order to be rid of him. Radamanthys became governor of the Asiatic islands and the founder of the city of Chios on the same name-bearing island, and that of Erythrai on the Asiatic mainland⁴⁶. Another tradition⁴⁷ tells us that Sarpedon, another brother of Minos, led a colony to Lykia and to Miletos, whose name is the same as that of a Cretan town, probably of Mallia (see above and note 11). Other traditions of Cretan settlement involve the island of Karpathos (eastward of Crete)⁴⁸, Kolophon⁴⁹ and the Troad. Kallinos of Ephesus (7th century BC) states that it was a colony of Teukrians from Crete⁵⁰ who introduced the worship of Apollo Smintheus (Apollo the mouse-god) in the Troad. Regarding Asia, the mythology of the Greek island of Rhodes relates that it was in Lycia that Lycus settled - and he probably introduced arts of civilisation there - that is, one of the Telchines⁵¹, the webbed-fingered mermen-elves of Crete, and that Caria had connexions with the "children of the Sun" which is probably a name the Minoan folk were known by⁵². Cretan Couretes (the name perhaps being an ancient variant of the very similar "Cretes" which is used of modern Cretans), the famous legendary priests of Zeus, are credited with the same civilising roles on the Mainland of Caria⁵³. The island of Rhodes is said to have been the scene of the dolorous tale of Althaimenes, son of Katreus, a Cretan prince who is called in the narrative "Son of Minos" or "of Kres". Althaimenes, in his desperate bid to avoid the fate predicted for him by an

oracle which attributed patricide to him, fled to Rhodes but when his father in his old age longed to see him and went to Rhodes, he was, along with his company, mistaken for hostile raiders because of the darkness and was slain in the fighting by this own son⁵⁴. Finally, Sicily is another region where Minoans are said to have settled⁵⁵. The archaeological evidence supports most of these traditions and dates the respective Minoan activities to the latter half of the 16th century (Late Minoan I A) and to the subsequent first half (or even slightly more) of the 15th century (Late Minoan I B). The difficulty arises in Asia where the archaeological record does not seem to agree fully with the existing traditions. Yet they seem to be worth taking into account, especially when coupled with the material evidence from other places such as Mainland Greece, the Aegean islands (especially Thera, Kythera, Kea), Egypt, Syria (Ras Shamra, Atchana, El-Beida), a place near Gaza in Palestine, Cyprus, the Lipari islands, Assur in Mesopotamia, Amisos in Pontus, even perhaps Marseilles. To conclude the survey of Late Minoan civilisation, we give a condensed account of its chief cultural characteristics and thereby an integrated picture of this culture as it appears in the late part of the Aegean Bronze Age.

III The Impressions of Late Minoan Culture on the Archaeological Record

a) Architecture

The Cretan palaces were first erected at about 2000 BC and destroyed by what seems to have been a terrific earthquake c.1700 BC. Our knowledge of those early palaces is very poor but it seems rather reasonable to say that they must have been like the later palaces, yet exhibiting a lesser degree of sophistication. The later palaces were rebuilt on a grander scale and underwent yet another major catastrophe c. 1450 occasioned, as is widely accepted now, by the Thera eruptions. However, the most important palatial centre, that at Knossos, survived the catastrophe and was apparently re-occupied by Mycenaean invaders, only to be finally destroyed sometime during the early stages of LMIIIA (c. 1400-1350). There is a strong likeness between all known Cretan palaces (Knossos, Phaestos, Mallia, Zakro), mainly to be seen in the

common plan which they share - derived probably from Knossos. This plan had evolved into a peculiarly Cretan one by the time the second palaces were raised, but it seems that the earlier versions exhibited a good number of western Asiatic architectural traits⁵⁶. At the centre of a Cretan palace there is a rectangular central court, measuring 50 x 25 yards. We find a central court in many an oriental palace too, but these latter palaces were surrounded by strong fortification walls and can be said to have been converging inwards, whereas Cretan palaces involved no fortification walls and had an outward tendency, spreading, that is, outwards from the central court and being restricted only by an ornamental facade on the west, which faced on to an outside court. The entrances - the western facades being without a major one - led, usually following a complicated route, to the central court, while the important structures looked on to the central court. The outward expansion of the Cretan palaces spanned all directions and involved many intricacies which culminated in a maze-like effect at the palace of Knossos - this being, almost certainly, what inspired the legend of Theseus and the Labyrinth - which is another standard feature of palatial architecture in Minoan Crete and was achieved by means of small courtyards and the use of flat roofs. There was actually little new in the Late Bronze Age palaces except that at Knossos a throne room was built in the characteristic Mycenaean manner in the west court about the middle of the 15th century.

Burial architecture constitutes another aspect of Minoan proficiency in building. We notice some tombs at Knossos which are stone-built and quite monumental, in certain instances, and may be those of Kings or Princes who ruled there during the period immediately after c. 1450 (period of Mycenaean rule at Knossos). A typical example is the tholos tomb (Tholos: a round building) at Kefala (s.n.17) with a circular chamber sunk deep in the ground. The Isopata Royal Tomb⁵⁷, a large rectangular chamber with a high stone vault and a dromos (a long passage approaching the chamber) is another example. There are several similar examples of stone-built princely tombs scattered over other parts of Crete and dating from LMIII (c.1400-1050). The

outstanding underground tholos tomb at Archanes is an exceptional case in that it was found unlooted, as opposed to most of the other tombs of this class, and possessing a great wealth of jewellery. The tomb dates from the early fourteenth century BC⁵⁸. So, the main patterns of the Royal stone-built tombs of LMII and III times (c. 1450-1050 BC) can be reasonably said to be the rectangular tomb and the tholos tomb, the latter being apparently of Mainland origin and coming into existence on Cretan soil after the conquest of Knossos (c.1450 - see note 37). The practice of collective burial, a habit which can be traced back to EM times, survived in some parts of Crete until the end of the 15th century or later⁵⁹, but after the middle of that century small tombs are employed over most parts of Crete, designed to accommodate a group of three or four immediate relatives, or a couple, or even a single individual⁶⁰. The new-style, exclusive, rock-cut chamber tombs which first turn up at Knossos during LMII (c. 1450 - 1400) and afterwards in the Greek Mainland consist of a chamber carved deep in the rock and approached by a long narrow passage (dromos) with inward sloping sides. This type of tomb may reflect influence of Egyptian or Cypriot models. As has already been said (see above and note 36), the spread of this rock-cut LMII tomb over the Mainland may perhaps be accounted for by the skill of Cretan architects working in the Mainland under Mycenaean control. Burials in these tombs are either placed on the floor, or in graves dug into the floor, as in the Isopata Tomb. The bodies are sometimes put in clay bath tubs or in rectangular clay coffins bearing gabled lids and panelled sides.

b) Frescoes

The great majority of extant Cretan frescoes were made between 1550 and 1450 BC. A few examples date from a slightly earlier period and also a few from slightly after 1450. The heavy, ponderous style of the frescoes that fall in the latest group is suggestive of Mycenaean influence, something which is not surprising at all in view of the Mycenaean occupation of - at least - Knossos during LMII (c. 1450-1400). There is a noticeable and considerable homogeneity in the style of all the other frescoes though, displaying the

spontaneous delight in fluid natural forms, an artistic style, that is, the Minoan painters so much indulged and excelled in. This style is "the first truly naturalistic style to be found in European or indeed in any art"⁶¹. It combines effectively the two chief Minoan traits: the employment of an exuberant, impressionistic manner in drawing natural forms, and the capability of applying the pigments on the area to be decorated. Bands of geometrical patterns were most usually used to frame the frescoes above and below. The subjects fall within two main classes: palace life and scenes from nature. Such things as processions, court ceremonial and religious festivals are included in the scenes of palace life. The famous cup-bearers fresco and the Priest-King relief, both from the palace at Knossos, are included in the class. The campstool fresco - the best-preserved portion of which is the so-called Parisienne, also from the Knossos palace - and the "dancing girl" from the same place are two further and admirably executed examples of wall-painting, portraying incidents of every-day palace life of Minoan Crete. Bull-sports provided another popular subject in the same category.

Subjects from nature include sensational renderings of flowers such as those from a room at Amnisos, and animals such as a blue monkey in a field of crocuses, a cat stalking a pheasant, birds and sea-creatures. The famous painted sarcophagus from Aghia Triadha is a unique monument which should not be classed in either of the two categories in which most Cretan frescoes are included, though its subjects are close to the palace life scenes rather than to those from nature. They are perhaps associated with the worship of the dead⁶². Frescoes which exhibit the characteristic Minoan attitude have also come to light on the island of Thera. They have been recovered from the houses of LMIB (c. 1500-1450) settlement which flourished at the part of the island known nowadays by the modern name Akrotiri. Fine examples from the Thera group of wall-paintings include the fisherman and the boxing boys frescoes, two lively executions reflecting the sophisticated Cretan artistic attitude that had presumably produced many other masterpieces of the same high standard of workmanship which did not, it appears,

survive the great volcanic eruption at this particular island at c.1450.

c) Pottery⁶³

The features which distinguish the pottery of the Late Bronze Age Crete from the earlier period are the prevalence of the dark-on-light decoration over the light-on-dark, the better quality of fabric and the fine glossy black kind of paint, helped out with touches of red and white. As regards the various styles (in terms of decoration) current throughout Late Minoan times, the first stage (c.1550 - 1500) comprises the so-called Pattern and Floral styles. Such geometrical designs as rows of thick-rimmed, solid-centred spirals joined by tangents are the characteristic traits of Pattern style. In the case of the Floral style, portrayals of various flowers, grasses and reeds, depicted in a somewhat more vivid manner than the motifs in Pattern style, are its main features. In the next stage of the Bronze Age (c.1500-1450) the Marine style predominates; nearly every form of marine life is represented on vases of this class. The next stage (c.1450-1440) is represented by the Mycenaean Palace style (this is the period of the Mycenaean occupation of the Knossos Palace) in which previously used motifs are now stiffened into rigid shapes. Such motifs include clumps of lilies, octopuses and architectural designs, these being the patterns which seem to have been used most. The large unpainted storage-jars which are a feature of the ruins of Cretan palaces and were, in all probability, hand-made and decorated with patterns in added clay, are typical Minoan products and a great number of them date from the 15th century BC. During the period from 1400 down to 1200, Cretan pottery was imitating the standard Mycenaean vases. The styles exhibited by the latter were the Pattern style - its usual motifs being scales, spirals, chevrons, octopuses, shells and flowers - the pictorial style the subjects of which mainly comprise human figures usually on chariots, and an animal-figure style probably inspired from contemporary textiles. But we also have a rather pure Cretan style in a group of vessels dating from this period. This style, at its best in pictures of birds, is characterised by rich all-over patterns. During the last stage of the Bronze Age (c. 1200-

1050), the characteristic styles in Cretan pottery are the so-called Fringed and Octopus styles. The first consists of thick beautifully-shaped curves often accompanied by fringes. The second employs the octopus pattern applied all over the vase. In the developed form of this style small birds and fish are painted between the tentacles of the octopus. The Octopus style may very well have evolved in the Dodecanese although the original decorative fashion from which it developed was certainly Cretan. Many examples of this style have been found, apart from Crete, in Rhodes, Cos, the Cyclades and in the cemetery of Perati in Eastern Attica.

d) Coffins

Not until c. 1400 BC did terracotta coffins become popular in Crete. But they were almost ubiquitous in this island in the course of the 14th, 13th and 12th centuries. These coffins were really instances of Cretan eccentricity during the time when Mycenaean civilisation had reached its climax. They were modelled out of coarse clay and decorated in much the same way as contemporary pottery. Abstract designs and scenes from nature are popular subjects and help make the absence of human figures even more noticeable. The two shapes that seem to have been most popular are the bathtub and the chest-like larnax, a terracotta copy, that is, of a rectangular wooden clothes chest topped with a gabled lid. In contrast to the situation in Crete very few clay coffins have been excavated on the Greek Mainland, the only site which has yielded a whole group allegedly being Tanagra in Boeotia. These coffins date from c. 1200⁶⁴. Though they are evidently imitating Cretan funerary chests, they are painted in a crude awkward manner indicative of an indigenous attitude. The subjects are mourning women and men.

e) Figurines

By far the most popular and characteristic class of Late Minoan figurines is that of the female goddess with upraised hands. This type evolved about the beginning of LMIIIA (c.1400). But it only became popular from LMIIIB (c.1300) onwards, until the beginning of the Protogeometric era (c.1050). Fine specimens have been recovered from such Cretan sites as Gazi near Knossos, Gortyna, Karphi, the Shrine of Double Axes at Knossos, etc. The goddess is always

represented standing, her hands upraised and almost always facing forwards, a hollow wheel-made cylinder forming a skirt as well as a base. Most of these figurines were made of clay and some of them bear sacred symbols on their heads, such as snakes, doves, horns, poppy-heads, etc.⁶⁵. Another class of characteristic Late Minoan figurines is that of the Bronze male and female votaries. The conventional gesture of these figurines is the raising of the right hand to the forehead, but some have both arms in front of the body.

f) Ornamental Weapons

Although the famous ornamental gold-hilted daggers with inlaid blades recovered from sites on the Greek Mainland exhibit a Minoan attitude evident in the way in which the whole process of decoration was carried out, one may not feel inclined to regard them as characteristic products of Minoan art, directly connected with the range of artistic production in Crete, since not a single specimen has been found in this island so far. It seems that these daggers as such were not the kind of ornamental object that appealed to the Cretans temperament and, if it was actually Cretans who fashioned them - something which is very likely in view of the very Cretan looks which they bear - it may very well be that they undertook this task either because they were ordered to by their Mainland masters (during the time of Mycenaean sovereignty in Knossos, that is, during the latter half of the 15th century) or because they were simply exporting these daggers to the Mainland as part of their trade with the Myceneans, this type of object being probably in heavy demand by the latter. These daggers have been found at Mycenae (in Grave - Circle A), at the Argive Heraeum, at Vapheio (near Sparta), at Pylos, and a fragmentary blade at Thera. They all date from the period between c. 1550 and c. 1400⁶⁶. But the miniature double axes in gold and silver found in a votive deposit in a cave at Arkalohorion in central Crete - and made probably between 1550 and 1450 - are undoubtedly Cretan artefacts and may be considered as quite characteristic achievements of Late Bronze Age Crete.

g) Gold and Silver Plate

The two famous golden Vapheio Cups which were hailed as two of the finest examples of Cretan art ever to have been

recorded are the most noteworthy products of this class. Both their outer cases and their plain linings are made of pure gold, while subjects concerning the capture of wild bulls are magnificently embossed on them. They were found together in a tholos tomb at Vapheio near Sparta in Peloponnese and, to judge from the pottery found along with them, they date from the period between 1500 and 1450. Inlaid cups of the Vapheio shape are represented in Egyptian tomb-paintings of 1500-1440, being brought as tribute by Cretan emissaries. These paintings, compared with a part of a Bronze Vapheio-type cup inlaid in silver with the same motifs as those depicted on the cups of the Egyptian paintings and considered as a Cretan artefact, testify to the accuracy of the Egyptian painters and, furthermore, to the fact that this class of objects must have been in vogue in Crete during that time (1500 - 1450).

h) Stone vases⁶⁷

Ritual vases (rhytons) made of soft stone in various shapes and decorated with scenes of low relief enjoyed a popularity in Crete in the first half of the 15th century. The finest examples from this class come from Agia Triadha near Phaestos (Southern Crete) and the palace at Zakro. They comprise the so-called Harvester vase - a rhyton the upper part of which bears a procession of twenty-seven hoe-bearing, seed-time festival revellers - the Chieftain Cup, showing in relief a young prince probably giving orders to the Captain of the Guard, and a rhyton from Zakro (eastern Crete) portraying in relief a mountain sanctuary with wild goats (chamois) as well as hawks adding to the naturalistic rendering of the whole scene.

Vases of ornamental stone "made to be enjoyed in their own right" (Higgins, Minoan-Mycenaean Art, p.156) were in vogue in Crete between 1550 and 1450 BC. Perhaps the most graceful shape - of which many examples have been found at Zakro (Eastern Crete) - is the chalice. Another popular shape at Knossos and at Zakro is a pear-shaped ritual sprinkler (rhyton). The serpentine rhytons in the forms of bull's and lion's heads recovered from Knossos, Zakro, and from the site at Delphi (Greek Mainland) - a site of legendary Cretan connexions - form another class of objects

displaying the subtleness and skilful workmanship characteristic of Minoan taste.

i) Jewellery

The really remarkable Cretan works of art falling under the heading of "jewellery" are admittedly few. I shall only refer to earrings made in Crete during that time, not just because they really are remarkably executed artefacts, but also - and this is perhaps the main reason - because they were scarcely worn outside Crete. In this island the variety which seems to have been in common use is a gold hoop with a large granulated pendant of conical shape. Such a specimen has been recovered from the Mavrospelio cemetery near Knossos and dates from the 14th or 13th century. Earrings of this style - it looks as if that particular shape is imitating, in a stylised form, a bull's head - were common in Crete during these centuries whereas elsewhere in the flourishing Mycenaean Empire earrings seem to have been almost totally out of use⁶⁸.

j) Seals⁶⁹

The Cretan seals in the Late Bronze Age (I use Higgins's classification of this material, in op.cit. pp. 180-188, one of the best which have so far been made) fall into three chronological divisions, corresponding to the three Late Minoan phases.

In late Minoan I (c.1550-1450 BC) the various subjects on the seals are treated in a much more free way than that used by the artists in the previous period. Again (as in previous periods) the main characteristics of the style involve the combinations of naturalism with the tendency to fill the field in the most expressive and impressionistic way. Subjects that predominate are religious scenes, lions charging at their prey and recumbent bulls and cows. The commonest shape is now the lentoid.

In late Minoan II (c. 1450 - 1400) - this is the period when the Mycenaeans had taken over Knossos - practically the same subjects as before are now used with the addition of heraldic arrangements of animals. Scenes from the bull-sports as well as bulls and cows enjoy a certain popularity as subjects in this period. What is really extraordinary is the way in which the bodies of the animals are contorted in order

to fill the circular field of the lentoid stone. Cylinder seals modelled after the Babylonian fashion appear during the closing stages of the 15th century.

In Late Minoan III (c.1400 - 1100) an apparent decadence in the art of seal-engraving is to be noticed in Crete, after the final destruction of Knossos. The materials now used are easily worked (serpentine and glass). The motifs do not exhibit new ideas but evidently now display a decline in taste.

Among the most skilfully-fashioned seals of the Late Bronze Age are gold signet rings, and it is perhaps quite worthwhile to mention two examples, hailed as great works of art. The first is a ring from a tomb at Knossos (c.1450 - 1400) on which a rather religious scene is portrayed involving four women and a diminutive goddess flying down from the sky. It is noteworthy that the women's heads are simplified so much that they hardly give the impression of a head at all. In another gold ring from Knossos (15th century) a female worshipper stands in front of a sanctuary, presumably praying to a deity. A tiny figure can be seen flying down, perhaps to meet her.

By means of the line-up of information presented so far in this survey we have attempted to give an account of the Late Minoan culture. Since its primary purpose has been to sketch only those events and characteristics which can be taken to have distinguished the Late Minoan Age the review of Minoan civilization in the Aegean Late Bronze Age may therefore be drawn to a close.

B. The Mycenaeans - The Expression of their Culture in the Archaeological Record

Introduction

Since Mycenaean activities are sufficiently attested by means of various archaeological finds over many parts of the Aegean area, Asia Minor, the Levant, Italy and areas to the north of Greece, there does not seem to be much need to try and amplify this picture by drawing upon the evidence of literary records. But the main reason for avoiding - temporarily - such a survey is that Mycenaeans as such are

always treated as an archaeological entity, the various accounts of them being based solely on the multi-natured discoveries unearthed and studied by archaeologists. This is usually the case unless special reasons exist for the coupling of the archaeological record with the literary, but such reasons do not concern the discussion in this chapter as opposed to later ones where, owing to various collations and juxtapositions of evidence being pertinent, the literary image of the Mycenaeans will be commented upon.

The Origin of the Mycenaeans

The origin of the inhabitants of Mycenaean Greece, that is, of the Greek Mainland - the home of Mycenaean culture par excellence - during the Late Bronze Age (c. 1600-1050 BC), a period which is otherwise referred to as Late Helladic times, has been accepted as Greek by the major part of modern scholarship, owing to Michael Ventris' decipherment of Mycenaean Linear B script in 1953, by means of which Ventris was able to claim that the language in - official at least - use in the Mycenaean period was Greek.⁷⁰ This decipherment has so far borne up well under the pressure of criticism which emerged soon after it appeared, and, although those who dispute it are almost as keen in doing so as its adherents are in championing its inferences, the conclusions it reached have not hitherto been seriously challenged⁷¹. Yet, the question when and from where Greek-speaking Indo-Europeans came to Greece to settle have not yet been definitely answered, owing to a lack of relevant evidence. However, it looks as though these Greek-speakers were in the Greek Mainland at least from the beginning of Middle Helladic times (MH c.2000-1600). There are suggestions that an incursion of Greek-speakers at the transition from Middle to Late Helladic followed an earlier invasion at the outset of the Middle Helladic era. The earlier incursion is believed by Palmer to have involved Luwians⁷², while Best and Yadin attribute it to Thracian invaders⁷³. Yet such theories as support the arrival of Greek-speakers in Greece at the end of Middle Helladic times may reasonably be held to be untenable, in as much as no break in the archaeological record is attested at the time when the Middle Helladic era comes to an end, that

is, no break so major and widespread as to suggest the arrival of a new population. The discussion by Mylonas of the overall problem of an earlier invasion of Greece by foreigners, followed by another involving a Greek-speaking population at the beginning of a Mycenaean era, makes it quite clear that the school of thought represented by the above scholars cannot be, by any means, seen to carry much weight⁷⁴.

It used to be said, until some time ago, as the result of a combination of the archaeological and the linguistic evidence, that the Middle Helladic inhabitants of the Greek mainland were the first Greek-speakers to enter Greece. The basic theory in favour of this view was put forward by Haley and Blegen in 1928⁷⁵. It is true that in many a site of Bronze Age Greece, the change from the Early Helladic (Early Bronze Age in Greece, c. 2800 - 2000) to Middle Helladic cultures was accompanied by violent destruction and this picture is quite clear in such sites as Aghios Kosmas in Attica, Asine and Tiryns in the Argolid (Peloponnese), Orchomenos and Eutresis in Boeotia, to mention but a few.

Throughout the Middle Helladic culture, which seems to have been agriculture-based and dominated by a high degree of architectural simplicity as well as by the tendency to employ both intramural and extramural burial - the latter in the form of pit-graves and cists (that is, shallow-built tombs) - the predominant pottery styles were the so-called Grey Minyan pottery and a matt-painted ware with unknown affinities, neither of which is attested before. Examples of Grey Minyan pottery were first excavated at Orchomenos in Boeotia and were called "Minyan" by virtue of Homer's "Orchomenos Minyaios". This ware which has a smooth, soapy surface and is thrown on the wheel, is superseded later in the Middle Helladic period by a new, yellow-buff pottery which forms an important link between Minyan wares and Mycenaean pottery of the Late Bronze Age.

The thesis set out by Blegen and Haley in their aforementioned work concerning the time of the arrival of the first Greek-speakers showed that there was a close correspondence between place-names formed with the suffixes -nth and -ss/-s (such as Korinthos, Arakynthos, Knossos,

Parnassos and others which had once been identified, through corresponding Anatolian formations, as non-Greek⁷⁶, actually in the first place as non-Indo-European, yet later on as proto-Indo-European, thanks to evidence from Luwian and Hittite documents) and the Early Bronze Age sites in Greece and Crete. Thus Blegen, believing that if the pre-Greek layer is identifiable, then the succeeding layer could naturally be identified as Hellenic⁷⁷, went on to conclude that the people who destroyed the Early Helladic culture and created the Middle Helladic one were none other than the first Greek-speaking Indo-Europeans to enter Greece.

The occurrence in City VI at Troy (roughly contemporary with the Middle Helladic era in Greece), for the first time, of a type of pottery very similar to Grey Minyan wares (which are typical, as we have stated of Middle Helladic culture) and of horse bones which are attested, also for the first time, in Greece, in Middle Helladic sites, led first Forsdyke and later Blegen to conclude, after examining the overall situation - the latter scholar putting forward the final theory through a synthesis of his own views and Forsdyke's inferences - that the Middle Helladic people of Greece and Troy VI belonged to the same ethnic stock, that is Greek⁷⁸. Serious linguistic as well as archaeological objections have subsequently been raised against Blegen's views concerning both the identification of the Middle Helladic people as the first Greek-speaking inhabitants of Greece, and the ethnic affinities between the population of that period and the inhabitants of Troy VI. It has been noticed that the overall number of toponyms in the Linear B tablets which can also be found in Classical Greek times is not more than eight and that again only three of them (all names of Cretan sites) can be placed on a map of Bronze Age Greece⁷⁹. Moreover, only three out of the scores of Greek place-names ending in -ss and -nth in the maps composed by Schachermeyr⁸⁰ can be found in Bronze Age records and associated with actual places. In conclusion, one could remark that there is evidence which attests to a number of non-Greek place-names occurring in Aegean and Anatolian areas in the Early Bronze Age, but it is less substantial than has been assumed and that, consequently, it is not capable of achieving a correlation

between Early Bronze Age sites and non-Greek names to the extent and effect suggested by Haley and Blegen⁸¹.

There are also archaeological objections to Blegen's theories. It has quite legitimately been noticed that the Early Helladic sites might have been destroyed - perhaps at different periods of time - by natural causes and that the arrival of Middle Helladic people followed later, in which case it would not be possible, as Blegen believed, to pinpoint the signs betraying the first Hellenic appearance in the archaeological stratification⁸². Regarding the Trojan affinities of the Middle Helladic people which Blegen strongly argued for, it has been noticed that they are based almost entirely on similar pottery styles only, which cannot be shown to have appeared at the same time in the two areas (Greece and Troy). Thus, recent scholarly approach to the question has judged that since other common features between the two cultures concerned are virtually lacking and similar pottery styles are considered insufficient index of a common ethnic stock, Middle Helladic Greeks and the inhabitants of Troy VI cannot necessarily have been of the same extraction.

Additional excavation at the Early Helladic sites of Lerna, Ayios Kosmas, Zygouries, Asine, Tiryns, Berbati (all on the Greek Mainland) and Lefkandi (on the west coast of Euboea) have shown that Grey Minyan ware need not always be associated with a destruction; and since destruction layers always formerly seemed to mark the arrival of intruders who inaugurated the Middle Helladic Age, it followed that Grey Minyan ware need not be attributed to any newcomers⁸³. Another view has it that Grey Minyan ware is more likely to have been developed in Greece by intruders at the outset of the Middle Helladic era than to have been brought by them from wherever they had set out⁸⁴.

After the thorough study of the Anatolian pottery of the second millennium BC by I. Mellaart and D.H. French, conclusions have been reached which render untenable such traditional views as the bringing of Grey Minyan technique from Greece to Troy or vice versa, as well as the theory that this type of pottery was brought to both areas from a common source⁸⁵. The only suggestion which can stand up to reason is that two types of grey ware bearing many common

characteristics "were evolved independently in Greece and in Anatolia"⁸⁶. French has suggested that the Middle Helladic potters are likely to have patterned their pottery after that of the Anatolian craftsmen⁸⁷ and such a view clearly points to a strong line of communication between Greece and north-west Anatolia. Modern research has indicated that, whatever the case, there must have existed a trading relationship between the two areas, perhaps a whole network of trading contacts, also involving Crete and Cyclades⁸⁸.

In more recent times scholarly research has highlighted the significance of Europe as an area whose connexions with Greece in the late stages of Early Helladic and in Middle Helladic might very well turn out to be of great importance. The regions to the north of Greece are seen to have provided parallels to typical characteristics of the Middle Helladic culture; additionally what have been considered as imports from the north have been unearthed in Early Helladic settlements. The role of Europe was first stressed by Kraiker in 1939⁸⁹, and in recent years such scholars as Bouzek (1972), Howell (1973) and Hood (1973) have taken up Kraiker's views and even corroborated them by using further evidence⁹⁰. Objections have once more been raised against this school of thought, mainly focussing on the facts that the quantity of the material used as evidence is not considerable and that there do not seem to be clear indications that the objects concerned can be dated at a definite time and that they are inter-related so as to be assigned to a group of invaders⁹¹. Such scholars as Hooker believe that, all considered, there seems to be more likelihood for internal unrest being the cause of the violent cultural change marking the transition from Early to Middle Helladic than for any inrush from outside. Yet, albeit that such a view is by no means unlikely, I think that in trying to assess the evidence for a European connexion in the Middle Helladic culture, one should couple this evidence (debatably seen to suggest northern connexions - whatever these might have been - from the end of Early Helladic II (c.2200 BC) and during the Middle Helladic) with the series of destructions attested at the end of Early Helladic and consider strongly the possibility of a foreign group of invaders arriving from

the north, raiding the Early Helladic settlements and influencing thereafter the pattern of cultural life hitherto prevailing in Greece. It seems as though some scholars tend to consider the northern connexions evidence on its own, thus underestimating the significance of the violent changes at the end of the Early Helladic, and not seeing the matter overall in what could be a more thorough perspective, that is not viewing the series of destructions of the Early Helladic settlements in the same light as the evidence for northern connexions. Should the matter overall be viewed in this way, I should think that a theory for an immigration from the north, even though it happened at intervals, as Bouzek in 1972 suggested, would acquire a higher degree of credibility.

In any case, it seems more than likely that the Late Helladic people of Greece, that is, the Mycenaeans, were the same people as the inhabitants of Greece during the previous, Middle Helladic, phase - that is, a branch of Indo-European speakers who entered Greece some time during the Bronze Age either from the east or the north. An incursion from the north seems to form a stronger possibility - in which case the end of Early Helladic seems to be a very likely time for the arrival of northerners - but again one can by no means reject the possibility that Indo-European arrived in Greece following a gradual infiltration process which may have covered a considerable span of time, since no reason exists for identifying Greek-speakers with the makers of Minyan pottery, even though there seems to have been an invasion of such people at the end of Early Helladic or thereabouts. Actually, there is even room for the possibility, particularly once the linguistic data are considered carefully, that Greek-speaking Indo-Europeans were in Greece already in the Early Helladic period (c.2800 - 2000 BC).

The Land-Marks of the Mycenaean Era

It is virtually impossible for one to reconstruct the whole history of the Mycenaean period in definite terms, as proper historical records of those times are sadly lacking. Yet, from what one can deduce from the archaeological image of these people and from later literary sources of

trustworthy historians, it seems that we can make a list of what could well have been the major events and landmarks that highlighted the Mycenaean era in rough chronological order. The era of the so-called Shaft graves (two circular arrangements of built tombs, sunk into the ground and excavated within the citadel of Mycenae, known as circles A and B), spanning the time from the end of Middle Helladic (c.1600) till the late stages of Late Helladic (Mycenaean) I (c.1500), (though Circle B was partly re-used at about the middle of the 15th century end of Mycenaean IA), makes up an important feature of the Mycenaean culture. It first turns up as such in Mycenae in the Argolid in c.1600, and signals the initial appearance of this culture which, in this very early stage, exhibits a good deal of Minoan influence, as the contents of the Shaft graves clearly show⁹². The so-called tholos Tombs, the standard form of royal burial from c. 1550 BC in the Western Peloponnese and from c.1500 in the rest of Greece, form another dominant characteristic of the Mycenaean era, serving to underline the change of fashion in burial architecture which is now exhibiting a spirit of monumentality indicative of the high significance, prestige and powers with which the royal office was vested in Mycenaean society. Tholos tombs were usually sunk in the ground, at first on flat surfaces and later, under the influence of contemporary chamber-tombs, in hill-slopes. They were dome-shaped masonries over the top of which a barrow-like mound of earth was always piled. A long unroofed passage, the so-called dromos which approached the front of the tomb was also a standard architectural element of the overall composition. The first Tholos tombs were built in Messenia, south-western Peloponnese, at about the beginning of the sixteenth century BC. Some of these early tombs may suggest a Cretan derivation of this type of burial architecture, since they appear to have been built above ground, like the earlier round tombs of south Crete⁹³. Few tholos tombs have survived un plundered, yet those which have suggest that the burial gifts accompanying the dead in such tombs might very well have been, as a rule, exceedingly rich. Tholos tombs which have yielded rich offerings have notably been found in Laconia in south Peloponnese, namely at

Analipsis, Kampos, Palaiochori and Vapheio, all dating from Late Helladic II (c.1550 - 1400 BC)⁹⁴. In Messenia, in western Peloponnese, similar tombs at Kakovatos, Routsis and Tragana have yielded Late Helladic IIA (c.1500 - 1450) pottery⁹⁵.

At about 1400 there commences the so-called period of the Mycenaean Empire which lasts some two centuries (c.1400 - 1200). The maturity and expansion of Mycenaean civilisation during that period, attested all over the Aegean area and the Levant and as far in the west as Italy and Sicily, must have, in all probability, had much to do with the recession of Minoan influence in the Aegean, following the fall of Knossos (c.1400). The latter event has, over the years, been associated (along with - and most notably - the preceding period of evident Mycenaean influence) with the aggrandisement of Mycenae⁹⁶, although a new approach has rather recently been developed - yet not gained so much acceptance as the previous theory. According to this approach the Mycenaeans may not have been directly responsible for the destruction of Knossos, whose Mycenaean affinities during the period prior to its destruction (c.1450-1400) were most probably the "result of prolonged intercourse between Crete and the Mainland"⁹⁷, rather than, as Wace's theory has it, the outcome of the Mycenaean occupation of Knossos.

A period of the Mycenaean Empire is marked by the ceramic styles of Late Helladic IIIA (especially IIIA2, c.1350-1300) and late Helladic III B (c.1300-1200). The Mycenaean culture in this period exhibits a great homogeneity which is reflected in such features as weapons, frescoes, book-keeping, megara (the standard and basic architectural unit of a Mycenaean palace), fortification walls, small-size statuary, burial architecture, and, of course, vase-modelling. Features which could be considered remarkable innovations of this era include the building of megara and of massive fortification walls in palaces and citadels, the habit of depositing terracotta figurines in tombs, and the employment of Linear B script for purposes of book-keeping⁹⁸.

The civilisation, undoubtedly one of the most brilliant of its time and of a considerable political importance in the balance of powers in the Eastern Mediterranean, reportedly

clashed with the powerful kingdom of Troy in north-west Asia Minor. This conflict, marvellously narrated with an enormous wealth of detail by Homer in his Iliad, was won by the Mycenaeans who nevertheless did not secure a stronghold in Asia Minor and returned to insecurity at home, after going through painful pettegrinations all over the Levant - if we are to believe the unanimous accounts of later Greek poets.

It is believed that the city the Mycenaeans took ten years to conquer and which Homer sang about is actually Troy VIIA in the archaeological stratification of the relevant area, a direct continuation of Troy VIH, yet with quite visible discrepancies in its overall reconstruction and even in its attitude to outside connexions. The date for the burning of Troy VIIA has been much debated, but it seems most likely that it must have occured at some time during the latter half of the thirteenth century⁹⁹. The reasons for which the Mycenaeans undertook this war are not clear, but it seems that there was a considerable upturn of their power at that time, especially if there really were, as is likely, Achaeans (Mycenaeans, that is) in the ranks of the Sea-Peoples who attacked Egypt in the fifth year of Pharaoh Merneptah (in 1220 BC); that span of time, in broad terms, is the same one in which the Trojan War seems to have happened. The overall context seems to suggest that this war was also another example of the Mycenaean imperialism, "in the period of recrudescent mainland strength at the end of the thirteenth century"¹⁰⁰.

As a result of the undermining effects of what could well have been over-population problems, uneven technological advances and prosperity, intense political self-interest and the increase in vulnerability of the main Mycenaean cities (resulting from the casualties of the Trojan War and the changes in the balance of power among Greek Mainland cities which this war occasioned), Mycenaean society entered an era of political decadence and social unrest. Civil wars may also very well have broken out. A vivid, somewhat dramatic picture of that situation is drawn by Thucydides who stresses that, after the Trojan War, restlessness and warfare were the dominant features of Mycenaean Greece¹⁰¹. Archaeologically, two series of destructions are attested as having afflicted

many important Mycenaean centres, the first in c.1200, the second some fifty years later. In the first, Mycenae and Tiryns are attacked but manage to weather the storm, whereas sites on the west coast from Olympia downwards are either burned, like Pylos, or deserted, like Mouriatada. Refugees fled to Achaia, the Ionian Islands and Attica and also the Aegean Islands such as Naxos and Crete¹⁰². A spell of brief revival comes afterwards with overseas trade ties renewed again, but at c.1150, a second series of disasters strikes the Mycenaean cities. Mycenae is now finally overcome and shore sites seem now to have suffered the main burden of the onslaught¹⁰³. However, continuity between twelfth century pottery styles and protogeometric wares of the ensuing so-called Dark Age in quite a number of places, such as Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos, Athens, Delphi, Eastern Crete, Naxos, Kos, Rhodes, suggests that, though the Mycenaean style of life, as it appears in the twelfth century, was lost, certain aspects of the cultural background which had been formed during the Mycenaean era proper, still lingered on. It is quite probable that, despite all the adversities suffered by these places, part (at least) of their inhabitants stayed on and tried to hold on to their Mycenaean heritage.

The widespread destructions which halted the progress of the Mycenaean civilisation, fragmented the Mycenaean world and brought about the actual end of the Mycenaean era, are traditionally linked with the Dorians (also a branch of the Greek-speaking Indo-European family), who seemed to originate from the north west of Greece¹⁰⁴. Nonetheless the many-sided question, namely which exactly was the process those destructions actually followed, what triggered them off, what factors and to what extent each must be blamed for them, who the victims and who the victors actually were and what pattern of tribal amalgamation, if at all, the overall unrest brought into being, has proved one of the most tantalising in the whole field of Mediterranean prehistory. No definite answers can as yet be provided, but it does look as though no invader from outside the Mycenaean world should take the entire blame for the destructions of the Mycenaean palaces and the widespread upheavals which are attested to from the end of Mycenaean III B (c.1200) up to the late stages of III

C (c.1100). It has been suggested that, since the linguistic and legendary aspects of the Dorian Invasion show that speakers of Doric might have existed in the Mycenaean world when Linear B tables were written¹⁰⁵ and since, in historical times (that is, after the Mycenaean age) Doric dialects were spoken in those parts of the Peloponnese where the Linear B tablets have been discovered, it is likely that the lower classes of the population spoke Doric, as opposed to the attestedly (according to the Linear B documents) non-Doric dialect spoken by the palatial aristocracy¹⁰⁶. If so, the suggestion goes on, the "Dorian Invasion" would actually not have been an incursion into Peloponnese from outside, but an ultimately successful uprising of the Doric-speaking subjects against the palatial centres. However, although this suggestion may well contain some truth and although cremation, the use of iron and objects such as the lanceolate spearheads, alien pottery and the Naue II swords, (all of which were traditionally linked with northern invaders) are now seen as having little or nothing to do with such peoples, but rather as being a result of the foreign connexions of the Mycenaeans (achieved mainly through trade)¹⁰⁷, I find it hard to envisage the Dorians as a population based wholly in the Mycenaean area, as an entire layer, that is, of Mycenaean society, a class of down-trodden subjects, who rose against their tasks-masters. I think it would perhaps make a more acceptable proposition if we considered part of them, actually those referred to as "Heracleids" in the traditions, to be of the same stock as the Mycenaean rulers whom they eventually overthrew (thus falling partly in line with the above suggestion), while holding the rest to be outsiders, that is, coming from areas outside the Mycenaean world proper and, at any rate, outside Peloponnese. Such a view would actually connect with the overall literary image of the Dorians in the numerous traditions much better than the previous one would, since all traditions hold them to be invaders from outside the Mycenaean world, notably from Thessaly. There are also other arguments in favour of a non-Dorian invasion theory; such arguments are: the continuity of the Mycenaean civilisation after the era of destructions, which is seen as contrasting with the literary accounts which

speak of the settlement and expropriation of land by the intruders; the absence of alien remains in the material record (which is inconsistent - it is argued - with the rampant activities of the invaders); and, finally, the scantiness, after the end of the Mycenaean era, of the objects which are of admittedly northern provenance, something which is taken to indicate that these objects cannot have been among the factors which transformed the Mycenaean culture¹⁰⁸. However, these arguments, although they admittedly do provide a firm challenge to an alien invasion theory, cannot undermine such a theory altogether. The literary traditions do not state, or actually even hint, that the Dorians had had a radically different culture from the Achaeans and further chapters in this survey will try to show that circumstances of habitation and commonly undertaken activities could have rendered the exchange of cultural features totally feasible. The same may be said with reference to the argument about the absence of alien remains at the time of the upheavals, a notion which does not, after all, tie in perfectly with the actual situation. Such objects as the Naue II swords and the lanceolate spearheads have always been seen as intrusive elements in the Mycenaean world at the time of the destructions and their occurrence in Mycenaean areas at the time of the great destruction should not, I think, be dismissed lightly as coincidence, resulting, as has been once argued, from commercial contacts¹⁰⁹. It is difficult, I believe, to come to terms with the notion that a culture which undergoes a crisis that may, as it finally did, spell doom for its existence, is in a position to sustain its commercial contacts, instead of trying to cope with its serious internal problems and to stave off the recurrence of the menace. A group of handmade, burnished ware recovered from Korakou (in Corinthia), Athens, Mycenae, Lefkandi and Perati is seen to indicate the appearance of northern intruders in southern Greece whose ultimate origin is to be sought in Thrace or southern Bulgaria¹¹⁰. Finally, the argument regarding the sparsity of the northern objects after the end of the Mycenaean era does not perhaps carry much weight in as much as the intruders could very well have given up some of their traditional habits and the objects

associated with them, only to adopt the superior Mycenaean ones which perhaps suited them better.

A serious, carefully-argued case for a north-west Greek origin for a wave of intruders in southern Greece in the time we examine (LHIIIC, C.1200 - 1050) has been made by the late V.R.d'A Desborough¹¹¹ who took up and integrated the theory first put forward by Hammond¹¹². The corner-stone of the evidence used by Desborough is the supersession (in LHIIIC) of family burials in chamber tombs - a standard Mycenaean habit - by individual cist-tombs, a kind of burial which is also attested in Epirus and Thessaly, thus making it likely that the cist-using invaders who brought the Mycenaean civilisation to a halt had come from north-western Greece.

Although Desborough's objections to a theory of internal conflict in the Mycenaean world as the cause of the subsequent disasters are not insuperable, as has rightly been remarked by Hooker¹¹³, the latter author's argument (falling in line with Snodgrass)¹¹⁴ that the use of cist-tombs should be attributed to the pre-Mycenaean substratum, on which the Mycenaean masters imposed their palatial order, does not account for the noticeable scantiness of cist-tombs in Mycenaean times. This is something which seems to be unjustifiable if viewed in the light of Hooker's argument, for if it was the downtrodden pre-Mycenaean inhabitants of Middle Helladic Greece (at which time cist-burial were, incidentally, very common) who rose against their Mycenaean masters and destroyed them, one should expect that these lower classes of population would not have abandoned their long-established habits during Mycenaean times, such as the use of cist-tombs, only to take up the burial habits of their hated task-masters. Yet the unmistakable scantiness of cist-tombs in the Mycenaean era as opposed to their abundance in the preceding MH age, seems to militate against Hooker's argument. It would, therefore, be more consistent with the sequence of the material evidence to assume that there was really at least one invasion from outside Mycenaean Greece proper that brought about the use of certain new customs and artefacts, perhaps taking advantage of the enfeebled state of the Mycenaean world occasioned by, as Hooker suggests¹¹⁵, probable civil warfare and by local risings of a population

with which the invaders might have even joined forces. (Perhaps there are allusions to such a development in the recurrent concept, in all literary accounts, of a body of local insurrectionists - perhaps to be seen in the case of the "Heracleids" who were of Achaean stock - who teamed up with an alien force, the Dorians, and set out to avenge themselves on their oppressors). It is, finally, likely that natural disasters might have added their own impart to help render the Mycenaean world even weaker and susceptible to disintegration, as Carpenter argued¹¹⁶, something that is in agreement with the archaeological evidence¹¹⁷, though such a calamity cannot possibly have been the only cause for the collapse of the Mycenaean civilisation.

The Evidence for Mycenaean Connexions

The centre of Mycenaean civilisation lay on the Greek Mainland. It was strongest in the Peloponnese - except its north western area - and in Attica and Boeotia but less strong in Thessaly, excluding the area round the coastal site of Iolkos, the modern city-harbour (and one of the biggest in Greece) of Volos. It had also woven a widespread network of connexions over the central and southern Aegean, especially the Dodecanese, and even had a precarious hold on the west coast of Asia Minor, at Miletus. A land-power though the Mycenaean civilisation primarily was, sea trade - not only within the Aegean but also to areas outwith this sea, such as Sicily, southern Italy and even the Levant - seems to have been operating regularly and frequently¹¹⁸.

Let us consider what the archaeological record has to offer about the various Mycenaean connexions. But first a few words on Mycenaean chronology: The Mycenaean (alias Late Helladic) era is divided into Mycenaean I (c.1580-1500), Mycenaean II A (c.1500-1450), Mycenaean IIB (c.1450-1400), Mycenaean III A (1400-1300), Mycenaean IIIB (c.1300-1200) and Mycenaean III C (c.1200-1050). These periods are more often referred to as Late Helladic I (LHI), Late Helladic IIA (LHIIA), Late Helladic II B (LHIIB), Late Helladic IIIA, (LHIIIA), Late Helladic III B (LHIIIB) and Late Helladic III C (LHIIIC) respectively and it is to this latter nomenclature that this study will adhere to hereafter.

LHIIA pottery has been recovered from a house of the local First Apennine period at Luni, up the Tyrrhenian coast near Viterbo in Tuscany in western Italy, and this discovery points to the probability that Myceneans had reached as far north in Italy as Tuscany in the course of the fourteenth century, although I would interpret the existence of this evidence as being due more to trade relations than to anything else¹¹⁹. There is also evidence of trade in Lipari, Ischia and Vivara in Italy during LHII-III, while in Sicily at Thapsos, a little offshore island north of Syracuse, it is likely that Mycenaean had planted a small colony which LHIIIA-B pottery helps us to date to late fourteenth-thirteenth century¹²⁰. We may say the same about Scoglio del Tonno, in the Gulf of Toronto. It is possible that Scoglio del Tonno was engaged in the purple trade with the Eastern Mediterranean¹²¹. Late Minoan pottery of the early phase (LMI) discovered on Lipari islands in the north of Sicily suggests Minoan connexions, probably during the time when LMI pottery was in vogue (c.1550-1450). There is also Late Helladic I (LHI) pottery on Filicudi islands, indicating Mycenaean connexions from that time (c.1580-1500)¹²². The revolutionary potter's wheel was, in all probability, introduced at Toronto in the 13th century by the Mycenaean and was never lost thereafter. Contacts between Italy and Sicily on the one hand and the Mycenaean world on the other seem to have suffered a severe change in the twelfth century, evidenced by the falling off, or even disappearance, of Mycenaean objects at a number of sites which had witnessed regular Mycenaean activity in the preceding centuries. Thus, although there is evidence that Scoglio del Tonno and two other places on the Apulia coast where Mycenaean IIIC pottery has also been recorded (Torre Castelucia, Leporano) remained in touch with the Aegean, and though Salerno, Monte Novello and Ischia, all have some LHIII C pottery, "the Aegean boats no longer visited Sicily, although the native Pantalican society was thriving"¹²³.

The Mycenaean had also exerted their influence in certain areas of the Eastern Mediterranean. There is ample archaeological evidence to suggest that the period between c.1425 BC and c.1200 BC was one of extremely active Aegean

trade between Mycenaean Greece and Cyprus. The chief evidence which points to this conclusion is to be found in the occurrence at Cypriot sites, mainly Enkomi, of substantial amounts of Mycenaean pottery of the LHIIIA and B type. It has been suggested that the vast proportion of Mycenaean pottery which has been found in Cyprus and dates from times prior to c.1200 was manufactured in the Aegean¹²⁴. Since this view has been further corroborated by scientific investigations carried out with a view to tracing the origin of the materials used for the manufacture of these vessels¹²⁵, it is widely accepted nowadays that this pottery serves as a pointer to extensive trade relations between Mainland Greece and Cyprus, throughout which Mycenaean pottery was the product under chief demand by Cypriots. The period in question is known, in standardised Cypriot chronology, as Late Cypriot II, corresponding to Late Helladic III A and B (c.1400-1200). It is almost certain also that this period was not one of settlement of Mycenaeans in Cyprus; this widely sustained view has been satisfactorily argued for by Porphyrios Dikaios in his masterly study of the Bronze Age city of Enkomi where more evidence of Mycenaean III A and B activity has so far been found than at any other Cypriot site. One should bear in mind, when dealing with Late Cypriot II Enkomi that, though this mass of Mycenaean pottery is widely distributed throughout Cyprus, it is in the port towns of the south-east and east that it is best represented. There is a related distribution in Syria and Palestine.

There is a sufficient number of corresponding aspects of Mycenaean material culture to justify one speaking of settlement in Cyprus or colonisation during the subsequent phase, Late Cypriot III¹²⁶. Dikaios believed that¹²⁷ this settlement happened in the wake of destruction of Enkomi which he put close to 1230 BC and had suggested that both the replanning of the town and the construction of ashlar buildings bear witness to the settlement of Mycenaeans from c.1200 down to c.1050 BC, that is down to the beginning of Cypro-Geometric period. Since the beginning of the 12th Century BC (the end of LHIIIB) is marked by considerable social, political and economic unrest in Mainland Greece, it seems reasonable to presume that this settlement of Cyprus

dating from the beginning of the 12th century (beginning of Late Cypriot III) would have been the result of a refugee movement from continental Greece, after the calamities that marked the end of Late Helladic IIIB. Desborough had suggested that the pattern of Cypriot history in the 12th century reflects a struggle between the local Cypriots and the communities where Mycenaeans had settled and established their authority¹²⁸. The same scholar interprets the second major disaster which struck the Cypriot cities during the first half of the 11th century¹²⁹ as part of the manifestations of the contest between the new settlers and the native Cypriots.

Discussion of the elusive developments in Cyprus during Late Cypriot III (c.1200-1050) is beyond the scope of this chapter and I shall confine myself only to setting out the list of places which seem likely to have been inhabited by Mycenaeans during that stage. They are: Enkomi¹³⁰, Sinda¹³¹, Kition¹³², Salamis¹³³, Idalion¹³⁴ and Kaloriziki, not far from Bamboula at Kourion¹³⁵.

From Cyprus we now turn our attention to Egypt where "The Mycenaean III A-B pottery from el-Amarna capital of the XVIIIth Dynasty of Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaton, provides the only fixed and secure point in the synchronisms between the Late Bronze Age culture of Greece and the New Kingdom of Egypt"¹³⁶. But apart from the Mycenaean pottery found at el-Amarna, ceramics from Mycenaean Greece have also been recorded at Sesebi, a site lying between the Second and Third Cataracts in Nubia and occupied by Egyptians in the time of Akhenaton. This ware is also of the LHIIIA - B style, like the Mycenaean pottery from this Pharaoh's capital. There is, however, no further evidence from el-Amarna or Sesebi to support the view that foreigners from the Aegean either came or settled at these sites. Additionally, no evidence attests to there being representations of Keftiu and the "Peoples from the Isles in the Midst of the Sea", both of Bronze Age extraction, from the reign of Akhenaton. In fact the only foreigners whose portrayal in fourteenth century frescoes may be regarded as historically authentic are the Syrians, one of whose maritime ventures is depicted in the Tomb of Kenanum. However, the origin of the LHIIIA - B ware from the time of

Akhenaton, the ultimate source, that is, of this pottery, remains obscure. We do not know whether this ware had been manufactured in the Greek mainland or fashioned in some other place within the sphere of influence of Mycenaean culture, and after the type of ceramics in vogue in the Mycenaean mainland. The only clue that articles of possible Greek mainland origin had arrived in Egypt at the time in question is the appearance of an amphora amongst "tribute" from the North in a painting from the Tomb of the Vizir Huya¹³⁷. But although one would feel inclined to suggest that the origin of the Mycenaean pottery from the time of Akhenaton does not point to the Greek Mainland, yet an empirical comparison of scientific data seems to favour such an origin for this ware. If, on the other hand, deductions are to be made from comparisons of data other than scientific, an inference could be reached for a Rhodian, Cypriot or even Syrian point of production¹³⁸. However, it is not the purpose of this chapter to account for this problem, therefore I will round off the discussion on this question by quoting Merrilees' view of it, one that seems to me to contain quite a good part of the truth, namely, "whatever the ultimate source (of the Mycenaean ware from Akhenaton's time), there are no good grounds for arguing either that Mycenaeans were settled in Egypt using pottery from their country of origin or that they arrived bringing their wares with them"¹³⁹.

Turning to the north-western connexions of the Mycenaean world, mention may first of all be made of a LHI - IIA (c.1550-1450 BC) cup of a "Vapheio" type (named after the same name-bearing site near Sparta in the Peloponnese) which has been discovered in a tumulus at Pazok in Albania. There is also Mycenaean pottery at Thermon on the way to the north, dating from LHIIA (c.1500-1450) and a tomb at Ilias near Amphilochia in Epirus (north-west Greece) may have been that of a Mycenaean settler¹⁴⁰. The fourteenth century also witnessed Mycenaean activity farther north in Yugoslavia, to judge from the LHIIIA (c.1400-1300) pots found at Debelo Brdo near Sarajevo¹⁴¹. A Mycenaean tholos tomb found at Parga near Kiperi in Epirus containing LHIIA₂ (C.1350-1300) pottery bears witness to north-western contacts in this remote area. Local imitations of the Mycenaean Horned Sword (type Ci) in

Epirus, and of cruciform swords (Di) in Albanian sites, in the Mati valley and Nenshat, suggest a certain knowledge of Mycenaean technology¹⁴². The horned swords versions in Bulgaria are even more elaborately worked out. These early specimens, which have been accorded a date in the fifteenth-fourteenth centuries, are followed in Epirus by a number of dirks and daggers of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries. They belong to Mycenaean type Fii and Fiii and were found in settlements and graves.

The total absence of the flange-hilted sword - a type said to be of northern origin, presumably from the areas of eastern Europe to the north of Greece - in north-western Greece at a time during which we find it in the East Mediterranean and Southern Greece (Cos, Naxos, Cyprus, Mycenae) may be taken to imply either that northern invaders, allowing for their existence, did not chance to use that particular route - through north-western Greece, that is, Epirus - on their way south or that they avoided it for some unknown reason. However the occurrence in those areas of a northern type of spear, of the kind which used to be wielded along with the usual Mycenaean dirk, may allow us to presume that this north-western route was simply not used as much as others; or, if the theory of a northern invasion at the end of LHIIIB (c.1200 and during the subsequent LHIIIC's is not to be taken into account, we may just say that whatever northern bronzes appear to have been in use at that period (late thirteenth and twelfth centuries) as a result in all likelihood of normal trading, were not perhaps as much in vogue in north-western Greece¹⁴³ as they were in other areas, particularly in the south.

Asia Minor is also an area over certain parts of which Mycenaeans expanded. To start with, "there is no known contact between the Aegean world (or Cyprus) and the south coast of Asia Minor west of Cilicia, while in Cilicia there is evidence of probably not more than casual contact during LHIII (c. 1400-1050) with the one exception of the settlement of a group of Mycenaeans at Tarsus, commencing at the period of transition from LHIII B to C (c.1200 BC) and probably continuing through the twelfth century, but progressively impoverished and not visibly in touch with the Mycenaean

world."¹⁴⁴ The town of Tarsus¹⁴⁵, though under Hittite domination was severely destroyed in all probability later than the reign of Hattusilis III, at some time in the thirteenth century. Another settlement was built above the levelled debris¹⁴⁶. The characteristic pottery of the reoccupation layer was Mycenaean of the transition from LHIIIB to C, but it seems that the traits of LHIIIB are stronger. In the excavator's opinion much of the imported pottery in this settlement came from the Argolid. The final stage of this settlement is marked, however, by a crudely modelled ware¹⁴⁷, exhibiting elements of very late Mycenaean III C (c.1100-1050) as well as influence of Cypriot, Syrian and Palestinian pottery. It has been suggested that whoever destroyed this Hittite town were the very people who introduced and used the LHIIIB-C pottery as well as built the succeeding settlement, but this is still highly hypothetical.

Troy is yet another area in Asia Minor which has furnished evidence of Mycenaean connexions. Three stages in the history of this site are relevant to the late Mycenaean (LHIII actually, c.1440-1050) period. First of all, the settlement known as Troy VIIA must be considered. The relevant excavation report states: "We believe that Troy VIIA has yielded actual evidence showing that the town was subjected to siege, capture and destruction by hostile forces at some time in the general period assigned by Greek tradition to the Trojan War, and that it may safely be identified as the Troy of Priam and of Homer"¹⁴⁸. Mycenaean vases were exported to Troy VIIA, and were locally imitated¹⁴⁹. The report states that while there was still a small number of LHIIIA wares in this settlement, the bulk of the pottery could be attributed to LHIIIB¹⁵⁰. Blegen, the director of the excavation, has said that while many of the Mycenaean sherds belonged to LHIIIA (c.1400-1300), the majority could be dated to early LHIIIB (c.1300-1250), thus putting forward a time of destruction in the first half of LHIIIB, in other words, in the first half of the thirteenth century¹⁵¹.

The subsequent settlement, Troy VIIB, is said to represent "an immediate re-occupation of the site"¹⁵² by the survivors of the disaster, and its duration, though somewhat

short, was of at least one generation. It is implied that the relatively small amount of Mycenaean pottery recovered from this settlement was wholly of LHIIIIC type¹⁵³. On account of some sherds of - locally made - bowls and cups similar to the latest known Mycenaean pottery style, the so-called "Granary Class" (which succeeds the "Close Style" and dates to the advanced LHIIIIC, that is, c.1130-1075), the excavators claimed that Troy VIIB₁ "is at least in part synchronous with the period when the Granary Class.... was in use"¹⁵⁴. This suggestion, though somewhat tendentious (it takes for granted that the rest of the VIIB₁ city Mycenaean ware is entirely of LHIIIIC type while assuming, by analogy with the situation in the preceding VIIA city, that the similarity of certain wares of the VIIB₁ settlement to "Granary Class" Mycenaean pottery is due to imitation of the latter ceramics) seems, nevertheless, to employ a sound argumentation and reaches, to a reasonable extent, tenable conclusions.

The fact that we have an immediate re-occupation after the destruction of the VIIA city and also the fact that during the re-occupation, which did not last long, we notice local pottery imitating (it appears) the Granary Class ware, made Desborough conclude that the destruction of the VIIA city cannot have occurred long before the end of LHIIIIB (c.1200 BC)¹⁵⁵. He finally assigns the destruction to the period between 1250 and 1230, taking into consideration such data as the LHIIIIB material from the VIIA city (indicating that it fell not later than LHIIIIB), the vague, yet worthy information of a record of a King of Ahhiyawa¹⁵⁶ - present in person in Asia Minor - according to which some kind of military operation at the district of the river Seha in North-West Asia Minor probably took place after the middle of the thirteenth century, and finally, the certainty that the Trojan war must have taken place before the destruction of Pylos at the end of LHIII B (c.1200). The third and final interesting stage of Trojan history is that known as VIIB₂ city, that is, the one that succeeds VIIB₁. The relevant excavation reports speak of imported as well as locally made Mycenaean ware to be identified as belonging to this city. Since they are of exactly the same style as that current in VIIB₁ we may assume that this stage of Trojan history was

contemporary with the late part of LHIIIC, when the Granary Class pottery of Mycenaean Greece was still in use. We may also assume that contacts with the Mycenaean world continued down to a time just before the end of LHIIIC (c.1050) and that these contacts were with that part of the Mycenaean world which lay in the East Aegean rather than with any other¹⁵⁷. Miletus, also in Asia Minor, was yet another site with attestedly strong Mycenaean connexions. It was actually a Mycenaean stronghold - to judge from the size of its Mycenaean-style fortification walls - along the western coast-line. It is the only Mycenaean settlement so far to have been definitely identified as such along that coastline and occupies the promontory opposite the mouths of Meander. The latest analysis suggests that the settlement (usually known as IIB), destroyed by fire, immediately preceding the construction of the fortification wall, was still occupied in LHIIIB (c.1300-1200)¹⁵⁸.

The fortification wall, therefore, could not have been built before the beginning of LHIIIB at the earliest (c.1300), though its architecture would seem to have connexions with that of the Hittites¹⁵⁹. Both the great fortification wall and the settlement were destroyed at some unspecified time in LHIIIC (c.1200-1050). The earliest re-occupation pottery is sub-Mycenaean and Protogeometric.

Finally, there are some other sites in Asia Minor which are likely to have had Mycenaean connexions. Yet these cases cannot be regarded as examples of settlement owing to the lack of appropriate evidence. Only a list of their names will be given, since it would be better to refrain from discussing them further, by reason of the somewhat vague nature of the relevant evidence. The sites in question are Sardis, Pitane, Clazomenae, Colophon, Degirmentepe, Kazanlı and eight or nine places in Cilicia, if we are to believe the results of the surveys of either Stubbings or Seton Williams, which are highly controversial. Certain Syrian sites also bear witness to Mycenaean influence, if not presence, during the twelfth and thirteenth century. Ugarit¹⁶⁰ has yielded much LHIIIB and a small quantity of LHIIIC_{1B} (c.1200-1130) ware. Atchana¹⁶¹ has yielded LHIIIB pottery, while LHIIIB and a little LHIIIC_{1B} ware has been recovered from Tell Sucas¹⁶² LHIIIB

and LHIIIC_{1B} ware has been discovered at another Syrian site too, Tell Abu Hawan¹⁶³. As for the so-called "Philistine pottery" recovered from sites of Philistine settlement in south-western Palestine and imitating the Mycenaean IIIC_{1B} pottery to a remarkable extent, there will be full discussion on this in a later chapter.

Crete is another area into which the Mycenaeans expanded after a terrible destruction struck the island and seriously affected its great culture in all the palatial centres except Knossos. For nearly one hundred years the impact of Mycenaean culture is strongly evident in Knossos in such fields of activity as architecture (including buildings at Gournia and Aghia Triadha which date from LMII and suggest Mycenaean concepts of architecture, and the underground tholos tomb which was probably introduced from the Mycenaean mainland to Crete at that stage, c.1450-1400, that is), pottery (the "palace style" jars being, perhaps, a fairly good example), weaponry (attested at warrior graves at Knossos) and decoration (exemplified by the adaptation of the throne-room at the Knossos palace, according to Mycenaean tastes)¹⁶⁴. After this period Knossos suffered its final destruction¹⁶⁵ (early LMIIIA, c.1400 BC)¹⁶⁶. The first destruction which struck the Minoan cities has been arguably attributed to the catastrophic impact of the Thera eruption in the course of LMIB (c.1500 - 1450),¹⁶⁷ while the second is one which, in all probability, must be attributed to the Mycenaeans themselves¹⁶⁸.

Finally, from the rest of the Aegean sites which have furnished evidence for Mycenaean activity, it is worth mentioning Ialysos on the island of Rhodes, where the material from the cemeteries of Moschu Vounara and Macra Vounara make it virtually certain that there was a Mycenaean colony at this site during LHIIIA-B (c.1440-1200)¹⁶⁹. Phylakopi on the island of Melos has also yielded evidence, mainly in the form of a Mycenaean megaron and wall paintings, that Mycenaean presence or at least influence was strongly felt in that island in the Late Helladic times.¹⁷⁰ Other Aegean sites which have yielded evidence of Mycenaean activity include Chalkis¹⁷¹, Delos¹⁷², Mykonos¹⁷³, Naxos¹⁷⁴ and Kos¹⁷⁵. Finally, the Ionian islands have furnished evidence of

Mycenaean connexions¹⁷⁶.

This is, in broad outline¹⁷⁷, the pattern of the various Mycenaean connexions during the Aegean Late Bronze Age. A brief and concise account of the main traits of the Mycenaean material civilisation must now follow, since it will help to integrate the portrayal of the Mycenaean civilisation and may also make the characteristics of this culture more familiar when comparisons involving certain of them will be needed later.

The Major Features of the Mycenaean Culture

a) The famous Mycenaean "shaft-graves" could, I think, prove a good subject to start with. Their use spans the time from c.1600 down to c.1500 (end of Middle Helladic down to late stages of Late Helladic I) and it is noticeable that some of them were partly re-used at about 1450 (end of Late Helladic IIA). These graves have been found in the two so-called "Grave-Circles" at Mycenae¹⁷⁸. The richer grave-circle, known as Circle-A, contained six royal shaft-graves which yielded a prodigious amount of luxurious grave-goods; the other, the Grave Circle B, contained twenty four graves, fourteen of which were shaft-graves. Many of the treasures from these two grave-circles are of Cretan origin and nearly all exhibit Cretan influences.

b) The shaft-graves were superseded by the tholos tombs which are to be found in many parts of Greece and apparently were the standard form of royal burial from about 1550 BC in the Western Peloponnese and from about 1500 elsewhere in Greece. This form of construction was a dome-shaped masonry tomb known to archaeologists as a bee-hive tomb or a tholos tomb¹⁷⁹.

c) Another feature of the Mycenaean civilisation was the so-called "megaron". In Homer the word simply means a large hall, but speaking in modern archaeological terms, it means a particular architectural form found in all Mycenaean palaces. It consists of an entrance-porch, a vestibule and a large hall with a central hearth and a throne. The porch faced onto a court-yard entered by an ornamental gateway. This type of building is likely to have been of Asia Minor origin¹⁸⁰.

d) The fortifications of the Mycenaean palaces are also to be considered as an indisputable feature of the Mycenaean material culture. Huge limestone boulders roughly shaped or left unrimmed and packed together with small stones and clay have been used to make up the imposing, massive walls, the so-called "Cyclopean". Such fortifications are notably attested at the five principal palatial centres of the fourteenth and thirteenth century Mycenaean Greece, that is, Mycenae, Tiryns, Athens, Thebes and Pylos¹⁸¹.

These are, very briefly considered, the striking traits of the Mycenaean material civilisation. Among the other manifestations of Mycenaean art which may be considered as minor characteristics of this culture we may list the following which seem to stand out as being of some special importance, owing to the frequency of their respective products, their multiple functions and the degree of workmanship attested on them:

a) The pottery. During the early stages (c.1550-1450) Mycenaean pottery looks very Cretan throughout, excluding the fabric which is still the old yellow one which originated in the Greek Mainland (the so-called "Minyan"), and certain new shapes, such as the goblet, unknown to the Cretan repertoire. The classification of the Mycenaean pottery is generally made in terms of decoration. The Pattern, the Floral and the Marine styles, undoubtedly of Cretan origin, are imitated by Mainland craftsmen during this period¹⁸². At this time, the palace style, a purely Mycenaean development, also evolved and was taken to Knossos (only), after 1450, where it predominated between c.1450-1400¹⁸³. A really remarkable shape in this class of vases is the so-called Ephyrean Goblet - a Mainland form with Cretan designs¹⁸⁴. The Red, Black and Monochrome wares of the Cyclades may be, and usually are, taken as a separate class of this period, which evolved independently of the Mycenaean pottery and need not concern us here. During the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC, the period known as that of "The Mycenaean Empire", the pottery exhibits a remarkable degree of homogeneity over a very wide area. Cycladic pottery is not a separate unit any

more. On the contrary, it is merged in a common style which is in vogue from Sicily and South Italy all the way to the Levantine coasts. Only Crete retained, but to a very limited extent, a certain individuality. There are now two principal styles of decoration: the Pattern style (see above) and the Pictorial style on which we notice a strong preference for human figures, very often on chariots.¹⁸⁵ Another style, probably inspired by contemporary textiles and involving animal figures evolves during this time too. We may also regard, as a separate class, a group of tin-plated ware which has perhaps received this special treatment to achieve a silver-surface-like effect.

Although most surviving examples of the pictorial Style have been found in Cyprus and were long believed to have been manufactured there, an analysis undertaken at Oxford proved these vases to have been made in the Peloponnese¹⁸⁶. Judging from the distribution of the few examples found on the Mainland, we may take a further step and pin-point Mycenae as their principal home.

During the last stage of the Mycenaean civilisation (LHIIIC c.1200-1500) the predominant styles seem to be the so-called "Close" style which evolved in the Argolid (Peloponnese) and was clearly influenced by Cretan Pottery of the thirteenth century, and the "Granary" style which also evolved in the Argolid. In the "Close" style, the entire vase or a selected zone is completely filled with complicated close-set patterns generally including rosettes and strange aquatic birds. In the "Granary" style the decoration is reduced to an all-over monochrome wash or dark bands and wavy lines. This latter style led on to the sub-Mycenaean (c.1100-1050) which in some areas, such as Athens, was interposed between the Mycenaean proper and the Protogeometric Pottery (beginning of the Iron Age). In terms of the Furumark classification (LHIIIC subdivided into LHIIIC_{1a}=c.1230-1200, LHIIIC_{1b}=c.1200-1130, LHIIIC_{1c}=c.1130-1075), the characteristic pottery of the LHIIIC_{1a} period is a debased form of the LHIIIB pottery, and an early stage of the "Close" style, while the predominant pottery of the next stage, LHIIIC_{1b}, that is, comprises both the "Close" style and the "Granary" class; finally, in LHIIIC_{1c}, the only prevalent

style seems to be the "Granary" class pottery¹⁸⁷. Generally speaking, the Granary class is that class of pottery which was in vogue at the time of the destruction of the Granary of Mycenae (hence the term), which is recorded as the final one in the wave of destruction that ruined the Mycenaean palatial civilisation from the end of LHIIIB (c.1200) onwards. The most likely date for the destruction of the Granary is c.1150 (it is usually thought to have occurred sometime in LHIIIC_{1b} and the middle of the twelfth century is the time most scholars consider as nearest to this event). The Granary class predominates at that time and thereafter¹⁸⁸. To round off this discussion of pottery we may mention the continuance of the Pictorial style during the twelfth century from the early part of which dates a unique vase painted in this style, the so-called "Warrior's vase" discovered on the acropolis of Mycenae and depicting a line of marching warriors armed - to judge from their helmets - with a rather Levantine armament.

b) The Mycenaean Terracotta figurines. They are mostly stylised portrayals of a female figure, possibly a goddess. The dress and pose are Cretan but the style is undoubtedly Mycenaean, characterised by a high degree of simplification. These figurines, discovered wherever Mycenaeans settled, fall into three classes: the arms may be either folded across the breast (T and Φ types, named after the respective Greece letters) or raised (Ψ type, called after another Greek letter). These figurines are made with a "certain slickness, but with no aesthetic feeling"¹⁸⁹ and they may well be a Mycenaean adaptation of the Minoan goddess with upraised hands which is the most popular type of terracotta figurine in Crete during LMIIIB, C and sub-Minoan times (c.1300-1200, 1200-1050)¹⁹⁰. Other popular types of figurines include a seated goddess, a chariot-group and a bull¹⁹¹.

c) The ornamental daggers with inlaid blades are another group of products characteristic of Mycenaean culture. Their treatment is typically Minoan though, and since many superb examples have been found at Mycenae (Grave Circle A), at the Argive heraeum, at Vapheio and at Pylos, it seems likely that they were made by Cretans for Mycenaean customers¹⁹².

d) The gold and silver plate of the Late Bronze Age comprises

also a substantial body of remarkable works of Mycenaean art. The richest collections come from the two grave-circles at Mycenae, from tombs of Dendra in the Argolid and Peristeria near Pylos in Messenia, and from Cyprus. The amount from Crete is insignificant. Higgins divides these artefacts into three groups¹⁹³: plain, embossed and inlaid vessels. It is to be borne in mind that, although most of these objects have been found at Mainland sites, yet they exhibit an unquestionable Minoan influence. The most noteworthy examples are the two brilliant Vapheio cups, found together in a tholos tomb at Vapheio near Sparta¹⁹⁴. They rather date to early LHII (c.1500-1450) and consist of an embossed outer case, and a plain lining all of gold¹⁹⁵.

e) Regarding jewellery, the relief-beads stand out from the rest of the products of the craftsmen of the Mycenaean Empire (c.1400-1200). In the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries they used to bear decoration achieved by means of little blobs of dark blue enamel laid dexterously in hollows surrounded by fine granulation. This is the earliest, so far, known example of enamelling in the ancient world and is very likely to have been conceived and carried out by Mycenaean craftsmen¹⁹⁶.

f) Seals of the period from c.1400 - c.1100 bear witness to an apparent Mycenaean activity in this particular field of art; the Mainland seals are by now frequently betraying their Mycenaean origin by a less flowing and a more monumental style, though they are very like the Minoan ones. There is a Mycenaean artistic attitude attested to on the gems from Knossos between 1450 and 1400. Mycenaean seal-working frequently produces better results than the Minoan one in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, something that must have much to do with the decadence of Minoan culture in this period. Gold signet rings are among the finest seals of this era. Remarkable specimens include the early examples from the fourth shaft-grave of Mycenae, the ring from Mycenae dating from the fifteenth century (though it betrays Cretan workmanship) and the very large ring from Tiryns of about the same date. Among other characteristic motifs on LHIII seals (c.1400-1100) we may list lions attacking their prey, portrayals of individual animals, stag-hunt, scenes of war, and cult scenes inspired from Cretan phototypes¹⁹⁷.

g) The Chamber tomb is another characteristic of Mycenaean civilisation. It was originally cut into a variety of shapes, square or round, with a flat or hip roof and, usually, three or four side chambers for large families. These tombs were usually set in hillsides and approached by long, unroofed passages, the so-called "dromoi" (after the respective Greek word for passage) which were faced with dressed stones. Early examples (LHI-IIA, C.1550-1450) seem to have been painted outside to resemble house or palace doors. Bedrock or a layer of beaten earth usually forms the floor. Certain tombs have benches, usually against the right-hand wall, on which older relics of extra gifts may be laid. The dead are always buried along with various gifts reflecting their social status. Chamber tombs appear simultaneously with tholos tombs (see above) and they are cut to look like them¹⁹⁸ at the dawn of LHI (c.1580). Later the vaulted chamber tomb fades away, giving way to the tholos tomb which became the most conventional form of burial architecture until the rise of the Dark Ages (c.1050 BC).

The Linear B Script

Though the Mycenaean Linear way of writing is one that clearly identifies these early Greek tribes and, consequently, could be listed in the previous account of the main traits of their material culture, it nevertheless bears a unique character combining both the features of an indisputable archaeological record and to a larger extent, no doubt, those of an invaluable literary source. Moreover, its value is not reflected by its artistic character and this counts it out of the previous list of major and minor Mycenaean features all of which exhibit, more or less, a certain degree of artistic tendency. Its value springs from the kind of script that it actually is, that is, the signs used by the Mycenaeans to depict the vowels and the consonants, and from the grammatical rules which can be inferred from the whole composition of the words written in it. Its value also springs, to a lesser extent, from the information provided by these texts. This script is an "adaptation of a Cretan syllabic system that was awkward to compose and to remember and relied heavily on ideograms for intelligibility¹⁹⁹. It is highly likely that Minoan Linear A

influence may be detected in the mason's marks on the Peristeria tholos facade. We may divide the Linear B texts into two classes, the first (and comprising by far the biggest number of the tablets) concerning palace records of various goods, products bound to be offered to gods, the staff of the palace, the craftsmen and their manufactures etc. and the second pertaining to the social and political structure of the Mycenaean world in a rather vague way. However, discussing the Linear B question extensively is beyond the scope of this chapter. Thus, I will round things off by adding that the sites which have yielded Linear B inscriptions on the Mainland are: Eleusis (one amphora, c.1350-1200 BC), Mycenae (twelve fragments, c.1350-1200 BC, 60 tablets and eight sealings from houses inside and outside the citadel, c.1250-1200 BC), Orchomenos (one stirrup-jar, c.1350-1200 BC) Pylos (one fragment, c.1350-1200 BC, more than 1,000 tablets and some 40 labels and sealings from the palace, c.1250-1200), Thebes (nearly 70 jars and fragments, c.1350-1200, 40 tablets from the Kadmeion and associated buildings, 1250-1200) and Tiryns (30 fragments c.1350-1200, two or three tablet-fragments from outside the citadel, c.1250-1200). Finally, it is worth noting that there are certain Semitic words and names in the Pylos and Mycenae archives and the problem of accounting for their occurrence in these texts may perhaps be answered by the presence of Easterners in central Greece as well as direct trade with the Levant²⁰⁰.

With this account of Mycenaean culture I think a general idea of what has come to be known as the Mycenaean civilisation may be attained ²⁰¹. Thus, we may now turn our attention to a tribe whose emergence in the historical scene of the Eastern Mediterranean is an inherent piece of the gigantic jig-saw-like pattern of interrelated tribal activities whose various repercussions and far-reaching implication heralded a new, all-significant era for the whole of the Eastern Mediterranean.

Chapter One

A

1. For a discussion by Evans of Libya-derived elements in the civilisation of Minoan Crete, see PM II, pp.22 - 59.
2. About Pharaoh Narmer in Palestine, see S. Yeivin, IEJ, 10, (1960), pp. 193-203; cf. Oriens Antiquus, 2, (1963), pp.205-213; in ibid, 3, (1964), p.5, S. Moscati shows some reservations about the evidence associated with certain Egyptian activities (namely the evidence for a pillage at Tell Gat), yet he shares the view that there had actually been a Narmer invasion in Palestine.
3. For a study on Palestinian characteristics in EMIA pottery (c.3000 - 2800), see Weinberg, in Ehrlich, Relative Chronologies, (1954), p.95, and idem, Chronologies, (1965), p.307.
4. See Hood, S., The Minoans, (1971) p.49
5. Hood, S. ibid, p.49.
6. R. P. Charles Anthropologie Archeologique de la Crete, Paris (1965), argues for a flow of population into Crete from the north, and from the Greek Mainland in particular, Caskey, in CAH rev. ed. vol. I, ch. xxvi(a), p.38, also suggests a similar view about refugees fleeing to Crete from the Peloponnese at the end of Early Helladic II period (c.2200 BC), but Hood, in op. cit. pp 50-1 takes a completely different view, suggesting that, if at all, the examination of the evidence indicates a current of influence in the reverse direction. Cf. also A. Sakellariou-Xenakis, Kr. Khr., (1961-2), vol. I, pp. 79-87 for a discussion of the evidence.
7. For a detailed discussion of all the forms of artistic activity in Middle Minoan times, see Higgins, R. Minoan and Mycenaean Art, (1967), pp. 26-52, where the fullest and most thoroughly illustrated account on this subject is to be found.
8. The theory of Luwians in Crete is argued by Huxley, Crete and the Luwians, (1961); see also Palmer Mycenaeans and Minoans (1965); their views were met with rather strong criticism by G. E. Mylonas, Hesperia, 31, (1962), pp. 284-309, and F. Schachermeyr, Kadmos I, (1962) pp. 27-39.
9. For a view strongly opposing the idea of the Cretan palaces being derived from the Anatolian ones, see J. W. Graham in E. L. Bennett, Mycenaean Studies, Madison (1964), pp. 195-213.
10. Hood, op. cit., p.52.
11. The original colonists of Miletus were traditionally believed to have come from Milatos, perhaps the name of the Bronze Age city at Malliz, see Huxley, op. cit. p.16.

12. For the Royal Shaft Graves at Mycenae, see, among others, Karo, G. Schachtgräber von Mykenai, I - II, München, (1930-1933); Marinatos - Hirmer Krete kai Mikinziki Hellas, Athens, (1959) pp. 55 ff., 109-112; Evans, A, The Shaft-Graves and Bee-hive Tombs of Mycenae; London (1929); Vermeule, E. The Art of the Shaft Graves of Mycenae, Cincinnati (1975); Mylonas, G., O Taphikos Kiklos E ton Mikinon, Athens, (1973).
13. The Thera eruption, usually taken to have occurred at about the end of LMIB (c.1450), is thoroughly discussed, along with its repercussions on Minoan civilisation, by D. L. Page, The Santorini volcano and the destruction of Minoan Crete, The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, (1970), supplement paper No. 12; see also Marinatos, S., Crete and Mycenae, Thames and Hudson (1960); idem, Excavations at Thera preliminary reports, Athens, (1967-73). D. Nincovich and B. C. Heezen in Santorini tephra, reprinted from vol. xviii of the Colston Papers, London (1965), first put forward the theory of an eruption punctuated by long intervals between the different phases, a supposition that drew heavily upon the original observations by Fouque (1879) and Reck (1935). Others, like Luce, J. V. The End of Atlantis, New Light on an Old Legend, London (1969); Galanopoulos A. G. and Bacon E., Atlantis, The Truth Behind The Legend, London, (1969), Page, D. L., op. cit. and Pomerance L., The Final Collapse of Santorini, Göteborg (1970) followed suit. But the scholars at the Thera Congress, (1969), did not favour the theory of long gaps between the different phases of the eruption, see Heezen, B. C. A Time Clock for History, Saturday Review, (1969) pp. 87-90; also Hood, op. cit. pp. 54-58.
14. Hood, S. op. cit. (1971) pp 56-60.
15. For the house of mainland type at Gournia, see F. Oelmann, Ein achaisches Herrenhaus auf Kreta, Jahrbuch 27, (1912) pp 38-51.
16. "Palace-style" pottery is discussed in Higgins, R. op. cit. (n. 7) p.107.
17. For the tholos tomb at Kefala, Knossos, one of the most imposing of its kind in Crete and a typical example of LMII (period of Mycenaean occupation), see R. W. Hutchinson, BSA 51, (1956), pp. 74 - 80. The tomb seems to have been re-used at a later stage, see G. Cadogan, BSA 62, (1967) pp 257-65.
18. Professor Galanopoulos, report to the Thera Congress (1969). The main argument, or one of the major ones, of the sceptics against an eruption as the cause of the LMIB destructions is that the catastrophic impact of such an event would not have spared Knossos which indeed survived the catastrophe whereas

the other places were severely damaged. But the theory advanced by Professor Galanopoulos in his report to the Thera Congress, seems to account satisfactorily for such a development. This view suggests that the effect of an eruption on a place depends on the depth and location of the seismic epicentre.

19. PM IV pp. 430 ff. For Minoan "genii" and dragons see M.A.V. Gill, AM 79, (1964), pp. 1-21; London Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin No. 10, (1963) pp. 1-12.
20. PM, IV, fig. 597. This hint at a Mesopotamian connexion - whether direct or indirect - may perhaps be coupled with, and even corroborated by, a LMIB faience rhyton from Ashur, JHS, (1928) p.71, see also L.D.S. Pendlebury, Archaeology of Crete, (1939), p.225.
21. A. J. Evans, The Prehistoric Tombs of Knossos, London (1906) p.146.
22. Mon. Ant., xiv, p: 735, see also Pendlebury, op. cit., p.222.
23. See Higgins, Minoan-Mycenaean Art (1967) p.150, ill. 187.
24. For a thorough discussion of this type of evidence, see J. Vercoutter, L'Egypte et le monde Egeen prehellénique, (1956), idem Essai sur les relations entre Egyptiens et Prehellènes, (1954); cf also F. Schachermeier, Das Keffiou-Problem, in Jahreshefte des Osterreichischen arch. Inst. Wien, 45, (1960), pp. 44 - 68.
25. See Hood, op. cit. pp. 95-96, for a discussion, and fig. 60. Pendlebury had already remarked on this alteration, though the frescoes were only cleaned twenty years ago, see The Archaeology of Crete, p. 223; also PM II, fig. 473a.
26. A tall alabastron from Sedment in Egypt, decorated with a stylised imitation of alabaster veining which has been found in a context from the time of Thotmes III (Sedment, II, grave 137, PM, IV, p.271, Pendlebury, op. cit. pl. XL, 2) and the magnificently manufactured Marseilles Oenochoe (PM II, p.509, Pendlebury, op. cit. pl. XL, 1) of whose discovery we possess no details, but which has also been recovered from Egypt, are among the specimens to be certainly assigned to LMIB.
27. It may very well be that one of the people buried in this tomb had an ancestor who had joined the Cretan Embassy to Egypt, at the time of Thotmes III, where he was given the vase (S. Alexiou, Isterominoikoi Tafoi Limenas Knossou (Katsamba), Athens, (1967), pp. 46, 76 ff; Hood, op. cit. pl. 11).
28. It should always be borne in mind that the period which modern scholarship has agreed to refer to as LMII (c.1450 - 1400) is found only at Knossos and that LMIB (the preceding period, c. 1500 - 1450) still continues in parallel with LMII in the rest

of the island, until the final destruction of the palace at Knossos in an early stage of the 14th century, from which point LMIIIA (c.1400-1300) commences for the whole of Crete.

29. Syria, XIII, pp. 5, 22, Cf. P. of M. IV pp775 ff.
30. PM IV, p.403.
31. Ibid., II, p.255.
32. For Thera and its Minoan connexions, see S. Marinatos, Excavations at Thera, Preliminary Reports, Athens, (1967-1973).
33. For Late Minoan frescoes and the influence of Cretan wall-painting abroad: see Higgins, op. cit. pp.94-102, with illustrations.
34. Higgins, op. cit., p.128
35. For Cretan Colonies overseas, see P. Warren, PPS, 33, (1967), pp.37-56.
36. Hood, S. The Minoans, pp.58-9, 147, fig.29.
37. For tholos tombs and their origin see S. Hood, Antiquity, 34, (1960), pp.166-76.
38. See Higgins, op. cit., pp.103-122, for a very comprehensive and well-documented summary on Late Minoan and Late Helladic (Mycenaean) as well as Cycladic pottery.
39. For a thorough-going, insightful, parallel survey of the various fields of artistic activity of both the Minoan and Mycenaean cultures in the Late Bronze Age, see Higgins, op. cit. pp.129 - 188, with chapters on each major or minor facet of the wide-ranging artistic proficiency of Minoans and Mycenaeans in the Aegean Late Bronze Age.
40. Vermeule, F., "Excavations at Toumba tou Skourou, Morphou 1971", paper delivered in the International Archaeological Symposium, The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean, Nicosia (1972); for more information on this site see the Acts of this Symposium, pp. 25-32, also The Department of Antiquities Blue Book, 10, 216/36 (cf. RDAC (1936), p.115) and H. Catling, Patterns of Settlement, Op. Ath. IV, (1963), pp.142, 144, 167 No. 188; see also CAH, 51, 2.
41. Bietti-Sestieri, A.M. "The Metal Industry of Continental Italy 13th-11th Century and its Aegean connexions", PPS 39 (1973) pp.383-424. The information about this western Minoan connexion is also briefly quoted by Burn, A. R. Minoan Philistines and Greeks (1930), p.91, and by Sanders N.K., The Sea Peoples, Thames and Hudson (1978) p.97.

42. This information was already known by Burn, A. R., op. cit. p.92.
43. Diodorus, V. 84. See also Fick, Vorgriechische Ortsnamen, p.27.
44. Pendlebury, Archaeology of Crete, p.286.
45. There was a site by the name of Casas in Crete. We meet this name, slightly differently, in Caria too, in the form Cassos, as that of a certain locality. The double s reappears in the termination of a very large number of old Aegean place-names, such as that of Knossos, as well as of corresponding groups of names in Asia Minor, such as the aforementioned in Caria, and it might hint at some kind of connexion between these places and, in this case, between Cretan Casas and Carian Cassos which after all are almost the same. "Naxos" could be a degenerated form of, or a variant to, the original Oasos, the name of a Cretan town from which colonists are likely to have sailed over to what was later to be called Naxos, although we don't possess any such reference in the literary records. Ancient Karia is not otherwise devoid of Minoan connexions. The Leleges one of the tribal entities who inhabited this land, are said to have manned King Minos' fleet (Herodotus, I. 171, 173). Additionally the words "Labyrinth" (meaning "the house of the double axe" and used of the maze-like palace at Knossos and later of any building with exceedingly complicated structure) and "Labrys" (=double axe), which are intimately associated with Minoan Crete, are attestedly of Carian origin and, lastly, the legendary Cretan Curetes are said to have civilised Caria (Diodorus, V.60).
46. Diodorus, V.79; ibid. v. 84.
47. Herodotus, I, 171, 173.
48. Diodorus, V.54.
49. Pausanias VII, 3, 1ff.
50. Kallinus of Ephesus, I. 37-9, Strabo, XIII .604, quoting Kallinus.
51. Diodorus, V.55-56.
52. Ibid, V.56-57, 61. J. L. Myres in his book Who Were the Greeks? pp. 139-40 argues ingeniously that these "children of the sun" ("Heliadae") were the early Minoan settlers of Rhodes.
53. Diodorus, V.60.
54. Ibid, V.59.
55. Ibid, IV. 79.

56. For a comprehensive survey of Minoan palatial architecture, see Graham, J. W., The Palaces of Crete, Princeton (1962), still the standard work on the subject. J. W. Graham puts forward some strong arguments against a derivation of the Minoan palaces from those in Anatolia, in E.L. Bennett, Mycenaean Studies, Madison (1964), pp. 195-215.
57. The Isopata Royal Tomb was described by A. J. Evans, The Prehistoric Tombs of Knossos, London (1906), where also an account of a typical cemetery of the era after c.1450 is provided.
58. For the Archanes burial complex, see J. A. Sekellarakis, "Minoan Cemeteries at Archanes", Archaeology 20, (1967), pp.276-81.
59. For round communal tombs in Early Minoan Crete, see S. Xanthudides, The Vaulted Tombs of Mesara, London (1924); Pini, Beiträge zur minoischen Graberkunde, (1968); E. Branigan, The Tombs of Mesara, London (1970); for their roofing system and influence on later tholos tombs, see S. Hood, Antiquity 34, (1960), pp 166-76.
60. Hood, The Minoans, p.147.
61. Higgins, R. Minoan-Mycenaean Art, p.95. The Late Minoan frescoes are brilliantly discussed in this book, pp.94-102.
62. For comprehensive accounts of Minoan frescoes see also Zervos, G., L'Art de la Crete neolithique et Minoenne, Paris (1956) (a very full collection of pictures of the archaeological sites and the material recovered from them), Demargne, P. Aegean Art: The Origins of Greek Art, London (1964); Schaechermeier, F., Die Minoische Kultur des alten Kreta, Stuttgart (1964).
63. Good studies of Bronze Age Cretan Pottery include: Evans, P.M. (remains basic); Furumark, A. The Mycenaean Pottery and The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery, Stockholm (1941); Popham, M. R. "Late Minoan Pottery, A Summary", BSA 62, (1967), pp. 337-51; Zois, A. A., Der Kamaresstil, Werden and Wesen, Tübingen (1968) where the author deals with Middle Minoan pottery; Hood S., The Minoans, London (1971), pp.35-45; Higgins, R. Minoan-Mycenaean Art; London, (1967), see ed. (1974), pp.23-31, 103-122; Pendlebury The Archaeology of Crete, (1939), pp.48-52, 103-115, 201-211; F. Matz, "The Minoan Civilisation: Maturity and Zenith", CAH (1962), II, iv, xii; L. Pernier and L. Banti, Il Palazzo Minoico di Festos II, (1950), p.515; see also Catling, R. "Spectrographic Analysis of Mycenaean and Minoan Pottery", Archaeometry 4 (1961) p.31.
64. JHS, lxxxv, (1965) p.123.
65. The whole problem of the origin, function, importance and correlation of this class with other parallels has been exhaustively discussed by Alexiou, S. in his article "The

Minoan goddess with upraised hands", Cretika Chronika, (1958), xii, pp. 179-299. The author favours a Mesopotamian origin for this quite interesting class of LM figurines and suggests that the type was first adopted by Cretan art in two signet rings and a seal impression on clay, all dating from MMIB-II times (c.2000-1700, according to the author's suggested dates). He also stresses the importance of the fact that the first Mesopotamian cylinder seals to have been recorded in Crete were introduced there at almost the same time as that of the first appearance of the goddess pattern on the aforementioned rings. In addition he points to the similar posture of the Mesopotamian parallels as further evidence of the Cretan versions' derivation from them, and also refers to the many common features of the dressing of both the Mesopotamian and Minoan representations (Alexiou, ibid, pp.237-243).

66. For the ornamental daggers from Grave-Circle A at Mycenae, see Vermeule, E. The Art of the Shaft Graves of Mycenae Cincinnati (1975).
67. The best study of the Cretan stone vases is that of Warren, P, Minoan Stone Vases, Cambridge (1969). A relevant chapter occurs in Higgins, R. Minoan-Mycenaean Art, pp.153-165.
68. See Higgins, R. Minoan-Mycenaean Art, pp.165-180, with excellent illustrations. Ill. 215 pictures the earring from the Kavrospelio cemetery.
69. The studies of Minoan seals which are perhaps worth picking out are: Evans, A, P.M., who offers much information which is still pertinent; Biesant, H. Kretisch-Mykenische Siegelbilder, Marburg (1954), with suggested criteria for distinguishing Cretan seals from those of Mycenaean origin; Kenna, V.E.G., Cretan Seals, Oxford (1960) with a catalogue of the unique collections of Minoan seals in the Ashmolean Museum; Matz, F. and Biesantz, E. (eds) Corpus der Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel; Kenaki-Sakellariou A. Les Minoens de la Collection Giamalakis*Cachets* Paris (1958); Matz, F. (ed) Corpus of Minoan and Mycenaean Seals.
70. Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J. Documents in Mycenaean Greek, Cambridge, 1956, 2nd ed. (1973). See also Chadwick, J. The Decipherment of Linear B, Cambridge (1958), (2nd ed. 1967); idem "The Prehistory of the Greek Language", C.A.H. revised edition, Vol. II, Ch. XXIX, Cambridge (1964); E. Bennett, J. Chadwick, M. Ventris and F. Householder, "The Knossos Tablets²" (=BICS Supplement 7, 1959); E. Bennett, J. Chadwick, A. Wace, "The Mycenae Tablets II" (=Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 48, I, 1958); J. Chadwick et al. "The Mycenae Tablets III" (=Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 52, 7, 1963).
71. For studies opposing Ventris' decipherment, see Beattie, A. J. "Mr. Ventris' Decipherment of the Minoan Linear B. Script", JHS 76, (1956), pp 1-17; idem, "A Plain Guide to the Ventris Decipherment of the Mycenaean Linear Script" Mitt des Instituts fur Orientforschung 6, (1958), pp. 35 - 104; Grunach, E. "Bemerkungen zu M. Ventris - J. Chadwick, 'Evidence for Greek dialect in the Mycenaean archives'", Orientalische Literatur-Zeitung 52, (1957), pp 293-342.

72. Palmer, L. R., Mycenaeans and Minoans, 2nd ed. London (1965) pp 321-327.
73. Best, J. G. P. & Vadin, Y. The Arrival of the Greeks, Amsterdam, (1973); cf. Schachermeyr, F. "Zum Problem der griechischen Einwanderung", GMic, 1, (1968), pp.306-7.
74. Mylonas, G. E. "The Luwian invasion of Greece", Hesperia, 31, (1962), pp. 284-309, esp 297-302.
75. Haley, J. B. & Blegen, C. W. "The Coming of the Greeks", AJA, 32, (1928), pp.141-54.
76. Kretschmer, P. Einleitung in die Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache, Göttingen, (1896); idem, "Die protindogermanische Schicht". Glotta, 14 (1925) pp. 300-19.
77. Haley and Blegen, op. cit. p.148
78. Forsdyke, E. J. "The pottery called Minyan ware", JHS, 34, 126-56; Blegen, C. W. Troy and the Trojans, London, (1963), esp. pp 145-6.
79. Hooker, J. T. Mycenaean Greece, London (1976) p.23.
80. Schachermeyr, F. "Prehistorische Kulturen Griechenlands", Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, 22/2, (1954) Stuttgart, pp. 1350 - 548; Die Ältesten Kulturen Griechenlands, Stuttgart, (1955); Die Minoische Kultur des Alten Kreta, Stuttgart, (1964); Agais und Orient, Vienna (1967)
81. Hooker, J. T. op. cit., p.23
82. Ibid, p.24.
83. For a perceptive discussion concerning a re-assessment of the situation during the last stages of the Early Helladic period in the light of new important evidence mainly from the Argolid and mostly from Lerna, see Caskey, J. L. "The Early Helladic period in the Argolid", Hesperia, 29, (1960), pp.285-303; for the evidence from Berbati, see Saflund, G. Excavations at Berbati 1936 - 1937, Stockholm, (1965); for Lefkandi, see Howell, R. J. in Popham, M. R. & Sackett, L. H. Excavations at Lefkandi, Euboea, 1964-66, London, (1968), pp. 8-11.
84. Schachermeyr, F. op. cit. (1954) (n.80) p.1468.
85. Mellaart, J. "The end of the Early Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Aegean", AJA, 62 (1958) 9-33; "Anatolia, c.2300-1750BC" CAH, 1/2, 3rd ed. (1971) pp. 681-703, esp. 700-2; French, D. H. "Some problems in Macedonian prehistory", B.S. 7, 103-110.

- "Prehistoric sites in northwest Anatolia, I" AS 17, (1967), pp. 49-96; "Prehistoric sites in northwest Anatolia II" AS, 19, (1969) pp. 41-98; see also Buchholz, H. G. "Grey Trojan Ware in Cyprus and Northern Syria", BAMA, 179-87.
6. Hooker, op. cit., p.28.
 7. French, D. H. "Migrations and 'Minyan' pottery in Western Anatolia and the Aegean", BAMA, (1973) pp. 51-7.
 8. The so-called "Lianokladi" type of goblet from the Grey Minyan repertoire, well known from Middle Helladic sites in southern Greece, is amply represented in Troy VI and has provided a strong link between the two areas; Milojevic's finds at Peukakia, near Volos, in Thessaly, confirm the above link and further suggest the involvement of Cyclades and Crete in the network of trading connexions between Greece and Anatolia, see Milojevic, V. "Bericht über die deutschen archäologischen Ausgrabungen in Thessalien 1973", AAA, 7, (1974), pp. 45-51.
 9. Kraiker, W. "Nordische Einwanderungen in Griechenland", Die Antike, 15, (1939), 210-1.
 10. Bouzek, J. believes that at least one wave of migrants came to Greece from Europe in the Early Helladic, see his "Aegean relations with Europe during the Neolithic and Early Bronze Ages" Acta of the Second International Colloquium on Prehistory, Athens, (1972), pp. 138-141; Howel, R. J. traces parallels between the "Baden" culture of central Europe, the latest stages of which are contemporary with Early Helladic II (ending roughly at c.2200), and Middle Helladic civilisation in the case of houses with wooden frameworks and apsidal ends found near Belgrade, and intramural as well as pit-grave burials in the same place. See his "Origins of the Middle Helladic culture", BAMA (1973), pp. 90-3; Hood, M. S. F., believes that two features of the "Kurgan" culture turn up in Greece, namely pottery with corded patterns from Thessaly and Macedonia (perhaps from the end of Early Helladic, c. 2000/30) and hammer-headed pins from Asea and Lerna (Middle Helladic) and believes that this evidence can go some way towards confirming that there were population movements from the north into Greece at the end of the Early Helladic. See his "Northern penetration of Greece at the end of the Early Helladic period and contemporary Balkan chronology", BAMA (1973) pp 59, 61-3.
 1. See Milojevic, V, "Zur Frage der Schnurkeramik in Griechenland", Germania, 33 (1955) pp. 151-4. Hooker shares his views in op. cit. p. 31.
 2. See note 12. For Egyptian influence in the Shaft Graves, see Hooker, J. T. "The Mycenae siege rhyton and the question of Egyptian influence", AJA, 71 (1967) pp 269-81.
 3. Hood, S. discusses the origin of the tholos tombs in Antiquity, 34, (1960) pp. 166-76.

94. For the Laconia tholos tombs see Waterhouse, H. and Hope Simpson, R. "Prehistoric Laconia, Part I", ABSA, 55, (1961), pp. 67-104; idem "Prehistoric Laconia, Part II", ABSA, 56, (1961) pp. 114-75. For a general survey of Tholos Tombs, consult Racht, G. "Les tombes a Tholos dans le monde Egeen", Archaeologia (Paris), 42, (1971) pp 64-9; Pini, T., shares Hood's view in op. cit. (n. 93) that mainland tholos tombs might have been derived from Cretan prototypes, see his Beitrag zur Kinoischen Graberkunde, Wiesbaden, (1968), p.49; so does Branigan, K. in The Tombs of Mesara, London, (1970), pp. 152-8
95. Pelon supports the view that tholos tombs were independently developed in Messenia and subsequently introduced in the rest of Mycenaean Greece, see his "Sur deux tholoi de Messenie", BCH, 98, (1974) pp 37-50.
96. Wace, A. J. B. Foreword to Ventris and Chadwick, 1972 (1973).
97. Hooker, Mycenaean Greece (1976), pp. 78-9. For a full development of his views on the events of Late Minoan II (c.1450-1400), see pp. 70-79.
98. For a thorough-going penetrating discussion of the era of the Mycenaean Empire and the numerous aspects of the material culture developed by the Mycenaeans of that period, see Vermeule, E. Greece in the Bronze Age, Chicago (1972) (fifth edition), pp. 156-280.
99. See Vermeule, E. op. cit. (previous note) pp. 274-9.
100. Ibid, p. 277.
101. Thucydides, I. 12.
102. Vermeule, op. cit. (n.98) p.270.
103. The horizon of the destructions as they are attested in the archaeological record during the late 13th and the 12th centuries BC in Mycenaean Greece is broadly, yet lucidly, outlined in Hooker, op. cit., (n.97) pp 148-9. The question of the nature, the sequence and the causes as well as the aftermath of those destructions has been dealt with by many scholars, see Blegen, C. W. "The Mycenaean Age", Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple, 1, Princeton, p. 27; McDonald, W. A. and Hope Simpson, R., "Archaeological Exploration" in McDonald and Rapp (ed): The Minnesota Messenia Expedition: Reconstructing a Bronze Age Regional Environment, Minneapolis, (1972) p.143; Desborough, V. R. d'A. The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors, Oxford, (1964), esp. pp 73-110, 217-237, 241-258, idem "History and archaeology in the last century of the Mycenaean age", CMic, 3, pp. 1073-93, Mastrokostas, E. I. "Anastaphi tou teichous Dymedion", FAAH, (1964, pp. 60-7 and 1965, pp 191-36), Iakovidis, S. E. Perati : To Nekrotapeion, Athens, (1969)

104. So Meyer, E., Geschichte des Altertums, 2/1, 2nd Ed. Stuttgart, (1928), p. 573; Lenschow, T., "Bericht über griechische Geschichte (1907-1914)", BJ, 176, (1916) p.162, thinking in terms of the profound change from Mycenaean to Archaic Greece, declared that even if the Dorian Invasion had not been recorded in the traditions, it would have to be inferred from other evidence, obviously implying that an appearance of intruders could be the only event which could have caused so thorough a disruption and subsequent change of culture.
105. Schachermeyr, F., in "Dorische Wanderung", Der Kleine Pauly, 2, Stuttgart, (1937), p. 145, suggested, on the basis of his study of the Linear B tablets, that Dorians were not present in Greece "and above all not present in the Peloponnese in Mycenaean times", but Hooker, J. T. in Mycenaean Greece (1976) pp 171-2, rightly observes that all that can be inferred from the Linear B tablets regarding this issue is that an East Greek (non-Doric) dialect was used, for bureaucratic purposes, by the palace-scribes of Pylos and Mycenae (where the tablets in question have been found) and that, since this dialect might very well have been an "ossified official jargon", as suggested by the fact that it was used in the Knossos tablets two hundred years earlier, it can hardly serve as a guide to the patois spoken at the areas which produced these documents.
106. Hooker, op. cit. (n. 105), pp. 172-3.
107. Snodgrass, A. M. "Metal-work as evidence for immigration in the Late Bronze Age", BAMA, (1973) pp. 209-214.
108. The arguments which oppose an invasion of Mycenaean Greece by intruders from the north are summed up by Hooker, op. cit., pp. 173-5.
109. Snodgrass, A. M., op. cit. (n. 107) p.213.
110. A northern origin for the makers of the coarse, hand made, burnished pottery which is distinctly different from Mycenaean wares and has been recovered from early LHIII C (c.1200-1150) contexts at certain sites in Southern Greece, mainly Korakou, is eloquently argued by Rutter, J. E. in "Ceramic Evidence for Northern Intruders in Southern Greece at the Beginning of the Late Helladic III C Period", AJA, 79, (1975), pp. 17-32.
111. The Last Mycenaeans and Their Successors, Oxford (1964), pp 221-32; "The Greek Mainland, c.1150-1000 BC", PPS, 31, pp. 221-3.
112. Hammond, N. G. L. "Prehistoric Epirus and the Dorian Invasion", ABSA, 32, (1931), pp. 151-79, esp 151-6; Studies in Greek History, Oxford, (1973) pp. 36-46.
113. Hooker, op. cit., pp. 176-7.

114. The Dark Age of Greece, Edinburgh, (1971) p. 186.
115. Hooker, op. cit. pp. 179-180.
116. Discontinuity in Greek Civilisation, Cambridge, (1966).
117. Bryson, R. A., Lamb, H. H. and Donley, D. L. "Drought and the decline of Mycenae", Antiquity, 48, (1974), pp. 46-50.
118. For a comprehensive lay-out of the Mycenaean sites and a general geographical and political picture of the Mycenaean Empire, especially as it appeared during the closing stages of the Bronze Age, see Desborough and Hammond "The End of Mycenaean Civilisation and the Dark Age", CAH, 2/2, 3rd ed. pp 658-77; Desborough The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors, pp. 217-8; idem, The Greek Dark Ages, London, (1972), (early chapters); also, by the same author "History and archaeology in the last century of the Mycenaean age", CMic, 3 (1968) pp 1073-93. Other studies that may be consulted for information on the Mycenaean expansion abroad include Sanders, N. K. The Sea Peoples, pp 95-100; The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean, (Acts of the International Symposium held in Nicosia, Cyprus, in 1972), esp. pp 79-82, 127-9, 193-8, 62-8; Stubbings, F. H. "The Expansion of Mycenaean Civilisation", CAH 2nd Vol. 3rd Ed. (fascicle 26)
119. Cf Van Buren, A. "Newsletter from Rome", AJA, 68, (1964) p.373.
120. See Sanders, N. K. The Sea Peoples, p. 97. The Mycenaean finds in Italy and Sicily, particularly pottery, are discussed by Lord William Taylour in Mycenaean Pottery in Italy and Adjacent Areas (MPI), Cambridge (1958) Cf also Biancofiore, Studi Salentini, ii, pp 32 ff, and Rivista dell' Instituto Nazionale di Archaeologie e Storia dell'Arte, vii, pp. 5ff; see also Desborough The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors, pp. 215-6.
121. Taylour, L. W. op. cit. pp. 128, 183 ff.
122. Bietti-Sestieri, A. M. "The Metal industry of continental Italy 13th-11th century, and its Aegean connections", PPS, 39, (1973) pp 383-424.
123. Sanders, op. cit. p.98.
124. For a clear-cut statement on the origin of the Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus, coming from Late Bronze Age contexts, excluding Late Cypriot III contexts (c.1200 - 1050), see Catling, H. "The Achaean Settlement of Cyprus" in Acts of the International Symposium, The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean, Nicosia, (1972), p. 37.

125. Courtois, L. La Ceramique de Chypre au Bronze Recent where her findings seem to be consistent with those reported by the investigations of the Archaeological Research Laboratory in the University of Oxford.
126. Catling, H. op. cit. p. 38.
127. Eukomi, (1969) vol I.
128. Desborough, V. R. "Mycenaeans in Cyprus in the 11th Century BC" in Acts of the Nicosia International Symposium (see n. 124), pp. 79-87.
129. The pattern of the second wave of destructions in Cyprus is expertly treated and discussed in Dikaios' Eukomi, vol. II, pp. 531 ff., where the writer dates the final desertion of this city at c. 1075 BC.
130. Ibid, (1969), vols. I, II and III.
131. Desborough, op. cit. (n.124), pp. 79-87. Also P. Astrom "Comments on the corpus of Mycenaean pottery in Cyprus" in ibid, (1972), pp. 122-7.
132. V. Karageorgis, Kition, (1976)
133. M. Yon, Salamine de Chypre I and II, 1971.
134. Karageorgis, Nouveaux Documents, pp. 185 ff; Furwangler and Loschke, Mykenische Vasen, 27 and pl. 23.
135. AJA, 58 (1954), 131 ff.
136. R. S. Merrillees, "Mycenaean pottery from the time of Akhenaton in Egypt" in op. cit. (n. 124) pp. 174-84. Cf. Stubbings, F. H. Mycenaean pottery from the Levant, Cambridge, (1951) p.90.
137. Vercoutter, J. L'Egypte et le Monde Egeen Pre-Hellenique, Paris, (1956), p. 339, document 375; cf. Karageorgis, V., Nouveaux Documents pour l'Etude du Bronze Recent a Chypre, Paris, (1965) p. 223.
138. R. S. Merrillees, "Mycenaean pottery from the time of Akhenaton in Egypt", op. cit. (n.124); Stubbings, F. H. op. cit. (n.136), p. 106; Karageorgis, op. cit. (n.137) pp. 201 ff.
139. R. S. Merrillees, op. cit. (n. 124) p.181
140. Snodgrass, A. M. "The Problem of the Epirot Chronology" in Crossland, R. A. (ed) The Sea Peoples, Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory, Sheffield (1973), forthcoming (abbreviated in Crossland, 1973, henceforward).
141. Sakellarakis, J. Germania, 53, (1975), p. 153; this pottery is reported to be very much like Attic vases recovered from Vourvatsi.

142. Sanders, N. K. op. cit., p. 96.
143. On the northern-western expansion of the Mycenaeans, see Sanders, N. K. op. cit. pp 95-7; Papadopoulos, Th. "The Bronze Age in Epirus", Dodona 5, Ioannina (1976), pp. 271-338; Desborough, V. R. d'A, The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors, 1964, pp. 102-112; also pp. 126-147 in ibid for the Mycenaean connexions in northern Greece as a whole.
144. Desborough, op. cit. (1964), (n.143), p.206.
145. Goldman, H. Excavations at Gozlu Kule, Tarsus. Vol II, Princeton, (1956).
146. Op.cit. pp. 50, 58 and 63.
147. Ibid, pp. 208 ff.
148. Blegen, Boulter, Caskey and Rawson, Troy, Vol IV, p.13.
149. Ibid, p. 23.
150. Ibid, p. 8ff.
151. AJA, LXXIV, p. 159; Blegen suggests c. 1250 in CAH, Vols i and ii (in the rev. edn.); fascicle i (Troy) p. 14.
152. Troy, IV, pp 142ff.
153. Op. cit. p. 145. Blegen had later said in CAH loc. cit that some LHIII B shards were discovered in this settlement.
154. Ibid, p. 146.
155. Desborough (1964, n. 143), p. 164. This book contains a thorough coverage of the situation which turns up at this site after the excavations which were conducted there unearthed so interesting a body of evidence. See also pp. 163-165 in ibid and cf. pp. 220 ff.
156. For the problem of the identification of Ahhiyawa as Achaeans, see Huxley, G. L., Achaeans and Hittites, Oxford, 1960.
157. Desborough, op. cit. (1964) p 165.
158. 1st. Mitt. ix-x, pp. 5 and 36
159. Ibid, ix-x pp 73ff. See also Desborough op. cit. (n. 143), pp. 161-3; for further information on the situation which turns up in Miletus, see Weickert, 1st Mitt. vii, pp 102 ff; ibid, ix-x, pp 1 ff. See also Archaeological Reports for 1959-60, p. 48; 1st Mitt, vii, p. 132 ff; pl.32, 4; ibid, ix-x, pls. 14, 16, 17, 49(2), 52.

160. Schaeffer, Syria, xxxi, pp. 14 ff; idem Ugaritica, i, (1939), p. 105; Nougayrol, Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit, iv, pp. 6 ff; Sandars, N. K. op. cit. pp. 36-40, 166-7.
161. Woolley, L. Alalakh: An account of the excavations at Tell Atchana, Oxford, (1955) p 734.
162. AAS, viii-ix, p. 131. Sandars, N. K. op. cit. pp. 166-7.
163. Hamilton, QDAP, iv. pp. 1 ff. Also Sandars, op. cit. pp 166-7
164. See supra, "The Late Minoan Age" Part I: "An outline of the main events" and notes 14, 15, 16, 17. Also ibid part III, "The Reflection of the Late Minoan culture on the archaeological record", Sections a, b, c and f, and notes 57, 58, 63, 66.
165. See supra "The Late Minoan Age", where the discussion of the final destruction of the Knossos palace, in the late section of Part I; Also ibid Part II, "Overseas Connexions" (opening section); see also the Appendix in Hood, S. The Minoans (1971) pp. 149-150.
166. See supra, "The Late Minoan Age", Part II, the discussion of the evidence for the dating of the final destruction of the Knossos palace.
167. See supra, "The Late Minoan Age", Part I and notes 13, 14 and 18.
168. See supra "The Late Minoan Age", part I (closing stages). See also Hood, The Minoans (1971), p. 60. This theory actually dates back to very early stages of the study of the Aegean Bronze Age, see Burn, A. R. Minoans, Philistines and Greeks (1930), pp 96-102. Evans (PM, vls IV and Index, London 1936 repr 1964) on the contrary, interpreted the final disaster as the result of extensive internal unrest, an "upheaval of submerged elements within the island." However, the universal character of the destruction, the resultant alteration in the whole balance of power in the Aegean and the lack of evidence indicating uneven prosperity, social disorder and some sort of civil strife, all seem to suggest the notion of a destruction brought about by an external powerful enemy.
169. A Furumark: "The Settlement at Ialysos and Aegean Prehistory", OpArch 6, (1950) p. 150.
170. R. Bosanquet "The Wall Paintings" in Excavations at Phylakopi in Melos, (=JHS Supplement I), (1904), p. 70; idem ESA, 16, (1910-11), p. 1, Barber R. "Phylakopi 1911 and the history of the later Cycladic Bronze Age", ESA, 69, (1974) pp 1-53 has also useful information on the Late Bronze Age Cycladic sites and a comprehensive discussion of the evidence from Phylakopi.

171. V. Hankey, BSA, 47, (1952) p. 49.
172. Delos, 15; 5, 63; BCH (1924) p. 247; MMR² p. 611; Gallet de Santerre, Delos, 89, p. 165.
173. AM (1898) p. 362.
174. Praktika, (1903) p. 118.
175. J. Caskey, Hesperia, 31 (1962), pp. 263-83; Idem ILN 19 May (1962) p. 801; Archaeology 16 (1963) p.284
176. P. Dessoulay, "Vases Myceniens du Musee de Neuchatel", RA (1900), p. 128, Sp. Marinatos, Ephemeris (1932) I; (1933) p. 68; Benton, S. BSA, 32, (1931-2) p. 213.
177. This account is by no means meant to provide a full catalogue of all the sites with attested Mycenaean activity. It only intends to draw a broad scheme of the numerous Mycenaean connexions, while mainly holding on to those particular sites which may have some direct or indirect relevance to the tribal movements and their various repercussions in the Aegean and the Levant which were destined to upset the overall balance of powers in these areas of the world.
178. See also supra "The Land-Marks of the Mycenaean Era", where reference to the Royal shaft graves is also made. See also note 92 in ibid, and note 12 in "The Background to the Late Minoan Age".
179. See supra "The Land-Marks of the Mycenaean Era" for a discussion of Tholos tombs, and notes 93, 94, 95.
180. Studies of the Mycenaean "Megaron" include: Muller, V. "The Development of the 'Megaron' in prehistoric Greece", AJA, 48, (1944) pp. 342 ff. Smith, E. "The Megaron and its Roof", AJA 46 (1942) pp 99 ff; Boethius, A. "Mycenaean Megara and Nordic Houses", BSA 24, (1919-21), pp. 161 ff; Dins Moor, W. "Notes on Megaran Roofs", AJA 46, (1942) pp. 370 ff; Schweitzer, B, "Megaron und Hofhaus in der Agais", BSA 46, (1951) pp 160 ff.
181. For a discussion of this topic see Mylonas, G. Ancient Mycenae, Athens (1957); idem "Hi Akropolis von Mikinion", Ephemeris (1958), 1961, p.153. Also Muller, K. "Die Architektur des Burg und des Palastes", Tiryns III (1930). For an authoritative, thorough-going discussion on the overall subject of Mycenaean architecture (both domestic and palatial) and its various functions, see also Vermeule, E. Greece in the Bronze Age (1964), pp. 116-120, 156-178.
182. See supra in the text, "The Reflection of the Late Minoan Culture on the Archaeological Record" for a discussion of these Late Minoan Pottery styles.

183. The palace style pottery is also discussed in ibid (previous note).
184. See Wace, A "Ephyrean Ware", BSA 51 (1956), p. 123 ff.
185. Studies of Mycenaean pictorial vases include: Akerston, A. "Some Pictorial Vase Representations from the Mainland in Late Helladic Times" Op.Ath. I, (1953), p. 9 ff; Benson, J. "Pictorial Mycenaean Fragments from Kourion, AJA, 65, (1961), p. 53ff. Karageorghis, V. "Deux peintres de vases Mycéniens", Syria 34 (1957), p. 81; "A Mycenaean Chalice and a vase Painter", BSA, 52, (1957), pp. 38 ff; idem "Myth and Epic in Mycenaean Vase Painting", AJA 62, (1958), pp. 383 ff; Stubbings, F. "Some Mycenaean Artists" BSA 46, (1951) p. 168 ff.
186. BSA Lviii (1963) p. 94; ibid, LX (1965) p. 212.
187. Furumark, A., OA, liii, pp. 196 ff. For a thorough discussion of the LHIIIC pottery, see also Desborough, V. The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors, (1964) pp. 9-28. Furumark, A. has made the most exhaustive scrutiny of Mycenaean pottery, in Furumark The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery, Stockholm (1941), and The Mycenaean Pottery: Analysis and Classification, Stockholm, (1941); and also by the same author "The Mycenaean III C Pottery and its Relation to Cypriot Fabrics", Op Arc, 3, (1944) pp. 194ff. His subdivisions of the LHIIIC period according to pottery styles, though now themselves somewhat antique and controversial, are still of considerable value in terms both of chronology and assessment of the Mycenaean ware.
188. Desborough, op. cit. (1964), p. 11.
189. Higgins, R. Minoan-Mycenaean Art, (1967), p.125. See also ill. 149-51 in ibid, for the three standard varieties of these figurines.
190. For a detailed discussion of these classes of Mycenaean figurines, see E. Wace-French The development of Mycenaean terracotta figurines (dissertation, London, 1962). For the problem of the Minoan goddess with upraised hands, see Alexiou, S. "The Minoan goddess with upraised hands", Cretika Chronika, (1958), xii, pp 179-299.
191. For the various types of the Mycenaean figurines, see Mylonas, G., "Cycladic and Mycenaean figurines", Bulletin of the City Art Museum (St. Louis), (1955), i; "A Mycenaean figurine at the University of Illinois", AJA, 41 (1937), p.237ff; idem "Seated and Multiple Mycenaean Figurines", Aegean and Near East, (1956), p.110ff.; Also F. Jones "Three Mycenaean Figurines", Aegean and Near East, (1956), pp. 122ff.
192. Higgins, R. Minoan and Mycenaean Art, 1967, pp. 136-143.
193. Ibid, (1967), p.143.

194. Ibid, ill. 178-9, 180.
195. For more information see Vapheio: Ephemeris (1889), pp 10ff; Evans, P. M., Ind. Vol. S. V. "Vapheio Tomb"; Kenna, Cretan Seals, (1960) p. 52, 79; Karo, AM 35 (1910) p.182.
196. For a comprehensive discussion of Mycenaean jewellery, see Higgins, op. cit. (n.192), pp. 165-80, ill. 204-30. For the relief-bead technique, see ibid, p. 172-3, ill. 205, 206, 212, 213, 214, 216; see also, by the same author, Greek and Roman Jewellery, London, (1961). Also see G. Becatti, Oreficerie antiche dalle minoiche alle barbariche, (1955).
197. Studies of Mycenaean seals include Matz F. (ed) Corpus of Minoan and Mycenaean Seals; Biesantz H. Kretisch-mykenische Siegelbilder, 1954; Evans, A., PM, vol. IV, (1935), ii, p.484 and passim, through Indx; Nilsson, M. MMR², (1950), passim (iconography), Sakellariou, A, Mycenaean seal-engraving, Higgins, R. op. cit. (N. 192), pp. 180-88, Vermeule, E, Greece in the Bronze Age, (1972) pp. 223-37.
198. Vermeule, E, op. cit. (n. 197), p. 121. For a discussion of the subject of the chamber tomb see Wace, A., "Chamber Tombs at Mycenae", Archaeologia, 82, pp. 1932 ff, Vermeule E, op. cit. pp. 299-300.
199. Vermeule, E. op. cit. p. 237.
200. Vermeule, E., op. cit., p. 239. There is a vast bibliography on the Linear B question. What works could perhaps be picked out are: M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, Documents in Mycenaean Greek (1956), idem "Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives" JRS, 73, (1953), p. 84; Chadwick J. The Decipherment of Linear B, (1957); L. Palmer, Mycenaean Greek Texts, (1963), with bibliography up to 1962; J. Chadwick, L. Palmer, M. Ventris, Studies in Mycenaean Inscriptions and Dialect (1956). For a full bibliography on this subject, see Vermeule, E. op. cit. pp. 344-5, 379-80.
201. It is obvious that the above account of Mycenaean culture is limited and somewhat sketchy in certain respects; it has been undertaken with a view to making up only a very general and collective portrayal of the Mycenaean civilisation which could be helpful when comparisons involving Mycenaean material characteristics will take place later. It is, I hope, understandable that whatever evidence may be used either to corroborate a certain argument or to illustrate an obscure piece of information or simply to suggest a correlation, should be referring more or less to well-known data. This chapter attempted, therefore, to render such data familiar, so that further juxtapositions and collations will be easier to comprehend. It avoided labouring points other than those associated with what aspects of different cultures may later be studied. Readers who need a thorough-going survey of the Mycenaean civilisation will have to resort, as I have often done, to Mrs. E. Vermeule's Greece in the Bronze Age, (1972), particularly pp. 82-317.

This book also contains a full bibliography on every aspect of Mycenaean activity, in pp. 351-383. Also for a comprehensive bibliography, see J. Hooker, Mycenaean Greece, (1976), pp. 256-308. For a detailed discussion of the Mycenaean Art, see Higgins, R. Minoan and Mycenaean Art, (1967), pp. 74-189.

CHAPTER TWO

THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT OF PHILISTINES' HISTORICAL EVOLUTION IN PALESTINE. THE "PELESET" OF THE EGYPTIAN RECORDS AND EVIDENCE OF THEIR ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT IN PALESTINE

Introduction

Baffling as well as elusive for scholarly research though the Philistines have so far turned out to be, they exude the same mystique on modern scholars as before, a mystique that stimulates them to persevere with the challenge to unveil the secrets hitherto withheld so successfully by this controversial tribe despite the fact that Philistines still defy all attempts to produce satisfactory answers to such problems as what their actual birthplace is, what meaning their name conveys and what affinities they might have had with Aegean, Levantine and Near Eastern Tribes.

This research will primarily draw upon the biblical sources (the most trustworthy so far) and, secondly, on Egyptian records to give an account, in this chapter, of their history in Palestine, prior to embarking, in the following ones, on a grand-scale attempt to reconstruct their overall historical evolution by unravelling the laboriously woven material of still unscrutinized literary sources and by studying, in parallel, the necessary archaeological records while holding on to what former knowledge seems reliable, with a view to providing such suitable historical perspective as might help this survey to trace this ancient people back to their actual origins.

The process of Philistine history in Palestine involves facts and attitudes other than those which the archaeologist is confronted with when examining either the Minoan or the

Mycenaean civilisation. They are a people who lived, acted, suffered and vanished within a historical framework different from that in which the Aegean Bronze Age civilisations evolved. The fact that the Philistines first appear as a homogeneous isolated group in Palestine as early as the beginning of the 12th century, to judge from the material evidence as it turns up in Deir Alla in the Jordan Valley¹, supports, with much other evidence, the above thought in as much as it indicates that the Philistines started playing their role in the overall East Mediterranean drama of the late Bronze Age and the subsequent period when the Aegean Bronze Age cultures, especially that of the Mycenaeans, had started waning² (provided that the lack of evidence attesting to earlier Philistine activity in Palestine is not, at least totally, due to accidents of excavation). In other words the dawn of the Philistine culture occurred at the same time as that of the outset of the decadence of the Mycenaeans; and this might mean a lot in terms of the connexions of these people and in view of, as we shall see further on in this survey, the theory - considerably strengthened by literary and archaeological evidence - of a Greek mainland peoples' immigration to the Levant in an attempt to avoid the imminent scourge of warfare, burning of their cities and dislodgement from their homes or at least the exceedingly difficult living conditions in what seemed to be an over-populated and depressed Mainland.

What will follow in the next pages is an account of the Philistine history in Palestine for which this survey will draw mostly upon the biblical narrative since the purpose of this account is to outline a portrayal of the Philistines as such, as an indisputably, that is, biblical entity on whose existence and role we have a firmly set background of information provided by the Old Testament. By doing so we shall have a stable, unquestionably authentic body of data which will serve as the only historic portrayal of this tribe which is not

punctuated with equivocal references to them. So, although we today agree that the tribe referred to in the Ramessidic inscriptions as Peleset is none other than the well-known biblical Philistines and although this survey has no reason to discredit this connexion, it will only make a limited reference to these Egyptian sources of early 12th century in this chapter, thus saving a detailed one for a later stage because it only purports, in this chapter, to illustrate the Philistine history using mainly the source which can be safely considered the only one that speaks of the Philistines as such without employing other appellations of them, that is, the Old Testament. The various aspects of their material culture, their alleged affinities and relations with other peoples, discussion of various theories on their origin and overall juxtaposition of multi-natured evidence with a view to testing former approaches of the problem, all these will be discussed at a later chapter dealing with their overseas and other connexions.

The Old Testament account of Philistine history

The Philistines appear as mysterious aliens, entering to dispute Palestine with the Hebrews. They were traditionally settled in the five cities of the Philistine pentapolis - Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Ekron, Gath. These cities were their main political and administrative strong holds and all of them were in the coastal plain of the foothills of the Shephelah. Their precise topography still presents problems. Gaza - under modern town - Ashkelon (modern Asgala) and Ashdod (modern Isdud) are sufficiently well located. But Ekron and Gath still remain unidentified. A place, namely Khirbet el-Muganne is perhaps the best location so far proposed for Ekron³. But as far as Gath is concerned, nothing is as yet certain. Various sites such as Tell (Sheikh) el-Areini⁴, Tell en-Nagila⁵, Tell es Safi⁶, have been suggested from time to time

in an attempt to fulfil topographical demands involved in the case of Gath, but fail, more or less, to account for problems posed by biblical references.

In the 12th and 11th centuries the Philistines expanded their activities northward and seaward as well as eastward and inland. The narrative of the Egyptian Wenamon (c.1090 BC) who was chased out of Phoenicia by the warships of the Jekker prince of Dor probably alludes to the Philistines and their allies having some seafaring inclinations. Wenamon names three other rulers with nonsemitic names - possibly the Philistine governors of Gaza, Ashkalon and Ashdod⁷. If we are to take these hints into serious consideration, we may well assume, bearing always in mind that the Philistine pentapolis was in the south - west coastal strip of Palestine, that these five major cities could have been harbours of considerable naval power that may well have rivalled the re-emerging Canaanite centres of Tyre, Sidon and Byblos in maritime trade during the 12th and 11th centuries⁸. This assumption, first put forward by Mazar in his Philistines (1964), is also favoured by Kitchen, K.A., in his article on the Philistines in "Peoples of Old Testament Times" (1973) and I do think that it does not lack reason though we must always remember that points like this should not be overstressed since it might be dangerous for research interests to extend their implications to remote areas of historical developments especially when lacking evidence sufficiently strong to bear out ensuing speculations.

In Palestine proper the clash between the two major social and cultural entities - Philistines and Hebrews - presumably commenced at about 1100 BC. There is no occasion other than the isolated incident of Shamgar Ben Anath⁹ in which the Philistines played any part in the narratives of Judges until the last major story therein contained, that of Samson. We notice that in this narrative part of the Philistine-Hebrew

boundary is between Timnah and Ekron on the one side, and Zorah and Beth Shemesh on the other. Could this really be, as seems likely, a situation in which the Philistines had gained control over Israel¹⁰ and which is referred to in biblical texts as one during which the Judean's fear of offending the Philistines was predominant¹¹? It is very likely since the Bible scribes could hardly have exaggerated the situation at the expense of their own people's image and prestige. Thus, one may assume that Kitchen is right when saying that "from 1100 BC onwards, eastward expansion brought clashes in which the Philistines subdued western Judah contemporaneously with their maritime activities"¹². The Philistines also expanded northwards, over north-central Ephraim. The main facts, always according to biblical texts, of the further Philistine history in Palestine are as follows.

A double defeat of Israel and a temporary loss of the Ark of the Covenant¹³ could have been the cause of the Philistine sack of Shiloh. A limited success over the Philistines achieved by Samuel and the Israelites at Mizpah¹⁴ is to be noticed some two decades later. The recovered territory from Ekron even unto Gath¹⁵ was not to remain under Israelite sovereignty for long. The Philistines managed again to get hold of their former areas by the time of Samuel's old age¹⁶. During the subsequent war between Philistines and Saul we do not notice any decisive victory in favour of either of the opponents, but Kitchen believes that the Philistines "kept a tenuous supremacy most of the time"¹⁷. But after the death of Saul at Gilboa the Philistines appear to have gained effective control over all north-central Israel west of the Jordan¹⁸. Hebrew independence was apparently banished to the southern and eastern areas of their territory.

Not until all the Israelites united under David's orders did the Philistines find themselves in a difficult situation.

David "smote the Philistines and subdued them"¹⁹ at Baal-perazim, taking from them the not-as-yet-identified - Methegammah - perhaps Gath and district²⁰. It was this David's great victory that smashed Philistine sovereignty, reduced the "old enemy" to the defensive and completely restored the Israelites' independence. Nevertheless, we don't find the Philistines actually ruled by the Hebrews; but the fact remains that the Philistines were never again a major threat to Israel, although there was at least one stifled major attempt to recover their former status at about 970-960 BC²¹.

An Egyptian Pharaoh, namely Siamun, of the Twenty-First Dynasty²² subdued Philistia and reduced Gezer, to judge from the fact that in his early years Solomon, who succeeded David in the Kingship, made a marriage-alliance with this Pharaoh of Egypt and received as dowry Gezer which had been sacked by this Egyptian overlord²³. It looks as if the alliance of Egypt and Israel caught the Philistines "in a vice" to the political benefit of both the Egyptians and the Hebrews²⁴. If we take these facts in conjunction with the Phoenician commercial activities beginning to expand rapidly we may then suppose that the decadence of the Philistines in both maritime trade and land control had set in. But even after Solomon's death conflict continued between Philistia and the Hebrews. The Philistines plundered Judah under Jehoshaphat's son, Jehoram²⁵. On the other hand Uzziah had some successes over the Philistines, breaching the walls of Gath, Jabneh and Ashdod, depriving the Philistines of some of their territory but his grandson Ahaz lost that as well as Hebrew territory to his enemies²⁶. Hezekiah had a rather insignificant success against Philistia²⁷.

From 745 BC, with the accession of Tiglath-pileser III of Assyria, we enter a new, quite dramatic chapter of Philistine history. This Assyrian King beat down the Syrian States within

five years (c.742-738) and reached South Phoenicia. In 734 he intervened in southern Palestine and perhaps sacked Gaza. Next year (733) he subdued Ashkalon enthroning a certain Rukibti there, in place of Mitinti I²⁸. During Sargon's II Kingship, two anti-Assyrian revolts are recorded as having broken out in Philistia. In the first we hear the name of Hanun, King of Gaza, involved; the revolt was quickly suppressed (720 BC) and Hanun was exiled. The second was organized by Ahimetu, King of Ashdod, who must have conspired against his own overlord, King Sargon, since he was the one Assyrians had set in the throne of Ashdod (713 or 712 BC). Sargon reacted promptly. His commander subdued Ashdod, Ekron and Gibbethon. In Ashdod he appointed an Assyrian governor alongside the local King. Senacherib, who succeeded Sargon in the Assyrian throne, suppressed another revolt (701 BC). A ruler with the Assyrian name Sharruludari was appointed in Ashkalon after the rebel local ruler Sidgi had been turned away. Ekron was then conquered and Senacherib punished Hezekiah who had accepted the rebel King of Ekron, Aadi, in his custody, by transferring some of his lands to Philistine rule, though Hezekiah released Aadi after Ekron had succumbed²⁹. Esarhaddon of Assyria, involved in war against Egypt, used Philistia as a stepping stone during his operation. The rulers of Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron and Ashdod are named in 677-676 but hardly anything else is said of them. Ashurbanipal who kept fighting against Egypt was keen on gaining Philistine alliance (667 BC). The last traces of Assyrian rule in Philistia are to be found in two Assyrian legal documents from Gezer of c.651 and 649 BC³⁰. After that we have a recorded twenty-nine-year-siege of Azotus (probably Ashdod) mentioned by Herodotus. We do not possess any clear information about its repercussions³¹ but it might well have been part of the Egyptian activities towards expanding their sphere of influence. If so, Psammetichus I of Egypt would be the one to blame for this siege.

Thus, we reach the epilogue of the dramatic history of Philistia. In this last stage, the Neo-Babylonian advance was the power destined to wipe out what had remained of the once powerful Philistine Kingdom. Ashkalon sought to resist the Neo-Babylonian advance in 604 BC. Nebuchadnezzar II subdued it and exiled its King to Babylon. We find this King's son in the ration-tablets in Babylon, along with Jehoiachin of Judah and his relations. These, with mention of Kings of Gaza and Ashdod at the Babylonian court are the last traces of Philistia as an entity before this nation which was sometime one of the greatest powers in the Near East ceased to exist.

But who were the Philistines? Whence had they come from to Palestine in the first place? And when did they settle there? These questions and those which can spring from them have posed a number of problems to students of Philistine history and culture which can be easily ranked among the most stumping that scholars of not only Mediterranean but indeed European archaeology and history have ever come up against.

To start off with the least challenged theory nowadays, we will have to turn to the Egyptian royal records at the great temple of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu in Upper Thebes, Egypt. There is unanimous agreement among students of the Philistines nowadays that the so-called "Peleset" (Egyptian-Plst-or-Prst) of these inscriptions are none other than what came later to be known, and referred to, as the biblical Philistines. This survey has no reason why it should not agree with this approach and therefore it shall adhere to this identification throughout its length. The Peleset are one of the so-called "Sea Peoples" who caused considerable havoc throughout large areas of Anatolia and the Levant at the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 12th century BC. It is the Egyptian texts of that time, particularly those of the reign of the Pharaohs Merneptah (c.1224)³² and Ramesses III (c.1194-1162)³³ that

furnish the bulk of information regarding these controversial peoples.

Egypt and the "Northern" allies

a) The invasions at the time of Merneptah and Ramesses

III

The situation in the Levant was far from peaceful during the closing centuries of the second millenium BC. Endless comings and goings, various tribes in search of new lands for settlement and hectic warfare operations staged in such theatres of war as Anatolia and Amurru had set the scene and paved the way for the effervescent tribal mobility in the form of the "Great Land and Sea Raids" of the late 13th - early 12th centuries BC., so eloquently, if not very accurately, commented upon by the Merneptah's and Ramesses III's scribes.

The first time the "northern allies" make their appearance in the Egyptian records is in year 5 of Merneptah's reign. Some sixty five years after the battle at Kadesh (c.1286/5) Egypt was faced with yet another serious challenge. It was an invasion by Libyans and Meshwesh this time which included a confederation of northern tribes who had joined forces with Meryry, the Libyan King, in what seems to have been a grand-scale attempt to settle down in the always-much-sought-after, because of their fertility, luxury and security, Egyptian lands. The Peleset are not named among this confederacy which was eventually crushed by Merneptah at c.1220, as Inscriptions at Karnak and the so-called Memphis "Victory Stela" of that Pharaoh relate³⁴. The northern allies who made up the confederacy were the Sherden or Shardana, the Lukka, already attested in Egyptian records, and three names, never-heard-of-before in Egyptian texts, the Ekwesh ('Ikws), Teresh (Trs) and Shekelesh (Skrs)³⁵. As the Philistines are absent in this list and the purpose of this chapter is only to

give an account of their historic evolution as such we need but say a few words of what entities or activities in previous time might help to account for their final settlement in Canaan, saving detailed discussion of these events and their implications for the following chapters.

As far as the "northern" allies of Libyans and the Meshwesh are concerned, only the Ekwesh may be picked up as of some special importance in view of the strongly supported Aegean extraction of both them and the Peleset who were to appear a few years later. Judging from the number of Ekwesh prisoners, 2201, that is, against 742 Teresh and 222 Shekelesh, we may infer that this tribe must have been the most numerous of the confederacy. The Ekwesh have been connected with the Ahhiyawa of the Hittite texts and, in turn, with the Homeric Achaeans. Chief nominations for the "land of Ahhiyawa" are western coastal Anatolia near Miletus, mainland Greece, Rhodes and one of the bigger Aegean islands, perhaps Crete³⁶.

Moving now on to the Ramessidic inscriptions at Medinet Habu, dating from the eighth year of his Pharaoh's reign (c.1186)³⁷, we notice that another northern alliance threatened Egypt in this year. The confederacy included Peleset, Tjeker, Shekelesh, Denyen and Weshesh. The Egyptian Pharaoh defeated the alliance in two battles, one on land - perhaps near the eastern frontier fortresses which protected the Nile Delta on that side³⁸ - the other at Sea, probably within the Delta³⁹.

The inscriptions and the reliefs in Medinet Habu, no doubt set up to exalt Ramesses III's victory over the foreign invaders to judge from the fact that they are written in an almost purely bombastic and panegyric style which renders them a poor historical record, furnish a lot of information as to how these battles were fought and how the foreigners were dressed, armed and, generally, looked. However, we cannot take

this information very seriously, since it is obvious that the Egyptian artists and scribes took a very general view of the overall matter, without, that is, bothering to distinguish one foreign tribe from another. The situation becomes worse when it comes to seeking information as to where these foreigners came from. The only reference to such question are the not-very-illuminating, though by no means immaterial, phrases "in their islands" (Medinet Habu, year 8), "the northern countries" (Medinet Habu year 5), "the isles"⁴⁰, "from the midst of the Sea"⁴¹, "in their isles"⁴², "of the sea"⁴³. It is obvious that these tribes share a trans-Mediterranean origin and that the Egyptians looked on all of them as "Peoples of the Sea". According to Papyrus Harris which also refers to the events of year 8 of Ramesses III, the victorious Pharaoh took great numbers of his defeated northern enemies as captives to Egypt, settled them as garrison troops in strongholds and taxed them all "in clothing and grain from the store-houses and granaries each year"⁴⁴.

b) Evidence for the original "Peleset" settlement in Palestine

Archaeological evidence from three sites in Palestine, namely Beth-Shan, Tell el-Farah (Sharuhem) and Tell Deir Allah (Succoth), furnish strong material corroboration of the above claim by Ramesses III regarding his having settled northerners as garrison troops in Egyptian fortresses. Anthropoid clay coffins uncovered at Beth-Shan and bearing bearded heads modelled crudely in relief on them with a row of vertical strokes reminiscent of the feathered headgear worn by Sea People in the Egyptian monuments of Ramesses III's time, date from the 13th century and have been associated, from a certain stage onwards, with the settlement of this Pharaoh's northern enemies in Palestine as garrison troops and mercenaries after their defeat in Egypt at c.1186⁴⁵.

At Tell el Farah early Philistine pottery has been recorded at the fortified "Residency" in a structure which must have originally been erected by Sethos II (c.1216-1210) judging from his figure-bearing sherds which have also been found in this "Residency" and date the original jar from the foundation of the fortress, thus allowing us to assume that the Philistines were settled here as garrison troops at some time between the foundation of this fortress and its destruction in the latter part of the 12th century⁴⁶. In Deir Alla, a broken faience bowl inscribed with the cartouche of Queen Tewosret (c.1210-1200) was found on the floor of a sanctuary from the end of the Late Bronze Age, about 1200 BC. Three inscribed tablets and a discarded fourth were uncovered at two rooms bearing the same type of pottery, in the same occupation level, just 8m. east of the sanctuary. Though the sanctuary had probably suffered a destruction by earthquake, Philistine pottery has reportedly been found in the same stratum and according to the excavation reports is assignable to a time immediately after that of the tablets⁴⁷. Thus if we presume that the faience bowl, on account of it having been found in a very late 13th or, possibly, very early twelfth century level, is assignable to a time c.1200 (this very view being corroborated by the cartouche of Tewosret who reigned during the last years of the 13th cent.), it follows that it is more or less contemporary with the early 12th century sanctuary which could have been built by this Egyptian Queen. However, we are not obliged to assume that the tablets, though found in the same level, are contemporary with the sanctuary. It is quite conceivable as well as reasonable that in cases of habitation a certain amount of time is always allowed between the original date of the construction of the building and the introduction in it of the articles assignable either to inhabitants or to invaders, or both. Thus, we may go on and say that the tablets could have been brought to the sanctuary two or even three decades after its original building, and this

dating takes us headlong into the time when Ramesses III was using the defeated northerners as garrison troops in old and new fortresses. Consequently, the pottery bearing Philistine features is assignable to a time after 1186⁴⁸.

So, to sum up, we see that the Philistines were a seaborne tribe, at least in the eyes of the Egyptian scribes of the reign of Ramesses III and that they attempted what seems to have been a major-scale early twelfth century invasion to Egypt, most probably with a view to settling there, if we are to judge from the impression the Sea People representation at Medinet Habu convey. We easily notice that the people depicted in them are a whole population on the move, not a military contingent in the process of attacking. It's very likely that the far-from-ideal conditions of living in the whole of the eastern Mediterranean basin must have forced great numbers of ill-faring population (whether famine-smitten or enemy-harassed or both) to abandon their homelands and emigrate in a desperate search of new lands for settlement. The Peleset of the Egyptian records must, in all probability, have found themselves in such a situation but Ramesses III foiled their plans and, after beating them as well as their allies, settled them as garrison troops and mercenaries in Egyptian fortresses in Palestine where they later became the Hebrews' most serious adversaries as the two tribes fought a ruthless war over the conquest of Canaan. After the war was won by "the chosen People" Philistia entered a period of decline and suffered many conquests by Egyptian, Assyrians and Babylonians until it finally lost its historical identity and its inhabitants were merged with the keen and much stronger tradition-minded Jewish people. In the next chapter we will give an account of the hitherto known archaeological and literary evidence on the Philistines and thus provide a portrait of this tribe consisting of the up to date scholarly knowledge of them which will serve as a general "historical" horizon against which the

fresh authentic evidence that this survey has to offer will be clearly and vividly laid out.

NOTES ON THE 2nd CHAPTER

1. For reports on Deir Alla, see H.J. Franken, V.T. xi (1961) and idem Excavations of Deir Alla I (1970). Note also the Summary account by Wright, B.A. xxix (1966), 73 ff.
2. It is sufficiently illustrated by archaeological evidence that the first great wave of destructions which afflicted the Mycenaean palace civilization and brought about an era earmarked by the lack of political stability and the coming into being of a period of political uncertainty, took place at about the close of LH III B, c.1200 B.C. the time, that is, when, according to literary (the Ramessidic inscriptions of Medinet Habu) and archaeological evidence (at Deir Alla and Tell el Farah) the Philistine presence is first attested as such.
3. See J. Naveh, I.E.J. VIII (1958), pp.166 ff; B. Mazar, I.E.J. x (1960), pp.106 ff; and cf. "context" of other sites, in Y. Aharoni, P.E.Q. xc (1958), pp. 27-31.
4. In C.A.H. ii, ch. xxxiii, p.26 and n.3, Albright retains Tell Areini for Gath and goes back to 'Aqir for Ekron; the latter identification is, however, totally dismissed by Kitchen, K.A. in Wiseman, D.J. (ed.) Peoples of Old Testament Times, Oxford 1973, p.75, n.79. Albright sets out his view about 'Aqir and Ekron, in the first place, in A.A.S.O.R. ii-iii (1923), pp. 1-3.
5. cf (e.g.) Wright's views in B.A. xxix (1966), p.79.
6. E.g. Y. Aharoni The Land of the Bible (1966) p.250.
7. See Mazar The Philistines (1964), pp. 2-4.
8. Idem in ibid., pp. 4-6. (previous note); he suggests that Ashkalon was the leading Philistine port down to this period and clashed with Tyre.
9. Jud. 3:31.
10. Jud. 14:4; cf. 13:1.
11. Jud. 14:11,12.

12. Op.cit (n.4), p.63. As for the maritime activities of the Philistines, W.F. Albright in C.A.H. vol. II, part two (1969), p. 515, seems to agree with Kitchen that the Philistines were practically in control of the waters of the South-Eastern Mediterranean, since there is no evidence of any Phoenician overseas colonization activity before the 10th century. He thinks that this Philistine control over south - eastern Mediterranean was ruined - early in this century after their defeat by the combined forces of Israel and Tyre.
13. I Sam. 4:1 - 7:1.
14. I Sam. 7:2.
15. I Sam. 7:14.
16. cf. I Sam. 9:16.
17. Op. cit., p. 64.
18. I Sam. 29:1, 30-31; note 31:7.
19. II Sam. 6:1.
20. As the parallel I Chronicles 18:1 might suggest.
21. Four successive conflicts in Gob or Gath; cf II Sam. 21:15-22.
22. Kitchen K.A. in op.cit (n.4) p.76, n.90 upholds the year 945 B.C. as the inaugural date for the 22nd Dynasty and, based on this estimation, goes on to maintain that the two immediately previous Kings of the 21st Dynasty, namely Psusennes II and Siamun, reigned some 14 years (959-945) the former and some 19 years (978-959) the latter. See also idem The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1972).
23. I Kings 9:16; cf. 3:1.
24. The whole case tempts me to compare this situation with that which turns up in the Aegean at about the middle of the 15th cent. We then notice Crete being rendered weaker than ever before and Cretan objects ceasing to be imported into Egypt, whereas Mycenaean imports into Egypt enjoy a considerable increase from that time onwards. It looks as if the Mycenaeans were

involved in the almost rapid disruption of Minoan-Egyptian transactions. Taking into account the likelihood that Crete, in the heyday of its civilization and political power, could well have barred Mainland Greece from the trade with Egypt in order to achieve an exclusive promotion of its exports to the Egyptian market, we can go on and assume that, during LM II (c. 1450-1400, the period of Mycenaean rule at Knossos), a sort of commercial treaty might have been signed by both Mycenaeans and Egyptians this time, reversing the former balance in Aegean-Egyptian trade by giving full priority to Greek mainland (Mycenaean) products in the Egyptian markets, a situation that must inevitably had sent Minoan imports into Egypt plummeting. Of course such a development could have happened only after Minoan civilization had suffered its first serious set-back, most probably because of the Thera volcanic eruption (c.1450). A theory with certain points in common with the one set out above is also favoured by Pendlebury J.D.S. in The Archaeology of Crete pp. 228-31. This hypothetical but quite likely agreement between Mycenaean Greece and Egypt could have as much affected the Minoan trade (to the benefit of Mycenaeans) as the alliance between the Israelite King Solomon and the Egyptian Pharaoh Siamun some five hundred years later seems to have affected the maritime trade of Philistia.

25. II Chron. 21:16-17.
26. II Chron. 28:18.
27. II Kings 18:8.
28. cf. A.N.E.T., pp. 282-4, plus D.J. Wiseman, *Iraq* xiii (1951) pp. 21-4 and *idem*, *Iraq* xviii (1956), pp. 117-129, cf. also H. Tadmor, *I.E.J.* xii (1962), pp. 114-22, and Aharoni, *Y. Land of the Bible* (1967), pp. 328-33.
29. A.N.E.T., pp. 287-8.
30. Ibid, p. 101.
31. Ibid. p. 102 and refs. For an Egyptian envoy, Fediese, son of Apy, to Canaan and Philistia, of 22nd-26th Dyn. date cf. Steindorff, G. J.E.A. xxv (1939), pp. 30-3 and pl.7.

32. The whole state of Egyptian New Kingdom Chronology is still very controversial. The crucial date is that of the accession of Ramesses II. The old "high" date of 1304 is now virtually dismissed. The choice is now between a "middle date" for Ramesses II of 1290-1224 which would make Ramesses III 1194-1162 and a "lowest date" with Ramesses II 1279-1213 and Ramesses III 1183-1152. K. Kitchen tends to favour the lowest date and next to it the middle one which he himself has put forward in Kitchen K.A. "Date, Nature, Content of Egyptian Sources on the Sea Peoples" in Crossland (ed.), The Sea Peoples, Acts of the International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory. See also Kitchen K.A. The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt. (1100-650), Wannister, 1972.
33. In this survey I have adhered to the middle chronology (see previous note) as the lowest date which was proposed by Kitchen in 1977 is still too revolutionary to be adopted without any misgivings, whereas the middle date does not upset the consistency of the accepted sequence of Periods in Egyptian Chronology. The overall matter is of a very foggy nature and as N.K. Sandars remarks, quoting Kitchen (loc.cit., previous note) in The Sea Peoples, London, 1978, in n. 2 of her introduction, "even after fixing for one or other date there may be ten to thirty years' "surplus" to be distributed piecemeal among Merneptah's successors". However, for the sake of consistency and in order that the hitherto accepted sequence of periods and scheme of dates in Egyptian chronology be not altered (something that would in turn, call for inevitable adjustments to all events dated by reference to Egyptian chronology) we shall hold on to the middle date, something which means that we date the accession of Merneptah at 1224 and of Ramesses III at 1194. There are shadowy Pharaohs after Merneptah and then follows the Interregnum at the end of the 19th Dynasty (1200) which is again a vague period and then follows Seknakht who was succeeded, after a year or two, by his son Ramesses III. It is extremely difficult to pin-point the exact year of the termination of the Kingship of Merneptah. On Egyptian chronology see also Hankey, V. and Warren, P. The Absolute Chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age, Institute of Classical Studies, Mycenaean Seminar, London 1973, where they offer alternative schemes of dates and their implications for Aegean chronology.

34. The Hymn of Victory of Merneptah also known as the "Israel Stela", probably dating from Merneptah's fifth year, was found at Thebes and a fragmentary replica at Karnak, see Pritchard 1969, pp. 376-78.
35. Breasted 1906, vol III paras 251-351.
36. On the locations of Ahhiyawa see Huxley 1960, passim; Gurney 1969, pp. 46 ff; Page, D.L. History and the Homeric Iliad, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959, pp. 13 ff. see also Wainwright, G.A. "Some Sea Peoples", in J.E.A., 47 (1961), pp.71-90.
37. Breasted 1906, vol. iv paras 59-82; Edgerton and Wilson 1936.
38. Sandars, N.K. The Sea Peoples, London, 1978, p. 120.
39. Sandars, N.K. op. cit., p. 124.
40. Historical Stela of Ramesses II from Deir el Medineh in Kitchen, K.A. Ramessid Inscriptions, vol. II, Oxford 1958-74, pp. 90-1. cf Stela Petrie Tanis II, pl. 2 no. 73, also Aswan Stela in Kitchen, K.A., op. cit. vol. II, 290, 1-4. See also Gurney 1969, p. 56; Weinright 1959.
41. Stela from Deir el Medineh in Kitchen, op. cit. (n. 40), pp. 90-1. Dr. Kitchen has laid emphasis on the fact that the inscription referring to Peleset and Tursha (Teresh) as "from the midst of the Sea" employs the conventional semitic word for sea "yam".
42. Papyrus Harris, Breasted 1906, vol. IV, paras. 397-412. Sandars, N.K. in op.cit. (n.38), p. 133 takes up the version of translation put forward by Breasted.
43. Papyrus Harris, in op.cit. (n. 42), vol. IV, parag. 397-412.
44. Papyrus Harris, in op.cit. (n. 42). The account given of the wars with the Sea Peoples in this record which is the longest extant papyrus writing - 40.5m long with 117 columns of 12 to 13 lines - referring to Egypt's early history and gives an account of the reign of Ramesses III, eulogizing him for his actual and fictitious victories, is at a certain variance with the respective account given in the Medinet Habu inscriptions in as much as it names Shardana among the northern invaders.

45. Oren, E. The Northern cemetery of Beth Shan Leiden 1973, chs. 5 and 6. He seems to prefer Denyen to Peleset at Beth-shan. This type of coffins seems to stem from an Egyptian tradition from Tell el Yahudiyeh (Egypt) and those found at Beth-shan were probably the coffinlids of Egyptian garrison troops many of whom must have been recruited from the ranks of northern raiders after the defeat of the latter at c. 1186 (Papyrus Harris, Breasted 1906, vol IV, paras. 397-412). For this theory Dothan, T. argues on good grounds in "Egyptian and Philistine burial customs" in Crossland (ed.) The Sea Peoples, Sheffield colloquium on Aegean prehistory, see also idem "Anthropoid clay coffins from a Late Bronze age Cemetery near Deir el-Balah" I.E.J. 23 (1973), pp. 129-46.
46. Petrie and Starkey, 1930.
47. See Albright, W.F., CAH, vol. II, part two, 1969, ch. xxxiii, p. 510 and nn. 2,3,4.
48. This argument is quite consistent with the thesis set out in Mrs. Dothan's article "Archeaological Reflections on the Philistine Problem", Antiquity and Survival, ii, (1957), pp. 151-64, esp. 154 ff., in favour of the likelihood that Philistine pottery was introduced at a date later than that of the original foundations of the Philistines in Southern Palestine. The evidence that she uses is based on the material from Beth Shan where anthropoid clay coffins (see n.45) and other objects displaying Egyptian connexions were found with objects of Aegean origin, including only a quite trivial quantity of Philistine pottery. Mrs. Dothan's conclusions are first that the coffins belonged to "Philistine high-ranking Mercenaries" and second that the "almost complete absence" of Philistine pottery at the same site (Beth-shan) means that the Philistines were settled here as garrison troops immediately after their defeat, before the appearance of their characteristic pottery.

CHAPTER THREE

Part 1

The hitherto attested archaeological record and the traditional literary evidence regarding the Philistines and their culture.

Part 2

The main schools of thought and theories on the Philistine question.

Introduction

This chapter will be concerned in its first part with the setting-out of the so-far-known archaeological record and the traditional literary evidence concerning the Philistine question, endeavouring a break-down of the relevant records whenever such a task will help to clarify the picture provided by a piece of information which might be difficult to process because of its composite nature. Necessary steps have been taken to ensure that evidence of equivocal value, as well as that which cannot be safely attributed to Philistine activity, be treated with the required reservation. Whenever similarities are detected between archaeological evidence attesting Philistine presence and that which indicates or suggests a different cultural activity, correlations and juxtapositions will take place so as to lead to corollaries and whenever feasible, to conclusions whereby the reader will be provided with a clear picture of such cultural connexions and affinities between the Philistines and other Levantine tribes as are indicated by, or can be inferred from, the hitherto common knowledge of that ancient people. This picture will hopefully serve as a firm background on which the fresh, authentic evidence that Chapter Four is going to provide will be built so as to enhance the so-far acquired concepts of the overall affinities of the Philistines, thus enriching the image that we have of them. It is to be noticed at this stage that what is denoted by the expression "traditional literary

evidence" is the overall body of the primary literary sources which have by now come to be unanimously looked on as well as drawn upon as, more or less, indisputable references to the Philistine question or to either events or entities which in one way or another might be taken to have a strong bearing upon it. This survey has therefore considered the following sources as belonging to this category and as worth quoting in this chapter:

- a) The biblical narratives.
- b) The Ramessidic records bearing upon the problem.¹
- c) The Ugaritic correspondence of the time of the final days and the destruction of this state, speaking of the frantic situation spawned by the activities of hostile contingents in Anatolia, its Syrian border and the sea between Alashiya and Ugarit, as well as the contemporary Hittite texts bearing upon events in which the Sea Peoples might have been involved.
- d) The Egyptian representation of the people from the land of "Keftiu".

The accounts given by the Jewish writer Josephus and the Egyptian writer Manetho, as well as the biblical references to "Rephaim", "Annakim" and "Zanzumim", although they are either undoubtedly referring to Philistine history (speaking in terms of the texts of the aforementioned authors) or indirectly bearing upon the Philistine question, (speaking in terms of the references to "Rephaim", "Annakim", "Zanzumim") will not be discussed and in any way examined in this particular chapter since they are going to be treated in conjunction with other valuable references in the next chapter because their nature makes it better for them to be coupled with other not-so-far scrutinized sources in such a way as to help shed new light to certain problems and lend credit to a wholly fresh approach on the overall question of the origins of the Philistines. At this stage it should be noted that when it comes to quoting and examining the biblical references to the Philistines in the book of Genesis as well as those to the terms "Avvim",

"Cherethites", "Pelethites", "Caphtorim" which also occur in biblical texts of the O.T. and are the various appellations employed by the Jewish scribes to denote Philistines or people particularly akin to them, there will not be, in this chapter, a complete coverage of all the aspects of the various problems entailed by these terms and their ensuing connotations. Discussion of some of them which involves new, not-so-far-examined data will be saved for the following chapter which deals with authentic primary evidence employed and treated so as to establish a new view of the Philistine question. Finally, discussion of those appellations in association with the various traditional views regarding the origins of the Philistines will be made in the second part of this chapter - which deals with the main trends of thought concerning the Philistine question - to which we presently turn.

In the second part of this chapter the most important schools of scholarly reflection on the Philistine problem are listed. These are theories mainly concerned with this tribe's extraction, the areas from which they set out to raid the Levant, the route via which they came to Egypt and the meaning of their name. Regardless of the degree of credibility that these theories enjoy nowadays, they are still rated high in the hierarchy of views periodically taken of the overall matter and assume attitudes which have not hitherto been seriously challenged - hence the large number of their supporters. It follows that reference to them will be made time and again in the course of this survey and that therefore, discussion of them will not be confined in this part of the research of the matter. However, their main treatment will take place in this chapter.

Part 1: The Extant Archaeological Evidence and the
Traditional Literary Records

A. The Archaeological Record

a) The evidence of pottery.

We are no doubt justified in believing that the group of archaeological evidence that reflects the most considerable and unmistakable image of the Philistines and one that furnishes many good reasons to believe that there is a strong connexion between this tribe and Aegean cultures is provided by the "so-called" "Philistine" pottery. It is perhaps right to accept the term "hybrid" applied to Philistine pottery by N.K. Sandars in her book The Sea Peoples, 1978, p. 166. This style of pottery is a type the chief characteristics of which, both in terms of shape and decoration, are traceable to some Mycenaean area², yet some shapes are native Levantine and we often see pots displaying a bichrome technique unfamiliar to the Mycenaeans but attested on earlier Syro-Palestinian wares and also found on Cypriot Proto-White Painted and Cypro-Geometric pottery³. A list of points of difference between the Philistine ware and the Mycenaean one may be as follows:

- 1) The shapes of certain Philistine pots which exhibit native Levantine character.
- 2) The clay of Philistine ceramics which proved by scientific analysis to be of Palestinian origin (particularly of that type which occurs in the coastal parts of Palestine)⁴
- 3) The matt paint which apparently differs from the lustrous paint of Mycenaean ware.
- 4) The particularly common motive of a bird which is looking backwards, a pattern vary rare in the Aegean though not altogether absent.
- 5) The use of two colours in the decoration of Philistine pottery, usually red as well as black (bichrome pottery).
- 6) The employment of a whitish ground in Philistine pots in form of either a wash or self-slip that disappears in the kiln. This ground in some pots, particularly the later ones, has a greenish tinge.

The last two characteristic of Philistine pottery stem from an old native tradition of bichrome pottery which dates from the 16th century and in which we occasionally notice birds, trees, wheels and other similar patterns.⁵

Despite these differences it remains a fact that Philistine ware has undoubtedly copied the Mycenaean methods of approaching the final result. Geographically, Philistine pottery is found in greater abundance within as well as near the territories of Philistine settlement. When it occurs in areas outside the sphere of Philistine habitation, for example at Megiddo and Hazor, its quantities are relatively smaller. Thus, territorially, it is a pottery associated with the Philistines. A strong claim can also be made for this pottery being in vogue during the time of Philistine sovereignty in Palestine. It is produced in great numbers in the 12th century and after it a decadence sets in, especially to be noticed in the latter part of the 11th century. That the type and decoration observable in Philistine pottery are imitating those evident on Mycenaean ware is beyond question. Yet Philistine pottery is almost always so crude that it is least likely that it has been manufactured by any skilful Mycenaean potter.

Only a few pieces are very close to Mycenaean prototypes. Among these we may quote the examples referred to by Desborough⁶, that is, the deep bowl uncovered at Askalon and bearing a carefully designed antithetic "tongue pattern"⁷ (the sole instance of the use of this pattern in Philistine ware) which stylistically resembles a piece recovered from Sinda (Cyprus) and dated by Furumark to Mycenaean III C1b (c. 1200-1130)⁸, and a sherd from Tell-Fara⁹ bearing a fish (again the only instance of this motive in Philistine ware) and a bird both of which are strongly reminiscent of Mycenaean early LHIIIIC originals. The main shapes of Philistine pottery are four in number.¹⁰ One of them, the one-handled jug with strainer spout, turns up frequently in Cyprus and only

occasionally in Dodecanese where we find it in Mycenaean III C tombs. Its occurrence on the Greek Mainland is scanty. The majority of these pots have not so far been dated - in the Mycenaean sphere - before the end of Mycenaean III B (c.1200).

The other shapes are the deep bowl, the Krater and the stirrup jar which are Mycenaean shapes throughout and undoubtedly the most popular vases in Mycenaean III C. Of these four shapes of Philistine pottery, the deep bowls and Kraters vary considerably in size. In shape they resemble clearly the Mycenaean prototypes and, in a way, certain Cretan deep bowls¹¹, in that the sides of the bowls tend, as in some Cretan bowls, to come down more vertically and also because there is an evident, inward bend to the foot. Of course, the similarity to the Cretan bowls may be, in view of the poor quality of the examples, only accidental; yet, it may be taken to be an example of the influence of Minoan pottery on that of the Philistines, if we allege that this biblical tribe passed through Minoan territory during the course of their travels, a conjecture which is quite likely if we take into consideration the Egyptian records of Ramesses III stating, among other things, that the Peleset (the Egyptian appellation for Philistines) and the Teresh (another tribe of the allied Sea-Peoples) came "from the midst of the Sea", that is, probably from Crete.¹² The biblical passages also give clues about the Philistines having come to Palestine from an area probably identifiable with Crete or at least associated with it. But there will be much more room for discussion on this matter at a later stage. For the moment we must not forget that if the Philistines or Peleset passed through Minoan territories on their way south, they must have done so during the early stage of LH (Mycenaean) III C (c. 1200 - 1050), since they are mentioned in the inscription of year 8 of Ramesses III (c. 1186) as already threatening, along with the rest of the "northerners", the land of Egypt. So it is possible that the Philistines made the acquaintance of this type of Minoan pottery which was current or simply, in some use at the time of

their contact with Minoan culture. Of course, a case for some influence of this Cretan pottery (deep bowls with vertical sides and an inward bend to the foot) on the Philistine ware can also be made if the Philistines were already settled somewhere in Crete or in Cretan territories at some stage of time prior to embarking upon their trek southwards.

And now back to the study of the Philistine pottery. The chief element of decoration on the bowls and Kraters is the spiral, the motive most commonly found. There are usually two spirals between the handles, also this pattern turns up in panel arrangements, the dividing element being a set of vertical lines fringed by collateral semicircles; the same designs (semicircles) are combined with a variant to the spiral, the bird - usually pluming its wings. Much rarer motives comprise chequers, concentric semicircles, and cross-hatched rectangles. The style apparent on these bowls and Kraters comprises motives common both to Mycenaean III B and C; yet the birds on Philistine ware "have no connexion with Mainland fowls"¹³ and the (dotted) semicircle motive is particularly rare in the Aegean area,¹⁴ yet there is a useful example on a Mycenaean III C sherd from Nicosia, Cyprus. The spirals on the other hand are extremely popular in the Aegean. It is evident that the characteristic decorative features of Mycenaean III C1c (c. 1130 - 1075) are absent on this class of Philistine ware. These bowls and Kraters form a crushing majority of the Philistine decorated material from settlements and, to some extent, from tombs (Tell Fara).¹⁵

The stirrup jars are not as common as the bowls or the Kraters; they vary somewhat in shape, but there is no example of the rather squat or piriform types, characteristic of Mycenaean III B. The knob that occasionally turns up on the disc of the stirrup is a feature of Mycenaean III C. The decoration applied to the belly as well as to the shoulder is an innovation of Mycenaean III C stirrup jars. From the motives on the belly such patterns as birds and vertical lines

with flanking semicircles are characteristic while those of the shoulder include multiple concentric loops or semicircles. All these motives seem typical of the Mycenaean III C series in the Aegean and help us date the whole of this class to Mycenaean III C.

The jugs with strainer spout finally are less common than the stirrup jars, though they exhibit the same decorative motives.

So much for the shapes and decorative patterns of Philistine pottery. It is noteworthy and must always be borne in mind that this pottery enjoys a remarkable uniformity both in shape and in decoration.

If we are to deduce an area of origin of this ware, judging from the available archaeological data, we must rather rule out Mainland Greece and no less must we do so for both Crete and the Dodecanese, because although there are parallels in the contemporary Cretan and Dodecanesian pottery, there is no trace in the Philistine pottery of the Cretan fringed ware which is the most characteristic class of contemporary Minoan pottery, nor of the octopus-style-stirrup-jar, the class which is typical of Dodecanesian pottery in the 12th century; yet the area of Dodecanese should not be totally ruled out. Perhaps Cyprus¹⁶ is the place we are looking for and a Cypriot origin during the early period of Mycenaean III C (c.1200 - 1050) influence would probably make a very good answer.

Coche de la Ferté has attempted to link Philistine pottery with that from Enkomi (Eastern Cyprus) mainly on the basis of the fragments of jugs with strainer spout found at that site.¹⁷ He placed these sherds in his "Sub-Mycenaean inferior" level which is perhaps equivalent with what Schaeffer has termed floor III (or II), according to the latter scholar's stratigraphic assessment.¹⁸ We know for certain nowadays that this shape was already known in Cyprus at the end of LC II (c. 1200). The best parallels with Philistine ware however come

from Nicosia (Cyprus) and are two sherds recovered from this place¹⁹, one of which bears dotted collateral semicircles, a motive that hardly occurs outside Philistine territories, while the other displays decoration reminiscent of a jug from the Tell Farah cemetery.²⁰ Moreover the illustrations of the Enkomi sherds make it clear that the antithetic spiral motive was known in Cyprus in early Mycenaean III C. (12th cent.) And finally the bowl from Cyprus²¹ with the fish on it, forming so close a parallel to the solitary Philistine equivalent²², supports the view that Philistine pottery might very well have originated in Cyprus. This theory actually seems to be favoured by many scholars without serious reservations; thus, Albright seems to have almost no doubt about the origin of the Philistine ware.²³ He suggests that it stems directly from the LH (Mycenaean) III Clb ware of the Aegean basin and that its manufacture seems to have been brought from Cyprus to Palestine not later than the early 12th century; he underlines the likeness of Philistine pots to pieces found by A. Furumark at Sinda (Cyprus) and by C.F.A. Schaeffer and P. Dikaios at Enkomi. Two points are, I think, of special importance in his discussion of the case. The first stresses the fact of the Cypriot influence on the local variation of LH III C 1b that turns up in Cyprus and considers it a good reason to "reject the view that it was brought by the Philistines directly from their Aegean home". The second point refers to a possible interpretation of the appearance of the Philistine pottery in Philistia at an early stage of the 12th century and says that this chronological situation could be accounted for by the probable existence of some Philistines in eastern Cyprus, settled there several decades before their occupation of the Pentapolis²⁴; it is clear then that Albright assumes that it was these Philistines (the ones who were settled in Cyprus) who brought the Cypriot variation of LH III Clb to Philistia and that, in suggesting so, he does not quite take up the view which Desborough takes of the matter; the latter scholar thinks that a local potter is very likely to have fled from Cyprus to Philistia, on account probably of the second wave of disasters

that struck the island, and introduced this variation of Mycenaean III C lb pottery which was later to become so popular in Southern Palestine and known by the appellation "Philistine pottery".²⁵

Hall is in no doubt that Philistine pottery is native-made, imitating the Mycenaean.²⁶ He calls this local imitation of Mycenaean pottery "the manufacture of a population accustomed to pottery of Aegean shape and decoration, and desirous of continuing its own style".²⁷ It is to be noticed that he calls the Philistine pottery "Sub-Mycenaean ware", a connexion that cannot be tenable in the light of recent years knowledge, since the actual Sub-Mycenaean period began at c. 1100 BC and terminated at c. 1050 BC, whereas the Mycenaean III C lb pottery which is imitated by Philistine potters dates from 1200 BC down to 1130²⁸. Hall draws parallels from such sites as Phaestos in Crete, Cyprus, Assarlik in Caria and Calymnus, but since he considers them as such on the grounds that they all bear the same characteristic Late-Mycenaean "bird" and "metope" (semicircles is what he means, in all probability) motives of decoration, it is doubtful whether these examples could really be considered as good parallels. It is clear that Hall draws a crude comparison between Aegean and Philistine ware, since neither the characteristic Philistine bird-pattern, nor the dotted collateral semicircles (metopes) of the Philistine pottery are common in the Aegean area,²⁹ and so far as the latter motive is concerned, I know of but a single LH III C sherd from Nicosia quoted by Desborough.³⁰ Thus, it looks as if Hall's examples are to be treated with the utmost reservation. It must also be said here that R.D. Barnett in his interesting article on the Philistines³¹ obviously makes a mistake when referring to the Aegean prototypes of Philistine ware as LM III Clb ceramics. LM III C (c. 1200 - c. 1050) is characterised by the so-called "fringed" style, the most characteristic in Crete during this period and one which does not turn up on Philistine ware at all. Thus, Barnett's aforementioned reference can be taken to be a slip-up. Of course, it might well have been LH III Clb (instead of LM III Clb) that he had in mind when drawing this comparison, yet the mistake remains. Regarding the rest of his

discussion of the subject, he observes correctly that Philistine pottery is a hybrid, partly Mycenaean in shape but unlike Mycenaean ware "in being not varnish-painted but matt-painted bichrome ware, decorated in metopes".³² He also remarks that Philistine pottery is found not only at those sites in Palestine which are associated with the Philistine invasion, but at other sites too such as Megiddo in level VIB and Beth-Shemesh at level III.

Kitchen K.A. makes the remarkable point that Philistine pottery occurs throughout Philistia "following closely upon Late Bronze II levels in coastland sites, but only after an interval on sites well inland".³³ He thinks that, on the whole, this pottery marks conveniently the areas of Philistine habitation and also serves as a pointer to Philistine influence in the borderlands of their immediate neighbours, but "only rarely further afield". We must now give an outline of the sites which have yielded Philistine pottery. Thus far there have only been occasional and sketchy references in this survey. A complete account must therefore be given. As we have stated above, clay analysis has shown that this ware was manufactured in the coastland parts of Palestine. Thus when we find it inland we may conclude that it has been traded there from the coastland sites. Indeed this pottery was traded inland from Ashdod and probably other cities, to Tell Eitun (near Tell Beit Mirsim) and farther east. We find it at Beth Shan (in a very scanty quantity) and Deir Alla in the Jordan valley and also at Megiddo, Hazor and Laish in the north.³⁴ It is useful here to recall Kitchen's points (set out above) that this ware turns up at every Philistine site following closely upon Late Bronze Age II levels in coastland sites³⁵, whereas at sites occurring inland it is to be found on the next but one level.³⁶ The sites in the south which yielded Philistine pots are Yurza, Sharuhem, Gerar; eastward Philistine pottery occurs in Philistine and Hebrew border sites (Shephelah) from Debir up to Gezer and even as far as Joppa on the Mediterranean coast.

Furumark has placed the earliest appearance of Philistine pottery some ten years after the beginning of his Mycenaean III C1b phase (c. 1200), which would make 1190 a roughly convenient date for the earliest appearance of the Philistine pottery, according of course to his own estimations. The remarkable uniformity of this pottery suggests that the influence of Mycenaean III C pottery was felt at one point of time,³⁷ that of the creation of the Philistine ware, and also that the style of this pottery may owe its development to one man or to one workshop dominated by one man, with his sons keeping up the family tradition.³⁸ The deductions arising from the study of the pottery found in Syria³⁹ seem to suggest that the Philistine pottery was current in south Palestine only after the settlement there of the Philistines. The evidence from sites of Philistine occupation seems to confirm this conclusion. The Philistine pottery does not appear in conjunction with Mycenaean III B and Cypriot wares such as were current during the 13th century. What sites provide us with evidence supporting this view include Ashkelon,⁴⁰ where a destruction level separates the Mycenaean III B and Cypriot wares from the Philistine pottery, and also Tell Farah, where the earliest Philistine pottery found in the court-yard of the Residency was associated with a sherd bearing a cartouche with the figure of Seti II (the Egyptian Pharaoh) assignable to his reign (1216 - 1210)⁴¹ and thus suggesting that the Philistine ware was in all probability hardly earlier than his reign or - what is much more likely - later than it. But perhaps the strongest evidence comes from Beth-Shan where the almost complete absence of Philistine pottery, taken in conjunction with the anthropomorphic clay coffins and objects suggesting Egyptian connexions made Dothan⁴² conclude that the Philistines were settled here as garrison troops immediately after their defeat and capture by Ramesses III (c. 1186), before the appearance of their pottery.⁴³

All the evidence so far available suggests that the Philistine pottery is too closely connected with the development of the Philistine foundations to allow the

conclusion that the interval between the original settlement in Southern Palestine of the Philistines and the appearance of their pottery could have been a long one. In all probability this ware must have evolved during the very early years of Philistine occupation.

b) The evidence other than that of pottery.

Though pottery is still the chief indicator of Philistine material culture, thanks to fresh excavations and finds we now have a much more sufficient view of the Philistine culture and can thus build up our understanding of it by means of a combination of various archaeological data.⁴⁴ Following is a list of sites where excavations have enhanced considerably our knowledge: Ashdod, Gezer, Tel Quasile (where a Philistine temple was excavated by A. Mazar in 1972), Tell Deir Allah, Tell Eitun, Tell Zeror.

Our next step will be the listing of the various archaeological data which are indicative of Philistine cultural activity.

i) Terracotta figurines.

Stylistically, they are a clear adaptation and development of the Mycenaean female figurines seated on a throne. From Ashdod, for example, comes a clay figure, part woman, part chair which is claimed to indicate strong Mycenaean influence. This figurine has been recovered from the level XII of Ashdod which contained a shrine in which this figure was found. A rather similar unpainted figure comes from tomb 28 at Katydhata in Cyprus and dates to Late Cypriot III, that is, from about the 13th century. With these must be compared a characteristic type of Mycenaean seated figure from chamber tomb 91 at Mycenae; only a few of these figures have been uncovered at Mycenaean sites, and the chair on which this figure is supposed to be sitting was found separately. The Ashdod example, usually thought to form part of a throne, has been called "Ashdoda" and along with broken beads and thrones of

similar figurines recovered from the same site are among the most significant finds of the early Philistine period (12th cent. B.C.), as they represent, particularly "Ashdoda", the first archaeological evidence of what could very well have been a Philistine deity other than the Canaanite deities known from biblical passages (Dagon, Baal Zebub, Ashtoreth). At this stage it is perhaps worth quoting Dothan's words: "Thus, in the first half of the 12th century at least, the Philistines appear to have been worshipping the so-called 'Great Mother of the Mycenaean World, the prototype of "Ashdoda"'.⁴⁵ R.D. Barnett⁴⁶ applies a rather peculiar term to these Philistine figurines, that is, "chimney-pot" figurines; in referring to these remarkable artefacts, he states that they were recovered from Tell-Mor near Ashdod and that they point clearly to Mycenaean origin.

ii) Ritual vases

In this class we may list the so-called "Kernoi", "Kernos-bowls", and especially the lion-headed rhyta. These artefacts form a characteristic group of Philistine products and clearly exhibit Aegean Bronze Age connexions. They have been recovered from the recently discovered Philistine temple of Tell Quasile of whose temple furniture they were part. Really remarkable finds such as female figurines attached to the rims of kraters and kraters with cups attached (cemeteries at Azor and Tell Eitun) bear witness to a strong relationship with the burial practices and cults of the dead found in the Aegean at the close of the Mycenaean era (c. 1150 - 1050).⁴⁷ As for the Kernoi, it is always useful to bear in mind that they form a strikingly characteristic class of Minoan ritual vessels. They turn up in Crete from the Early Minoan period (2800 - 2000) onwards and the most characteristic as well as biggest example so far known is the KERNOS found at the Minoan palace at Mallia. The Kernos has been interpreted as a ritual utensil, used during religious rites in order to hold the offerings to the gods. Its very early form is a small or big round block of stone bearing small, shallow hollows running parallel to its

circumference and very close to it. A longer central hollow occurs in all these examples, probably intended for a larger quantity of offerings.⁴⁸ The later form of it consists of a rather big bowl with small cups attached all around its rim. A variation of this is the Kraters with cups appended to it, an object which is commonly found in Mainland Greece as well as in Crete in Mycenaean III (c. 1400 - 1050). The resemblance between the Philistine equivalent and these Aegean prototypes is remarkable. The Kraters with figurines on the rim form another class of objects which apparently have Mycenaean origin. They appear in the Aegean area during Mycenaean III C times (c. 1200 - 1050) in such places as Ialysos in Rhodes and Perati in Attica (Greek Mainland). There is also no doubt about the Aegean origin of the lion-headed rhyta which evolved in Crete during Late Minoan times.⁴⁹

iii) The rock-cut chamber tomb.

This type of burial architecture is another aspect of funerary ritual common to both Philistine and Mycenaean practice. It is from Tell Fara that the evidence for the use of this type of tomb comes.⁵⁰ It is well attested that similar tombs carved deep in the rock and approached by a long narrow passage (dromos) with inward-sloping sides are in use in the Greek Mainland since the latter part of the Mycenaean LH II period (c. 1450 - 1400).⁵¹ Since there are patterns of cultural activity attesting to Mycenaean influence on the Philistines (see above) we may well assume that this type of rock-cut tomb which turns up at Tell Fara evolved under Mycenaean influence too. However we may go further and trace even a Minoan origin since this type of rock-cut chamber tomb makes its first appearance, as far as the Aegean area is concerned, at Knossos (Crete) during LM II (c. 1450 - 1400). It rapidly spreads over the Greek Mainland ever since and it has already been assumed⁵² that the dispatch of Cretan architects to Mainland Greece after the conquest of Knossos by the Mycenaeans (c. 1450 BC.) could have been responsible for this type of tomb coming into vogue there. Thus it is really

very tempting to suggest that the Philistines, should they really have been the Peleset of the Egyptian records—a view that is almost universally accepted nowadays — might have adopted this type of funerary architecture from the Minoans provided, as is likely, that they passed through Minoan territory on their way south. One more point regarding the origin of these tombs may very well be pertinent at this stage. There are even earlier examples than those already mentioned on Cretan and Greek mainland soil. These earlier examples appear in Cyprus and Egypt and caused Sinclair Hood to assume⁵³ that the Minoan equivalents (and in turn these of the Greek mainland) might have evolved under the influence of their Cypriot or Egyptian prototypes. Thus, a Cypriot rather than Aegean origin for the Philistine tombs at Tell Fara would not, I think, seem unlikely. If we are to judge from the obvious derivation of Philistine pottery from the Cypriot variation of Mycenaean III C1b pottery, we may look upon a further exchange of cultural conceptions between Cyprus and Philistia as quite possible. In any case the resemblance between the Philistine rock-cut tombs at Tell-Fara and those in both Crete and Mycenae is unquestionable. R.D. Barnett takes up this view⁵⁴ but he dates these tombs at the 13th cent. judging, as far as I can see, from the occurrence of Mycenaean III B (c. 1300-1200) pottery in these tombs. However, there is, I think, some danger in drawing sweeping conclusions about chronology from the occurrence of a single group of pottery which might well have been earlier than the tombs in which it was found. Sometimes old styles of pottery keep enjoying some popularity even though new styles are beginning to come into vogue. This phenomenon usually turns up either in backward peoples or racial groups whose cultural standard is lower than that of the people to whom the makers of the imitated or imported pottery belong, or in cases of people who are away from their country of origin and lack the stimuli which would have naturally caused them to be more creative in every field of cultural endeavour had they been in their usual, well-known environment. In all probability, pottery is not always a strong factor for anyone to use in cases like this. Let us not forget that the

Minoan envoys on the tomb of the Egyptian Menkheperresenb carry objects which were not fashionable at his time; they were obviously artefacts of a past period; yet the artist depicted these and not other objects in their hands, maybe because he had not seen any later Minoan artefacts or simply because the old ones appealed to him more than the new. A rather far-fetched view put forward by Dothan⁵⁵ says that the Tell-Farah tombs attest to the common religious background of Philistines and Mycenaeans. I am not quite ready to accept that a common architectural pattern which could have been applied on account of practical purposes only is a safe pointer to common religious concepts of the peoples who used it.

iv) The ships of the Peleset

These are queer-looking vessels involving such appendages as a single sail to power them, a central mast with a crow's nest on the top for the enemy look-out, a curved keel, a high prow, and a bird's - a duck's presumably - head on the stern post. These peculiar ships, so accurately represented on the reliefs at Medinet Habu, have yet their parallels on a Mycenaean III C vase from the Greek island of Skyros in the northern Aegean Sea. On this vase a bird-headed ship is unmistakably, if crudely, represented and the resemblance to the Philistine versions of the Medinet-Habu sea-battle reliefs is unquestionable. Parallels to the Philistine ships can also be found on a 16th century wall-painting uncovered at the LMIA (c. 1550-1500) settlement of Akrotiri on the Greek island of Thera - Southern Aegean; this painting represents a square-rigged ship with a large sail that could only be used - it seems - for running before the wind.

The boats of 12th century Egyptians and the Sea Peoples, as we described them above - according to what information their Medinet Habu portrayals afford us - do not seem to have been better equipped.⁵⁶ As a further parallel to the Philistine vessels one may also quote a Levanto-Helladic pictorial style vase from Enkomi, Cyprus⁵⁷.

v) The "feathered" head-gear.

All the Philistines represented on the reliefs of year 8 of Ramesses' III's reign at Medinet Habu wear what may very well be a feathered cap, that is, a line-up of almost vertically arranged feathers held together by one or more decorated bands, close-set and running parallel to each other. An identical headgear is worn by the Tjekker and also the Denyen and Shekelesh as well, that is, by some other tribes among those that the Sea-Peoples' alliance consisted of.⁵⁸ No theory on these Philistine caps has so far been able to vouch for them being made of feathers, whereas there have hitherto been other suggestions for these "crowns" involving leather, rushes held together, folded linen or even a special hairstyle which involves a way of stiffening so that the hair virtually stands on end. There are quite a few theories linking the Peleset's feathered cap with various head-gears. A statuette of Baal from Ugarit wears a soft-material turban reminiscent of the horned and plumed helmet worn by one of the spearmen portrayed on the Mycenae Warrior Vase which is a fair specimen of the advanced form of LH III C "Close Style" preceding "Granary Style" and therefore is likely to date from the second quarter of the 12th century.⁵⁹ In both these representations, the head-gear suggests something of the Peleset cap on the 12th century Egyptian reliefs at Medinet Habu. There are also some LH III C sherds found in the Greek island of Cos bearing naive representations of rowers who wear feathered head gear that, despite its differences, is not altogether unsimilar to that of the Peleset of the Egyptian reliefs. Among the 12th cent. Egyptian representations at Medinet Habu we may also pick off those depicting Egyptian soldiers from southern Palestine, fighting the Libyans⁶⁰ (year 5 of Ramesses III's reign, that is, 1189) and accompanying Ramesses III on a lion hunt which seems to have a symbolic character.⁶¹ In these cases, as well as in another involving prisoners portrayed on glazed tiles recovered from Ramesses III's palace,⁶² the human figures wear what seems to be stiffened hair, held by a headband. We cannot say that this hair style bears a strong resemblance to

the Sea Peoples' head-gear, yet it is by no means a far cry from it. It may not be out of place to recall, at this point, that the Lycians in King Xerxes' Persian army in the 5th cent. B.C., are said by Herodotus to be wearing a head-cover encircled with plumes. These Lycians could have been offsprings of, or in any way related to, the Lukka or some other tribe of the Anatolian section of "Sea Peoples". The Lukka, as such, do not appear in the foreign confederacy that threatened Egypt in year 8 of Ramesses III (c. 1186), but they do so in the list of the Libyan allies who marched against Egypt in year 5 of Merneptah (c. 1220). What can also be a variant to the Philistine headdress is a low turban with two humps sometimes held with a headband. It is worn by a number of Ramesses III's troops shown campaigning against the Libyans in the second Libyan war (year 11 of Ramesses III, c. 1183) and parading along with soldiers with "northern" appearance", as is clearly indicated by the horned helmets of some of them.⁶³ It is also worn by a medallion-bearing prisoner taken back from what seems to have been a fictitious campaign of Ramesses III against Amor (Amuru).⁶⁴ Reminiscent of this headgear may very well be that worn by two naked prisoners presented to a ruler on an ivory inlay from Megiddo,⁶⁵ as well as that of two Hittite allies at Kadesh, appearing in a representative line-up on the relief of the battle at Luxor.⁶⁶ Perhaps this is the right moment to make reference to the Phaistos disk. It is usually said that it is on this unique monument which has been found at Phaistos, Crete, that we have the earliest-recorded appearance of the Philistine type. This disk dates from a time covering the period from c. 2000 - c. 1550 B.C. (Middle Minoan) and it is almost certain that it is of either Lycian or Carian origin. One of the recurring representations on it depicts a male head, clean-shaven, with what looks like a feathered crest on his head. It is on account of this feathered-looking arrangement on the head in question that many scholars are keen on identifying it as a Peleset, the type of Philistine as it occurs on the Egyptian reliefs. Although there is here room for more than one interpretation of the "head-gear", such as hair stiffened so as to practically stand on end, there is no

denying that this problematic head does remind one of the Medinet Habu representations of the feathered "Sea Peoples". However, even by making allowances for the divergent details of the designs in the two cases, there is still the chronological discrepancy to account for. Nevertheless, the appearance on the Phaestos disk of such a design is an important clue which may be coupled with other evidence that is presented and discussed in the following chapter of this survey. The alleged appearance of the Philistines on the silver vase from Mycenae with the famous siege-scene embossed upon it where the figures in question carry a rectangular shield resembling a Roman shape as well as such representations as the one occurring on the 12th century ivory gaming-box from a tomb at Enkomi, Cyprus⁶⁷ and depicting two hunting men bearing Sea Peoples' looks, and as that on the ivory-mirror handle from the same site, and of the same date, depicting the so-called griffin-slayer⁶⁸ whose appearance implies Sea people's connexions, are also cases which must be treated with a good deal of reservation.

vi) Secular and religious architecture

In the south of Palestine there are signs of Aegean architecture in certain buildings at Gezer and at Tell es-Safi (Gath). Here one can notice the characteristic Cretan light-well.⁶⁹

Traces of a massive mud-brick fort joining the city wall have been uncovered at Ashdod.⁷⁰ Another temple at Gaza, bearing a colonnade, presents some problems as to its actual identity and function. Another small temple from Ashdod is recorded. Regarding the houses in Philistine areas, one notices that the usual architectural types are the rectangular and the round ones.

vii) The pointed short kilt.

This particular feature is an appendage of the Peleset's attire.⁷¹ It falls to a point in front and is generally divided into panels by a series of lines which follow the curve of the lower edge. We often see it fringed with bunches of tassels, three in each tuft. The Minoans, as far as we can judge from their representations (frescoes, embossed plates, figurines, seals etc.) bear this type of short kilt as well, though there are certain differences.⁷² Good examples for comparison involve LMIA (c.1550 - 1500) bronze figurines from the Minoan sites at Aghia Triadha, Tylissos, Dictaeon cave, Palaikastro, LM (c.1550 - 1050) frescoes such as that of the Priest-King at Knossos, the famous steatite rhyton (ritual vase) from Aghia Triadha representing a chieftain giving orders to a probably high-ranked officer, LMI (c.1550 - 1450) and II (c.1450 - 1400) seals etc.

viii) Funerary gold foil

A plate of gold foil was occasionally tied over the dead's mouth in the clay slipper-type sarcophagi with bearded heads crudely modelled in relief on them, recovered from Beth-Shan. This is a custom that, as Barnett⁷³ suggests, is reminiscent of burials at Mycenae⁷⁴ and remained in the Levant till at least the 10th century when we meet it at Tell-Halaf, a half-Aramaeam city of Northern Syria.

ix) A deposit of seals recovered from near Gaza

These seals have actually been identified as Cretan (Minoan)⁷⁵ and, granted that this identification is correct, then this discovery may be, in all probability, coupled with the biblical reference to part of the Philistine coast as the "Cretan South" or "Negeb"⁷⁶ and with those involving both Cretans and Philistines in the same description.⁷⁷

x) The armour of Goliath

It has often been noted by many scholars that Goliath's armour had a European look, involving, as it did, helmet, cuirass of bronze and especially the bronze greaves, things that were not familiar to Egyptians or Syrians, whereas they were so to Greeks. In view of the Philistines being greaved, especially interesting are the pair of bronze greaves of about the time of Goliath (actually about 12th - 10th cent.) which are among the oldest extant examples known and were found at Enkomi in Cyprus. Hall⁷⁸ goes so far as to say that "Goliath must have been conceived as looking very much like the griffin-slaying Arimaspians on the ivory mirror handle from Enkomi, whose dress is absolutely that of the Shardana and Pulasati (Peleset) of the Egyptian monuments". Although Hall's view may not belong to those ones that can go down unchallenged, the fact remains that the Philistine armour had an Aegean, probably Greek (Mycenaean) look, particularly if coupled with the Homeric account of Greek armours.

xi) The "theatral area" of the temples.

This architectural pattern, that is, the theatre or the "theatral area", as Arthur Evans calls it, was a striking feature of Minoan architecture of the palaces of Knossos and Phaestos, Crete. Thus it is interesting to observe, as Hall has first done,⁷⁹ that the biblical narrative about the exhibition of Samson in the temple of Gaza gives us so clear and convincing a clue regarding the architectural order of the temple as to make one assume or even conclude that the Philistines must have indeed introduced this feature of Minoan palaces to their own architectural conceptions. Says the relevant passage⁸⁰: "Now the house was full of men and women; and all the tyrants of the Philistines were there; and there were upon the roof about three thousand men and women that beheld while Samson made sport". This account is strongly reminiscent of a Minoan fresco at the palace of Knossos, depicting scores of spectators looking on at the sports of

boxing and bull grappling (tavrokathapsia). The people in the incident described in the aforementioned biblical passage consist of both men and women intermixed according to their non-semitic habit which, being alien to Hebrew temperament, is purposely emphasized by the Jewish writer.

xii) The Deir Alla tablets.⁸¹

At this town, on the floor of a sanctuary from the end of the Late Bronze Age (c.1200 B.C.) was found a broken faience bowl bearing the inscribed cartouche of queen Tewosret who is reported to have reigned in Egypt in the last decade of the 13th cent. B.C. In the same occupation level were found three inscribed tablets and a discarded fourth in two rooms in which a homogeneous type of pottery was also recorded. It is a little bit strange that although the sanctuary is reported to have suffered destruction by earthquake, yet Philistine pottery was identified in the same stratum and is to be dated immediately after the time of the tablets. The tablets contain over fifty characters, grouped into some fifteen words separated by vertical strokes; they look like elongated Minoan Linear A and B tablets, and some of the characters closely resemble signs of Minoan Linear A though they exhibit a rather simplified, stylized form and are reduced in number. It is likely that this script is a sort of phonetic syllabary, "analogous to the Cypriot and in part to the Carian".⁸² It is probable that these tablets are early Philistine texts, though they may be assignable to another tribe of the "Sea Peoples" confederation.

xiii) The armour of the Sea Peoples

The majority of the Sea Peoples on the Medinet Habu representations wear a banded body armour that leaves the shoulders exposed and even part of either side of the chest. In fact what we have to do with here is a strap corselet which does not seem to afford adequate protection.

xiv) The Medinet Habu reliefs of the Land and Sea battle.

The relief scenes depicting the Land and Sea-clash between the Egyptian and their allies on one hand and the Sea People's confederation on the other, must now be commented upon in their overall perspective to integrate the "archaeological" picture that has so far been gained from piecemeal information. Though the queries that one is confronted with when one attempts to construe the relevant inscriptions on the Great Temple may very well apply to the study of the respective relief-scenes and although the student has to bear always in mind that the Egyptian artist must have probably been as keen to lay emphasis on the Egyptian victory - while carving these portrayals-as the scribe had been in quoting the respective events - irrespective of how much such an attitude would have been to the detriment of sheer historical value - we must grant it that what we have to deal with in this case of artistic endeavour can but be of considerable importance in that it is the rendering of the events in question by no less than people who must have witnessed them themselves.

Let us deal with the land battle first. One of the authorities on Sea Peoples, N.K. Sandars maintains that if the camp in Amor (Amuru), which is spoken of in the relevant inscription at Medinet Habu describing the crucial events of year 8, has been designed as a base-camp intended for the mustering and restoring of the invader's army prior to the attack on Egypt, then this attack could have happened "somewhere north of the old Egyptian province of Canaan, perhaps immediately north of Tripoli".⁸³ However, she goes on to make the point that it is hardly likely that serious Egyptian interests could have been extended so far north at that course of time and that, since Ramesses speaks of "organizing his frontier", it is likely that the fight took place near the fortresses that extended along the frontier line which lay to the east of the Nile Delta, thus protecting it as well as the rest of the mainland from any assault which was likely to emanate from that direction.⁸⁴ The battle is

portrayed as fought between the Egyptian troops - fighting in chariots - and their allies and, on the other side, the Sea Peoples, some of whom also fight in chariots each one of which nevertheless carries three of them whereas its Egyptian equivalent carries only the driver and a soldier.

The combat has all the trappings of a perfect scramble and it becomes instantly obvious that the Egyptian artist has hardly bothered to conform to any symmetry rules in carving the portrayals of people, transport vehicles, weapons and animals. Thus many human figures are disproportionately big if compared to those of the animals or those of other people involved in the scene while the situation is reversed when it comes to comparing the chariots and carts to people; they are smaller than they ought to have been although they are in proportion with the oxen or the horses attached to them. Weapons, finally - spears and swords - are disproportionately long if compared to people other than those who yield them. Charioteers and footmen are fighting in close quarters.⁸⁵ What is really worth pointing out is the presence of ox-drawn carts loaded with women and children among the ranks of the Sea Peoples, a feature suggestive of a whole people on the move, not just of an invading army. One would feel inclined to look upon these people as a group of tribes on a long trek in search of new lands to settle in. The scene also suggests that they have been attacked rather than the other way round. It looks as though they have been set upon while marching or assaulted while they were in their camp. The sort of transport used to carry the invaders' families, a two-wheeled, solid or wicker-sided cart drawn by a span of oxen yoked four abreast, is an unusual contraption, a real rarity in Anatolia and the Near East. The most common type of cart to be found in these areas is a four-wheeled vehicle drawn, by one or two pairs of oxen.⁸⁶ What explanation can possibly be put forward to explain away the riddle posed by the extra pair is that they were hitched on either side to provide the vehicle with more drawing power and higher speed as well as stability, qualities which must be quite necessary to heavy-loaded transports trekking through

what must in all probability have been unknown and hostile territories. Another reason is that the extra pair could have been attached in order that they come to the rescue by replacing the other pair in case the transport was meant to be hauled by two oxen in the first place, something that would of course make the likelihood of the original drawing oxen suffering an accident or breaking down at some stage of the ride, quite high. Finally it is more than likely that, besides all other reasons, the Sea Peoples, wished all their livestock with them - or at least those cattle that stood for their main property - since they are portrayed as emigres in search of new lands for settlement. One would perhaps not very readily endorse N.K. Sandars' view that these peoples were farmers who were dislodged and knocking about, bringing their families and cattle with them.⁸⁷ What I personally find difficult to agree with is the view that they were mostly farmers in that if they really were such, it seems really weird that they proved able to cause such havoc, as they did, to areas populated and dominated by such militant people as the Hittites, the inhabitants of Amurru, Alashiya, and others. However, she is definitely right when she maintains that they are not typical corsairs and raiders, on the grounds that the latter normally operate from a base and avoid having their families with them in as much as families and belongings could only hold them up in their operations.⁸⁸ And of course there does not seem to be serious doubt that these tribes must have been on the move in search for new lands for settlement.

A careful study of the relief makes it clear that one of the carts has three aged women in it as well as two children. A third child is falling out of the wagon. Another cart carries a Hittite-looking woman grabbing a falling boy's hands to pull him up, while a man wearing a feathered cap is wielding the oxen's bridles and another woman is standing next to him gesturing as if she is whipping the beasts to make them gallop faster. Another cart carries a fighting man and what seems to be the figure of another as well as a woman and a child, whereas another vehicle carries what seem to be the figures of two women and just as many children.

Taking into consideration the rough weather conditions and what in all probability seem to have been rutted-road ridden country side terrains that the Sea peoples must have found themselves up against, one may fall to wondering why they actually employed such a slow-moving transport beast as the ox. However, it may well be that the emigrating Sea-tribes were short of any other transport animal, or at least, of that number of animals which was necessary for drawing their carts. Of course the ox can only cover a limited number of miles per day and is always liable to sickness, bogging-down, getting wounded, and eventually to breakdowns. In view of all these short-comings, particularly of the family element in this rigorous trek, it is somewhat baffling to hear from the Egyptian writings that the emigrating, family-hindered, rigours-ridden Sea Peoples dealt so devastating a blow to the powerful kingdoms of Hatti, Amuru and Alashiya.

Turning over to the Sea-battle now, what the spectator of the respective illustration is immediately struck with is the extent of the Sea Peoples catastrophe, as it is pictured by the Egyptian artists. It is a real rout of the invading enemy by the Egyptians who no doubt notched up a glorious victory over the peoples whose invasion had hitherto spelled disaster for so many kingdoms in the Near East and the Levant. In what seems to be a frightful scrimmage covering a major part of the north wall of the Great Temple at Medinet-Habu, the Egyptian ships on the left handside and a contingent of bowmen on the right have caught the Sea-Peoples vessels in a vice, hurling arrows at them, grappling them, throwing them into perfect disarray - one of the invaders' boats has been overturned - and taking their passengers captives.⁸⁹ It looks as though the Egyptian vessels managed to surround the invaders' ships at a certain stage of the battle and that they subsequently proceeded to close in on them, showering arrows on their enemies from all directions, thus working up a state of panic and confusion to them, perhaps enhanced by the Delta waters being quite likely to have proved a serious hindrance to the Sea Peoples whose overall effort to

tack and manoeuvre their ships and their all-out challenge to beat the odds they were up against must have been gravely handicapped by the fact that they found themselves in these alien waters for the first time and that they consequently were quite unfamiliar with their secrets. The bowmen lined up on the shore in front of the symbolic, colossal figure of what must be Ramesses III were probably assigned the task of disposing of the remnants of the Sea Peoples who would manage to escape the Egyptian attack in the Nile waters and would therefore seek refuge ashore. The waters are crawling with drowning Sea Peoples and one would naturally feel inclined to ponder over the total absence of Egyptian casualties but one should remember that both the carvings and the accompanying texts were composed with a view to eulogizing Ramesses III's victory over the invaders and to providing the Egyptian people with something to boast over in a period that was hardly reminiscent of the former days of glory and pride that the Egyptian nation had so often seen. So it was natural for the Egyptian artist to disregard reason in several respects and to exaggerate the dimensions of his Pharaoh's victory in order to exalt the gallantry and patriotism of the Egyptian soldiers and, in a way, boost the morale of his compatriots at a time that such a feat was really badly needed.

Turning back again to the Sea-battle representation we notice that two of the Sea Peoples' boats are manned by men in horned helmets which are a headgear not conventionally associated with the Philistines, whereas three, including the one which has been overturned, are manned by men in the peculiar "high headgear", the ones that are generally considered as a kind of feathered crown. The Egyptian ships are four in number and three of them already have a number of captive Sea Peoples - mainly those wearing "feathered crowns", which would make them very likely to be Philistines. The rigging, superstructure and crow's-nest are identical on both the Egyptian and the Sea-Peoples' vessels. One cannot but recall the 16th century Theban wall-painting portraying a

similar, square-rigged, large sail ship that could not tack and needed rowers as well as rudders - in the form of steering oars - on the same side of the stern.⁹⁰ The Sea Peoples are armed with long swords in the Sea-battle carving, yet some have a sort of horned, dirk-like blade, reminiscent of earlier Aegean swords. At the bottom of the Sea-battle lay-out, Egyptian high-ranking officers, accompanied by bowmen and lancers, are taking Sea Peoples as captives. This latter representation is arranged in two parallel-running registers. What detail is perhaps worth singling out from the rest of the overall Sea-battle representation is the Egyptian soldier hurling grappling hooks which are hitched on the overturned Sea Peoples' boat sail which already bears an unmistakable hole, the result, in all probability, of the impact of the hooks which were probably employed either with the view to tearing the enemy's boat sail to shreds, thus rendering the ship unable to tack, or to bringing down the mast, thereby capsizing the boat which is the obvious outcome in this case. One may also note in another part of the carving, Egyptian soldiers hanging down from their ships' gunwale - two from the upper deck; another one from the lower - in an attempt to collect (two of them have already done it) Sea Peoples' soldiers who are adrift.

xv) Raw materials

The Philistines were hailed as masters of metal-working⁹¹ of which the Hittite Kings boasted and which is strengthened by the actual discovery of iron furnaces at the Philistine sites in Palestine of Tell el-Qasileh, Ain Shems and Tell Jemmeh.

xvi) Burial customs

As well as interring their dead in such constructions as are the Aegean type rock-cut chamber tombs with "dromoi" attested at Tell Farah (see above no. iii) and dating from the 13th cent., cremating the bodies was a funerary practice exercised by the Philistines as is borne out by traces of cremation at Azor and by similar ones at Hamath, dating from

the 11th cent. However, these were not these people's only burial habits. Laying the bodies in sarcophagi was another custom and the clay sarcophagi uncovered at Beth-Shan and dating at the 13th century are quite interesting since we can clearly notice bearded heads crudely modelled in relief on them. Some of these heads have a row of vertical strokes indicating perhaps the common headdress worn by Sea Peoples on the Egyptian monuments. However, it is questionable whether the latest and "grotesque group" of coffins are really wearing the "feathered" headdress of the Sea Peoples.⁹²

xvii) The overall appearance of the Peleset (Philistines) in the Egyptian reliefs at Medinet-Habu

To round off the archaeological image of the Philistines, a general, concise outline of their actual portrayal on the Egyptian reliefs will be now provided listing all the main traits of their overall appearance and thus helping integrate the picture of these people as it is afforded by the aforementioned account of the archaeological evidence.

First of all we must remember that, apart from the Meshwesh - the neighbours and allies of Libyans during Merneptah's Libyan war of the 5th year of his reign (c.1220) when we have the first recorded appearance of "northerners coming from all lands" - the Sea Peoples form one general group, at least as far as the lands, generally speaking, they come from are concerned. Thus they bear some common characteristics.⁹³ All of them, both the Peleset and the rest of the invaders' confederation, carry the circular shield with the central handle. Then again, they all wear the kilt that falls to a point in front and is generally divided into panels by a series of lines following the curve at the lower edge. This kilt is generally decorated with bunches of tassels. However the Peleset (Philistine) group has also some particular characteristics which differentiate it from some of the other Sea Peoples. The most striking is the cap with an ornamental band - which is also worn by the Denyen, the Tjekker and Shekelesh - from which a circle of feathers stands up. Though

this headgear looks indeed very much like a feathered crown, yet there are still some doubts about its nature supported by the fact that the feathers worn by the Libyans in other representations are unquestionably shown on such. Thus other suggestions for the crown involve leather, folded linen, a sort of rushes or even a special way of stiffening the hair so as to make it stand on end.⁹⁴ Around the lower part of this helmet we see either a horizontal strip with a single row of little circular projections or a horizontal strip with two similar rows of circular projections, or, sometimes, a similar strip with a row of chevrons or zigzag decoration above and a row of circular projections below. A strip with a single row of zigzag or chevron decoration is also sometimes seen. The Peleset's characteristic weapon is the pair of spears which was to be considered as such for the rest of the Sea Peoples too. However, the Peleset are in some cases seen to wield a great cutting broad-sword like that recovered from Beit Dagin very near Gaza, from a Philistine, that is, territory.⁹⁵ It is 39.5 in. (1.05 m.) long, including the tang of the hilt. On certain occasions the Peleset are seen to wield smaller, dirk-like, horned blades having strong Aegean looks. Turning now to their natural characteristics, we notice that the Peleset are all clean-shaven (something that distinguishes them sharply from the Shekelesh - Teresh, two other tribes, that is, of the invaders' coalition) except the captive prince on the northern collonade at Medinet-Habu, who is the only individual Peleset named in isolation. Turning back again to their dressing, we notice that their chests are protected by bandaging with horizontal strips, perhaps of linen, or by a ribbed corselet. In all probability this chest cover is a sort of laminated body armour.⁹⁶ On land, the Peleset fight in the Hittite manner on a chariot with crews of three, while their families follow in wooden ox-drawn peasant carts which is a specification that fits northern Syria, Anatolia, or even possibly the foothills of the Caucasus.⁹⁷ Finally, the ships of the Peleset are powered by sail only, with a central mast bearing a crow's nest, a curved keel, a high stern and prow shaped so as to look

like a duck's head. Such a ship was not unknown to Mycenaean Greeks, since it is portrayed on a LH III c (c.1200 - 1050) pot from the North Aegean island of Skyros in the northern Sporades cluster of islands.⁹⁸ As to conclude this account, we must say that the natural human type afforded to the Peleset by the Egyptian artists is that of a thin, sometimes almost emaciated frame indicative of people who have been tested by many hardships, while the overall set of their face bespeaks hard-bitten, harsh people. This picture ties in well with the rest of the elements making up their looks, that is, the ox-drawn carts loaded with their families and further corroborates the view that the Peleset, along with the rest of their allies, were more of a people on the go in an all-out bid to find new and better lands for settlement than of savage, ruthless invader who has set out to conquer whatever land they would chance upon in their long way.

B. The Traditional Literary Evidence

a) The biblical narratives

The most important direct and instructive source of information about the Philistines is the Old Testament. In fact it is a source which undoubtedly furnishes more important and clarifying information than the Egyptian records and in most cases it can be looked upon as a safe and very valuable instrument for digging up the much-sought-after and long-searched-for secrets of the overall Philistine question. A gap of 400 years separates the Ramesside inscriptions at Medinet-Habu - and of course the Sea Peoples invasion into Egypt - from the earliest biblical reference to the Philistines. "Did I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?"⁹⁹ This is the most important information concerning the Philistines origin and has raised more discussion and controversy¹⁰⁰ than any other statement concerning the extraction of these people. The same information occurs also in the reference in Jeremiah, written

about 600 B.C., to the Philistines as "a remnant of the coastland of Caphtor".¹⁰¹ There, a prophecy against the Philistines declares that Yahweh "destroyeth the Philistines, the remainder of the sea-shore (or isle) of Caphtor". A similar reference in Ezekiel only repeats the connection of the Philistines with Caphtor.¹⁰² The name "Caphtor" recurs in cuneiform documents on "Kaptara" (in late tablets referring back to Sargon of Akkad - c.2370 B.C. - also in the Mari archives - 18th century B.C. - and later at Ugarit in Akkadian and in the epics), and in all probability, is identifiable with Egyptian Keftiu. I reserve further discussion of the whole case for a later stage, dealing with the evidence for relations between Philistines and Minoans (See Second Part of this chapter). Resuming our survey, we notice that according to Genesis¹⁰³ the Philistines came from Casluhim whose "father was Egypt". It is interesting that the Philistines are here derived from the shadowy Casluhim rather than the Caphtorim, although, as Kitchen¹⁰⁴ says, "one may infer that the latter and the Philistines at least belong to the same general horizon".¹⁰⁵ In other references to them, the Philistines are associated with the Cherethites and Pelethites, so that it is possible that the Pelethites may be Philistines. There was a "Negev" of the Cherethites (or "Kerithites") that may have been somewhere in the hinterland of Gaza.¹⁰⁶ If so, Negev seems to have been located at the same area as, or - at any rate - very near to, Avvim's territory, an area which is something of a problem in as much as its precise whereabouts and its inhabitants' connexion to the overall Philistine question have not hitherto been explained away. Avvim seems to have been somewhere south from Gaza, at any rate, yet whatever other reference to it should still be treated for what it is worth.¹⁰⁷ "Cherethites" later served as a poetic synonym for Philistines¹⁰⁸ or was very closely connected with them. "Woe" cries Zephaniah "to the people of the sea-coast, the folk of the Kerethim! The word of Yahweh is against thee, O Canaan, land of the Philistines, and I shall destroy thee that thou shalt have no inhabitants. And Kereth shall be dwellings for shepherds and fold for flocks".¹⁰⁹

By Ezekiel, too, the Philistines and the Kerethim or Kerethites are involved in a common denunciation. (see n. 102) Elsewhere the Cherethites are mentioned as mercenaries of King David with the "Peleth" or "Pelethites" who may simply be Philistines, the terms Pelethi - Pelethites having perhaps been concocted "in order to produce an assonance between the names".¹¹⁰ Elsewhere it is made quite clear that both Pelethites and Cherethites were Israelite subjects during David's reign and were commanded by high-ranking officers loyal to, and appointed by, him.¹¹¹ There is a close, unmistakable connexion between the Philistines and Caphtor, something which is already evident in the aforementioned references from Amos 9.7, Jeremiah 47.4, Ezekiel 25.16. The Caphtorim are said to have come from Caphtor and to have destroyed the Avvim "who lived in villages as far as Gaza", after which feat they are reported to have settled in the latter peoples' territories.¹¹² So, since both the Philistines and the Caphtorim are said to have come from Caphtor, they can be legitimately considered to either have been entities of the same stock or have come to Palestine from Caphtor but not originated there. It is interesting to note here that at the late stages of Joshua's reign, the Avvim were still to be conquered; so were the Philistines whose all five cities are named and each one is said to be under individual rule;¹¹³ Avvim are again, in this passage, said to be "in the south". So, does that mean that by the time the Caphtorim came from Caphtor and supplanted the Avvim, the Philistines were already settled in Palestine? If such a concession is made we can only perceive a chronological discrepancy between the time of settlement of the Philistines in Palestine and that of the Caphtorim. However, the biblical narrative is not to be fully trusted when it comes to chronological appraisals. It is quite likely that by the time the Philistines and the Caphtorim settled in Palestine - something that resulted in the dislodgement of the Avvim from their territories by the Caphtorim - the Avvim land had come to be sanctioned as such by customary and long-time reference to it as the land of its original inhabitants, the Avvim, that is. So, even after the

Caphtorim settled there the Israelites might have kept referring to it as the "land of the Avvim" which of course had to be conquered as well as the rest of the Philistine territory. Of course the likelihood of the Philistines having settled in Palestine at a different time from that of the Caphtorim settlement there can by no means be ruled out. Another likely development which can be put forward to match Deut. 2.23 with Josh. 13.3 is the one that would have the Philistines and/or the Caphtorim conquer the Avvim territories a certain while after they settled in Palestine in which case we can take Josh. 13.3 to refer at exactly the time which intervened between these tribes' original settlement in Palestine and the action they took against the Avvim which resulted in the latter tribe's displacement from their territories. Talking about the Caphtorim, there is one more point that has to be made because of the bearing it has on the overall case. The word "Kaptor" remains in Hebrew as a curious vestige that by the time of Exodus¹¹⁴ had come to mean for the Hebrews, borrowing it - in all probability - from the Phoenicians, an ornament perhaps in the form of a lily-flower or palmetto, presumably originally of Aegean (Minoan) origin.¹¹⁵

Let us now turn to an interesting point made by Kitchen¹¹⁶ and based on biblical sources. As external sources so far attest Philistine presence only from c.1200 B.C. and in the O.T. the earliest narrative references to the term "Philistines" turn up in Genesis¹¹⁷, that is, in passages concerned with the Hebrew patriarchs who no doubt must long precede c.1200,¹¹⁸ these early allusions have often been thought of as anachronisms. However, says Kitchen, the Philistines of Genesis do not bear the characteristics of those attested from c.1200 onwards. Those in Genesis live around Gerar and under just one king, not in the "pentapolis" under their five lords ("seranim"); they are not a warlike people and are strongly reminiscent of the Caphtorim of Deuteronomy 2.23 who came, like the Philistines, to Canaan

from Caphtor. The early term "Philistines" which occurs in Genesis may rather be, according to the same scholar, a thirteenth to twelfth century term used of an earlier Aegean group - such as the Caphtorim might have been - by the narrator. Thus, concludes Kitchen, the Genesis references would indicate Aegean contacts with "Patriarchal" - maybe Middle Bronze Age - Palestine, and suggest a further use of the term "Philistine" for Aegean peoples apart from the "Plst" of the Egyptians. Actually the evidence available nowadays, attests Aegean contacts with Canaan and the Levant as early as the Middle Bronze Age. The Mari archives have the King of Hazor send gifts to Kaptara¹¹⁹ while Middle Minoan II pottery (c.1900 - 1700, that is, "Patriarchal" times in biblical terms) was found at Hazor and Ugarit.¹²⁰ In Middle Kingdom Egypt, Middle Minoan Kamares pottery has been recovered from Cahun, Harageh, Abydos and Minoan Silverware from Tod¹²¹ and finally the mixture of names of both semitic and non-semitic origin in Genesis¹²² illustrates assimilation of aliens to a cultural framework with apparently semitic characteristics. The story in Genesis¹²³ concerning Abraham and the Philistines has it that Abraham deceived Abimelech, the Philistine King of Gerar, into believing that his wife, Sarah was his sister, this being a trick Abraham was keen on employing out of fear that he could be killed in his wanderings by any potential rivals as well as out of desire to be done well to by any likely suitors.¹²⁴ So, when Abimelech, who had taken Sarah to live with him when Abraham settled in Gerar - believing she was the latter's sister - discovered the truth through a dream, restored her to her husband and bestowed silver cattle and slaves to Abraham out of fear that a different attitude of his might induce God's wrath against him, the case being that he already knew, through the aforementioned dream, of Abraham's prophet status and of the terrible fate that would befall him should he not restore Sarah to her husband. Actually Abimelech's house was already in trouble because of the temporary stay of Sarah with him, for the women in it could by no means bear children as a result of the sin committed by the King. This "plague" was removed when Abraham got his wife back.

In another passage,¹²⁵ Abraham, who had been granted the right to sojourn in Philistine land - a privilege bestowed on him in Abimelech's attempt to appease God over Sarah's temporary removal from Abraham - and Abimelech were mutually plighted to two covenants, one being that they, and their posterity, would be in peaceful terms and the other being that a well was mutually agreed to rightfully belong to Abraham, as it had been dug by him in the first place.

A quite similar story, this time involving Isaac, his wife Rebekah and Abimelech is repeated in a later passage¹²⁶ where Isaac is urged by the Lord to sojourn in Gerar during which stay he passed off his wife as his sister out of the same reasons that urged his father, Abraham to do likewise. Abimelech reacted just as he had done in Abraham's case, upon knowing the truth. Later on, when Isaac prospered a lot, Abimelech asked him to leave Gerar, fearing his wealth and might. Isaac dwelt in the nearby valley and dug again the wells which Abraham had dug in his days and which the Philistines had filled with earth. There were arguments between Isaac's servants and the Philistine herdsmen of Gerar over the ownership and appropriation of two wells¹²⁷ but not over a third one which was finally appropriated by the Israelites. Eventually Abimelech, Ahuzzah his adviser and Phicol, the commander of his army on one hand and Isaac on the other were mutually bound to a covenant aiming at keeping Israelites and Philistines in peace.¹²⁸

Proceeding with listing and examining the evidence from the biblical narratives, we should deal a little more with the reference to the Cherethites and Pelethi or Pelethites being mercenaries of King David, a correlation that, as already stated, might mean a lot in view of the "Pelethites' being, in this case, another appellation for Philistines (see above). The obvious connection, if such an identification is conceded (Pelethites - Philistines), is between Cherethites and Philistines. It is highly possible that south of Gaza, which

was one of the major five Philistine cities, was a Cretan settlement¹²⁹ and that the Cherethites who were employed by David as mercenaries were Cretans, the inhabitants of the biblical Negev, which in the O.T. can be made out to be somewhere in the vicinity of Gaza, through the following scheme of correlations: The Avvim are said to have been inhabiting territories which spread as far as Gaza, in Deut. 2.23 and the Caphtorim are said in *ibid.* to have dislodged them and settled in their "stead"; now the Caphtorim are said to have come from Caphtor in this narrative and Caphtor is, in all probability, the island of Crete, as it will be argued in the second part of this chapter and as scholarly research widely accepts nowadays; consequently the Caphtorim could have been Cretans, a term that could quite reasonably be rendered as "Cherethim" or "Cherethites" in Hebrew. It follows that, if the Caphtorim were the so-called Cherethites who dwelt in their Negev (see I. Samuel 30.14), then this land, the Negev of the Cherethites, that is, must be geographically established as being in the same territory as that of the land of the Caphtorim, that is, somewhere in the major Gaza area; this conclusion is helped by the discovery, south of the city, of a group of Minoan seals, already slated, which points to this area's affinities to Minoan activity; so it is very likely that the Cherethites who were employed as King David's royal bodyguard were Cretans and that the Pelethites - most probably Philistines - who were so closely connected with them had also strong Minoan affinities an inference that is corroborated by, among other things, the clear-cut biblical references to them having close connections with Caphtor. Thus, there is an unmistakable, very close connection between "Kerethi" or "Cherethites", "Chaptorim" and "Philistines". Hebrew "K(e)reti-u-p(e)leti", that is, "Cherethites and Pelethites" is the common designation for David's favourite bodyguard. Albright makes an interesting point¹³⁰ by saying that, since the Lucianic recession of the Septuagint (known from Qumran cave 4 to be exceptionally reliable) offers a reading "pheltei", we may be justified in treating the expression as a typical semitic hendiadys, in which case the second word in the

overall designation, that is "pelti" (standing for "Pelethites") might be of the same Aegean origin as that of later Greek "Pelte", which means "light shield". From the same root comes "peltastes", that is, "light-armed warriors". It is the term used by later Greeks of troops only armed with bows and light shields who never engaged in cut-and-thrust-combat but were only used to throw the enemy into confusion by showering arrows on them. The Cretans were hailed as good archers in classical times. So, this interpretation of the word "p(e)leti" ties in well with the rest of the evidence suggesting an indisputable Minoan background for the Philistines. Additionally the name "Kerethi" is translated as "Cretans" in the Greek version of the passages from Zephahiah 2.5 and Ezekiel 25.16, referred to above. It is also a fact that in classical era the inhabitants of the Palestinian coast were certainly of the opinion that they were of Cretan origin an idea that was generally accepted by the rest of the world. We find it in Tacitus although he confuses the Jews with the Philistines. Gaza was called Minoa in Roman times and its god Marnas ("Our Lord") was considered to be the same as Zeus "Kretagenes" ("Cretan-born") or "Velchanos", that is, the Minoan Zeus of the double-axe who is of Carian extraction and was adopted by the Minoans.

b) The Ramessidic Records

The Philistines have been identified as the "Peleset" (Plst or Prst) of the Egyptian records by modern scholarly research, that is, with one of the main tribes of the so-called "Sea Peoples" confederacy who seemed to have caused widespread havoc throughout large areas of Anatolia and the Levant at the end of the 13th and the outset of the 12th cent. It is the Egyptian texts of those times, specifically those of the time of the Pharaohs' Merneptah and Ramesses III (c.1194 - 1162)¹³¹, that furnish the bulk of information about those raids and the overall Sea Peoples' involvement in them with particular, as is natural, reference and emphasis on the role of Egypt in the eventual suppression of the menace.¹³²

Following is an account of the Egyptian literary sources speaking of the "Great Land and Sea Raids" - which involve the Philistines - and dating from the year 8 (c.1186) of Ramesses III. The fact that almost all the records suffer from an unmistakable, highly-diffused bombastic spirit and that not all of them include nominal references to Philistines had to be disregarded in listing these documents in order that the knowledge affordable by them is as useful as their nature permits it to be. An account of the events associated with the first attack of the foreigners confederation against Merneptah's Egypt will also be given in a form of a digest, after rounding-off the listing of the Ramessidic records bearing on the Philistine's appearance and activities, in order that some link might be hopefully established between the two big allied raids and their implications.

The Peleset occur as an entity in the following Egyptian records:

a) Inscriptions set up by Pharaoh Ramesses III at his Great Temple at Medinet Habu (Thebes). They refer to year 8 of this Pharaoh's reign, that is, c.1186, which is the year to which most Egyptologists nowadays attribute the events that are commonly called the "Great Land and Sea Raids" and involve the Philistines as a prominent tribe of the alien confederacy that menaced Egypt. Before embarking on the task of quoting the relevant texts it should once more be reminded that these inscriptions were composed with a view, above all, to exalting Ramesses victory over the foreigners - hence the almost purely panegyric and pompous style they exhibit - and that, consequently, allowances have to be made for a good deal of distortion of the actual historical details of these events. Nevertheless they still are an indispensable source of information furnishing, no doubt, primary and illuminating knowledge of matters which could not be otherwise accounted for. Here is the line-up of the relevant quotations:

I) "...As for the foreign countries they made a conspiracy in their islands. All at once the lands (i.e. the people) were on the move, scattered in war. No country could stand before their arms. Hatti, Kode (Kizzuwatna, that is, Cilicia), Carchemish, Arzawa, and Alashiya. They were cut-off. A camp was set up in one place in Amor (Amurru). They desolated its people and its land was like that which has never come into being. They were advancing on Egypt while the flame¹³³ was prepared before them. Their league was Peleset¹³⁴, Tjekker, Shekelesh, Denyen, and Weshesh, united lands (i.e. people). They laid their hands upon the lands to the very circuit of the earth, their hearts confident and trusting: "Our plans will succeed."¹³⁵

II) Pharaoh boasts: "My strong army has overthrown (those) who came to exalt themselves; the Peleset,¹³⁶ the Denyen, and the Shekelesh". (This is an inscription no doubt, referring to the aftermath of the battle. There are representations portraying captive Sea Peoples being presented to the gods Amon and Mut by Pharaoh. They are arranged in three registers, the upper one, according to the accompanying inscription, are "leaders of every country", the middle ones are the "fallen ones of Denyen", and the bottom are also "fallen ones of Peleset").¹³⁷

III) There is a repetition of the account of the same events under the inscription for year 5 of Ramesses III (c.1189). The inscription is primarily concerned with the first Libyan war of Ramesses III, in which northerners do not seem to have been involved, a view shared by most authorities on the Sea Peoples, so the later part must refer to year 8.¹³⁸

"...The northern countries quivered in their bodies, namely the Peleset, the Tjekker (?)...They were cut off from their land and coming, their spirit broken. They were Teher¹³⁹ on land. Another group was on the sea. Those who came on land were overthrown and slaughtered. Amon-ra was after them

destroying them. Those who entered the river mouths (The Nile Delta) were like birds ensnared in the net...their leaders were carried off and slain. They were thrown down and pinioned..."

IV) Another inscription quoting the events of year 8 relates the following in regard to the preparations made by Ramesses with a view to beating off the incoming menace:

"I organized my frontier in Djahi¹⁴⁰ (I) prepared before them: princes, commanders of garrisons, maryannu,¹⁴¹ I caused the river mouth¹⁴² to be prepared like a strong wall with warships, transport and merchant-men, they were manned entirely from bow to stern with brave fighting men, and their weapons. The troops consisted of every picked man of Egypt, they were like lions roaring on the mountain tops. The chariotry consisted of runners, of picked men, of every good and capable chariot-fighter...as for those who reached my frontier their seed is not, their heart and their soul are finished for ever."¹⁴³

V) The year 8 inscription goes on to describe the sea-borne invasion:

"As for those who came together on the sea, the full flame was in front of them at the river mouths, while a stockade of lances surrounded them on the shore (or "canal"). They were dragged ashore, hemmed in and flung down on the beach (another reading could be: "They were grappled, capsized, laid out on the shore dead"), their ships made heaps from stern to prow and their goods..."¹⁴⁴

VI) The same inscription goes on to give a supplementary account of the sea-battle:

"Now the northern countries (i.e. "people") which were in their islands were quivering in their bodies. They penetrated the channels of the river mouths (the Nile Delta). They struggle for breath, their nostrils cease. His Majesty is gone

out like a whirlwind against them fighting on the battlefield like a runner, the dread of him and the terror have entered their bodies, they are capsized and overwhelmed where they are. Their heart is taken away and their soul is flown away, their weapons are scattered upon the sea. His arrow pierces whom he wishes, and the fugitive is a drowned man..."145

VII) The aftermath of battle is a parade of captive Sea Peoples led by Ramesses who presents them to the Gods Amon and Mut. They are lined up in three registers, the upper line being "leaders of every country", the middle one showing "the fallen ones of Denyen" and the bottom depicting "the fallen ones of Peleset". All wear the high "feathered" headgear and identical kilts fringed with tassels. Over the middle is written:

'Words spoken by the fallen ones of Denyen, "Breath thou good ruler, great of strength like Montu in the midst of Thebes"'. .

And over the bottom line: Words spoken by the fallen ones of Peleset, "Give us the breath for our nostrils thou King, son of Amon"'. .

On another relief, portraying the "fallen ones" of Tjekker, the inscription reads: "O mighty King...greater is thy sword than a mountain of metal...Give to us breath"..

b) An historical stela of Ramesses III from Deir el Medineh. On this record is stated, in form of an inscription, that "Ramesses has trampled down the foreign countries, the Isles who sailed over (or "against") his (boundaries?)...(gap) the Peleset and Turshe (Teresh) (coming?) from the midst of the sea".146

c) The Papyrus Harris. This papyrus is the longest extant papyrus writing referring to Egypt's early history. It was presumably composed at, or just after, the death of Ramesses III and gives a flattering account of his reign. It ends with a retrospective view of his victories. The account given of the wars with the Sea Peoples does not quite agree with the Medinet Habu inscriptions, naming Shardana among his enemies 147 instead of Shekelesh, who are an entry in the Medinet Habu quotation. Says the relevant quotation:

I) "I extended all the boundaries of Egypt. I overthrew those who invaded them from their lands. I slew the Denyen (who are) in their isles, the Tjekker and the Peleset were made ashes. The Shardana 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 store-houses and granaries each year".148

II) The narrative proceeds to give an account of a Ramesses' victory over the Shashu people from Edom who were living in tents with their livestock:

"I gave them to the gods as slaves in their houses".149

III) A citation of an account of some of Ramesses national welfare deeds might be useful in that the Shardana, one of the tribes of the Sea Peoples' confederacy, are referred to in the narrative:

"I made the infantry and chariotry to dwell (at home) in my time; the Shardana and Kehek were in their towns, lying the length of their backs; they had no fear, for there was no enemy from Kush (nor) foe from Syria. Their bows and their weapons were laid up in their magazines, while they were satisfied and drunk with joy. Their wives were with them, their children at their side (for) I was with them as the defence and protection of the limbs."150

These are the Egyptian records bearing upon the Philistine question as viewed by Ramessidic scribes. Despite the fact that the information afforded by them does not comprise very illuminating clues, it is equally obvious that they point to a trans-Mediterranean origin for this tribe as well as for the rest of the alliance. The record which, most of all specifies the Peleset as "of the sea" is the historical stela of Ramesses III from Deir el Medineh, already quoted. There there is a double connexion of the Philistines with the sea. The first considers them, along with the Teresh - another tribe of the attacker's confederacy - as being "the isles who sailed over (or "against") his (Ramesses', that is) boundaries", thus giving one the impression that the Egyptians considered them as islanders who set off from their islands with a view to overrunning other countries; the other connexion has the Philistines and the Teresh associated with the "midst of the sea". The Peleset are here linked with the Teresh who were probably from the Anatolian coast land. The Egyptians looked on all the attackers as "Peoples of the Sea" and did not make clear-cut distinctions between them, to judge from these raiders' overall appearance and the tactics, intentions, equipment and appendages attributed to them in their Medinet Habu portrayals. However, there is a detail in this particular inscription on the Deir el Medineh stela which has not been given proper consideration and which may well provide a very useful clue to the overall problem. It is the very phrase "from the midst of the sea". Who can definitely deny the probability that the Egyptian scribe had in mind, when writing this phrase, that the Peleset and the Teresh had actually come from a land which literally was in the middle of the sea? And who can contend that the best-known sea to the Egyptians was other than the Mediterranean? Both the literary and the archaeological records bear witness to highly developed sea-faring activities of the Egyptians as far as many coasts of the Mediterranean.¹⁵¹ And if we assume, as is most natural, that the "sea" in question is the Mediterranean, we must then look for a land roughly in "the midst" of it, that is, for a land

lying half-way (no doubt, roughly) between north-eastern Africa, that is, Egypt, and the south-eastern tip of Europe, that is, Greece. Now it is easy to go on and claim that such a land can most probably be Crete which would quite legitimately figure, in the Egyptian eyes, as being in "the midst of the sea". Of course one should not go so far as to say that it was definitely the island of Crete that the Egyptian scribe was implying when carving this phrase. However, this survey holds that such a possibility is very strong and should be given priority over many others in view of the advantages it carries. And it is to these advantages we are now turning in an attempt to lend credibility to the aforementioned statement in favour of Crete's highly likely nomination for the land which lay in "the midst of the sea", as far as the Egyptian geographical conceptions are concerned. The inscription on the tomb-wall of Rekhmara, governor of Upper Egypt under Pharaoh Thutmose III, refers to a delegation from the land of Keftiu and other obviously neighbouring lands, and reads as follows: "The Coming in Peace of the Great Ones of Keftiu and of the Isles in the Midst of the Sea". The envoys in question are depicted bearing the same physical type as that of the Minoans and stringing out in a procession while carrying their tribute. Thus, these people are none other than Minoan tributaries who, along with their equals from countries which must reasonably be seen as belonging to the same administrative, cultural and tribal (the anthropological type given is one and only) framework, came to Egypt from Minoan Crete and other areas within the Minoan sphere of influence, something which ties well with the evidence for the various Minoan connexions and their overall impact on other areas, afforded by both archaeological and literary records.¹⁵² The point that is important par excellence is that the areas from which the envoys are said to have come are referred to as the "Isles in the Midst of the Sea", thus providing the same couple of low profile particulars as those employed by the Deir el Medineh inscription in its reference to the Philistines and Teresh. Both these tribes are said to be "Isles" who came (or "are" or "attacked") "from the Midst of the Sea". Now, since the Rekhmara inscription dates from an earlier period than the reign

of Ramesses III, in fact from the period c.1500 - 1400 and, to be more precise, from the first half of the 15th century¹⁵³, we may well assume that the idea that the lands of Keftiu were "in the midst of the Sea" had most probably become a common belief in the 12th century Egypt, at least common enough to vindicate this century's scribes thinking that the "Isles" or "Lands in the midst of the Sea" could not be other than the Keftiu ones, that is, Minoan Crete and its contiguous areas. It could be argued then that the Peleset and Teresh who are associated with the Isles in the midst of the sea in the Deir el Medineh inscription, must, in all probability, be connected with the lands of Keftiu, that is, with Minoan Crete and its adjacent areas. Of course the geographical conceptions of the Egyptians and their observance of historical accuracy, when it comes to recording events involving other peoples and/or putting their country's pride at stake, are not so highly-rated as to render them trustworthy in these cases. Even if the scribe really had Crete in mind when carving the phrase in question on the Deir el Medineh inscription, we are not obliged to accept this very island as the land of origin of the Peleset and the Teresh. They might simply had come to the Levant via Crete. And, to cover every probability, it might well have been Cyprus that is implied in the case in question or even, less plausibly (in view of the existing evidence) Sicily or Sardinia, all of which would probably seem to be somewhere "in the midst of the Sea" to the Egyptians. Yet Crete, in the light of the aforementioned evidence being more explicit than any other linking other areas with the "midst of the Sea", seems to stand out as of some special importance and as the likeliest candidate.

The Peleset are never named apart from some one or other attacker in the Egyptian passages. However there are two representations portraying them exclusively. One depicts an individual Peleset who is a bearded captive prince, one of the prisoners of Ramesses III, and can be seen on the northern colonnade of Medinet Habu.¹⁵⁴ The other representation, also to be seen in Medinet Habu, depicts a line of captive Sea

Peoples over which an inscription reads "Words spoken by the fallen ones of Peleset: "Give us the breath for our nostrils thou King, son of Amon"".155 Nothing more is heard of the Peleset apart from the Papyrus Harris which states that Ramesses III used Peleset along with Shardana, Washesh, Denyen, and Tjeker (see above) as garrison forces and mercenaries.156 Peleset are unknown to the Hittites, this name being absent from the Hittite texts. It is not unlikely that they were familiar to them, but if so, they must have been known by a different name.

A brief account of the first Northerners' attack against Egypt during Pharaoh Merneptah's reign during the late stages of the 13th century will now follow in an attempt to establish a perspectival view of the two north-extracted, leagued thrusts against the much-coveted Egyptian lands, whereby some common external as well as intrinsic traits of the two invasions and their protagonists might be perceived.

It was in year 5 (c.1220) of the middle-aged Pharaoh Merneptah that a powerful foray by the Libyans under their King Meryry and their allies coming from the western desert tested Egypt's military potential as well as prestige to a good extent. However Merneptah averted the crisis in a desert-staged, vicious battle which eventually spelled doom for the invaders. The Libyans and their allies were routed, the spoil was huge and the victorious Pharaoh could boast of a glorious victory which his scribes took prompt action to record in the usual bombastic Egyptian manner. Inscriptions at Karnak furnish the relevant information.157 It is interesting to note that we have again here the case of an invasion with a view to settling down, not just inroads with the purpose of looting. It is made clear in the inscriptions that the Libyan King brought his entire family, his valuables and his livestock and so most probably had done the majority, if not all, of the invading force. With the Libyans and their neighbours, the Meshwesh, came a number of allies who are said to be of

northern extraction. The Sherden or Shardana, the Lukka, the Ekwesh (Egyptian Ikws'), the Teresh (Trs) and the Shekelesh (Skrs). Of these only the Ekwesh will engage the interest of this survey, as they seem to be the tribe with more likely connexions with the Philistines than the rest of the above line-up seem to have.

The Ekwesh were not heard of before in any Egyptian records and, in this occasion, seem to have been the largest contingent of the northerners - who are said to have come from the "Countries of the Sea" - judging from the high number of them captured by the Egyptians that is, 2201, as opposed to 742 captive Teresh and 222 Shekelesh. The Ekwesh, by virtue of the linguistic connexion conceded between their name and that of the Homeric Achaeans, have been associated with the Ahhiyawa of the Hittite texts, usually identified with the Homeric Achaeans who sailed over to Asia Minor to attack Troy. There are Hittite records making reference to Mycenaean world or the Ahhiyawa, such as the controversial Maduwattas Indictment, known after the name of a rebellious Hittite subject - where there are recurrent references to conditions and events denoting Mycenaean connexions - and the Tawagalawas Letter, addressed to an unnamed Hittite king, probably Muwatilis, dating from the 13th century and referring to Lukka pirates, Milawanda (Miletus), the practice of chariotry and the Ahhiyawa.¹⁵⁸ If a connexion between the Homeric Achaeans and the Ahhiyawa of the Hittite texts is granted - something that is almost a habit in modern era - and in turn, with the Ekwesh in the Egyptian texts of Merneptah's year 5, it is a bit strange that the latter, in view of their presumed Indo-european extraction, are made out by the Egyptian texts to be circumcised. One inscription, the Athribis stela, refers only to the Ekwesh as "of the Countries of the Sea". However in the Great Karnak inscription, Shardana, Ekwesh and Shekelesh are all said to have come from the "Countries of the Sea".

Though the date of certain of the Hittite archives making references to Ahhiyawa is not easy to establish and therefore renders it difficult to associate these references with the Mycenaean world, yet the information furnished is really valuable and can in no case be dispensed with. We learn from these texts that there was a time that the Ahhiyawa lord was held in such high esteem by his Hittite equivalent that the latter actually considered marrying a lady of the Ahhiyawa royal family. The two royal houses still held each other in mutual respect in the second half of the 14th century as can be clearly inferred from another document of that time stating that the gods of Ahhiyawa and of Lazpa - perhaps the Aegean island of Lesbos - were summoned to heal the suffering Hittite King Mursilis II. There are occasions when correspondence connects Ahhiyawa with Milawanda (Miletus in Asia Minor). The aforementioned Tawagalawas Letter, addressed to an unnamed Hittite king, perhaps Muwatalis (1306 - 1282) refers to a former Hittite subject now turned buccaneer, operating from a base at Milawanda and raiding the Lukka Lands which were somewhere between the Hittite country and an Ahhiyawa-dominated Miletus. In later documents it is stated that the envoy of the Hittite King to Ahhiyawa was a very distinguished person who had "ridden in the chariot" with the Hittite King himself and with the King of Ahhiyawa's brother, during the latter's visit to the Hittite court. In another text a vessel of Ahhiyawa seems ready to set sail for a Syrian port. It looks as though there is a close connection between Ahhiyawa, the Lukka Lands and Miletus, corroborated by their mutual concern with buccaneers, piracy and sea-faring activities. This situation ties in quite well with that appearing in the Egyptian records of Merneptah's year 5 (c.1220) and presenting both the Ekwesh and the Lukka as members of the same confederation; in view of the Lukka appearing to have had links with both Ahhiyawa and Ekwesh as can be inferred from the aforementioned Hittite and Egyptian documents, we can perceive a possible connection between Egyptian Ekwesh and Hittite Ahhiyawa. Regions which have been seen as likely candidates for the "Land of Ahhiyawa" are

western coastal Anatolia near Miletus, the major Troad area (the theatre of military operations during Trojan War), Mainland Greece, Rhodes and one of the largest islands in South Aegean, perhaps Crete (see chapter two).¹⁵⁹ Whatever "canvas" we choose to lay out the Ahhiyawa pattern upon, it is certain that their people were a considerable sea-power with frequent contacts with coastal Anatolia and of enough prestige at one time to claim equal status with no less than the Hittite King himself. There are linguistic objections to the traditional direct identification of Ahhiyawa and Homer's Achaeans, and one of the authorities on the Sea Peoples, N.K. Sandars propounds that the name Ahhiyawa might have carried different meanings to the Hittites at different stages of their history, "just as Keftui changed its meaning for the Egyptians, and later still Ionia and the Ionians".¹⁶⁰ So, it is likely, she continues, that Ahhiyawa may have referred to all the Mycenaeans known to the Hittites, or only certain Mycenaean strongholds in Western Anatolia, something that would allow one to envisage the Ekweš, granted a connexion between them and Ahhiyawa, as having come to Egypt either from Western Anatolia or from one of the Aegean islands, or from mainland Greece.¹⁶¹ Apart from the Shardana and the Lukka, the rest of the "northerners" have names with the same termination, thus making the late G.A. Wainwright think that this may well afford the whole group strong links with western coastal Anatolia.¹⁶² All considered, there remains the impression that the Ekweš on one hand - who are not at all unlikely to have had strong connexions with the Hittite Ahhiyawa and, in turn, with the Homeric Achaeans, that is the Mycenaeans who were one of the main sea-faring powers in the Aegean at the time of the relevant Hittite texts - and the Philistines on the other - whose material culture has so many unmistakable Mycenaean characteristics and who are connected by primary Egyptian and biblical sources with Caphtor and Keftiu, that is, an area, which in all probability is to be found in the Aegean, preferably in the case of Crete (see above) - seem to have some common points; these, though they surely must be considered for whatever it is worth, seem to be stronger than

those potentially linking the Philistines with any other tribe of the confederation that menaced Egypt at the year 5 of Pharaoh Merneptah (c.1220).

c) The Hittite texts speaking of events potentially related to Sea Peoples' activities and the Ugaritic correspondence referring to sustained offensive against the Hittite country, the state of Ugarit and the island of Alashiya at the time of the Kingdom of Ugarit's last days and its final destruction.

The royal state of Ugarit is attested as having been destroyed at c.1200 by what the majority of scholars hold to have been fierce, hostile action;¹⁶³ it was under the ingenious policy of King Niqmad II, who had entered the confederacy of the Hittites' allies and recognized the supremacy of the Great King of Hatti, that Ugarit enjoyed a period of high prosperity which culminated in the city becoming one of the largest and richest capitals of the ancient Near East in the 13th century. Niqmad II's pro-Hittite policy brought about a considerable territorial expansion of the Ugaritic dominion at the expense of the defeated Mukish.¹⁶⁴ The Pro-Hittite policy and Ugarit's subordination to the Hittite Kingdom continued until the final days of the city. It was under King Hammurabi that the state of Ugarit suffered a devastating catastrophe at the peak of its prosperity, only to lie in ruins and to be totally abandoned for thirty-one centuries.

In view of Egypt and the majority of Anatolian, Syrian and Palestinian sites having been beset by a series of troubles and disasters late in the 13th century and early in the 12th, that is, at the time of the Sea Peoples' appearance and catastrophic action during their southward thrust all the way to Egypt, it is a general view nowadays that Ugarit, like many other sites in Anatolia, Syria, Palestine and Cyprus, is very likely to have been destroyed by the coalition of southward-migrating Sea Peoples. It looks as though it all started when the Hittite Empire was distressed by a series of internal harassments which must, in all probability, have triggered off the process of its

collapse. A Hittite text, probably of the last Hittite King, Suppiluliumas II, records the King's complaints over his being left stranded in the town of Alatarma when military operations against an unknown enemy seemingly reached a crux.¹⁶⁵ Apart from the Hittite Empire - which seems to have crumbled under the climactic pressure of concerted internal factors such as defection by the army and the vassal states, the King's most trustworthy men having been taken captive or getting killed, the king's desertion by the nobles, his being laid low with some illness or his being away on a long campaign¹⁶⁶ as well as by what must have been a devastating Sea Peoples attack which probably dealt the Hittite empire the coup de grace - other sites too suffered catastrophes at that time; they include Troy VIIA¹⁶⁷, Tarsus in Cilicia¹⁶⁸ - where intrusive pottery of an early LHIIIC type was found above a burnt layer - Carchemish, Alalah, Qatna, Qadesh, Hazor, Lachish¹⁶⁹, Ashdod¹⁷⁰ - where the Late Bronze II, Level XIV city was destroyed by fire and the succeeding Ashdod XIII, particularly the later XIII A phase, yielded a lot of Philistine pottery - Beth Shan¹⁷¹ - where the Canaanite (Late Bronze II) level VII city was destroyed only to be succeeded by the level VI city bearing the same layout and an inscription of the Great Steward of Ramesses III¹⁷², Deir Alla¹⁷³ - destroyed by an earthquake shortly after 1200, as is suggested by the discovery of a Tausert¹⁷⁴ cartouche - bearing faience vase on the earthquake damaged floor¹⁷⁵, as well as attested as having yielded Philistine pottery after its reconstruction and re-occupation; and Cyprus¹⁷⁶ - where during the years spanning the time from c.1200 to c.1050 climactic changes affecting the islands' patterns of life and cultural activity took place¹⁷⁷ with the three destructions at the city of Enkomi standing out as major landmarks at that stage of the island's history, the first involving the Late Cypriot IIC (level VI, late 13th century) fortification wall, whose fall occurred when LHIIIB pottery (13th cent.) was still in use, the second marking the transition from Late IIIA to B (early 12th cent.) and the third being perhaps the result of an inrush of Aegean population in the 11th century.¹⁷⁸

It was within exactly this context of the late 13th - early 12th century series of destructions and overall unrest that the royal correspondence between the King of Ugarit and that of Alashiya provides a tantalizing, if patchy, yet quite exciting, close-up view of the events that brought Ugarit's cultural progress and overall historical development to a complete halt as well as spelled disaster for part of the island of Cyprus. It seems quite clear that the "enemy" who plagues the Ugaritic and Cypriot Kings and is repeatedly referred to in these letters was a sea-borne raider and must have formed a separate contingent operating in the coastal regions, quite independently of the land-power that was sweeping its way southwards from the Hittite Kingdom all the way to the Egyptian border.¹⁷⁹

It seems fit to start off citing the relevant texts by quoting one from Boghazkoy in which Suppiluliumas II, the Hittite King at the time of the overall unrest in the Levant and Near East, boasts of having defeated a fleet from Alashiya in a sea-battle.¹⁸⁰

"...I mobilised and I reached the sea quickly, I Suppiluliuma, the Great King, and the ships of Alashiya placed themselves against me three times in battle in the middle of the sea. I destroyed them, (while) I seized the ships and in the middle of the sea set them on fire. But as I then reached...., the enemies from Alashiya came in hordes towards me to fight."

Suppiluliuma goes on to say that he raised a "lasting" rock sanctuary with what seems to have been a carved image of a Hittite god, most probably in commemoration of his victory.¹⁸¹ On first sight the description of the Hittite undertaking, making no explicit mention of any participating troop contingents and the origin of the Alashiya ships, hardly furnishes any clarifying information as to the designation of the "enemy". However, as Otten remarks,¹⁸² it becomes apparent that in

contrast to Col. I of the same text, the surviving part of it does not mention the "King of Alashiya" once, which leads one to presume that it is a question of a power not bound by the state, in which case these enemies from Cyprus could very well denote invading hordes of the Sea Peoples who could have been using Cypriot harbours as temporary bases for their inroads; at this stage these peoples might have overrun the whole island as well as only used it, or part of it, as a stepping stone in their eastward operations.¹⁸³

Let us now turn to the dramatic exchange of letters between the "High Steward of Alashiya" and Hammurabi - the last King of Ugarit, dating from the last days of Ugarit.¹⁸⁴ The first letter from the King of Alashiya to Hammurabi runs as follows:

"Greetings to yourself, and to your country. As to those matters concerning the enemy. It was indeed men of your country and your boats that did it, your people were indeed responsible for that offense, but don't complain to me. The twenty boats that the enemy left previously in the mountainous parts did not stay there, but they went off suddenly, and now we don't know where to look for them. I write to inform you, and to put you on your guard".¹⁸⁵

It looks as though some subjects of the Ugaritic King had been involved in buccaneering activities on their own account, thus ignoring their King's alliance with Alashiya; the enemy spoken of in the letter might as well have been those offending rebellious men of Ugarit as an alien force; it is also highly likely that the Ugaritic raiders had joined some unknown contingent in their pillaging activities.¹⁸⁶

The next two letters are concerned with what seems to be a further development of the already alarming situation appearing in the previous letter, and may be taken as answering each other; from the King of Alashiya to Hammurabi:

"Thus says the King to Hammurabi King of Ugarit" "Greetings, may the gods keep you in good health. What you have written to me "enemy naval forces have been sighted at sea". Well now, even if it is true that enemy ships have been sighted, be firm. Indeed then, what about your army, what about your chariots, where are they stationed? Are they stationed near by or are they not? What menaces you behind the enemy? Fortify your towns, bring the troops and the chariots in to them, and wait for the enemy with feet firm."¹⁸⁷

The reply of Hammurabi reflects this King's desperation and need for help at this exigency:

"To the King of Alashiya, My father,¹⁸⁸ thus says the King of Ugarit his son. I fall at my father's feet. Greetings to my father, to your house, your wives, your troops, to all that belongs to the King of Alashiya, many many greetings. My father, the enemy ships are already here, they have set fire to my towns and have done very great damage in the country. My father, did you not know that all my troops were stationed in the Hittite country, and that all my ships are still stationed in Lycia and have not yet returned? So that the country is abandoned to itself....Consider this my father, there are seven enemy ships that have come and done very great damage. Now if there are more enemy ships let me know about them so that I can decide what to do [or "know the worst"].¹⁸⁹

In view of the information afforded by the already cited letters between the allied kings of Ugarit and Alashiya, in other words No. 23 = RSLI, No. 22 = RS 20.18, No. 24 = RS 20.238 it looks as though the ships raiding Ugarit were the ones referred to by the Alashiya King in No. 22 = RS 20.18 as having set out from the "mountainous parts" of the island with unknown intentions and as having had some kind of a mysterious connexion with the mutinous forces of Ugarit, unless of course we suppose that the "enemy" and the Ugaritic insurgents are one entity. Whatever the case, it is very likely that the "enemy"

referred to in the aforementioned letters is mutually understood as one and the same force and that their raiders have used Alashiya as their base - and perhaps as a hide-away - from which they launched their sea-borne inroads against Ugarit. It is also likely that these raiders manned the ships that attacked the Hittite fleet of Suppiluliumas II three times only to be defeated by him (see above). The texts from Hattusas and Ugarit speaking of sea-borne forces menacing and raiding their kingdoms, respectively, that is, KBO XII 38, reverse III¹⁹⁰, already mentioned, and No. 24 = RS 20.238,¹⁹¹ also cited, belong to the same chronological context, that consists of the very early stages of the 12th century which is the time connected with the Sea Peoples' appearance and their catastrophic impact on the aforementioned kingdoms; thus, the "enemy" referred to in both these important texts might very well have been a contingent of the southward-heading Sea Peoples and one should remember that since the contemporary Ugaritic texts mentioned above make it clear that Alashiya was an ally of Ugarit (and, consequently, of the Hittites, see n. 184) it is very difficult to envisage Alashiya's people as fighting the forces of Suppiluliumas II, whereas the Sea Peoples' eligibility for being the forces who assaulted the Hittite royal fleet as well as raided Ugarit seems both plausible and tenable.

On first sight, seven ships seem rather a small force, perhaps disproportionate to the havoc said by the King of Ugarit to have been wrought to his state by the "enemy". However, as Astour, M.C. and Sandars, N.K.¹⁹² believe, this flotilla might very well have been only one section of the raiders' forces, forming what could have been only one in a climactic sequence of sea-borne incursions.

It was stated above (see text and n.180) that it is very likely that the Sea Peoples were operating in two attacking bodies, one following the well-known inland highway which runs roughly due south via Hittite Kanesh and the Taurus mountains.

to Tarsus in Kizzuwatna (Cilicia) with a branch continuing east to Carchemish, and the other following a southward sea-route in what might have been a shore-hugging, island hopping course. What piece of information might serve as an indication that the situation was really developing in this wise is the King of Ugarit's reference to his having sent his fleet to Lycia (thus making it plain that it was a naval offensive he and his Hittite masters would try to stave off) and his troops to the Hittite country¹⁹³ (thereby making it clear that there was also another attacking force, land-borne this time, which menaced the Hittite Kingdom to whose aid the Ugaritic army had been commissioned to rally and hurry). It looks as if the Hittite King was engaged with either of these invading forces, perhaps with the sea-borne one attacking Lycia - if we are to judge from the Hittite King's boast over defeating the Alashiya fleet three times,¹⁹⁴ an indication that Suppiluliuma was engaged with the naval forces of the invaders - and as if meanwhile the land-borne contingent mounted an attack on Hattusas, the Hittite capital; if so, Suppiluliumas might at that stage or slightly earlier - upon receiving word of the impending offensive on his capital - have called upon Hammurabi, the King of Ugarit, to summon his forces and send them over to the Hittite plateau in an attempt to avert the hostile advance on Hattusas. Presumably, Suppiluliumas himself, in view of the danger hanging over his own capital, abandoned the Lycian coast and hurried to Hattusas only for his attempts and of course those of his Ugaritic allies to be foiled and for Hattusas to be overrun by the enemy. The two separate enemy detachments might, after that, have continued their pillaging activities on a roughly southward course, Ugarit in northern Syria being among the states to be destroyed by what seems to have been the sea-borne party of enemies, rather than the land-borne one, a view suggested by Hammurabi's letter to the King of Alashiya, speaking of the already "very great damage" inflicted on his state by the ships of the invaders.¹⁹⁵ It is likely that after these developments, the two contingents joined forces further south, somewhere in the Amorite dominion, if we are to believe

the inscription of Ramesses III's year 8 at Medinet Habu, speaking of the "foreigners" setting up a camp in Amor (Amurru) that's something that a perusal of the text makes clear that had not happened at an earlier stage of the Sea Peoples' advance during which - until they reached Amurru - the invaders are referred to as "scattered", an indication perhaps that at this early stage they were not yet united and that they were operating in separate groups.¹⁹⁶ The inscription speaks of them - after they made a camp in the Amorite country - as a league "advancing on Egypt" and as "united peoples". I believe this detail might very well be significant in that it may hint at these peoples joining forces in Amurru for the first time, prior to which they may be seen as operating as separate parties, a view which falls in line with the aforementioned one speaking of two separate contingents, one following the Anatolian highway to northern Syria and all the way to Palestine and the Egyptian border, and the other being a sea-borne one operating in the coastal areas and being perhaps responsible for the assaults on Alashiya and Ugarit.

Other Ugaritic texts bearing upon the events customarily associated with Sea Peoples' activity and dating from the last stages of the state's history before it was terminally destroyed afford a grim image of the exigency which the Hittite and Ugaritic Kings were trying to survive, and an even grimmer outlook for these Kingdoms' chances for success in their undertakings. There is a tablet from the oven of the Ugaritic palace which is the translation of a letter written to Hammurabi, last King of Ugarit, by "The Sun, thy Lord", that is most probably, by the Hittite King. The stylized, set introductory formula "With the sun everything is very well" is here blatantly refuted by what follows in the sequel.¹⁹⁷

"The enemy [advances?] against us and there is no number [...] our number is pure(?) [] whatever is available, look for it and send it to me."

This letter must have resulted in Hammurabi sending his army and fleet to the Anatolian hot-bed of military operations, if we are to judge from what he himself mentions in the aforementioned letter to the King of Alashiya.

Another letter is a dispatch from what seems to have been a Ugaritic high-ranking military officer on the northern front who names himself Shiptibaal.¹⁹⁸

"To the King, my L[o]rd, say: Message of Shibtibaal [thy s]erva[nt]. To the feet of my lord seven times (and) seven times from afar I fall. Thy servant in Lawasanda fortified [his] positions with the King. And behold, the King retreated, fled, and there he sacrificed" (The rest of the text does not make sense).

Two places can be nominated for Lawasanda. The first is a city called Lawazantiya by the Hittites and lying, according to the Hittite story of the siege of Urshu under Hatushilish I, between the Antitaurus and the Upper Euphrates, that is at the eastern fringes of the Hittite Empire.¹⁹⁹ The second nominee is a city situated in Eastern Cilicia, not far from Mount Amanus and appears by the name of Allusanda in the much later Annals of Shalmaneser III.²⁰⁰ Since one cannot vouch for the Ugaritic and the Sumerian texts speaking of the same city, a choice has to be made: Astour prefers the Cilician city as the likeliest candidate²⁰¹ and he is most probably right in as much as if the raiders' attack menaced Hattusas, the Hittite capital, it must have been the adjacent areas - and, at any rate, those not far off Hattusas - that could also have been threatened by their offensive as well as served as theatres of Hittite resistance against the hostile advance, rather than any remote territories such as those which were near the eastern borders of the Empire, to which Lawazantiya is said to have lain. Besides, the Medinet Habu inscription of Ramesses III's year 8 quotes Kode, that is Cilicia, as having been overrun by the northern confederation - see above - and it places its name

second in the list of the destroyed states, just after that of Hatti. This evidence falls completely in line with that furnished by the aforementioned Ugaritic PRU V, No. 63 = RS 1840 which states that the King referred to by Shiptibaal - most probably the King of Hatti - "retreated" and "fled" from his Lawasanda stronghold, thus leaving it to the hands of the enemy. Thus, we may say that we have here a reference to the conquest of what may very well have been a Cilician city - Lawasanda - by the invaders who defeated the allied forces of Ugarit and Hatti.

Another interesting letter affording evidence on the fatal developments in the Anatolian theatre of war and most probably belonging to the same context as the events referred to in the previously mentioned dispatch from Shiptibaal, is one written by a certain Ewir-Sharruma to his "Lady", apparently the mother of the King of Ugarit.²⁰² For all the damage of the first part, line 10 makes much sense:

"and behold, the enemy who is in Muqishhe".²⁰³

Lines 15-17 are also clear but only so far as their latter parts are concerned:

"...And I, too,...to Mount Amanus...behold, the enemy destroyed"

The explicit insertion of Muqishhe - which has been identified with Mukish, that is, a Ugaritic territory - and of mountain Amanus - near the Syrian border to the north of Ugarit - in connection with both the enemy's advance in what seems to have been a southward thrust as well as with the Ugaritic resistance to it - and no doubt with the Hittite, as we have seen from previously cited texts - may well be coupled with the citing of Lawasanda; This site now seems even more likely to be identified with the Cilician city since the latter was in the area of mountain Amanus; all this seems to provide a jig-saw-puzzle pattern which, patchy though it is, has perhaps enough pieces

fitted in it to vindicate the claim that by the time the Ugaritic officer was writing the above dispatch, almost all of Anatolia had already been lost to the enemy as far as the mountain Amanus near the Syrian border and that the attackers advance had now reached Ugaritic territory thus menacing Ugarit itself. From line 23 on; in the aforementioned letter Ewir-Sharruma records his complaints about the two thousand horses which the King asked him to provide. This number of horses is a very considerable one and clearly suggests that the King of Ugarit - who, like Ewir-Sharruma, was absent from his capital²⁰⁴ - must have been facing a powerful enemy contingent and that there was no such number of horses available at that time in the state of Ugarit. Ewir-Sharruma complains that by commissioning him to supply these horses, the King of Ugarit has "declared a jeopardy (or a "harshness") on him", and asks the King if he "could provide these horses himself". However he states that if the King insists on this commission being carried out, he would like to have confirmation by means of an intermediary appointed and sent by the King with the final word of his on the matter - so that, as one may infer, Ewir-Sharruma complies with his master's wish. The letter reaches a tragic climax in lines 27-29:

"And, behold, the enemies oppress me, but I shall not leave my wife (and) my children...before the enemy".

It is very likely that soon after the dispatch of this letter, Ewir-Sharruma's very area (wherever that might have been) and also his own residence were overrun by the raiders.

So, we learn from this letter that the enemy was now in Mukish, that is, immediately at the north of Ugarit. Since there is no evidence for any other invasion of Mukish by forces hostile to Ugarit²⁰⁵ and in view of this dispatch dating from just prior to the destruction of Ugarit - like the rest of the correspondence already cited - from a time, that is, at which we have the recorded appearance of the Sea Peoples in the Levant, one may perhaps legitimately look upon those Peoples as the likeliest candidates for the raiders of Mukish.

Another letter which is of interest is addressed by a Ugaritic King to the Queen, his mother, who is in all probability the same as the "Lady" of Ewir-Sharruma's letter in as much as both letters were found in the Central Archives at the same depth.²⁰⁶ After the standard introductory formula, the King - most probably in charge of a Ugaritic contingent somewhere far from his capital - writes to his mother:²⁰⁷

"And if the Hittites mount, I will send a message to thee, and if they do not mount, I will certainly send a message. And thou, my mother, be not afraid and do not put worries into thy heart."

It is likely that the King of Ugarit had drawn up his forces somewhere between the mountain Amanus and Mukish or at the latter site itself in anticipation of the enemy's attack, being well aware of how great the danger would be for Ugarit itself should he fail to stem the impending onslaught. It is not clear what he means by the reference to the Hittites. Perhaps he was expecting a Hittite detachment to come to his aid and his uncertainty on the matter argues eloquently for the serious conjunction of circumstances in which the Hittite troops seemed to have been involved at the time.

And we come to the last letter which is of interest to this survey. It is a brief dispatch to a certain Zrdn (or Grdn) by one who calls him "my lord"²⁰⁸ and it does not belong to the group found in the oven, yet it dates from the eventful as well as fateful last days of Ugarit and gives a lurid picture of the situation during this very time:

"To Z(?) rdn, my lord, say: thy messenger arrived. The degraded one trembles, and the low one is torn to pieces. Our food in the threshing floors is sacked (or: burned) and also the vine yards are destroyed. Our city is destroyed, and mayst thou know it!"

The account given in this letter resembles that of No. 24 = RS 20.238, lines 12-29, in Ugaritica, vol. V, Paris (1968), cited above. It is not very likely that the King of Ugarit left the city and went over to the Hittite country to fight the invaders - thus responding positively to the King of Hatti's call for help - after his state had been invaded by the enemy ships referred to in No. 24 = RS 20.238, lines 12-29. By that time he had already dispatched his troops to the Hittite plateau and his ships to Lycia, following a call for help by the King of Hatti mentioned in PRU V, No. 60 = RS 18.38, lines 31-35. So, he should reasonably enough not have been further worried over his loyalty to his Hittite overlord and, having complied with the latter King's request, he could legitimately turn his attention to his state's plight and take the necessary steps to avert it rather than abandon it stranded and forlorn only for him to march to the aid of the Hittites who, after all, had already been joined, as has just been said, by the Ugaritic contingents sent earlier for this purpose. So it looks as though letters PRU II, No. 12 = RS 16.402, lines 10, 15-17 and PRU II, No. 13 = RS 16.379, lines 16-24, which make clear that the King of Ugarit was away from his capital - most probably involved in military operations against the raiders - must predate Ugaritica, V, No. 24 = RS 20.238, lines 12-29 - the letter in which the King of Ugarit speaks of sea-borne hostile raids to his capital - as well as PRU V, No. 114 = RS 19.11, lines 2-13, where we have again references to catastrophic activities exerted on Ugarit.

After the above analysis, the sequence of events culminating in the destruction of Ugarit could perhaps be reconstructed in the following two versions:

a) In view of the raiders' menacing advance towards his capital, the Hittite King calls upon his Ugaritic ally to send him military assistance (PRU V, No. 60 = RS = 18.38, lines 31-35): What perhaps precipitated this initiative was the sea-borne threat posed by the ships of Alashiya [Keilschrifttexte

aus Boghazkoi X II 38, column III, in Otten, H. MDOG, 94(1963, pp. 20-21)]. The Ugaritic King complied with this call by leading the Ugaritic contingents to the Hittite country himself and by staying there, warring along side his Hittite overlord against the enemies for a certain while during which time he writes to his mother back in Ugarit (PRU II, No. 13 = RS 16.379, lines 16-24). It is most probably during that time of the King's absence from Ugarit that Ewir-Sharruma, a Ugaritic high-ranking officer in all probability, writes to the King's mother complaining over what he considers a preposterous assignment imposed on him by the King, as well as informing her of the various developments on the war-front (PRU II, No. 12 = RS 16.402, lines 10, 15-17, 23-29). The King of Ugarit receives word about nasty developments taking place back in Ugarit and hurries to his capital, leaving the bulk of his army and fleet at the Hittite hot-bed of warfare (perhaps what can be blamed for causing him to return was information about the insurrection of some of his subjects, something that is mentioned in Ugaritica, V, No. 22 = RS 20.18). While in Ugarit, the King receives dispatches from the Hittite and Syrian war-fronts by his subordinates, informing him of the gloomy developments there (PRU V, No. 63 = RS 18.40, line 1-19). During this time he receives word from the King of Alashiya about some of his - Ugaritic - subjects having raided the island and that the "enemy" boats have put out to sea to an unknown direction (Ugaritica, V, No. 22 = RS 20.18). Another letter from the same King asks him to bear up well against the enemy advance, should it take place, and ponders over the availability of his troops (Ugaritica, V, No. 23 = RSL I). The King of Ugarit's answer speaks of "great damage" wrought already to his country by seven enemy ships, of his army and ships being stationed in Hittite country and inquires about any further enemy ships bound for Ugarit (Ugaritica, V, No. 24 = RS 20.238, lines 12-29). Another letter, speaking of the state of Ugarit being destroyed, can be seen as belonging in the same chronological context and as referring to the same enemy attack - or a further escalation of it - as the previous letter. In any case it can be regarded as one of the very last texts recording the fateful developments during the last days of Ugarit (PRU V, No. 114 = RS 19.11, lines 2-13).

b) Responding to his Hittite overlord call for help, (PRU V, No. 60 = RS 18.38, lines 31-35) the Ugaritic King dispatches a big detachment of his army and the bulk of his fleet to the Hittite country and the Lukka lands respectively (Ugaritica, V, No. 24 = RS 20.238, lines 12-29). After a certain while though he receives a dispatch with dismal news from the war-front, speaking of the Hittite King being defeated in Lawasanda and retreating, only for the enemy to gain the upper hand in the overall sequence of the operations (PRU V, No. 63 = RS 18.40, lines 1-19). The King of Ugarit, knowing how fateful the implications of potential Hittite power collapse would turn out to be for Ugarit, hurries to the Hittite front from where he communicates news to his mother (PRU II, No. 13 = RS 16.379, lines 16-24) and commissions his functionaries to supply him with what he considers necessary to stem the hostile advance (PRU II, No. 12 = RS 16.402, lines 10, 15-17, 23-29). However, the situation back in Ugarit seems to be getting very awkward for the King and it looks as though insurgent activities have set in, resulting in some of his subjects taking to buccaneering habits on their own account (Ugaritica, V, No. 22 = RS 20.18). The King returns to Ugarit where he exchanges letters with the King of Alashiya who tries to cheer him up in view of the impending sea-borne attack (Ugaritica, V, No. 23 = RSL I), whereas the King of Ugarit speaks in his letter of an enemy flotilla having raided his kingdom which is left stranded and defenceless: owing to his troops and ships being in the Hittite theatre of war (Ugaritica V, No. 24 = RS 20.238, lines 12-29). Nothing, it seems, can be done to weather the storm, and the country is finally destroyed as is attested by another letter which probably refers to the same wave of sea-borne invasions to which the one in the previously mentioned letter belongs (PRU V, No. 114 = RS 19.11, lines 2-13).

d) The Egyptian representations of the people from "Keftiu"

Citing and discussing the Egyptian texts referring to "Keftiu" will be saved for the second part of this chapter with a view to them serving as an instrument to shed some light on the problem of the identification of the people associated with that name in the Egyptian monuments and thus provide some help towards forming a better approach to the problem of the Philistines' extraction; So there will only be, at this stage, coverage of the evidence afforded by the portrayal of people from the land of "Keftiu", something that might be helpful in view of the often recurring connexion of the Philistines with Kaphtor in biblical passages.

In the tomb of Senmut, architect of Queen Hatsepsut, a procession of Minoan envoys bearing gifts is shown. Among these we can identify typical LMIA (c.1550 - 1500) metal vessels as well as very big Vapheio-type cup²⁰⁹ decorated with bull's heads. More Keftians can be seen on the walls of the tomb of User-Amen, vizier in the earlier part of the reign of Thotmes III (c.1504 - 1450). They are also offering gifts among which are what can be clearly identified as metal vases, a bull's head-rhyton and the figure of a bull in the process of galloping. Keftians are also depicted on the tomb of Rekhmara who was User-Amen's nephew. The scribe calls them by that name - just as the scribes do in the rest of the cases concerned - and a typical LMIB (c.1500 - 1450) collared rhyton can be seen in the hands of one of them. Pendlebury has made a noteworthy remark²¹⁰ regarding the way in which the artist had begun to draw the so-called cod-piece and flap of the old LMIA (c.1550 - 1500) type of dress but had changed it to the new style of decorated kilt of LMIB (c.1500 - 1450).²¹¹ We may also see Keftians on the pointed tomb of Rekhmara's son, Menkheperresenb, High Priest of Amon of the time of Thotmes III's reign. It should be noted here that, although LMIB vases have been recovered from Egyptian tombs of the time of Thotmes III²¹² (c.1504 - 1450), an alabaster vase inscribed

with his name was recovered from a tomb at Katsamba by the Bronze Age Harbour-town of Knossos with burials assignable to early stages of LMIIIA (c.1400 - 1300).²¹³ This fact, however, should not create confusion because this jar may simply have belonged to an ancestor of one of the people buried in the tomb. This ancestor had presumably joined the Minoan Embassy to Egypt, at the time of Thotmes III where he was given the vase which one of his descendants eventually acquired, either as a gift or as a bequest and treasured so much as to demand that he be buried with it, see Alexiou, S. Isterominoikoi Tafoi Limenos Knossou (Katsamba), Athens, (1967), pp. 46, 76 ff. The inscription on the tomb-wall of Rekh-ma-ra employs the following words in referring to the Keftian delegation: "The coming in Peace of the Great Ones of Keftiu and of the Isles in the Midst of the Sea". It is striking that something like four hundred years later the Deir-el-Medineh stela inscription attaches the same particulars to the Peleset and the Teresh, that is, two of the tribes of the Sea Peoples' coalition that attacked Egypt at the time of Ramesses III. (see above, in section B - the Ramessidic records - the relevant discussion of this similarity between the Thotmes III references to Keftiu and the Deir-el-Medineh stela reference to Peleset and Teresh).

The Keftians, in their earliest representations on Egyptian monuments, such as those on the tomb of Rekh-ma-ra, are distinctly Minoan Cretans with the characteristic coiffure of the latter, that is, the long tresses to the waist and part of their hair done up in an elaborate curl on the top of the head, while their dress consists of an embroidered loin-cloth hanging from a belt drawn tight about the slim waist, and of soft-leathered boots, laced up above the ankle; so these Keftians are completely different from the Semites, at least as far as their appearance goes, since the various Semitic tribes never wore their hair so long or dressed in this distinctive way. The Keftians are also distinctly Minoan on the tomb of Menkheperresenb and User-Amen which are datable also to the

reign, as we already stated, of Thotmes III. At this point it is worth stating that the vessels carried as tribute by the Minoan envoys on the tomb of Menkheperresenb are distinctly of LMIB type (c.1500 - 1450) and not fashionable at the time of this high Priest of Amon. They were obviously artefacts of a past period; yet the artist depicted those and not other - contemporary - objects in their hands, maybe because he had not seen any later Minoan artefacts or simply because the old ones appealed to him more than the new.

The most frequent occurrence of the name "Keftiu" in Egyptian records was within the period between 1500 and 1400 and in particular during Thotmes III's reign (c.1504 - 1450). Speaking in terms of the Minoan culture this was a period comprising both the last part - LMIB - of Minoan prosperity - which is quite likely to have ground to a halt as a result of the Thera eruption - and the period of the Mycenaean conquest, that is, LMII. Hall²¹⁴ suggested that the Minoan dynasts of the time of Thotmes III, learning about his power and renown, "hastened to send him ambassadors with gifts". This we may consider quite likely in view of the triumphant inscription of Karnak, in which the court poet makes Amon say: "I have come: I have caused thee to smite the lands of the west: Keftiu and Asy are in fear. I have caused them to see thy majesty as a young bull, firm of heart, sharp-horned, unapproachable".²¹⁵ Though Thotmes is not reported to have approached Crete in arms, he could regard the gifts from their land as a tribute to his power, as they really may have been.

At this stage, it should be noted that the controversy that once raged over whether or not a Minoan or Cilician origin should be postulated for the Keftians represented on the tombs of Thotmes' officials - sparked off by a number of works by G.A. Wainwright - will be commented upon in the second leg of this chapter dealing with the main schools of thought on the Philistine question.

Prior to drawing this last piece of evidence from the literary records to its close, it should be added that the inscription on the mural fresco on User Amen's tomb speaks of men of "The Isles in the heart of the Great Green Sea".²¹⁶ The final point that should be made with reference to these representations is that we do not have any serious doubts as to the identification of Egyptian Keftiu with Hebrew Kaphtor. Final r often disappeared in Egyptian words, and though the name "Keftiu" or "Kefatiu" has been considered as Egyptian, meaning "the Hinder Lands" or "lands at the back of beyond" - it is just as likely that it has been a Cretan name with a possible relation to the Latin word "caput" or "capitul" which means "head" and it is significant that in Hebrew Kaphtor is also employed to denote the capital of a pillar. Of this Cretan name the final r or l seems to have existed in Asiatic foreign pronunciation but lost in the Egyptian.²¹⁷

Part II: The main schools of thought and theories on the Philistine Question

The capital problem relating to the Philistine question is that of their origin and in this main respect what really looms as an outstanding question of argument throughout the era of the research on that tribe is the continuous controversy as to the identification of Caphtor from where the Philistines are quite explicitly said to have come.²¹⁸ This name turns up in cuneiform documents as Kaptara and particularly in late tablets referring back to Sargon of Akkad (c.2370 B.C.).²¹⁹ It is really interesting to learn that this name was already known in Mesopotamia since that time. Kaptara recurs in the Mari archives which date from the 18th century B.C.²²⁰ and also later at Ugarit in Akkadian²²¹ as well as in the epics.²²² It is therefore reasonable to assume that Kaptara as a name is not unfamiliar to cuneiform scripts. The apparent resemblance to "Kaphtor" makes it equally reasonable to assume that both the words refer to the same entity. Consequently it is equally

natural to identify Kaphtor with Egyptian Keftiu which is the name by which at least Minoan Crete and its adjacent areas were known to the Egyptians. If so, it follows that the Philistines come from Crete but this point has been and still is strongly challenged. Of course there are no objections to the identification of Kaphtor with Keftiu - something that is generally accepted as a well taken step in the whole process of pin-pointing the actual position of the place known by this name.²²³ The problem for many scholars lies in the identification of Keftiu with Crete. There are two major schools of thought on this problem, that is, the problem of the identification of Keftiu. The first is the one put forward by Wainright in quite a number of his works. The one which triggered off the support of his theory is the article in JEA, (1961), pp. 71-90. His view of the subject favours Cilicia as the land which should be identified with Keftiu. The other school of thought favours Crete itself as the place which had come to be known as Keftiu to the Egyptians.

Wainright claims that what is implied by Keftiu is Cilicia Tracheia i.e. Western Cilicia up and down the Calycadnus River "the very country that was the domain of Teucer".²²⁴ He says that the Philistine pottery of Palestine is a Mycenaean-like style, the prototypes of which occur in the regional Mycen. III c₁ ware of Cilicia. A brief account of his further arguments is as follows: The King of Gath and Ziklag was Akis (Achish) (1 Sam xxvii ff., 2 Kings id, 39-40) and the name "Akkisi's" - a woman's name in all probability - turns up in Palaia Isaura beyond the sources of Calycadnus. These names have their parallels in the form - jks, jks.t which holds good both for the masculine and feminine on the Egyptian writing board of not later than 1500 B.C. Again at Palaia Isaura once more we meet a name "Tarkinthveras" including the same foggy combination of consonants - n, th, v, r, - as the Keftian name on the aforementioned writing board - bndbr. The name - "Ronthverras" of a similar formation is found in the Corycian cave to the east of the mouth of Calycadnus River. It seems, says Wainright, that Caphtor - Keftiu was the country up and down

that river and this is shown once more by the Septuagint translating Kaphtor as Cappadocia. He goes on with his arguments: There is a Greek tradition that Kabderos was King of Cilicia. Kabderos is the eponymous King of Kaphtor which is thus equated with Cilicia. It follows that the Philistines occupied western Cilicia, particularly the country up and down the Calycadnus River in the eastern part of which lived the Teucri - Tjekker. The story of Perseus who delivered Andromeda from the sea-monster at Joppa on the Philistine coast seems to provide contributory evidence for the invasion of Palestine from Cilicia Tracheia and its coastlands. Perseus was actually worshipped at Ace - Ptolemais (Acre) on the other side of Mount Carmel from the Tjekker town of Dor. At Iconium in Asia Minor, where he had brought an image of Medusa he figured as one of the chief types on the coinage.²²⁵ Other places which used to put his figure on their coins were Karalia to the south west, Koropissos down the river Calycadnus, Iotope on the coast²²⁶ and Amemourion on the coast too. The tradition concerning another hero can also be used in favour of the connections of south Asia Minor and Philistia; and that is Mopsus. Greek tradition tells us how he captured the Philistine city of Askalon²²⁷ only some 30 miles south of Joppa, the scene of Perseus' activities. Mopsus is said to have set out from Clarus, a city of Lydia; a connection between Mopsus and the Philistine title "seranim" can be conceived. This title was given to the Philistine rulers, "The Lords of the Philistine Pentapolis". "Seranium" is accepted as being the same word as the Greek "tyrannos"²²⁸ which is accepted as being of Lydian origin.²²⁹ The place between Clarus and the Calycadnus River which was called, at least in Roman Times, "Prostanna" and was part of Pisidia could bear a connection with the Philistine immigration. Its name can be broken down into the native forms prustta - (a) nna and seems possible that - prustta - might be the word from which the Egyptians got the name "prst", "plst", and modern scholars the word "Philistine". It is not unlikely that "Prostanna" may have been a stage on Mopsus' route.

According to the Greek tradition which says that Mopsus' people "were scattered in Cilicia and Syria and even as far as Phoenicia"²³⁰ Mopsus, again like Perseus, passed through Cilicia. This we can clearly accept, since eastern Cilicia called two of its towns after him, "Mopsouestia" and "Mopsoukrene" (these are Greek words meaning "Mopsus' house" (or "homeland") and "Mopsus' spring") and we may go further on and discern connections between Mopsus and Denyen-Danune, that is, another sea-tribe reported to have menaced Egypt and eventually been defeated by Ramesses III (c.1186). It is from Karatepe in eastern Cilicia that we hear that Mopsus was the progenitor of the royal family of the Dananiym.²³¹ Mopsus connects the Philistines with the Denyen in that besides being the progenitor of the Denyen royal family he was also husband of a daughter of the King of Cilicia Kabderos²³², that is, Caphtor, from where came the Philistines.

This is the body of Wainright's arguments regarding the identification of Keftiu.²³³ They are actually attractive arguments which tempt one to accept them. However, the evidence available nowadays seems to argue for a Cretan - or Aegean - origin of the Keftiu more convincingly than that in favour of a Cilician origin of that people. Additionally the whole south-east Mediterranean area, that is, an area comprising Cyprus and the isles within it could qualify as a very likely motherland of the Keftiu. It looks as though Crete is the land which one may claim is the territory of the Egyptian Keftiu. In 1857 Birch identified Keftiu with the biblical Kaphtor, either Crete or (as he had some queries about it) Cyprus. In the same year Bengsh identified the Keftians preferably as Cretans rather than Cypriots. The Keftians or "the Men of the Isles" are a group which appears in the time of Queen Hatshepsut, Thotmes III and Amenhotep III and does not reappear afterwards. This fact is quite interesting in view of the certainty (as we shall see) that these Keftians were Minoans, and we must bear in mind that the fall of the Minoan culture must be ascribed in all probability,

to the 14th century, before that is, the time of the raids of such migratory tribes as "The Peoples of the Sea" who caused great havoc to various Near Eastern lands and appeared finally threatening at the "gate" of the Egyptian Kingdom. Ptolemaic historiographers identified Keftiu with Phoenicia. However there is virtually nothing on the appearance of the Keftians that is reminiscent of Phoenician people. The Keftians who are depicted in Ptolemaic representations in costumes approaching the Syrian fashion may just be of Levantine origin, that is a particular group, perhaps migrants of Crete, that had settled in the Syrian coast and had finally been "Syrianised". Besides, we may well attribute this depiction to inaccuracy on the part of the Egyptian artists. In the earliest representations of the Keftians, like those on the tomb of Rekh-ma-ra during the time of Thotmes III they are distinctly Minoan Cretans, with the characteristic coiffure of the latter, that is, the long tresses to the waist and part of their hair done up in an elaborate curl on the top of the head, while their dress consists of an embroidered long-cloth, hanging from a belt drawn tight about the slim waist, and of soft-leathered boots, laced up above the ankle. So these Keftians are completely different from the Semites, at least as far as their appearance goes, since the latter people never wore their hair so long or dressed in this distinctive way. The Keftians are also distinctly Minoans on the tombs of Menkheperresenb and User-Amen which are also datable to the reign of Thotmes III.²³⁴ We see Minoan Keftians also on the tomb of Senmut architect of Queen Hatshepsut, where typical LMIA (c.1550 - 1500) vessels and a decorated "Vaphio cup" can be seen. We can also clearly identify an LMIB rhyton with a collar in the hands of one of the Minoan Keftians in the procession of Rekh-ma-ra tomb. The vessels carried by the Keftians on Menkbeperresenb's tomb are also distinctly LMIB (c.1500 - 1450). Thus, it seems that Keftiu and Keftians are appellations given by the Egyptians to Minoan Crete and its inhabitants respectively. It is possible that migrants from Crete may have lived as far east as the Cilician coast and that the Egyptians used to call

them by the same name as they did the Cretans proper. However it would go much too far to assume that "The Great Ones of Keftiu and of the Isles in the Midst of the Sea", as the artist on the tomb of Rekh ma ra puts it, could be the remote "migrants" from Crete, who had settled in Asia Minor (something that is yet to be established) and not the rich, powerful and stately "lords of the Sea" coming from Crete proper. Besides, the fact that we do not see any more Keftians after the reign of Thotmes III (which ended c.1400 B.C.) suggests that this lack of evidence²³⁵ agrees with the fall of the Minoan culture (also c.1400), a fall which can only be applied to the centres of Minoan civilization in the island of Crete itself on account of the havoc wrought upon them (c.1400) by the Mycenaeans. As for the Ptolemaic identification of the Keftians (see above), it can be regarded as a wrong one.

The Ptolemaic priests refer to matters relating to a period more than a thousand years before their time²³⁶. Therefore they cannot be as reliable as the Egyptian representations of Keftiu in Thotmes' time. Now to something else. The first mention of the name Keftiu, in the form Kefatiu, occurs in the papyrus containing the prophecies of Ipuwer, known as "the Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage". The original text is most probably as old as the Middle Kingdom and thus the mention of Kefatiu, unless it is an interpolation, is much older than the time of Thotmes III (xviii Dynasty). We do not have evidence for early relations between Crete and Egypt even in the VIth Dynasty but the most frequent occurrence of the name was within the period between 1500 and 1400, in other words within Thotmes III's reign. Speaking in terms of the Minoan culture this was a period comprising both the last part (LMIB) of Minoan prosperity - though Crete had already received the first serious blow by the Thera eruption - and the period (LMII) of the Mycenaean conquest. Hall²³⁷ suggested that the Minoan dynasts of the time learning about his power and renown "hastened to send him ambassadors with gifts". This we may consider quite likely in view of the triumphal inscription of Karnak, in which the court

poet makes Amon say "I have come: I have caused thee to smite the lands of the west: Keftiu and Asy are in fear. I have caused them to see thy Majesty as a young bull, firm of heart, sharp-horned, unapproachable".²³⁸ Though Thotmes is not reported to have approached Crete in arms, he could regard the gifts from their land as a tribute to his power, as they may really have been. In a Theban tomb picture of the XVIII Dynasty a Phoenician ship, manned by Semites, brings Aegean (Mycenaean?) pottery to Thebes. Under Amenhotep III, the name occurs once, under the XIX Dynasty twice officially (in one case in a list of subject peoples but in a vague and general form which does not allow us to draw any conclusion about the geographical position of Keftiu).²³⁹ The list of Keftian names on a writing board in the British Museum, dating from the middle of XVIII Dynasty, the charm in the Keftiu language against the Asiatic disease, also in the British Museum, (of XVIII - XIX Dynasty)²⁴⁰ and the mention of a Keftian under the XIX Dynasty are also Egyptian references to the name "Keftiu". The document which in all probability is the one which attests that Keftiu is to be certainly identified with Crete, is the Theban topographical list of Amenophis III (c.1400) which lays out just what the Egyptians understood by Keftiu. Two names on the right side - Keftiu and Tanayu - define the areas of the thirteen extant names on the left side. "Tanayu" best corresponds to the Greek "Danaoi"²⁴¹ used of Greek in the Argolid and later on - quite soon indeed - more widely.²⁴² The correspondence between Crete - plus the Argolid and the Aegean - and the twelve names legible out of thirteen can be set out as follows:

<u>Keftiu</u>	<u>(Tanayu (Danaoi))</u>
1. Amnisos (i)	4. Mycenae
2. Phaestos 243	5. Dqis (?)
3. Cydonia	6. Messenia
<hr/>	
10. Knossos	7. Nauplia
11. Amnisos (ii)	8. Cythera
12. Lyctos	9. Wilia (Ilion?)

This evidence cannot be challenged. Four names (one - Amnisos - duplicated), perhaps five, clearly belong in Crete. Thus, Keftiu and Caphtor must be inescapably considered as names by which Minoan Crete had come to be known, to Egyptians, and Semites respectively. "Kaptara" also must be thought of as the Akkadian version of the same name, in all probability.

After all this discussion we are quite justified in saying that, if Philistines reached Canaan from Caphtor, they did so from Crete. It is now time to say more about a particular Egyptian document which although it has already been referred to, has not added much evidence to the already existing body of information about relations between the Philistines and the Aegean peoples. It is the list of Keftian names on a school boy's writing board from Egypt of (early or middle) XVIII dynasty date. On one side is a list of names headed "to make names of Keftiu". Some of the names however are Egyptian, such as Sennefar and Sennefert; one, Benjeber, is Semitic. Yet one is of considerable interest, Akesh,²⁴⁴ which it has been suggested (quite reasonably, no doubt) is the same name as Achish, (Ikausu), the Philistine friend of David. This name must be coupled with another name, Akesht, perhaps, the feminine.

Did the Philistines then derive from Crete? The answer or at least a very useful clue regarding this question may again be provided by the Old Testament. Under Egypt, along with other names, Genesis 10:13-14 quotes the Casluhim, a place from which the Philistines are said in that reference to have come forth, and ends with the Caphtorim. It can be concluded that the Philistines are derived from the foggy Casluhim rather than the Caphtorim. Amos, as we saw,²⁴⁵ has the Philistines coming from Caphtor like Israel from Egypt, and we know that Israel came out of Egypt, but did not originate there. Thus, we may say that the Philistines arrived from Kaphtor, but originated elsewhere. Could Casluhim be the actual answer to the question of their origin? I do not think so. This clue might just be a memory of the setting up of garrisons in Palestine

by the Egyptians, who manned them with captive Sea-Peoples, or of the political subordination of the Philistines to Egypt after their defeat by Ramesses III. Since even the Egyptians themselves considered the Philistines as coming from the north and, specifically (if we may say so) "from the midst of the Sea" we cannot vouchsafe to accept the Philistines' derivation from Egypt. A last point about Kaphtor has, I think, to be made here, before we get on with listing the rest of the evidence. The word "Kaptor" remains in Hebrew as a curious vestige that by the time of Exodus (xxv.31-6, cf, Amos ix.1) had come to mean for the Hebrews - a language loan from the Phoenicians though it seems to be - an ornament, perhaps in the form of a lily flower or palmetto, presumably originally of Aegean (Minoan) origin.²⁴⁶

The interesting point suggested by Kitchen²⁴⁷ and based on biblical sources must now be quoted. As external sources so far attest Philistine presence only from c.1200 B.C. and in the O.T. the earliest narrative references to the term "Philistines" turn up in Genesis 21:32, 34 and 26: 1, 8, 14-18, that is, in passages concerned with the Hebrew patriarchs who most probably must long precede 1200,²⁴⁸ these early references have often been thought of as anachronisms. However, says Kitchen, the Philistines of Genesis do not bear the characteristics of those attested from 1200 onwards. Those in Genesis live around Gerar and under just one King, not in the "pentapolis" under their five "seranim"; they are not a warlike people and are strongly reminiscent of the Caphtorim of Deuteronomy 2:23 who came, like the later Philistines, to Canaan from Kaphtor (Crete). The early term "Philistines" which turns up in Genesis may rather be, says Kitchen, a thirteenth to twelfth century term used of an earlier Aegean group such as the Kaphtorim by the narrator. Thus, he concludes, the Genesis references would indicate Aegean contact with "patriarchal" - maybe Middle Bronze Age - Palestine, and suggest a further use of the term Philistine for Aegean peoples apart from the "Plst" of the Egyptians. Actually, the evidence available nowadays,

attests Aegean contacts with Canaan and the Levant as early as the Middle Bronze Age. The Mari archives have the King of Hazor sending gifts to Kaptara (Crete)²⁴⁹ while Middle Minoan II pottery was found at Hazor and Ugarit.²⁵⁰ In Middle Kingdom Egypt, Middle Minoan Kamares pottery has been recovered from Cahun, Harageh, Abydos and Minoan silverware from Tod²⁵¹ and finally the mixture of names of both Semitic and non Semitic origin in Genesis 26:26 illustrates assimilation of aliens to a cultural framework with apparently semitic characteristics.

According to what we have discussed, the Philistines may be taken to be an entity of the same stock as that of the Kaphtorim of Deuteronomy 2:23. Both are said to have come from Kaphtor. And indeed the biblical narrative gives us hints in this direction. First of all the Caphtorim partly supplanted the enigmatic Avvim, south from Gaza.²⁵² In terms of topography, this coincides nearly with the Negeb of the Cherethites (Kreti) mentioned in I Sam 30:14. Cherethites is later found as a poetic synonym for Philistines²⁵³. Thus, we can clearly perceive a strong interrelation of the terms "Philistines", "Kaphtorim", and "Cherethites". It is worth citing once more the quotation from Zephaniah (ii, 5 sq.) which sets out the connection between "Kerethim" or "Kerethites" and Philistines: "Woe, to the people of the sea-coast, the folk of the Kerethim: The word of Yahweh is against thee, O Canaan, land of the Philistines, and I shall destroy thee that thou shalt have no inhabitants. And Kereth shall be dwellings for shepherds and folds for flocks". Ezekiel, too²⁵⁴ involves both the Philistines and the Kerethim in a common denunciation. So, by this connection of the Cherethites with Philistines, we have already a clue pointing to a Minoan origin or affinity for the former. However there are other hints in this direction as well. We meet both the Cherethites and Pelethi or Pelethites as mercenaries of King David and here the Pelethites may well be taken to be Philistines. It is just possible that south of Gaza was a Cretan settlement²⁵⁵ and that the Cherethites who were employed by David as mercenaries were Cretans, the

inhabitants of the biblical Negeb, which in the O.T. is also said to be south from Gaza²⁵⁶ Hebrew "k(e)reti - u-p(e)leti", that is, "Cherethites and Pelethites", is the common designation for David's favourite bodyguard. Albright²⁵⁷ makes an interesting point by saying that, since the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint (now known from Qumran Cave 4 to be exceptionally reliable) offers a reading "pheltei", we may be justified in treating the expression as a typical semitic hendiadys, in which case the second word "pelti" might be of the same Aegean origin as that of later Greek "pelte" which means "light shield". From the same origin comes "peltastes", that is, "light-armed warriors". The Cretans were hailed as good archers (the archers certainly ranking as "light-armed warriors" in Greek military terminology) in classical times. The name "Kerethi" is translated as "Cretans" in the Greek version of the passages from Zephaniah and Ezekiel quoted above. With all this in mind, it might be that the expression "k(e)reti - u-p(e)leti", that is, "Cherethites and Pelethites", would, rather reasonably, be rendered as "Cretan peltastes", that is, "Cretan (Minoan) light-armed warriors".

This theory strengthens the connection between "Cherethites" and Crete and, in view of the connexions between "Caphtorim", "Cherethites" and "Pelethites", it also enhances the affinities between "Caphtorim" and Pelethites' on one hand and Minoan Crete on the other.

It is also a fact that in classical days the inhabitants of the Palestinian coast were certainly of the opinion that they were of Cretan origin, an idea that was generally accepted by the rest of the world. We find it in Tacitus although he confuses the Jews with the Philistines. Gaza was in Roman times called Minoa and its god "Marnas" ("our Lord") was considered to be the same as the Zeus Kretagenes (Velchanos), the Minoan-Carian Zeus of the Double Axe.

In 1950-51 a new element was introduced into the debate about Philistines' origin. The old identification of them with the Pelasgians was proposed again by V. Georgier²⁵⁸ and good evidence was presented for an ancient variant "Pelastikon", etc for "Pelasgikon" and Albright presumes²⁵⁹ that both terms go back to an older form comprising a consonant found by the Greeks difficult to pronounce. According to Homer²⁶⁰ the Southern Troad was populated by "spear-brandishing Pelasgians", and Herodotus, who was a native of Alikarnasus in Caria, traces both the Ionians and the Aeolians to Pelasgian origins. It is quite likely that what he calls "Coastal Pelasgians" preceded the Ionians in Ionia and not in the Peloponneses as he states.²⁶¹ In Homer, Idomeneus is King of Crete and vessel of Agamemnon.²⁶² In his realm are Achaeans, Eteocretons, Kydonians, Dorians and Pelasgians²⁶³ who are said to be "aborigines". Thus, the group which according to Homer is said to have inhabited Southern Troad could have been a number of immigrants from Crete who had settled there. However, as has already been stated, Philistines arrived from Kaphtor but originated in all probability, somewhere else. Some onomastic data available seem to suggest a derivation from South-Western Asia Minor. These names, maybe those of Philistine Chieftains or princes, occur in the Wenamun's report. Waractir (Wr/lktr/l), Waret (Wr/lt), and Makamar (MKmr/l). If these names are slightly modified so as to become Warkat/dara, Ward/ta and Mag/kamola, they have excellent equivalents in the daughter dialects of Luwian (Lycian, Carian, Cilician, Pamphylian, Pisidian etc.). Perhaps the Philistines were Pelasgians of some kind and their language a Luwian dialect, something that is likely, in view of part of the Pelasgians living in Anatolia (see supra).

To round off it is worth quoting a very interesting theory put forward by Allen H. Jones²⁶⁴. It goes as follows: By the time the descendants of Danaus, brother of Cadmus, had reached territories in Greece such as Attica, Boeotia and Euboea, part of them had become known as Abantes, whose territory, as Homer says, was Euboea and the cities on it.²⁶⁵ By the time

the . . . Abantes had arrived in Euboea, goddess Histia (the goddess of the hearth) must have been known to them. It was in Euboea that the descendants of Danaus intermingled with a group of Indo-Europeans with whom they were to affect the history of the East Mediterranean, particularly Canaan. These Indo-Europeans were known as "Histiaaeans" after the name of their city Histiaea, named in turn after goddess Hestia or Histia. These Histiaaeans may have been the same Athenians as those reported by Strabo as having gone to Euboea before the Trojan War and founded there the two cities of Eretria and Chalkis.²⁶⁶ In this case they could have been Mycenaean, Achaeans, Proto-Ionians etc. In addition to that city of Histiaea, there was also a territory in Thessaly whose name originated from the same source, Histieotis. Thus, there could have been certain groups of Histiaaeans who are likely to have been referred to as "The Tribes of Histia" after the main goddess of their religion. This etymology phyle (phylai - plural), meaning "tribe"(s) and Histia seems correct in view of the custom of ancient Greeks to use "phyle(ai)" to refer to a certain group. The inhabitants of the city of Phylakopi on the island of Melos were noted for . . . their dexterity with the oars ("kopi", hence their name came out as "Phyla-kopi", that is, the "tribe of the oar"). So such a combination as "Phyle(ai)" and Histia may be a good possibility and could be employed to designate a group or groups whose name later would possibly come out "Phyle-esti" (plus a plural ending used perhaps of what tribes . . . in modern terms would be called Minoans, Mycenaean etc.) - and in one way or another could very probably have become "Philistines". Since the word "Phyle" was sometimes applied by the Greeks to designate a military contingent from a certain tribe²⁶⁷, "Philistines" might have meant a military contingent of Histiaaeans. It is interesting to remember that both Denyen and Peleset (possibly Danaeans and Philistines) were allies, at least for some time, for they were parts of the same confederation of tribes which fought against Ramesses III (c.1186). This fact is in harmony with what is suggested above, in other words with the mixture of Descendants of Danaus

and the Histiaeans (Denyen and Peleset), in Euboea. Strabo makes a noteworthy observation regarding a writer called Andron. This writer, says Strabo, claimed that some of the inhabitants of Crete were actually foreigners who had come from Histiaetis in Thessaly, a piece of information indicating that at least some of the Histiaeans had migrated south and reached Crete.²⁶⁸ So perhaps one tribe - phyle - of them settled there. The biblical texts also, as we saw, consider the Philistines as having come to Canaan from Crete.

Notes on the Text

1. While in the process of examining this group of evidence, reference will be made to the sources from Merneptah's time speaking of the first alien confederation which threatened Egypt in the fifth year of this Pharaoh's reign. Although Philistines are not involved in that occasion, the involvement in that campaign of Ekwesh - a tribe that seems to belong to the same ethnic "horizon" as the Philistines as well as to have come to Egypt via a route possibly similar to that employed some 34 years later by the Philistines - and the common aspects in both the foreign allied campaigns against Egypt (year 5 of Merneptah, year 8 of Ramesses III) certainly call for an examination of the evidence regarding the foreign attack against Egypt during Merneptah's reign.
2. Furumark, A. Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery, 2nd ed., Stockholm, (1972), pp. 118 ff.; *idem* O.A. III, p. 260; Dothan, T. Antiquity and Survival, II (1957), pp. 151 ff. (henceforth abbreviated to "Dothan").
3. Benson J.L. "A Problem in Orientalizing Cretan Birds: Mycenaean or Philistine Prototypes?", JNES, 20 (1961), p. 81.
4. Edelstein, G. and Glass I. "The Origin of Philistine Pottery Based on Petrographic Analysis", Jubilee volume for Shamu'el Yeivin, Tel Aviv, (1973), pp. 125-131. (Hebrew, English summary).
5. Amiran, R. Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land, Engl. lang. ed., Jerusalem, (1969), especially ch. X which deals with the Late Bronze Age; see also Epstein, C. Palestinian Bichrome Ware, Leiden, (1966). The suggestion made by *idem*, in Hoffman, H. (ed.) Orient and Occident : Essays Presented to Cyrus Gordon, Neukirchen, (1973), that Palestinian bichrome ware originated in Cyprus does not essentially affect the situation as it turns up in the 12th century. However, it is an interesting suggestion in that it puts forward Cyprus as the place of origin of the bichrome ware, instead of Palestine proper; Cyprus is the area from which the much later influence of Mycenaean pottery passed over to Philistia.
6. Desborough, V.R.d'A. The Last Mycenaeans and Their Successors, (1964), p. 209.
7. Phythian-Adams, PEFO, (1923), p. 71 and pl. 2, 12. We had better accept this example with some reservation, since the excavation report does not make it quite clear whether this vase belonged to the Philistine level or to that which preceded it.

8. ASA, Lii, pl. 58A.
9. Petrie, Beth-Pelet, II, pl. 63, No. 46; cf. Ohnefalsch-Richter, Kypros, the Bible and Homer, pl. 98, 4 for two very similar fish from Cyprus.
10. Shapes and decorations of non-Mycenaean origin (e.g. Egyptian and Cypriot, cf "Dothan", pp. 152 ff.) are not altogether absent in Philistine pottery, but they are rather scanty. There is also plenty of plain Palestinian ware in addition to the Philistine pottery.
11. Cf. Seiradaki, BSA, Lv. 21, fig. 14, bowl. 1.
12. Historical stela of Ramesses III from Deir el Medineh in Kitchen, K.A. Ramessid Inscriptions, vol. II, Oxford (1958-74), pp. 90-1.
13. Desborough, V.R.d'A. op.cit., (n.6.) (1964), p. 210.
14. Cf. Hesperia, VIII, p. 368, fig. 46, 0 (Athens); BSA, Lv, p. 33, fig. 23 (Karphi in Crete).
15. A certain amount of deep bowls have been recovered from these tombs.
16. Cf. "Dothan", p. 154.
17. Coche de la Ferte, Essai, pp. 30 ff.
18. It is to be noticed that Schaeffer, in a later publication, that is, in EA, P. 307, makes clear that the stratification at this point was not "intacte". He has published a fine specimen of this class of ware (jugs with strainer spout) from Floor V in Building 18. For this publication see op.cit., p. 271, fig. 91.
19. Karageorghis, BCH, Lxxxiii, p. 354, fig. 19.
20. This Nicosia sherd comes from the shoulder of a closed vase which might quite possibly have been a jug with strainer spout. The jug from Tell Farah which has actually been found in tomb 542 (one of the earliest of the group) has been published in Beth-Pelet, i., pl. 23,3.
21. Cf. Ohnefalsch-Richter, Kypros, the Bible and Homer, pl. 98, 4 for this bowl and another pot, both from Cyprus, bearing fish very similar to the sole Philistine instance of the use of this pattern.
22. Petrie, Beth-Pelet, ii, pl. 63, No. 46.
23. CAH, 3rd ed. (1969), vol. II, part 2, p. 509.

24. Albright, ibid., p. 509.
25. Desborough, V.R.d'A., op.cit. (n.6), p. 214.
26. CAH, (1924), II, pp. 293-4.
27. Ibid., p. 294.
28. See Higgins, Minoan-Mycenaean Art, (1967), p. 120.
29. Cf. Desborough V.R.d'A., The Last Mycenaeans and Their Successors, (1964), p. 210, also Sandars N.K., The Sea Peoples, (1978), pp. 166-7.
30. Desborough, op.cit. (previous note), p. 210.
31. CAH, vol. II, ch. xxviii, (fascicle 68), (1975), p. 17.
32. Ibid., p. 17.
33. Kitchen, K.A. "The Philistines", in D.J. Wiseman (ed.), Peoples of Old Testament Times, Oxford (1973), p. 61.
34. The Philistine pottery from Tell Eitun has been recovered from native-type, rock cut tombs (Edelstein, G. and Glass J., "The Origin of Philistine Pottery Based on Petrographic Analysis", Jubilee volume for Shmuel Yeivin, Tel Aviv (1973), pp. 125-31). The native pottery does not contain any sand, whereas the Philistine pots do contain this substance from the Palestinian coast, as at Ashdod.
35. As at Ashkelon, Tell Gemmeth (Albright, A.A.S.O.R., xii, (1932), pp. 54-55) and probably Ashdod (B.A. xxvi, (1963), p. 136).
36. As at Beth Shemesh and Tell Beit Mirsim (Albright, loc. cit.) both of which are Israelite rather than Philistine sites.
37. Desborough, op.cit., 1964, p. 212.
38. Benson, JNES, xx, p. 82.
39. Desborough, op.cit., (1964), pp. 207-208.
40. Gerstang, EBSA, III, pp. 20 ff.; cf. Albright, AASOR, XII, p. 54.
41. Beth-Pelet, II, p. 30.
42. "Dothan", pp. 154 ff.
43. Op.cit. (previous note), p. 157.

44. Many salient features of the material culture of the Philistines are dealt with at length in the revised English translation of the book by Trude Dothan The Philistines and their Material Culture (Hebrew, Jerusalem 1967).
45. Dothan, T. "The Philistine Material Culture and its Mycenaean Affinities", paper delivered in the International Archaeological Symposium The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean Nicosia, 27th March-2 April (1972), see the Acts of this Symposium, Nicosia (1973), pp. 187-88.; see also Dothan, M. Ashdod II-III, Atiqot IX-X, Jerusalem (1971), pp. 20-22. See also Sandars, N.K. The Sea Peoples, (1978), p. 171, ill. 116; for Ashdod, see also Dothan, M. Ashdod II-III, IEJ, 19/4, (1969), passim.
46. CAH, II, 1969, ch. xxviii (fascicle 68), p. 17.
47. Dothan, T. Antiquity and Survival, II, 1957, p. 188. (usually referred to as "Dothan").
48. See Hood, S. The Minoans, 1971, pp. 122-3, favouring another interpretation of this class of objects; according to his view of the subject, these stone pieces were used for some kind of game with a religious or magical side to it.
49. See chapter 1, n. 67.
50. See Waldbaum, J.D. "Philistine Tombs at Tell Fara and their Aegean Prototypes", AJA, 70, (1966), pp. 331-340.
51. This type of rock-cut tomb should in no case be confused with the typically Mycenaean so-called "chamber tomb" which appears on the Greek Mainland almost one hundred years before the appearance - also on the Mainland - of the rock-cut tomb which is of Cretan (Minoan) origin. In fact, the Mycenaean "chamber tomb" appears simultaneously with the "tholos tombs" (see chapter 1, p. 52), and they are cut to look like them (see chapter 1, n. 198), at the close of MH period (c. 1550). Later the "chamber tomb" is superseded by the "tholos-tomb" which became the most-often employed fashion of burial architecture down to the dawn of the Geometric period (c. 1050 B.C.).
52. Hood, S. The Minoans, (1971), pp. 58-59.
53. Op.cit., pp. 58-59, 147.

54. CAH, II, (1969), fascicle 68, p. 17 and n. 8, p. 10 and n. 2. Barnett agrees to some extent with Sandars, The Sea Peoples, (1978), p. 174, who suggests that these tombs may antedate the main Sea Peoples' attack in the 12th century, but both do not argue very convincingly in order to claim, the former that these tombs are to be dated to the 13th century, and the latter, that these tombs may be native. As for Barnett, his argument about the pottery does not carry much weight. This ware might well antedate the tombs and yet have been buried with the dead found within them since it could still be popular locally; as to the argument of Sandars that these tombs may antedate the time when we have evidence for the same type of tombs in Cyprus, the answer could well, I think, be that the rock-cut chamber tomb made its appearance in Cyprus before its equivalents first turned up in Crete and Greek mainland in the 15th century, (see Hood, op.cit., pp. 58-59, 147). Thus, it is virtually impossible for the Tell-Fara tombs, which are unquestionably assigned to the Philistine era (12th century onward), to antedate the time of the first appearance of their Cypriot counter-parts. Additionally, the fact that the Minoan and Greek mainland models are later than the Cypriot ones, and the strong likelihood that part of the Sea-Peoples who eventually settled in Palestine to become known as Philistines set out from Aegean territories to find new lands for settlement, renders the thought that the tombs of Tell-Fara were built by architects of Minoan or Mycenaean stocks - or, at least, developed under their influence - quite acceptable.
55. Op.cit., (n. 45), p. 188.
56. See Sandars, N.K. The Sea-Peoples, (1978); ill. II (colour). and 80-82, 83-84, 85 (monochrome).
57. This vase is mentioned by Barnett R.D., CAH, II, (1969), fascicle 68, p. 17. The pot has been recovered from tomb no. 3 at Enkomi.
58. Schachermeyr, F. Ugaritica VI, Paris (1969), pp. 451-9; Gallings, F. ibid., pp. 24-265 with full bibliography.
59. See Sandars, N.K., op.cit., (n. 56), p. 135, ill. 91.
60. See Sandars, N.K., op.cit., p. 119, ill. 74.

61. Idem in op.cit., p. 135, ill. 90, top right.
62. Op.cit., p. 135, ill. 90, top left.
63. Op.cit., p. 34, ill. 14.
64. Op.cit., p. 136, ill. 93, bottom.
65. Op.cit., p. 136-7, ill. 94, bottom.
66. Op.cit., p. 34-35, ill. 13.
67. Sandars, op.cit., pp. 40-41, ill. 18.
68. Higgins, R. Minoan - Mycenaean Art, London, (1974), p. 135, ill. 166.
69. Hall, CAH, II, (1924), ch. xii, p. 293.
70. Cf. D.M. Freedman, B.A. xxvi, (1963), pp. 136-7.
71. For a lengthy and very detailed description of this sort of kilt, see Wainwright, G.A. "Some Sea Peoples", J.E.A., (1951), p. 73 and n.6.
72. In the Minoan version the tassels are missing as well as the division of the kilt into panels. For a detailed discussion of the Minoan dress throughout Minoan era, see Sakellarakis-Sapouna, E. To Minoikon Zoma, Athens, 1971, (dissertation) with a very useful list of illustrations.
73. CAH, II, (1969), fascicle 68, p. 18.
74. See Hood, S. The Home of the Heroes, The Aegean before the Greeks, (1967) (reprinted 1974), p. 71 and ill. 58. This habit is actually of Egyptian extraction and it must be from that country that it probably found its way to the Greek Mainland.
75. Kenna, V. Cretan Seals (Oxford, 1960), pp. 65, 78, 151, ff; W.F. Albright in J.P.O.S. I, (1921), p. 187 ff.
76. I. Sam., xxx.14.
77. Ezekiel, xxv.16; Zeph. II.5.
78. CAH, II, (1924), xii, p. 293.
79. Op.cit. (previous note), p. 290.
80. Judg. xvi, 27.

81. It is not as yet proved that these tablets are actual Philistine texts since they are virtually undeciphered. The assumption that they may be some sort of degenerated version of Minoan linear A is only based on the mere, yet clear, resemblance of these tablets' signs to characters on Minoan Linear A tablets. However, even if the language of the Deir Alla tablets turns out to be neither akin to Minoan linear script nor even authentic Philistine texts, it is still useful and interesting to bear in mind that a number of tablets bearing a kind of script similar to Minoan Linear A have been recovered from a Philistine site and are still extant. Besides, whatever the nature of the language in question, this discovery gives us some information as to a tribe other than the standard Aegean ones, which also employed this Aegean-like script.
82. Albright, W.F. CAH, II, part 2, (1969), xxxiii, p. 510.
83. Sandars, N.K. op.cit., p. 120
84. Op.cit., p. 120.
85. Op.cit., p. 122, ill. 76-77.
86. Piggot, S. "The Earliest Wheeled Vehicles and the Caucasian Evidence", PPS, 34 (1968), pp. 266-318; Littauer, M.A. and Crowel, J.H. "Early Metal Models of Wagons from the Levant", Levant, 5 (1973), pp. 102-126.
87. Op.cit., (n. 85), p. 121.
88. Ibid.
89. Op.cit., p. 126, ill. 80-2.
90. Sandars, op.cit., p 27, ill. II.
91. Cf. 1 Sam. xiii 19-22 and the apparent reference to metalwork.
92. Oren E. The Northern Cemetery at Beth Shan, Leiden, (1973), chs. 5 and 6. Dr. Oren seems to prefer Denyen-Danune to Peleset at Beth-Shan. At one time clay coffins with anthropomorphic lids were taken to imply Sea Peoples' presence and habitation, specifically Peleset, that is, Philistines. Yet this type of coffin is quite likely to have stemmed from an Egyptian tradition from Tell el Vahudiyeh (Egypt) and those found at Beth-Shan were probably the coffin lids of Egyptian garrison troops, many of whom must have been recruited from the ranks of northern raiders, after the defeat of the latter at c.1186 by Ramesses III. For this theory Dothan, T. argues on good

grounds in "Egyptian and Philistine burial customs" in Crossland ; idem "Anthropoid Clay Coffins from a Late Bronze Age Cemetery near Deir el-Balah", I.E.J., xxiii, (1973), pp. 129-46. See also Wright, G.E. "Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries", B.A., xxii, (1959), pp. 53-66.

93. In order for one to approach the Egyptian point of view regarding the Sea Peoples' representations as much as it is possible, one must, I believe, understand that, above all these attackers were overseas raiders to the Egyptians, coveting the Egyptian lands, savage foreigners from the north having nothing in common with the "noble people" of Egypt. It is therefore not so baffling to see these northerners bear so many common features in the Egyptian reliefs; the "lands of the North" were, most probably, considered by the Egyptians to be a homogeneous group and so consequently were their inhabitants. Therefore, the Egyptian artist depicted this ethnical (foreign to him) homogeneity by almost homogeneous traits in the look of these foreigners.
94. For a discussion about this question, see Sandars, N.K. The Sea Peoples, (1978), pp. 134-7, ill. 88, 89, 90-4.
95. Hall, in Proc. Soc. Antiquaries, xxvii, (1914-5), pp. 127 ff.
96. For the appearance of Peleset, see Sandars, N.K., op.cit., (n.94), (1978), pp. 134-137, with illustrations; Hall, CAH II, (1924), pp. 286-7; Albright, W.F. CAH, vol. II, part two, (1969), p. 511; Wainwright, G.A. J.E.A., (1961), pp. 73-75; Barnett, R.D. CAH, vol. II, (1975), ch. xxviii, pp. 15-16, (fascicle 68).
97. Sandars, N.K. op.cit. (previous note), (1978), p. 169; see also Barnett, R.D. CAH, II, (1975), ch. xxviii, p. 16, favouring an Anatolian type and origin of these carts and stating that they are reminiscent of those employed by the Hittites at the battle of Qadesh (c.1286 B.C.).
98. Sandars, N.K. op.cit., (see previous notes), p. 130, ill. 85.
99. Amos 9.7.

100. Almost every study of the Philistines as an historical entity discusses the vague, yet unquestionable connection of this biblical tribe with Kaphtor. What written works have a particularly interesting bearing on the problem are: Hall, CAH, II, (1924), pp. 275-295; Barnett, R.D. CAH, vol. II, (1975), ch. xxviii (or fascicle 68), "The Philistines", pp. 15-21; Albright, W.F., CAH, II, part two, (1969), p. 512 n. 2; Erlenmeyer, M.L. and H. "uber Philister und Kreter, I" in Or.n.s. 29, (1960), pp. 121 ff. and 241 ff. ibid. 30, (1961), pp. 269 ff.; Wainwright, G.A. "Some Sea Peoples", J.E.A., 47, (1961), 71-90, idem "Kaphtor-Cappadocia" in Vetus Testamentum, 6, (1956), pp. 199-210, idem "Some Early Philistine History" in ibid., 9, (1959), pp. 73-84, idem, "Kaphtor, Keftiu and Cappadocia" in P.E.F.O.S., (1931), pp. 203 ff. idem "Keftiu: Crete or Cilicia" in J.H.S., 57, (1931), pp. 1 ff.; Kitchen, K.A. "The Philistines", D.J. Wiseman (ed.) Peoples of Old Testament Times, Oxford, (1973), pp. 53-78; Vercoutter, J. L'Egypte et le monde Egeén prehellénique, (1956), pp. 106-114, esp. pp. 109-112; cf. also idem Essai sur les relations entre Egyptiens et Prehellènes, 1954.
101. Jeremiah 47.4
102. Ezekiel 25.16. The connection here is between Philistines and Cherethites which might be the ethnic appellation employed of Cretans (most probably the inhabitants of Kaphtor, that is Crete, by the biblical scribes).
103. Genesis 10.13-14.
104. "The Philistines", in Wiseman (ed.) Peoples of Old Testament Times, (1973), p. 53.
105. According to one trend of thought on the problems posed by this reference to Casluhim, it is perhaps the Philistines' political subordination to Egypt that is hinted at in this particular biblical quotation, see Sanders, N.K. The Sea Peoples, (1978), pp. 165-6 and cf. G.E. Wright, B.A., 29, (1966), p. 71, n.3. An altogether different approach to the problem posed by this reference is proposed and argued for in the following chapter of this survey.
106. I. Sam. 30.14.
107. Deut. 2.23; cf. Josh. 13.3.
108. Cf. Zeph. 2.4-5 and Ezek. 25.15-16.
109. Ibid (previous note).

110. Hall, CAH, II, (1924), ch. xii, p. 285. See II Sam. 15.18 and II Sam. 20.7.
111. II Sam. 8.18.
112. Deut. 2.23.
113. Joshua 13.3.
114. Ex. 25.31-6, cf. Amos 9.1.
115. Barnett, CAH, II, (1969), ch. xxviii (fascicle 68), p. 18.
116. Kitchen in D.J. Wiseman (ed.) Peoples of Old Testament Times, Oxford (1973), ch. III, p. 56.
117. Genesis 21.32,34 and 26.1, 8, 14-18. Genesis 10.13-14 cannot be taken to be "an early reference" to the term in as much as it cites the Philistine extraction according to the table of Nations and it cannot possibly stand for a precise chronological point of the narrative.
118. According to what evaluations of all the evidence available have been carried out so far, the patriarchs from Abraham to Jacob would be placed somewhere in the first half of the second millenium B.C. (probably at the time 1900-1700); cf. Kitchen K.A. Ancient Orient and Old Testament, (1966), pp. 41-56, with refs.
119. Dossin, quoted by A. Pohl, Or., xix, (1950), p. 509.
120. Hazor: see Y. Yadin et al. Hazor II, (1960), p. 86 and pp. 115; 12-13, and A. Malamat, J.B.L., Lxxix, (1960), pp. 18-19; Ugarit: cf. C.F.A. Schaeffer, Ugaritica, I, 1939, pp. 54 ff.
121. Cf. H. Cantor, in R.W. Enrich (ed.) Chronologies in Old World Archaeology, (1965), pp. 19-22 and refs.
122. Genesis 26.26.
123. Genesis 20.1-18.
124. Cf. Genesis 12.11-20.
125. Genesis 21.22-34.
126. Genesis 26.1-35.
127. Genesis 26.19-21.

128. Genesis 26.26-33.
129. A group of Minoan seals was found near Gaza, see Kenna, V. Cretan Seals, Oxford, (1960), pp. 65, 78, 151 ff.; also Albright, W.F. in J.P.O.S., I (1921), pp. 187 ff.
130. CAH, II, (1969), ch. xxxiii, p. 512.
131. See ch. three, n. 32 and 33 for the way of arranging chronological sequences applying to the New Kingdom era and to the period commencing with Ramesses II's accession to the throne in particular, that is, to a period that covers the reigns of Merneptah and Ramesses III who are the Pharaohs whose names are directly associated with the dual foreigners' attack against Egypt.
132. See "Egypt and the Northern Allies" in chapter two, part I: "The Invasions at the time of Merneptah and Ramesses III", and notes 34-44.
133. Perhaps a disguised, poetic license-generated reference to scorched earth - tactics or perhaps the Egyptian navy itself, see Sandars, op.cit., p. 119 suggesting either.
134. It should not escape one's attention that the Egyptian scribe names the Philistines first as if they were spearheading the onslaught.
135. Breasted, (1906), vol IV, paras 59-82; Edgerton and Wilson (1936), pl. 46, p. 53; and Wilson, J. "Egyptian Historical Texts" in Pritchard (1969).
136. Named first again as of some special importance.
137. Breasted, ibid., in op.cit., (n. 135).
138. Breasted, (1906), vol IV, para 44; see also Edgerton and Wilson (1936), pp. 30-1.
139. Teher is otherwise attested in connexion with Hittite troops; its meaning is still to be decided.
140. Djahi should probably have been somewhere near the fortress-line guarding the eastern side of the Delta and the frontier districts of the Palestinian border, for if - as the Egyptian texts relate - the attack was orchestrated at Amurru, where the main base-camp is explicitly said to have been set up, then the Egyptians must legitimately have expected that the hot-bed of the operations would be somewhere near their Palestinian frontier, something that meant that the fortresses set up to protect these areas had to be prepared accordingly to bear the brunt of the onslaught successfully.

141. Troops acting as mercenaries, that is.
142. The Nile Delta, in all probability.
143. Op.cit., (n. 135).
144. Op.cit.
145. Op.cit.
146. Kitchen, K.A. Ramessidic Inscriptions, pp. 90-1; cf. Stela Petrie Tanis II, pl. 2, no. 73, also Aswan Stela in Kitchen, K.A., op.cit., vol. II, Oxford (1958-74), pp. 290, 1-4; see also Gurney (1969), p. 56; Wainwright, (1959). Dr. Kitchen has emphasized that the inscription referring to the Peleset and Tursha (Teresh) in association with the expression "from the midst of the sea" employs the normal semitic word for sea, "yam".
147. See Sandars, N.K., op.cit., (1978), p. 116, ill. 72.
148. Papyrus Harris, Breasted (1906), vol. IV, paras 397-412. The Papyrus Harris is a last Will and Testament compiled by decree of Ramesses III's son, Ramesses IV. The summary of events starts with the grim situation around 1200, known as the "Interregnum Years", before peace was restored by Seknakht, father of Ramesses III and founder of the 20th dynasty.
149. Op.cit., (1906) (previous note).
150. Breasted, (1906), vol. IV, paras 397-412.
151. See Hood, S. The Minoans, London, (1971), introduction and Chapter one; also Malamat, A. "The Egyptian Decline in Canaan" and "The Period of the Judges" in Mazar, B. (ed.) The World History of the Jewish People, first series, Ancient Times, III, Tel Aviv (1971); Schaeffer, C.F.A - "A bronze sword from Ugarit with cartouche of Merneptah", Antiquity, 29, (1955), pp. 226-9.
152. See the discussion of the overall matter given in the first chapter of this survey.
153. It is very interesting to note that the artist in the relevant illustration had begun to draw a codpiece and flap as part of the clothes of one of these Keftians, which apparently is of the old LMIA type (c.1550 - c.1500) but has changed it to the new style of decorated kilt which was in vogue during LMIB (c.1500 - c.1450). See Palace of Minos, II, fig. 473a, also Pendlebury, J.D.S. The Archaeology of Crete, (1939), Norton (1965) (sec. ed.), p. 223.

154. Sandars, N.K. The Sea Peoples, 1978, p. 165, ill. 113.
155. Sandars, N.K. op.cit., p. 132, ill. 86.
156. It is obvious that N.K. Sandars has made a mistake by naming Shekelesh among the northerners recorded in papyrus Harris as recruited by Ramesses III to man his garrisons (see Sandars, op.cit., p. 165). The Papyrus Harris states clearly that the tribes which were used for this purpose were Peleset, Shardana, Weshesh, Denyen and Tjekker. Thus Sherden should be substituted for Shekelesh in the aforementioned reference. This mistake is not repeated in another citing of the relevant account in p. 133. That Tjekker were really settled in Palestine is attested by the "report of Wenamon" which is the latest mention in any Egyptian record of the Peoples of the Sea, as such, and clearly states that Tjekker enlisted the city of Dor which, in Palestinian topographical terms, is near Megiddo, south of Mount Carmel, in the north-western slip of the Palestinian coastland.
157. Breasted, J.H. Ancient Records of Egypt, vol. III, Chicago (1906), paras. 251-351.
158. The date of the Madduwattas Indictment and associated texts are discussed by Houwinkten Cate, Ph. H.J. in Crossland, R.A. and Birchall, A. (eds) Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean, Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory (Sheffield 1970), London and Park Ridge (1973), pp. 141-53 with full bibliography; see also Otten, H. "Die hethitischen historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie", Abhandlung der Akad. Wiss., Geistes - Soz. Klasse, Mainz (1968). Although most of the scholars on Hittite texts prefer to date this text (Madduwattas Indictment) in the 15th rather than the 13th century, there are still historical difficulties, especially regarding Alashiya-Cyprus, see Otten, H. "Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des hethitischen Reiches", MDOG, 94, (1963), 1-23, also Gutterbock, H.G. "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered", JNES, 26 (1967), pp. 73-81.
159. On the locations of Ahhiyawa see Huxley, G.L. Achaean and Hittites, Oxford (1960), passim; Gurney, O. The Hittites, Harmondsworth, (1969), pp. 46 ff.; Page, D.L. History and the Homeric Iliad, Berkeley and Los Angeles (1959), pp. 13 ff., Wainwright, G.A. "Some Sea Peoples", J.E.A., 47, (1961), pp. 71-90.

160. Sandars, N.K. The Sea Peoples, London, (1978), p. 111.
161. Ibid.
162. Breasted, J.H. Ancient Records of Egypt (1906), vol. III; Wainwright, G.A., JEA, 47, (1961).
163. See Nougayrol, J., Larouche, E., Viroliaud, C. and Schaeffer, C.F.A. Ugaritica, vol. V. Paris (1968), pp. 83-6, 105, 701-3, etc; also Astour, M.C. "New Evidence on the last Days of Ugarit, AJA, 69, (1965), pp. 253-258; also Sandars, N.K. The Sea Peoples, (1978), pp. 139-144, 151-155; cf Hooker, J.T. Mycenaean Greece, (1976), pp. 155-6, 158-160, who despite falling in line with the above scholars in dating the destruction of Ugarit at c.1200, he nevertheless is inclined to attribute it to an earthquake, thus agreeing with Schaeffer, C.F.A., "Commentaires sur les lettres et documents trouves dans les bibliotheques privees d'Ugarit", Ugaritica, 5, Paris, (1968), pp. 754-768; Lehmann, G.A. in "Der Untergang des Hethitischen Grossreiches und die neuen Texte aus Ugarit", VF, 2, (1970), pp. 39-73, is in no doubt about the city of Ugarit having been destroyed by the Sea Peoples and in having this view he agrees with Astour, op.cit., p. 255; for archaeological evidence on the date of the destruction of Ugarit, see also Schaeffer, C.F.-A., "A bronze sword from Ugarit with a cartouch of Mernephtah", Antiquity, 29, (1955), pp. 226-9.
164. Nougayrol, J. PRU, IV, RS 17.237. 17.340, 13.62, 17.339A, 17.366 and p. 14; Astour, M.C., JNES 22, (1963), pp. 236 f.
165. Otten, H. "Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des hethitischen Reiches", MDOG, 94 (1963), p. 5 and nn. 18-20. The text concerned, dealing with foreign policy is KBO IV 14 II 7 ff, the tablet, that is, designated by Laroche, E. "The Treaty with an Unknown Partner", in which the King speaks in the first person singular, whereby all the linguistic and graphic criteria for dating the composition testify to the time of Suppiluliuma II; see Laroche, E. RA 47, p. 76.
166. Otten, H., op.cit. (previous note), p. 5, n.21, citing KBO IV 14 II 53 ff. See also Sandars, N.K. The Sea Peoples, p. 139-140 also Hooker, J.T. Mycenaean Greece, (1976), pp. 155, 166.

167. Hooker, J.T., op.cit., (previous note), p. 155.
168. Hooker, J.T., op.cit., p. 155.
169. Astour, M.C., op.cit., (n. 164), p. 254.
170. See Dothan, M., Atigot, English Series, Jerusalem (1971), pp. 9-10; Ashdod II-III, idem, IEJ, 19/4, (1969), passim and the "beginning of the Sea Peoples and of the Philistines" in Crossland, R.A. (ed). The Sea People, proceedings of the Third International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory, Sheffield, (1973).
171. See James, F.W. The Iron Age at Beth Shan, Philadelphia, (1966); also Hankey, V. "Mycenaean Pottery in the Middle East" BSA, 62 (1967), p. 127 for published material from Beth Shan; also de Vaux, R. "Les Philistines, autres Peuples de la Mer en Palestine", Histoire ancienne d'Israel, part 3, Paris (1971), pp. 443-485.
172. See Sandars, N.K., op.cit., (n. 167), p. 172; also for anthropoid clay coffins at Beth Shan bearing what might be feathered head gear-wearing human figures crudely modelled in relief on their lids, see Oren, E. "The Northern Cemetery at Beth Shan", Leiden (1973), chs. 5 and 6, also Dothan, T. "Egyptian and Philistine Burial Customs" in Crossland, The Sea Peoples, Sheffield, (1973); idem, IEJ, 23 (1973), pp. 129-46.
173. See Sandars, N.K., op.cit., pp. 172-174.
174. Tausert was the widow of Seti II, last Pharaoh of the 19th dynasty after whose reign the dreary years of interregnum ensued, a period that might coincide with the temporary abandonment of Deir Alla after the earthquake, see Sandars, op.cit., previous note, p. 173.
175. Hankey, V. "Mycenaean Pottery in the Middle East", BSA, 62, (1967), p. 131.
176. For Cyprus - Bronze Age Alashiya - as it is attested in the archaeological record in the Bronze Age as a whole, see Schaeffer, C.F.A., Enkomi Alasia, Nouvelles missions en Chypre, 1945-1950, Paris, (1952), also idem Alasia I, Mission archeologique d'Alasia IV, Paris (1971), see also Sjoqvist, E. Problems of the Late Cypriot Bronze Age, Stockholm (1940), pp. 197 ff. Also Myhly, J.D. "The Land of Alashiya", Praktikon tou protou diethnous Kyprologikon syndriou, vol. I, Nicosia (1972), pp. 210-219.

177. See Catling, H. "The Achaean Settlement of Cyprus" in Acts of the International Symposium The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean, Nicosia (1972), Nicosia (1973), pp. 34-9.
178. For Enkomi, see Dikaios, P. Enkomi Excavations 1948-58, vols I-III, Mainz (1969), esp. vol. II, pp. 441-536 and table in p. 496, also Schaeffer, C.F.A., op.cit., (1952), (n. 177). For Kition, another site of importance for construing Late Bronze Age History in Cyprus, see Karageorghis, V. Excavations at Kition, I, The Tombs, Nicosia (1974) and idem Kition, London and New York, (1976).
179. Studying the Medinet Habu inscriptions of Ramesses III's year 8, one notices that most of the lands mentioned as having been overrun by the Sea Peoples form a reasonable geographical sequence in that they fall within an ancient very well-known route that ran almost due south via Hittite Kanesh and the Cilician Gates to Tarsus and Adana in Kizuwatna where it split off, one branch continuing east to Carchemish and another running a southward course through Alalah, Ugarit, Amurru and the Palestinian lands to Egypt, see Sandars, N.K. op.cit., n. 166, pp. 140, 143. The lands that fall within this logical southward and eastward course are Hatti, Kode (Hittite, Kizuwatna, that is the coastal parts of Cilicia) and Karkemish. However, the last two names in the inscription, Arzawa and Alashiya are off this ancient, most-frequented highway through the Taurus mountains in Eastern Anatolia to southern Cilicia and then to Northern Syria or Carchemish. Arzawa lies in western Anatolia while Alashiya, that is Cyprus, is overseas. Consequently, Sandars in op.cit., p. 140, is quite right in suggesting that had there been only one wave of attackers the peoples from western Anatolia "would have travelled a very round about way in the descent on Syria and eventually Egypt". She believes that there were at least two separate contingents of migrating Sea Peoples, one operating as a land force and therefore being responsible for the destructions of the sites falling within the aforementioned land route, and the other operating in the coastal regions and being at least partly a sea-power, something which would render it responsible for the raids on Alashya and Ugarit.
180. Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazkoi XII 38, Column III, in Otten, H., MDOG, 94, (1963), pp. 20-21.
181. Ibid, Column IV.

182. Otten, op.cit., (n. 181), p. 21.
183. Guterbock, H.G. "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered", JNES, 26, (1967), pp. 73-81. Hooker, J.T. in his Mycenaean Greece, (1976), ch. 7, p. 159, propounds the view that the "enemies from Alashiya" in the text in question (Col. III) are none other than the native people of Alashiya who revolted, after their subjugation by the Hittites - on information furnished in KBO XII, 38, Col. I - only to be subdued once again by the last Hittite King, Suppiluliumas II. However, the propriety of Hooker's view of this matter can be severely questioned in the light of the following: The island of Alashiya, according to the wording of the same text, seems to have been conquered not before the time of Tutholiya IV, father of Suppiluliumas II. It seems likely that the vassal revolted at the time of his death only for his son Suppiluliumas II to undertake military action and suppress the revolution, thereby enforcing once more recognition of Hittite suzerainty over the island (KBO XII, 38, Col. I, see Otten, op.cit., p. 22). So Col. I speaks already of unsuccessful revolt of Alashiya and not of the original conquest of it which had already occurred at an earlier time, thus making it not very likely that the people of Alashiya could have once again embarked upon revolutionary action within what seems to have been not a long time of their aborted attempt to shake off the Hittite yoke. But we can go further. The letters recovered from the Royal Archives of Ugarit and dating from the same chronological context as the aforementioned Hittite text speak of the King of Alashiya sending warnings to Ugarit with regard to approaching enemy ships. There is no warrant or indeed the slightest indication in these letters that Alashiya is at war with the Hittites. Additionally, Suppiluliumas II's documentary establishment of the "crimes of Madduwattas" [Goetze, A. Madduwattas = MVAeG 32, 1] might well be seen to lend credibility to the statement that Alashiya had been taken or used by foreign enemies, of whom Madduwattas, Attarsijas (who is called the "Achaean") and the man from Piggaja are mentioned by name. Otten, H. shares this view in op.cit., p. 21 and also Sandars in op.cit., p. 142 adopts the same attitude to the matter overall in believing that the Sea Peoples seem to be most likely to qualify as the "enemies from Alashiya" in KBO XII 38, Col. III. And of course one should not forget that, as has already been remarked (see text), there is no reference to "the King of Alashiya" in the passage in question, which in view of such references being typical of events concerning action undertaken by subjects of the overlords referred to, may very well signify that these "enemies" were not any Alashiya state-bound power and that, therefore they might very well have been foreigners who were simply

using Cypriot harbours to launch their maritime enterprises eastwards or wherever else they planned. Finally, it is evident from the correspondence between the Kings of Alashiya and Ugarit at the time immediately preceding the destruction of the latter state, that the two Kingdoms were allies to each other, and that therefore Alashiya was an ally of the Hittites [see Astour, M.C. AJA, 69, (1965), p. 1 and n. 23]. Therefore the offending ships in KBO XII 38, Col. III, could only be Alashiya-based foreign ships.

184. We cannot pinpoint the date of these letters but it looks as though it is safe to attribute them to the same chronological context as that of Ramesses' III northern war (c.1186), since the situation as it appears in these texts immediately precludes the destruction of Ugarit probably by the Sea Peoples confederacy. See Nougayrol, J., Laroche, E., Virolleaud, C. and Schaeffer, C.F.A., Ugaritica Vol. V, Paris (1968), pp. 83-6, 105, 701-3.
185. Nougayrol's No. 22 = RS 20.18. See Nougayrol, op.cit. (previous note), Vol. V, (1968), pp. 83-6, 105, 701-3, Astour, M.C. op.cit. (n. 183), pp. 255-6.
186. As the King of Alashiya's letter leaves no doubt as to the identity of at least part of the offenders and in the light of this correspondence having occurred at the time of the Sea Peoples' raids and just prior to the destruction - probably by those Peoples - of Ugarit, it looks perhaps legitimate to think of a temporary - at least - alliance between the two aforementioned parties as the likeliest development. Astour, M.C. in op.cit., (n. 183), pp. 255-6, is in no doubt that it was Ugaritic outlaws who gave the ships mentioned in the text (20) over to some invading force.
187. Op.cit., (n. 185), No. 23 = RSL I.
188. The only way to account for this rather bizarre address - which flies in the face of the fact that both kings were of equal rank, since Ugarit was in no way subject to Alashiya, both Kingdoms being actually vassals of Hatti, see Astour, M.C., op.cit., p. 255 and n. 19, also p. 1 and idem, JNES 22 (1963), 236 f., also Nougayrol, PRU IV, RS 17.237, 17.340, 13.62, 17.339A, 17.366 and p. 14 - is to assume some kind of blood relationship; the King of Alashiya seems to be the same person as a certain Pgn who addresses the King of Ugarit, in a letter, as "my son", assures him that there is abundance of food supplies in his Kingdom, thanks to a shipment delivered to him by his Ugaritic counterpart, and commissions him to equip a ship with comestibles bound for an unknown addressee. The letter in question is PRU, V, No. 61 = RS 18.147.

189. Op.cit., (n. 185), No. 24 = RS 20.238, lines 12-29; see also Astour, M.C. op.cit. (n. 163), p. 255.
190. In Otten, H. MDOG 94, (1963), pp. 20 f, see n. 184.
191. In Nougayrol, J., Laroche, E., Virrolaud, C., Schaeffer, C.F.A., Ugaritica, vol. V, Paris, (1968), see n. 185
192. Astour, M.C. op.cit. (n. 184), p. 255, Sandars, N.K., The Sea Peoples, (1978), p. 143.
193. No. 24 = RS 20.238 in op.cit. (n. 185).
194. XII 38, Column III in Otten, H. MDOG, 94 (1963), pp. 20-1.
195. No. 24 = RS 20.238 in op.cit. (n. 185). This letter might very well be the last to have been written by the royal scribes of Ugarit since it was found in the kiln in the city's palace, something that suggests that it was probably never dispatched through being overtaken by the escalation of hostile invasion-induced violent events, the climax of which spelled the final disaster for the city.
196. Breasted, J.H., Ancient Records of Egypt, vol. IV, Chicago, (1906), paras. 59-82; Edgerton, W.F. and Wilson, J.A. Historical Records of Ramesses III, The Texts at Medinet Habu, Chicago, (1936), vol. I. In the latter publication, pp. 30-31 where there is a citing of another inscription dating from year 8 of Ramesses III - although it is listed under year 5 in Medinet Habu, it looks as though the later part must refer to year 8 since year 5 is only connected with this Pharaoh's first Libyan war in which northern invaders are not mentioned - there is a reference to the Sea Peoples as operating both as land and also as sea-borne groups; this reference may of course be referring to the sea and land forces of the invaders involved in the sea and land battle against the Egyptians respectively, but perhaps it might be wise not to dismiss altogether the possibility that the Egyptian scribe refers to the invaders' original situation, prior to their making up a league, during which they were setting out from different areas, that is, from islands and sea-washed areas as well as from inland territories.
197. PRU V, No. 60 = RS 18.38, lines 31-35.
198. PRU V, No. 63 = RS 18.40, lines 1-15.

199. See references in Astour, M.C.'s Hellenosemitica, E.J. Brill, (1965), pp. 30 ff.
200. Fuad Safar, "A Further Text of Shalmaneser III from Assur" Sumer, 7 (1951), p. 12, iv: 22-34.
201. Astour, M.C. op.cit., n. 184, p. 257.
202. PRU II, No. 12 = RS 16.402, lines 10, 15-17.
203. The identification of Mgsh with Mukis, Mukishe, Mugis was first recognized in JNES 22 (1963), p. 237.
204. This is made clear in ibid, line 8 where it is stated that "he is moving somewhere" and 14 where it is said that "he spent the night somewhere". Thus Ewir-Sharruma had no option other than writing to the King's mother herself, in Ugarit.
205. The attack of Suppiluliuma against Mukish in 1366 was aided by Ugaritic forces under King Niqmad II. There is no evidence of either the Egyptians or the Assyrians having involved Mukish in their wars against Hatti. See Astour, M.C., AJA, 69 (1965), p. 258.
206. Astour, M.C., op.cit., p. 258.
207. PRU II, No. 13 = RS 16.379, lines 16-24.
208. PRU V, No. 114 = RS 19.11, lines 2-13.
209. These vessels were named after a site in Peloponnesse, near Sparta in southern Greek mainland where the two most noteworthy examples of Late Bronze Age gold plate have been recovered, namely two brilliant cups, found together in a Tholos Tomb. They rather date to early LHII (c.1500.- 1450) and consist of an embossed outer case and a plain lining, all of gold. For further information on this group see Vapheio: Ephemeris (1889), p. 10; Evans, A, PM, Ind. S.V. Vapheio Tomb; Kenna, Cretan Seals, pp. 52, 79; Karo, AM 35 (1910), p. 182.
210. The Archaeology of Crete, (1939), Norton (1965) (sec. ed.), p. 223.
211. Evans, A., PM, II, Fig. 473a.
212. Such as the Marseilles Oenochoe (Pendlebury, The Archaeology of Crete, pl XL I, also PM II, p. 509) and a tall alabastron from Sedment decorated with a stylized imitation of alabaster veining (Pendlebury, op.cit., pl. XL, 2, also Sedment, II, grave 137 and PM, IV, p. 271).

213. Hood, S. The Minoans, p. 48, pl. 11.
214. CAH, II, (1924), ch. XII, p. 279.
215. Ibid., pp. 279-80.
216. De Garis Davies, Bulletin of the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art, (1926), New York, II, pp. 42 ff.
217. Hall, R.H. "Keftiu" in Peet's "Essays in Aegean Archaeology", p. 32. For a Keftian or a Man of the Isles from the wall-painting in the tomb of Rekhmara at Thebes, see BSA, viii, p. 171, fig. 2. For Keftian envoys bringing gifts on the tomb of User-Amen at Thebes, see Garis Davies, op.cit., n. 221. For the Keftians on Senmut's tomb, see BSA, x, p. 156, fig. 2. For the Keftians on the tomb of Menkheperresenb at Thebes, see Hall, R.H., op.cit. in this note, pl. IVa and IVb. For the Keftians on the tomb of Senmut at Thebes see Hall, R.H., op.cit. in this note, pl. III.
218. See *supra* the first part of this chapter the relevant quotations from the biblical passages. The most explicit connexion between the Philistines and Kaphtor occurs in Amos 9.7.
219. For the occurrence of "Kaptara" in tablets referring to Sargon of Akkad (c.2370 B.C.), c.f., E.F. Weidner, AFO., xvi (1952-3), pp. 1 ff., cf. C.J. Gadd, CAH (rev. edn), I, ch. xix, pp. 15-16; also M. Astour, JAOS lxxxiv, (1964), p. 249, n. 109.
220. Cf., G. Dossin, Syria, xxi, (1939), pp. 111-113.
221. For the occurrence of that name in the Akkadian texts of Ugarit, cf. J Nougayrol, PRU, III., p. 107.
222. Cf. C.H. Gordon "Ugaritic text book", (1965), p. 422, No. 1291.
223. See J. Vercoutter, L'Egypte et la monde Egeén préhellénique, 1956, pp. 106-114, esp. pp. 109-112. By a well attested rule of phonetic decay in Egyptian, one may posit the original Egyptian form as "Kaftaru" becoming "Kaftaiu" and Kaftiu. Actually the name of "Keftiu" has naturally been identified with Kaphtor in spite of the final -r of the latter form - which has, however, been explained away by Egyptian philologists. See the discussion on the Egyptian representations of, as well as inscriptions on, Keftiu on the tombs of high-ranking officers of Thotmes III, in the final part of the literary evidence section of part I of this chapter and also n. 218.

224. JEA (1961), p. 78.
225. Hill, "British Museum Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lycaonia, Isauria and Cilicia", pp. xxiii - xxiv.
226. For all these cities see ibid, (previous note), pp. xxxvii, lvii and p. 147, n. 1
227. Athenaeus, viii, 37 (C. and T. Muller Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, 1-38, fragment 11), Ashkalon and Philistia had many connections with Lydia most of which are dealt with in Wainwright's article "Some Early Philistine History" in Vetus Testamentum, 9 (1959), 79 ff. See also Burn, A.R. Minoans, Philistines and Greeks, pp. 151-154.
228. R.D. Macalister "The Philistines", p. 79, Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, S.V. "Philistines".
229. G. Radet, Le Lydia et le monde Grecque, (1893), 146, 147, also Prellwitz, W. Etymologischen Wörterbuch, (1905), p. 471.
230. Strabo, xiv, iv.3.
231. O. Callaghan in Orientalia, 18 (1949), 177-9, and 199 ff. for the discussion; Barnett in JHS, 73, (1953), 142.
232. Hofer, loc. cit..
233. What works of G. A. Wainwright deal with the problem of the identification of Keftiu are: "Kaphtor, Cappadocia" in V.T. 6, 2 (1956), 200 ff; "Kaphtor, Keftiu and Cappadocia" in P.E.F.Q.S. (1931), 203 ff.; "Keftiu" in J.E.A., 17, (1931), 26 ff; "Keftiu and Karamania (Asia Minor)" in A.ST., 4 (1954), 38 ff; "Keftiu Crete or Cilicia?" in J.H.S., 57 (1931), 1 ff.; "The Keftiu People of the Egyptian Monuments", in Ann. Arch. Anthr. 6(1913), 24 ff.; J.E.A., 47, (1961), 71 ff.
234. See the relevant discussion above.
235. It is important that there is a remarkable increase in the number of imports from the Greek Mainland to Egypt from c.1450 B.C. onwards, that is, from the time that Mycenaeans took over in Crete and thereafter. On the other hand, Minoan products (other than perishables) begin to fade away in the Egyptian markets. At the same time this whole phenomenon is quite consistent with what the archaeological evidence has established, that is, the conquest of Crete by the Mycenaeans c.1450, who would be quite keen on barring Crete from the trade with Egypt and taking the south Mediterranean routes - as well as increasing their hold on the Egyptian market - themselves.

236. See Hall, CAH, II, (1924), ch. XII, p. 279.
237. CAH, II, (1924), ch: xii, p. 279.
238. Hall, ibid, pp. 279-280.
239. Ibid, p. 280
240. Ibid, p. 280. See also Pendlebury, The Archaeology of Crete, Norton Library (1965), p. 270. We cannot say with certainty as Pendlebury points out, that this document is an unsuccessful attempt by the Egyptian scribe, to write Minoan in Egyptian characters as it seems to be. This spell may well be nothing but a document on Egyptian witchcraft intended for the healing of the eyes. An interesting study by Wainwright (J.E.A., xvii, 26 ff.), has proved that many a name in this document has affinities common in Asia Minor.
241. So already Helck, op.cit., 73, and Faure, op.cit., 146.
242. For the narrower and wider uses of "Danaoi", cf. sir A. H. Gardiner, Ancient Egyptian Onomastica, i, (1947), p. 125 and refs, and Helck, op.cit., 73.
243. See Edel "Orsfnamanliste", p. 42 reading a vertical "f" for "seated man"; cf. idem "Archeion", pp. 41-2; Faure in op.cit., pp. 139-40 has queries about Edel's readings, yet his own suggestions seem at least as hypothetical.
244. Peet, in "Essays in Aegean Archaeology", p. 90 ff. Sanders, N.K., in her Sea Peoples, (1978), p. 166, making a point about this name states that it may be a Hurrian one from Cilicia, rather than Greek Anchises (as many suspect it is).
245. See above, p. 61.
246. Barnett, CAH, II, (1969), ch. xxviii (fascicle 68), p. 18.
247. D.J. Wiseman (ed) Peoples of Old Testament Times, Oxford, (1973), ch. III, p. 56.
248. According to what evaluations of all the evidence available have been carried out so far, the patriarchs Abraham to Jacob would be placed somewhere in the first half of the second millenium (probably at the time 1900-1700); cf. Kitchen, K.A. Ancient Orient and Old Testament, (1966), pp. 41-56, with refs.

249. Dossin, quoted by A. Pohl, Or. 'xix, (1950), p. 509.
250. Hazor: see V. Yadin et al. Hazor II, (1960), p. 86 and pp. 115: 12-13, and A. Malamat, I.B.L., Lxxix, (1960), pp. 18-19; Ugarit: cf. C.F.A. Schaeffer Ugaritica, I, (1939), pp 54 ff.
251. Cf. Cantor, H., in R.W. Enrich (ed.) Chronologies in Old World Archaeology, (1965), pp. 19-22 and refs.
252. Deut. 2:23; cf. also Josh. 13:3.
253. Cf. Zeph. 2:4-5 and Ezek. 25:15-16.
254. XXV, 16.
255. A group of Cretan seals was found near Gaza, see V. Kenna Cretan Seals, Oxford, (1960), pp. 65, 78, 151 ff., also W.F. Albright in J. P. O. S., I, (1921), pp. 187 f.
256. I, Sam. 30-14.
257. CAH, II, 1969, ch xxxiii, p. 512.
258. In "Jahrbuch fuer Kleinasiatische Forschung", I, (1951), pp. 136 ff.
259. CAH, II, (1969), ch. xxxiii, p. 513.
260. Iliad, II, 840.
261. Herodotus, VII, 94.
262. Iliad, II, 645.
263. Odyssey, xix, 175.
264. The Philistines and the Danites, (1975), p. 81-3.
265. Iliad, I, 91.
266. Strabo, V, 11-13.
267. Herodotus, III, 266.
268. Strabo, V, 127.

Chapter FOUR:

THE BEARING IN THE ANCIENT GREEK SOURCES AND IN THE BIBLICAL ONES ON THE PHILISTINE QUESTION IN ITS VARIOUS RAMIFICATIONS -THE EVIDENCE ON THE OVERALL MATTER IN JOSEPHUS*AND MANETHO'S WORKS.

This Chapter will primarily be concerned with drawing up such pieces of evidence from the ancient Greek authors, the Bible and Josephus' as well as Manetho's works as point, either directly or indirectly, to a strong Aegean element in the Philistine movement towards Levantine Areas -at the time of the Great Land and Sea raids of Ramesses III's times- as well as in their eventual settlement in Palestine. It will also deal with conducting various juxtapositions of the evidence coming from the aforementioned sources with the view to assessing the value of the various quotes and to -eventually- demonstrating the common views, and at times the unanimity -of the various authors as to the strong Aegean connexions of the Philistines, either in the form of a strong participation of Aegean tribes in the southward movement of the Peleset or in the presence of Aegean names, habits, customs, items, attitudes and other traces of Aegean affinities in the life of the Philistines in Palestine. Since the name "Philistine" or any such derivative hardly

ever turns up in the Greek authors' writings, emphasis can only be laid upon what movements of tribes or heroes or groups of people in general are attested in these sources as having started from the Aegean islands and/or the Greek Mainland and as having headed for Levantine areas during the time of the Sea Peoples' movements and various actions in the same regions.

Alternatively, points of interest can also be detected in those Greek quotes which speak of various Greek heroes or tribes' activities in Palestinian or Egyptian or other Levantine territories -just before or during or after the Great Land and sea Raids- or, in a reverse order, of Semitic -and generally Levantine- Kings', heroes' and peoples' activities in Aegean and Greek Mainland areas, thus suggesting a certain degree of cultural or even racial intercourse which is even further corroborated by the third interesting group of evidence in the Greek sources, that is, the information on various traces indicative of Aegean influence in Philistine culture in Palestine, either in the form of names of Aegean derivation or tendencies suggesting Aegean ties or habits and even memories of a distant "Aegean" past.

The research in this chapter will also suggest something of a Dorian element in the southward movement of

peoples during the time of the great tribal mobility attested during the turbulent period at about the turn of the twelfth century and a certain while thereafter. This is actually the time during which both the famous, so-called "Dorian invasion"- credited with having eliminated the Mycenaean palace civilisation and brought about the commencement of a new era- as well as the "Sea Peoples" movements and invasions in the Levant are attested. So far, the Dorians are credited with having forced the old inhabitants of the Greek mainland and the Aegean islands, that is, mainly the Mycenaeseans, to leave their homelands and migrate southwards in search of new lands for settlement -as well as with having engaged others in the same regions in warfare action which eventually turned the scale to the invaders' favour -rather than with having themselves trekked through the south and south-east seaways in a quest for just as much. This chapter will endeavour to prove or at least propound that there is much evidence for a Dorian involvement in the Aegean population's migratory movement bound for such Aegean and Levantine areas as are likely either to have been stop-overs in the Sea-Peoples' route to the Levant or to have been caught in the swath of destruction cut by those People's invasions of the Near Eastern Kingdoms. It will also endeavour to expand further on this matter and show that there is room to suggest a Dorian connexion in

the ranks of the Philistines in Palestine, notwithstanding the foggy and patchy nature of the data involved in this attempt.

However, the main and most important weight of the evidence and consequently the effort of this chapter will be directed towards proving or at least propounding the view that there is enough material in both the Greek and biblical - to which we will presently turn - sources to indicate the stand that a very considerable part of the so-called "Sea-Peoples" were of Aegean and mainly, Mycenaean, origin.

And now a few words about the contribution of the biblical sources. The attempt in this chapter, so far as these sources are concerned, will be to amass enough evidence to suggest that a good deal of the overall attitude of the Philistines during the time of their settlement in Palestine shows tendencies, stands, mentalities as well as habits that give away a non-Semitic and, more specifically, an Aegean affinity or at least connexion. Additionally there will be a discussion of such evidence as pertains to matters of their origin, that is, of evidence attesting to genealogical as well as various cultural matters or practices and to such other information as afford us more or less a useful and stimulating

knowledge of the Aegean affinities of the Philistines.

In doing so, this chapter will attempt to decipher a number of controversial biblical narratives by unravelling the sometimes intriguingly tangled strands of Hebrew accounts of various events or situations, with a view to uncovering not-so-evident parts of likely Philistine action or general involvement and to tracking the Philistine historical evolution in a way that will cast further light on the so-far dark and disputable aspects of their history.

And last but not least what has to be brought to notice with reference to both the Greek and biblical sources research, the attempt will also focus on bringing up such evidence as points to the arrival and settlement on Aegean lands of Semitic tribal elements from the Levant prior to the time of the Sea - Peoples' invasion of Levantine areas, and to the likelihood of these Semites having joined up with the later migratory movement of the Aegean folk, via Aegean routes, to the Areas that were also the hotbed of the Sea Peoples' activities.

This chapter will, in sub-dividing the material, employ an order based on the various major matters which have been referred to above as those which this survey

deems of great importance and on which the sources to be examined have much to offer. Consequently the first part of this chapter will deal with what the sources have to offer on the matter of the various movements of Aegean and Greek Mainland People(s) towards the Levant, the second with the various activities of Aegean people(s) in the Levant and with those of Levantine tribes or/and heroes in the Aegean areas and their options subsequent as well as incidental to the turbulent times towards the decline of the Achaean (Mycenæan) sovereignty, the third and final one with examining the evidence attesting or, at least, pointing to the various Aegean connexions - in form of practices, attitudes, names, habits, religion and social attitudes etc. - of the Philistines in Palestine¹.

Part 1:

The Evidence On The Various Movements Of Aegean Tribes
Or Heroes To Levantine Areas ² .

A. The Evidence From The Greek Sources.

A1. The Evidence On The Dorian Connexion.

1. Strabo quoting Ephorus says ³ that the ten Cretan cities out of a total of one hundred which are said by Homer ⁴ to have existed in Crete, a statement that forms a contrast with the latter author's account in another part of his narrative ⁵ , were founded later than the other ninety - after, that is, the Trojan war, by the Dorians who accompanied Althaemenes the Argive.

So we have here a reference to an influx of Dorian population, led by an Argive overlord, into Crete after the Trojan war, that is at a time assignable to the outset of the decline of Mycenaean civilization ⁶ and to the troublesome era of the Sea-Peoples' activities in the Levantine regions. So, this movement could perhaps be envisaged as a Greek mainland population movement overseas, as a migration, that is, induced by what perhaps was the imminent threat of a natural catastrophe or a grim

population expansion problem or an invasion or a combination of all these factors. What is certain is that we have a reference here to a Dorian population influx into Crete at a time which is customarily associated with the Sea Peoples' activities in the Levant.

2. Strabo, quoting Ephorus, says ⁷ that Lycurgus, the legendary Spartan Law-giver, was five generations later than Althaemenes who conducted the colony to Crete. (See previous reference).

Now, granted that, according to Thucydides ⁸, the Dorian invasion occurred at about eighty (80) years after the Trojan war whose termination is put by Ephorus at c. 1135, it follows that the Dorians invaded and settled the Greek Mainland at c. 1055, a chronological landmark which one would think it legitimate to assign to a time not much earlier than Lycurgus time, the latter being unanimously, in the various Greek sources, credited with having been the founder of Spartan legislation and social order at a very early stage of Spartan history, that is, at a very early stage of Dorian settlement, the Spartans being, of course, the most prominent - in all respects - Dorian group to have settled in Greek Mainland after the Dorian invasion.

The chronological calculation standing thus, it follows

that Lycurgus can be seen to have lived at c. 1000 which would make Althaemenes and his Dorian colonization of Crete datable at c. 1150, on the grounds of his being five generations earlier than Lycurgus, as Strabo, quoting Ephorus, claims. Additionally, if we make our calculations on the basis of Eratosthenes⁹ date for the Trojan war, and more specifically, for the fall of Troy, which is said to have occurred at c. 1184, then according to the already-mentioned Thucydides view, the Dorian invasion and settlement occurred at c. 1104, Lycurgus time will be pushed upwards to c. 1054, and consequently Althaemenes and the Dorian settlement in Crete can be envisaged as having occurred at c. 1204. Both these dates for the Dorian population movement to Crete, c. 1150 and c. 1204 belong to the same broad chronological framework as the turbulent, havoc - bringing Sea-Peoples' invasions in the Levant and, as a matter of fact, they afford us an average dating c. 1177 which takes us almost headlong into that broad chronological stage which the archaeological research nowadays connects with the Sea-Peoples' raiding activities and invasions of Levantine areas during the time of Ramesses III.

3. Strabo¹⁰ says that the whole of Parnassus which is clearly known to be a Dorian territory¹¹ is esteemed as sacred, since it has coves and other places that are held

in honour and deemed holy. Of these, he says, the best known and most beautiful is Corycium, a cave of the nymphs bearing the same name as that in Cilicia. Of the sides of Parnassus -he continues - the western is occupied by the Ozolian Locrians and by some of the Dorians and by the Aetolians who live near the Aetolian mountain called Corax; whereas the other side is occupied by Phocians and by the majority of the Dorians, who occupy the Tetrapolis which in a general way lies round Parnassus, but widens out in its parts that face the east.

Now what is of a special interest in this information supplied by Strabo is that we have two sites, two caves in particular, one in Parnassus, a typical Dorian territory, and one in Cilicia -a major landmark in the Sea-Peoples havoc spreading southward route towards Egypt - bearing the same name, that is Corycium. This piece of information is another hint connecting the Dorians on one hand and the Sea-Peoples -and consequently the Philistines - on the other.

4. Strabo¹² speaks about Dorians in Crete quoting from Homer¹³ and Andron who says that these Dorians came to Crete from Doris (Hestiaëotis in later times) in Thessaly¹⁴ and that it was from Doris too that the Dorians in Parnassus set out to found three of the four famous cities

of the Dorian Tetrapolis (four-cities complex) near Parnassus.

So we have another reference here to an overseas movement of Dorian population to Crete, a reference that expresses views falling in line with those in Strabo, X.4.15 (see refer. No 1), and Homer, *Odyssey* XIX.177 where the poet speaks of the three Dorian tribes co-existing in the ninety cities of Crete with such other tribes as the Achæans, the Cretans proper, the Kidonians and the Pelasgians at a time roughly that of the Trojan war.

5. In another quote from Strabo ¹⁵ we read: "The Rhodians, like the people of Halicarnassos and Cnidus and Cos, are Dorians; for of the Dorians who founded Megara after the death of Codrus, some remained there, others took part with Althaemenes the Argive in the colonization of Crete, and others were distributed to Rhodes and to the cities just now mentioned. But these events are later than those mentioned by Homer, for Cnidus and Halicarnassos were not yet in existence, although Rhodes and Cos were; but they were inhabited by Heracleidae. Now when Tlepolemus had grown to manhood, "he forthwith slew his own father's dear uncle, Licymnius, who was then growing old; and straight way he built ships and when he had gathered together a great host he went in flight". The poet ¹⁶ then

adds "he came to Rhodes in his wanderings, where his people settled in three divisions by tribes"; and he names the cities of that time, "Linds, Ialysos and Cameiros, white with chalk" ¹⁷, the city of the Rhodians having not yet been founded.

The poet then nowhere mentions Dorians by name here, but perhaps indicates Aeolians and Boeotians if it be true that Heracles and Licymnius settled there. But if, as others say, Tlepolemus set forth from Argos and Tiryns, even so the colonisation thence could not have been Dorian, for it must have taken place before the return of the Heracleidae. And of the Coans also, Homer says: "These were led by Phidippus and Antiphus, the two sons of Lord Thessalus, son of Heracles" ¹⁸. And these names indicate the Aeolian stock of people rather than the Dorian."

Now these arguments which Strabo employs to postulate a non-Dorian population background in Rhodes at roughly the time of the Trojan war are rather flimsy. Thessaly was certainly a focus of Dorian presence on account of Doris (renamed to Hestiaeotis in later times, Strabo IX.5.17) ¹⁹; one of the regions of Thessaly famous for its Dorian element of population, from which Dorians are reputed to have migrated to Crete ²⁰. So the Thessalians of Cos, Nisyros, Karpethos, Kasos, Kalydnes ²¹ may very well have

been Dorians or in one way or another related to them. As for the argument that, owing to Tlepolemus' expeditions - from Argos and Tiryns - having taken place prior to the Return of the Heracleidae, the colonisation of Rhodes could not have been by Dorians, this is hardly a strong argument at all. Strabo himself admits ²² that there were Dorians in Crete at the time of the Trojan war, thus accepting that this Greek tribe existed before the return of the descendants of Hercules (Heracleidae). As for Tlepolemus, it suffices that he and his followers were related to Hercules in order to make it plausible that they have been on good terms with the Dorians with whom Hercules himself had been on very good terms ²³.

After all, the later Dorian colonisation of the islands in question and the establishment there of the Dorian Hexapolis (six-city league) points to a whole earlier tradition of movements to, and settlements, on these islands of groups familiar with each other which paved the way for later Dorians and suggests perhaps that this south-east sea-route was well-known to settlers of later times from lingering "echoes" of migratory movements of their ancestors to these islands. Thus, the later Dorians can be envisaged as having followed a familiar sea-route, knowing perhaps that what their forefathers achieved they could, in all probability, carry out too,

that is, the colonisation of these islands, where they may well be welcomed by the locals.

6. In another quote from Strabo we read ²⁴ : "Herodotus says ²⁵ that the Pamphylians are the descendants of the peoples led by Amphilochous and Calchas, a miscellaneous throng who accompanied them from Troy; and that most of them remained here ²⁶ , but some of them were scattered to numerous places on earth".

This quote should be coupled with that speaking about the origins of the Dorians and classifying them into three tribes to which all Dorians can be ultimately traced back:

We read that Heracles seems to have been on good terms with the wild tribes of north-western Greece; for when he died his children took refuge among these tribes from their father's numerous enemies. They were said to have intermarried with the chiefs of a mixed horde of wanderers from the Illyrian border, now temporarily settled in the Pindos Valleys and in a fair way to become a nation: The Dorians, the names of whose three tribes give a hint at their origin. These are the Hylleis, a section of whom were still to be seen in southern Illyria in Hellenic Times ²⁷ , the Dymanes, the termination of whose name is like that of the Akarnanes, Ainianes and other

northwestern tribes of classical Greece; and the Pamphyloi ("those of all tribes"), the mixed multitude that might be expected to be found among a horde of semibarbarians on the move ²⁸.

Given now these two pieces of information, regarding the Pamphylians of Asia Minor and the Dorian Pamphyloi, one may postulate the thesis that the people who were led by Amphilocheus and Calchas to the Trojan war might have been a segment of the Dorian Pamphyloi. The names are virtually the same and one should also not overlook the fact that both peoples are understood to be a miscellaneous horde by virtue, mainly, of their name meaning, as has already been stated, "those of all tribes". The fact that the Pamphylians are not designated as ultimately of Dorian stock, in Herodotus' quote, may be due to the latter being not known as Dorian-born in the Greek (Mycenaean) South at the time of the Trojan War when the original information quoted by Herodotus may date and come from. This is understandable since the Dorian tribe does not seem to have been an important population element of the Mycenaean south at least at the time of the Trojan War and therefore we should not expect contemporary southern Greeks to refer to them by that name. The fact also that the Pamphyloi were a motley group may have confused the southerners even further, thus making it more convenient for them to refer to that tribe simply as "a miscellaneous

throng". Herodotus who picked up this information most probably did not bother to dig up the ultimate identity of those people led by Calchas and Amphilochus to Troy.

It is obvious from what is stated above that the Dorian Pamphyloi are made out to be contemporary with the sons of Heracles. The latter hero is said to have pillaged the city of Troy a generation earlier than the ultimate Trojan War sang by Homer in the Iliad²⁹.

So it is likely that, like the son of Heracles Tlepolemus who took part in the Trojan War³⁰, the Pamphyloi could also have taken part through being recruited by Amphilochus and Calchas. If we consult the archaeological record, the data involved are even more encouraging: the first sack of Troy is put around 1300³¹ thus making Heracles who conducted it contemporary with that chronology. The final destruction of Troy, that sang about in the Iliad, is not definitely settled but most scholars are inclined to put it somewhere during the second half of the 13th century, preferably nearer to its closing stages³². It follows that the Pamphyloi, being contemporary with Heracles' sons, can be envisaged as being in the Greek mainland a generation after 1300 which is Troy's first Heracles-caused sack date, that is at c. 1270. This chronology allows again, and in a more

comfortable way, the conclusion that they might have joined the Achaeen expedition to Troy which happened a good while later.

Now in the Herodotus passage, quoted by Strabo and stated supra, we read that most of the people who accompanied Amphiloehus and Calches to Troy, remained, after the termination of the War, in the area which was named Pamphylia after them, but that some of them "scattered to numerous places on earth". It might well be then, that these "Pamphylians" joined in the southward - moving, new lands - seeking multi racial coalition that came ultimately, through the Ramessidic records, to be known and remembered as "Sea-Peoples". The Sea-Peoples' raids are now envisaged as having occurred at the eighth year of Ramesses III, c. 1186, that is, at a date not much later than the Trojan War. The data involved fit in with each other quite well and encourage the view that these roaming Pamphylians - who might originally have been of Dorian stock, as has been argued above - might have joined in the major Sea-Peoples' coalition and appeared eventually as "plst" in the Nile Delta and later as Philistines in Palestine.

7. In another quote from Strabo we read ³³ : "They say that the Achaeans of Phthiotis came down with Pelops into

Peloponneses, took up their abode in Laconia, and so far excelled in bravery that the Peloponneses, which now for many ages had been called Argos, came to be called Achaean Argos and the name was applied not only in a general way to the Peloponneses, but also in a specific way to Laconia; at any rate the words of the poet "Where was Menelaus"³⁴ ... Or was he not in Achaean Argos³⁵?" are interpreted by some thus: "Or was he not in Laconia?".

This is very interesting information and should be coupled with a quote from Diodorus³⁶ where this author says that part of the Dorian expedition under the leadership of Tectamus, son of Dorus, to Crete, consisted of "Achaean from Laconia, since Dorus had fixed the base of his expedition in the region about Cape Malea". These Achaeans, or at least part of them, must have consisted of those brought over to Laconia by Pelops from Phthiotis in Thessaly. The inference from Diodorus' text is that the Achaeans of Laconia were already there when the Tectamus' expedition came to Peloponneses. Thus, the latter expedition must have occurred later than the Pelop's one, and if Pelops, was the father of Atreus the father of Agamemnon, he can be dated at a time two generations prior to the Trojan War, which means that the Tectamus - led, Dorian expedition to Crete must have taken place later than such a date. But if we go further and

bring the Tectamus' expedition date to Crete more into focus we read, in another Diodorus quote³⁷, that Tectamus, who is here said to have sailed to Crete with Aeolians and Pelasgians but this should not confuse us³⁸, was the father of Asterius who was the (earthly) father of Minos who fathered Lucastus who begat (another) Minos who in turn begat Deucalion. Deucalion gave birth to Idomeneus³⁹ - who fought at the Trojan War. Thus Tectamus is here explicitly made out to be six generations earlier than the Trojan War. It follows that this expedition - bringing Dorians - to Crete must have taken place quite a while before the Trojan War, which means that there were Dorians in Crete long enough before that War and consequently before the Sea - Peoples raids in the Levant⁴⁰. It follows that these Dorians are placed in Crete early enough to have joined a Levant - bound expedition later on at the time of the Sea-Peoples attacks against Levantine areas. Let us not forget that the Philistines are customarily seen in the O.T. as having come from Caphtor (Crete in all probability, see relevant discussion in previous chapters). Therefore it might be these Crete - based Dorians who were brought over by Tectamus that are to be seen under the guise of the Egyptian Peleset and the O.T. Philistines.

What can also be inferred is that, because "Dorus had fixed the base of his expedition in the region about Cape Malea" (near Laconia)⁴¹ it looks likely that he did it on purpose so that Achaeans could also join the expedition to Crete, as they indeed did. If that was really Dorus' intention, some sort of ties should be conceded between him - and of course his descendants, the Dorians - and the tribe of Achaeans. A possible relationship between the Dorians of Hestiaecotis and the Achaeans of Phthiotis must always be suspected, all the more so because Phthiotis and Hestiaecotis, both in Thessaly and almost neighbouring countries⁴², must have made intercourse between the two tribes quite an easy and frequent affair. But we can go further. Diodorus⁴³ says that the largest number of the Tectamus - led Dorians who came to Crete was gathered from the regions about Olympus, in other words from Hestiaecotis in Thessaly⁴⁴ which is an area adjacent to Phthiotis, thus making it likely that the peoples from these two lands, the Dorians and the Achaeans, being neighbours, were allies, something that is further corroborated by the information, quoted in Diodorus V.80, that part of the Crete - bound Dorian expedition was composed of Achaeans from Laconia, since Dorus, father of Tectamus, had fixed the base of his expedition in Cape Malea which is near Laconia. All the evidence available seems to suggest that the Dorians of

Hestiaeotis and the Achaeans of Phthiotis were on very good terms, had been allies and shared a number of common interests and also problems. If we are to couple now this evidence and the inferences we can work out of it with that of the O.T. and the Ramessidic records speaking of the Philistines and the Sea-peoples raids respectively and if we are to translate the 12th century turbulent situation in the Levant - as it appears in the latter records - in "Aegean terms", then the Peleset - Philistines and the Denyen, two of the most prominent Sea-Peoples who are envisaged as being of Aegean extraction in the Egyptian and biblical sources, and, more specifically, as coming from Caphtor (Crete most probably), can perhaps be seen in the case of those Dorians and Achaeans (Danaans) respectively who had migrated to and settled in Crete, at sometime prior to the Trojan War and then were perhaps forced to migrate again, in the form of another joint expedition like that which brought them to Crete.

8. In a Herodotus quote we read ⁴⁵ : "These races, Ionian and Dorian, were the foremost in ancient times, the first a Pelasgian and the second an Hellenic people. The Pelasgian stock has never yet left its habitation, the Hellenic has wandered often and afar. For in the days of king Deucalion it inhabited the land of Phthis, then in

the time of Dorus, son of Hellen, the country called Hestiaeotis, under Ossa and Olympus; driven by the Cadmeans from this Hestiaeian country, it settled about Pindus in the parts called Macedonian; thence again it migrated to Dryopia, and at last came from Dryopia into Peloponnese, where it took the name of Dorian".

So, we have here an explicit and important reference to the Dorian race having, at one time, inhabited the Thessalian territory called Doris, something that falls completely in line with Strabo X.4.6, quoting Andron, who writes that there were Dorians in Thessaly and in the area called Doris and later Hestiaeotis, in particular. Of course in Strabo, loc.cit, we also read that these Doris (Hestiaeotis) -settled Dorians migrated to Crete something that is also quoted by Homer⁴⁶, although he actually only speaks of Dorians being there, without mentioning their country of origin. However, we also have Diodorus' thesis on the matter⁴⁷ where he speaks of the Tectamus - led Dorian expedition to Crete "from the regions about Olympus", that is, from the area of Hestiaeotis in Thessaly, as Herodotus makes clear in I.56. Additionally, Diodorus in another quote⁴⁸ makes Tectamus out to be six generations earlier than the Trojan War, something that means that he brought Dorians to Crete from Hestiaeotis in Thessaly a long while - even though the

calculation of his time by Diodorus' is not very precise - before that War: consequently, these Dorians were in Crete when the social imbroglio in the Aegean and the Sea-Peoples' raids in the Levant occurred and it is likely that they, or part of them, migrated to the Levant looking for a better fate, perhaps for more spacious and fertile lands for settlement or that they were forced out of Crete by the incursion of other south-bound tribes from the Greek mainland or by local uprisings and social warfare or overpopulation problems in Crete. In that case, they could have joined the Great Sea-People inroads on Levantine areas, lured perhaps by the prospect of pillage or/and settlement in the rich, wealthy Levantine areas and above all, in those ruled by Egypt and of course Egypt itself. The Ramessidic and O.T. accounts speak of Philistines coming from "the lands in the midst of the Sea" and from "Kaphtor" - that is, Crete in all probability - respectively, therefore the Crete-based Dorians may perhaps qualify for the Peleset and Philistines (See also previous quote in this section, quote No. 7, that is, and the corresponding footnotes).

9. In another quote Herodotus writes ⁴⁹, speaking of the Scythians: "Thence they marched against Egypt: and when they were in the part of Syria called Palestine, Psammetichus, King of Egypt met them and persuaded them

with gifts and prayers to come no further. So they turned back, and when they came on their way to the city of Askalon in Syria, most of the Scythians passed by and did no harm, but a few remained behind and plundered the temple of Heavenly Aphrodite. This temple, as I learn from what I hear is the oldest of all the temples of the goddess, for the temple in Cyprus was founded from it, as the Cyprians themselves say".

So, we have here a reference to the temple of Aphrodite in Cyprus according to which it was founded by inhabitants of Askalon. This may be of outstanding importance in so much as one discerns here a connexion between Cyprus and Askalon. Since the Cypriot temple of Aphrodite dates further back than all its equivalents in the Aegean area - Cyprus being the very place whence Aphrodite's cult branched out into the rest of the Greek world, and of course the one on which the first Aphrodite's shrines were erected hence Herodotus' comparison of it to that in Askalon in order to underline the great antiquity of the latter - one is to envisage the Askalon temple, which is said to be earlier than the Cypriot one, as dating from a time when Askalon was inhabited by its very early inhabitants (perhaps the Philistines) who, consequently, were those who also founded the Cyprus temple. What is important here can be summed up in two inferences:

a) there seems to have existed some

kind of connexion between the Cypriots and the inhabitants of Askalon through them both sharing in the worship of Aphrodite and the latter having erected this goddess' temple in Cyprus, b) an Aegean background for the early inhabitants of Askalon is hinted at through their cult of Aphrodite who was only worshipped by that name in no other lands than the Greek world. Moreover one may discern the possibility of a Dorian connexion in the Philistines through the quote in question in as much as there is evidence of the Thessaly - based Dorians having been worshipping Aphrodite in the settlement of Metropolis⁵⁰ as well as evidence of having migrated to Crete - Caphtor in all probability from where the Philistines are credited to have come to Palestine⁵¹ according to biblical tradition - thus making it clear that it was ultimately from this area - Thessaly - of the Greek mainland⁵², and in particular, from that area's section which comprised the territory of Metropolis where the cult of Aphrodite was practised that the Philistines seem to have come to the Levant and eventually settled in Palestine⁵³. So one may perhaps legitimately suggest that those Philistines of Askalon who worshipped the "Heavenly Aphrodite" and also erected, as is very likely, the temple of Aphrodite in Cyprus, were partly, of least, derived from those Dorians who had migrated to Crete from Thessaly and carried with them the cult of Aphrodite of Metropolis - a

Thessalian territory - and who perhaps embarked later on upon a much larger - scale overseas trek . to the Levant in order to find a better fate in the pursuit of which they must, perhaps along with other Greek - mainland tribes, have followed the well - known, Aegean island-hopping, coast - hugging route to Levantine areas⁵⁴ where they quite possibly were joined by other "Sea-Peoples", themselves appearing as Peleset (the Caphtor - derived Philistines of the O.T.)

10. In a Herodotus quote⁵⁵ we read that according to an account given by the inhabitants of Praesus Crete was peopled by Greeks in especial among other men after it had been left desolate subsequent to the two disastrous Cretan campaigns to Sicily, the first undertaken by what we can infer to be the second Minos who was killed there and the second by a Cretan fleet who attempted it with a view to punishing the Sicilians of Kocalus over the death of their master.⁵⁶ The information furnished by Herodotus in VII 171, that the Trojan War occurred in the third generation after this Minos -the one who was involved in the Sicilian expedition- makes it easily understandable that the Trojan War happened during the lifetime of Idomeneus, grandson of Minos and son of Deucalion, Minos' son⁵⁷. It also makes it clear that the Minos in question is the second Minos as the study of the Cretan kings

genealogies bears out ⁵⁸. This second Minos was the son of Lycastus and Ide ⁵⁹ and his generation can be worked out as spanning the period, roughly no doubt, between c.1370 and c.1340, according to the dates of the Parian Marble ⁶⁰ which make the Greek expedition to Troy out to have happened at 1218 and the commencement of first Minos' ⁶¹ kingship at 1462.

What is of great interest to this study though is the question "when" the Greeks settled in Crete according to the information provided by Herodotus in this quote and those in other historians. Since we have the information that this happened after Crete was left desolate as a result of the two disastrous campaigns to Sicily and also the information that the Cretans laid a five - year -siege ⁶² to the Sicilian city of Camicus in the course of the second campaign -which is only very likely to have happened very soon after Minos' tragic end in Sicily during the first expedition since it was precisely this event that triggered it off -we can work out a date around 1340 - 1330 for the time of the coming of the wave of the Greek settlers to Crete and at any rate a date for this event during the late stages of the 14th cent. We should not forget that helping factors for this approximate, no doubt, dating are the approximate date for Minos' death, c.1340 that is (see above) which marks the end of the

first campaign, the information of the five - year -siege laid on a Sicilian city in the second campaign, the information that the Greeks arrived at Crete after it had been left desolate as a result of these two disastrous campaigns (something that seems to suggest that this Greek settlement happened soon after these two campaigns -when Crete was still desolate- so that it could anticipate any potentially rival newcomers) and finally the information, furnished in Herodotus VII.170 that after the five - year - siege of the Sicilian Camicus, we find the Cretans settled in Hyris in the major area of Iapygia in Sicily while Crete at the same time was bereft of all those who participated in this expedition . So this must be the time spoken of by Herodotus as the one in which Crete was left desolate because of the Sicilian campaigns.

The question that now emerges is whether these Greeks who settled Crete after the Sicilian campaigns were Dorians since it is Herodotus who speaks about this whole matter and we should always bear in mind that this historian designates the Dorian race as "Hellenic" (Greek).⁶³ If they really were, then what Herodotus says later on speaking of the Cretans in VII.171 acquires a major importance: "...When they returned from Troy they and their flocks and herds were afflicted by famine and pestilence, till Crete was once more left desolate".

So, we are told that the Greek inhabitants of Crete, after their return from the Trojan War, suffered a severe setback owing to them and their livestock being afflicted by famine and pestilence as a result of which the island of Crete was again left desolate. In other words, it is clear that what can be inferred here is a case of the local population leaving the island, that is migrating, in search of better lands. Since that happened soon after the Trojan War, at a time, that is, marking the end of the thirteenth century or even the outset of the twelfth, this overseas movement of the Cretan population - who, by that time, involved a lot of Greeks, as has been stated by Herodotus⁶⁴, and quite possibly, Dorians, as has already been pointed out - may well be envisaged as having happened at the same time as either of the Great Land and Sea raids of the Sea - Peoples against Levantine areas, a thought that would make the Cretan immigrants' participation in the same goal - seeking Sea - Peoples expedition by no means unlikely. After all, we should always bear in mind that the Ramessidic records look upon the Sea - Peoples as coming "from their islands", or from the north or from the "midst of the the Sea"⁶⁵ and that there is one tribe that stands out of the rest of the Sea - Peoples coalition as of some special importance for the issue in question in as much as it is the only one that is clearly said, time and again in the biblical narrative, to

have come from the land of Caphtor (most probably Crete, see relevant discussion in previous chapters)⁶⁶ or to be associated with the Cereti - Cherethites⁶⁷ who seem to be associated with the Cretans. This tribe is of course the Philistines, the Egyptian Peleset in all probability, and the overall thread of the evidence and the argumentation which are based on it and have been set out above lead to what seems to be a very strong possibility of the Crete - based Greeks having migrated in search of better, epidemic - free lands for settlement and having joined, in the process, the rest of the Sea - Peoples' motley horde heading towards Egypt, thus becoming (these "Cretan" Greeks) what was termed Peleset in the Egyptian records and Philistines in the Biblical narrative. The key - factor for this association is that there is evidence, as has been already shown, that both tribes are shown to have set out from Cretan soil at roughly the same time and with, roughly again, the same motives. Let us not forget that the Sea Peoples appear in the Medinet Habu inscriptions as a whole people on the go, possibly afflicted by some epidemic if we are to judge from the emaciated type given to them.

At this point it should be noted that there are repeated reference in Homer's Odyssey to certain prominent heroes' adventures in Egypt after the Trojan War, these prominent figures arriving there either through being steered off course owing to poor weather conditions or with the view to pillaging coastal areas. Menelaus, Agamemnon's brother is said to have been driven ashore in

Egypt through stormy weather -after touching at Crete- where he "amassed great wealth and a lot of gold" in the course of his wanderings among foreign tribes⁶⁸. The overall wording seems to be a broad hint at buccaneering activities; there are also another two references to the same person being involved in Egyptian adventures; the first speaks of him having amassed his treasures through his peregrinations in such Levantine areas as Cyprus, Phoenicia, Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya in the course of no less than eight years⁶⁹; This account also leaves hardly any room for misgivings regarding the way in which these "treasures" were obtained at a time when marauding and buccaneering habits were conventional practices in the whole of Eastern Mediterranean; This is borne out by the Great Land and Sea Raids described in the Ramessidic records, as well as the sea and land-borne offensive against Ugarit referred to in that city's archives and dating from the same era as the Sea-Peoples' attacks and the Trojan heroes wanderings, (see previous chapter for a detailed discussion and more references); the second speaks of Menelaus having arrived at Egypt, neglected to give the gods their dues and thereby been beset by windless weather in the small offshore island of Feros where eventually he and his men are put out of their misery through a fairy's advice and the instructions of Proteus, her father, following which Menelaus sails back

to Egypt, offers sacrifices to the gods and, the spell broken, sails back home.⁷⁰ We also have an account related by Odysseus regarding his expedition to Egypt from Crete after the Trojan War, a case that suits the argumentation based on Herodotus VII.170 and 171 perfectly, that is, the theory for a Greek contingent setting out from Crete after the Trojan War - in search for lands to settle in - and eventually joining the rest of the Sea-Peoples roaming the Levant at the same time. In this Odyssey quote Odysseus is said to have campaigned against Egypt from Crete -in order to practise his favourite, as he himself confesses, looting habits - and to have been, after having wrought havoc to certain areas, eventually foiled by the concerted Egyptian offensive and taken captive for seven years after which time he is tempted into going to Phoenicia where he spent one more year.⁷¹ The account is repeated, slightly changed (Odysseus is said to have been given as captive to the king of Cyprus after he was defeated in Egypt) later on.⁷²

Now, although the Odysseus' accounts are clearly fictitious they however may, as well as those involving Menelaus, reflect vivid and widespread memories of a very recent past or even the favourite practices of the current situation in the Aegean and the Levant regarding the booty-seeking campaigns of Aegean people, often resulting

in bloody acts of bravado from both parts and perhaps just as often induced by inescapable overpopulation problems, onrush of epidemics, invasion by other tribes etc.⁷³

Let us now examine how strong appears the possibility of the post - Sicilian campaigns Cretan Greeks being of Dorian stock. The often - quoted Homeric passage, that is, Odyssey XIX 172-9, which speaks of Dorians, Achaeans, Cretans, Kydonions and Pelasgians living in Crete in Trojan War times suggests that the Greek (Dorian, Achaean) element of population was strong in Crete at those times. Diodorus IV.60 hints at a Dorian expedition having arrived at Crete under the leadership of Tectamus, son of Dorus, at very early times even prior to the birth of the first Minos, that is, at a time prior to 1462 which is the date of this Minos' accession to the Cretan throne⁷⁴. This thesis, postulating such an early date for a Dorian influx of population in Crete is hardly tenable because it is not shared by the rest of Greek tradition. The same thesis Diodorus does imply in V.80, again placing the Tectamus expedition prior to the time of Minos and Rhadamanthys (Minos' brother). The information furnished by Herodotus in VII.171 that the Trojan War, that is, took place in the third generation after the second Minos, king of Crete and that the Greek immigrants came to Crete soon after the second Sicilian campaigns at a time when Crete was

desolate (idem VII.171) as well as that the first campaign to Sicily was conducted by what can be deduced -through the combination of VII.170 and 171 -it was the second Minos whose death was followed by the aborted, short-lived second campaign, all these lead to the conclusion that the Greek immigrants spoken of in VII.171 arrived at Crete sometime during the third generation before the Trojan War. One may suspect a Dorian presence in this move of Greek settlers, both because of Herodotus' identification of the Dorian race as Hellenic proper in I.56 (where the two appellations become synonymous)- and we should not forget that it is the same author who speaks of "Greeks" arriving in Crete after the Sicilian campaigns- and also because of the archaeological evidence attesting to Mycenaean presence and influence in Crete at a time earlier than that of the arrival, according to Herodotus, of the "Greeks" in Crete. This Mycenaean presence in the island is attested from c1450 - 1400 (see first chapter, the section about Mycenaean expansion overseas and that about that part of Minoan history which bears witness to Mycenaean cultural activity) whereas the "Greeks" said by Herodotus to have come to Crete in VII.171 can be easily worked out as having done so at an early stage of the 13th cent (The Trojan War being envisaged as having most probably occurred at a very late stage of the 13th cent., see Vermeule E. Greece in the the Bronze Age. pp.277-8.

Chicago (1972)) So what was the stock of those "Greeks" who colonized Crete after the two disastrous Sicilian campaigns, if not Mycenaean? It might have been Dorian in view of Homer's words in *Odyssey* XIX.172-9 about Crete. Perhaps the designation of the second Minos as the "first Greek to create a powerful naval force" in *Diodorus* IV.60 was construed by this historian in the sense that this Minos was a Greek (maybe a Mycenaean) but not a Dorian. Additionally we have the VII. 171 Herodotus quote speaking of "Greeks" arriving at Crete after the conclusion of the two Sicilian campaigns, that is, after the death of this second Minos. Consequently we may assume that the Greek element of Cretan population which is "disguised" under the 2nd King Minos' kingship and naval sovereignty and existed in Crete until and including the time of the second Minos, was not Dorian. It may have included or even actually consisted of Achaeans (see *Diodorus* V. 80 and IV.60, in the former passage the Achaeans appearing under the disguise of "Aeolian" yet this hardly causing problems since these two tribes were of the same stock, see *Strabo* VIII.1-2) but not Dorians. The latter might very well have come to Crete in that particular wave of Greeks which is said by Herodotus in VII.171 to have peopled Crete after the second Sicilian campaign, that is, in the third generation before the Trojan War. Herodotus refers to them as "Greeks" following his fashion of accepting only the

Dorians as a purely Greek tribe and of considering all the other pre-Dorian inhabitants of Greece as Pelasgians (*idem* I.56).

Thus, all considered, it looks as though the Greeks who are said to have been brought over to Crete by Tectamus (Diodorus IV.60 and V.80) and must have been those who lived in the island until and including the time of the second Minos, were anachronistically linked with the Dorian element in Diodorus loc. cit perhaps in order that even the early inhabitants of Crete be credited with the kind of Greek identity that only a Dorian origin could guarantee. It also seems as though a Dorian contingent arrived at the island soon after the second Sicilian campaign, during that is, the first generation after the second Minos or, to put it in other way, the third before the Trojan War. Alternatively, the expedition said to have been led by Tectamus to Crete in Diodorus V.80 (and is hinted at in idem IV.60) might have actually included Dorians but if so it must be conceived as only having happened at the time Herodotus gives as that of the coming of "Greeks" (presumably mainly Dorians) to Crete, in VII.171, that is in the course of the third generation before the Trojan War. In that case, the Dorian connexion should first appear considerably later in the overall evolution of the pedigree starting off with Tectamus in

order that Diodorus IV.60 falls in line with Herodotus VII.171. Whatever the case though, what seems to be very likely is that the Crete - based immigrants who left the island on account of the epidemics ruining their livestock after the Trojan War were Greeks (whether they included Dorians, which is very likely, or not) and that they wandered over the Aegean, perhaps eventually joining in the rest of the Sea-Peoples coalition who raided many Levantine sites and finally were foiled by Ramesses III. The appearance of the name Plst, a tribe that came to Egypt from the "midst of the Sea" (no doubt the Mediterranean, in the midst of which, no doubt in a broad manner of speaking, Crete is) in the Ramessid inscriptions describing these events, and the appearance of the biblical Philistines who came "from the land of Capthor" according to certain biblical passages and are also linked with the "Cherethites" (Cretans?) seem to strengthen the above propounded thesis.

11) In another Herodotus quote ⁷⁵ we read: "There is a custom too which no Greeks, save the Lacedaemonians, have in common with the Egyptians: younger men, when they meet their elders, turn aside and give place to them in the way, and rise from their seats when an older man approaches"

The fact that these habits were common to Egyptians and Lacedaemonians alone of all the Greek tribes can be perhaps satisfactorily explained away by reason of these habits having been handed down by the descendants of Heracles -who was an offspring of Perseus who in turn was a descendent of Danaus who came to Greece from Egypt and is said to have had Egyptian beginnings⁷⁶ -to that contingent of Dorians who eventually settled in Lacedaemon and came to be known as Lacedaemonians in historic times.⁷⁷ The Dorians had of course appropriated Heracles by virtue of having championed the cause of his descendants and having, through their steadfast alliance with them, come to be inextricably connected with the Heracleidae to the extent that the Dorian invasion and the Return of the Heracleidae had become synonymous expressions in the overall Greek tradition. So, it is only natural to assume that the Dorians, gradually adapted the Egypt - derived habits of their loyal allies, the Heracleidae, and that, by the time the most important and well - known segment of them settled in Sparte in Lacedaemon, these habits had grown to become an unmistakable as well as typical pattern of their social behaviour. It may be argued, in conclusion, that Herodotus II.80 corroborates idem VI.53 where the Dorian kings are ultimately found to be of Egyptian origin (see also corresponding footnotes of VI.65 and the relevant discussion).

12. In a Diodorus quote⁷⁸ we read that the Dorians were the third people to cross over to Crete - the first inhabitants are in ibid said to be the Eteocretans, the second the Pelasgians - and that they were led by Tectamus, the son of Dorus; The account continues by saying that the largest number of those Dorians was gathered from the regions about Olympus⁷⁹ whereas a part of them consisted of Achaeans from Laconia, since Dorus had fixed the base of his expedition in the region about Cape Malea.

Regarding this information - which has to be coupled with Strabo X.4.6 and VIII.5.5, Homer's Odyssey XIX.172-9, Diodorus IV.60.2-4 - one should feel that there seems to be no reason why a Dorian inrush of population in Crete occurred as Diodorus claims; yet, it looks more likely that the Dorians arrived at Crete not at the time of Tectamus who is made out to be even earlier than the first King Minos⁸⁰ -the second King Minos having roughly lived in the third generation before the Trojan War⁸¹ - but at some time during the first generation after the second Minos and at the time when Crete was left desolate following the two disastrous Sicilian campaigns⁸². It may well be though that this Dorian expedition to Crete was really led by Tectamus and that the rest of the information concerning it is true yet if this is the case

Tectamus has to be envisaged as having lived much later than Diodorus IV.60.2-4 credits him to be - the main reason being that such an early appearance of the Dorians in South Aegean as Diodorus IV.60.2-4 postulates is totally unattested and therefore has to be dismissed. It follows that corresponding amendments on the Tectamus-triggered pedigree have to be made. The likelier amendment seems to be the one which does away with some of Tectamus' offsprings, who are intervening between him and the second Minos. It looks as though the Dorian origin was stretched as far back by certain Greek authors as to comprise the first King Minos in Crete in order to bestow on him such a credit as only a Dorian "Greekness" could guarantee,⁸³ hence the ensuing mistakes in the Tectamus' pedigree in Diodorus IV.60.2-4

13. In another Diodorus quote⁸⁴ we read that the islands Calydna and Nisyros were settled in ancient times by Carians⁸⁵ and after that Thettalus, the son of Heracles, took possession of both islands. Diodorus goes on to say that this explains "why both Antiphus and Phidippus, who were Kings of the Coans, in the expedition against Troy, led those who sailed from the two islands just-mentioned". The ancient inhabitants of Nisyros, says Diodorus in loc. cit. par.3, were destroyed by earthquakes, and at a later time the Coans settled the

island, as they had done in the case of Calydna. At a later time, the account continues, Nisyros was desolated by an epidemic following which a Rhodian colony was dispatched to the island. Loc. cit par.4 speaks of Carpathos' first inhabitants having been "those men" who had joined forces with Minos during the latter's period of naval suzerainty.⁸⁶

In this quote, as well in Iliad II.676-680 we read that the islands of Nisyros, Carpathos, Kasos, Kos and Calydna were under the sway of Heracleidae Thettalus, that is, who was son of Heracles, and his sons, Antiphus and Phidippus. Since Dorian presence should be suspected whenever there is mention of Heracleidae, owing to the very strong bonds of alliance inextricably interlacing these two groups, it is not at all unlikely that there was a Dorian element of population among the inhabitants of the aforementioned islands and also at Rhodes - which is said to have been settled by Thepolemus, another son of Heracles, and his followers⁸⁷ - during Trojan War times. The information that Nisyros was laid waste by an epidemic after it had been settled by Coans, a people who were subjects of Phidippus and Antiphus and may consequently have included Dorians, makes one wonder whether this island's inhabitants headed eastwards, driven by the need to discover a non-problematic land, and

eventually ended up in Levantine areas where, after a process of raiding and being raided, they finally settled somewhere in Palestinian lands along with other Sea-Peoples. The reason which Diodorus furnishes in order to explain why Calydna and Nisyros were under Phidippus' and Antiphus' suzerainty during Trojan War is that these two islands had been appropriated by Thettalus, their father. This means that Nisyros had not as yet been settled by Coans, as we read in loc. cit par.3, otherwise Diodorus would have employed this situation as a reason why Nisyros was under Phidippus' and Antiphus control during Trojan War, the Coans clearly being stated as those two brothers' subjects. It follows that the Coan settlement of Nisyros occurred after the Trojan War and that the epidemic that drove them away was of course an event that even further post-dates this war. Hence, the Coan population of Nisyros found themselves in dire need of looking for a new home at a time when the Great Land and Sea-Raids are recorded as having happened in the Levant and it is likely that these Coans, who may have comprised Dorians, joined in the rest of what came to be finally known as Sea-Peoples. The above-stated assessment of the date of the Coan migration brings this Coan migration from Nisyros nearer to the second Sea-Peoples appearance, the one which happened at the time of Ramesses III, in which case the Peleset who are said to come "from the isles in

the midst of the Sea" may be good candidates for a strong connexion between them and those Coans. Another argument that points to those Nisyros' Coans having been driven away by this epidemic later than the Trojan War, but not much later, is that Coans settled both Nisyros and Calydna, that is, the islands under Thettalus' authority, so it is reasonable to assume that this shifting of population between these islands must have happened at a time when there were still strong ties between them on account of Nisyros and Calydna being ruled by Thettalus, and Cos by his sons. It does not seem to be a coincidence that this movement of population concerns islands which were ruled by the same family as has been set out above. Of course this time is the Trojan War time and a generation, at the most, after it.

14. In another Diodorus quote ⁸⁸ we read about Tlepolemus, Heracles' son, fleeing over to Rhodes from Argos in Peloponnese (southern Greece) shortly before the Trojan War. The story goes that he settled in Rhodes, became its king and portioned out the land in equal allotments. He eventually joined the Achæan expedition to Troy where he was killed, having left Butas, in his royal stead back in Rhodes.

This story may well be reflecting memories of an

eastward thrust of populations from the Southern Greece shortly before the Trojan War, and should be coupled with Diodorus V.54.1,3,4 and Iliad II.676-680, 653-669 speaking of offsprings of Heracles being overlords of many islands in eastern Aegean. In this Diodorus quote which is examined at the moment there may well be a hint at a Dorian presence in this Tlepolemus' settlement in Rhodes owing to three concepts. The first is the ubiquitous, unanimously-endorsed connexion between Dorians and the descendents of Heracles, even to the point of identity many times,⁸⁹ which should always make one suspect Dorian presence where the Heracleids are concerned and vice versa. The second is the information in Strabo VIII.5.5 about the whole of Peloponnese, and, in a more specific way, Laconia being called "Achaean Argos" owing to the settlement there of Achaeans from Phthiotis in Thessaly. Consequently this "Argos" whence Tlepolemus set out from to come to Rhodes may perhaps have been the area of Laconia. The third piece of information comes from Diodorus V.80 who says that Dorus the founder of the Dorian tribe, had fixed the base of the Dorian expeditions in the region about Cape Malea⁹⁰. It follows that if Tlepolemus set out from Laconia it is very likely that his expeditions were joined by Dorian immigrants, since Cape Malea, the base of this latter tribe's expedition, was near-by. Actually Diodorus V.80 does furnish information for

another Dorian expedition having set out from Cape Malea, namely the one led by Tectamus, son of Dorus, to Crete. So it may be that Tlepolemus' expedition to Rhodes, if it started from Laconia near by Cape Malea, also comprised Dorian immigrants.

15. In a Pausanias quote ⁹¹ we read about an interesting connexion between the Tyrrhenians and the Dorians by means of Tyrsenus being said to be the son of Heracles and "The Lydian Women" ⁹² and also by virtue of Hegeleos, the son of Tyrsenus, having taught the Dorians with Temenus how to play the trumpet.

It has been often quoted in the course of this survey that all Dorians credited their illustrious figures - and also everyone of Dorian descent - with being offsprings of Hercules and since in this quote we read that Tyrsenus - the eponymus ancestor and founder of the Tyrrhenian tribe - was also a son of Heracles, we have a clear-cut connexion, actually even affinity, between the two races. This connexion, if coupled with the common appearance of the Peleset and the Teresh in the Deir el Medineh inscription which states that Ramesses III has crushed "the isles who sailed over (or "against") his (boundaries?) ⁹³, the Peleset and Teresh from the midst of the sea" (no other Sea-Peoples are mentioned in this inscription) ⁹⁴, then

it might be seen to suggest some sort of ties between Dorians and the Peleset, the former being connected with the Tyrseni through Heracles and the latter appearing to form a union or some kind of special alliance - in the Deir el Medineh inscription - with the Teresh which may well be another name for Tyrseni.⁹⁵ So both Dorians and Peleset are connected with the Tyrseni - Teresh and this might lead one to suspect a connexion also between, as has been stated, Dorians and Peleset, particularly in view of the rest of the indications or evidence suggesting connexions between these two tribes, the Dorians and the Pelesets - Philistines.

16. In a number of quotes from Apollodorus⁹⁶ we read about the wanderings of the Greeks and their settlement in various areas such as Libya, Italy, Sicily, Thessaly, the islands near Iberia, Crete, Andros, Melos, the banks of the Sangarius River in Anatolia (Asia Minor), Thrace and Cyprus, at such a time as can be inferred to be that which marked the period right after the Trojan War. This inference is based on such grounds as are provided by an initial, broad line-up in Ep.6.15(E) of the names of the countries where these Greeks settled in which the settlements which are explicitly stated (or otherwise attested) as having occurred after the fall of Troy are mentioned along with those - in the same context, that is

- which are not followed by an explicit or broad date reference. The same can be inferred about the whole body of the accounts of each settlement given right after this statement. Those dated right after the fall of Troy are interlaced with those which are not placed in time, thereby giving a firm impression that the latter group too dates from the same period.

Regarding the entries that are of interest to this study there is no need (save the case of Libya) to work out their dates though. They are clearly attested as referring to the time right after the fall of Troy or (in one case) at the same (roughly) time as the Trojan War.

The first entry in the list that particularly concerns the study at this stage is Libya. We read ⁹⁷ that of those who were shipwrecked at Cephæus Guneus went to Libya, a statement which is repeated in a somewhat more detailed ⁹⁸ manner further on where we read that Guneus left his own ships and, having come to the Cinyps river in Libya he dwelt there.

The second entry regards Andros and Cyprus; we read that Phidippus with the Coans was driven to Andros and then to Cyprus where he settled ⁹⁹. This Phidippus story is explicitly stated to have happened "after the Sack of

Ilium" . Phidippus has Thessalian connexions by virtue of his father king Thebtalus who was a son of Heracles .¹⁰¹ So both the elements that imply Dorian presence are found combined in the case of Phidippus, that is, the Thessalian connexion - Thessaly, and in particular Doris or Histiseotis, being the home, the metropolis of the Dorians¹⁰² - and an origin that ultimately traces him back to Heracles, the latter being the legendary progenitor of the whole Dorian race. Consequently it is likely that Phidippus was accompanied by Dorians in his settlement of Cyprus at a time soon after the Trojan War, a time that is well attested as that of the Sea-Peoples raids in the Levant in Ramesses III time. So it may well be that those Dorians are to blame for the turbulent situation that the island of Cyprus seems to undergo at c.1200¹⁰³, and at about something like a generation later when, we have the second destruction of Enkomi and the Egyptian records speak of Sea-Peoples overrunning Cyprus. It looks as though, if one entry has to be singled out of those Sea-raiders as the candidate likeliest to qualify for the identity of those Phidippus - led Aegean new-comers (perhaps Dorians) to Cyprus, that would be the Philistines with their Aegean background- the tribe who are said to have come from Caphtor (Crete and major Aegean area) in the O.T. and with the Mycenæan - looking material culture. Finally, the information that Phidippus and his

people were first driven to Andros and then to Cyprus, may suggest that the island of Andros might also have been involved in the route of the people(s) who, traversing the Aegean, reached the Levant only to be connected with -perhaps even become- the notorious Peleset - Philistines.

These are the Apollodorus list entries with particular interest to this research. Regarding Guneus' settlement in Libya, it should be belatedly added that since this is likely to have happened soon after the Trojan War it may be seen to imply a potential involvement of this Greek chieftain in the attack against neighbouring Egypt, attempted in common perhaps with other Sea-People, at the time of Ramesses III.

17. In an Athenaeus quote ¹⁰⁴ the author comments upon traditions regarding Gergithes in Cyprus, said to be ultimately of Thessalian origin and to have been brought to Cyprus by Teucros, the Achaean king who settled in Cyprus and founded the city of Salamis.

Perhaps these Gergithes are the O.T. Gergashites or in some way connected with them ¹⁰⁵ and there may even be some connexion between them and the N.T. Gergasenes ¹⁰⁶.

So we have a reference that brings Thessalians in

Cyprus and of course it should be always borne in mind that part of Thessaly, Doris (later Hestiaeotis) in particular was a typical Dorian territory and the one from which waves of Dorian immigrants set out to colonize other Greek territories ¹⁰⁷. These Gergithes are said to have been brought over to Cyprus by Teucros who migrated to Cyprus after the Trojan War ¹⁰⁸ and consequently they must be envisaged as being there at the same time, that is, at a time when, more or less, the Sea Peoples' activities took place in the form of raids against Levantine kingdoms and Ramesses III's Egypt. It is interesting to note that there is literary evidence regarding strong Dorian presence in the island of Aegina whence Teucros migrated to come to Cyprus. The Greek poet Pindar furnishes the information ¹⁰⁹ that Aegina was founded under the gods' dispensation by the coming of the Dorian host of Hyllos and Aegimius. Now Hyllos was of course one of Heracles' sons ¹¹⁰ whereas Aegimius was king of the Dorian Tetrapolis (Erineus, Boeum, Pindus and Cytinium) at Parnassus, a contemporary of Heracles by whom he was handsomely befriended; Aegimius requited the favour to Heracles by adopting Hyllos, the latter and his descendants succeeding to the Dorian throne ¹¹¹. Now Hyllos was a contemporary of Telepolemus, another of Heracles' sons as can be inferred from the overall account of the attempts of the sons of Heracles and the

Dorians to capture Peloponnese ¹¹² . Since Tlepolemus is said by Homer to have fought in the Trojan War ¹¹³ , Hyllus' life is easily conceived as also comprising at least the generation of that war.

Consequently the campaign to Aegina happened at, roughly, the time of this war and therefore the Hyllus and Aegimius -led Dorians came and founded Aegina at that time. It follows that when Teucros returned after the Trojan War to his native Aegina the island's population consisted, at least to a good extent, of Dorians. Consequently when Teucros migrated to Cyprus it is very likely that there were Dorians among those who followed him and they may well be "disguised" under the term "Thessalian Gergithes" employed by Atheneus in loc. cit to denote those people brought over to Cyprus by Teucros. Since these "Thessalians" were in Cyprus at the time of the Philistine raids - and those of the other Sea Peoples - they are likely to have been involved and take some blame for them.

Chapter Four

Part 1

A1

Notes on the Text

1. It is to^{be} noticed that, whereas the main onus of the research will be focused on the three main subject - matters which have just been referred to in the text and which will cover the bulk of the evidence, there will also be references from the same sources to a variety of information - provided in these sources - attesting, either directly or indirectly, to various types of connexion between the Aegean tribes and the Philistines, without this information being necessarily linked with any of the three major subject - matters which will form the main focus of this survey. This type of often diverse and unco-ordinated information may refer to such matters as language, customs, habits, tendencies, religious concepts, superstitions, names e.t.c. of various Aegean tribes, - wherever these tribes, or individuals sometimes, may be or come from or whatever they may be involved in - which may indicate connexions or affinities or any kind of ties with the Philistines. However since this class of evidence can by no means, if taken alone, carry the same weight as the three major ones, it will not be considered a fourth major group of information and will constitute only a secondary, corroborative body of evidence, employed with a view only to strengthening the corollaries or conclusions to be drawn from the major groups of evidence.
2. What must be by all means brought to notice at this stage is that the picture of the overall south-east bound tribal movements in the Aegean area afforded by the Greek sources is a very fragmentary one and most quotes, if taken individually, only speak of part of what may well have been the long "Sea-Peoples" migratory trek heading south-east. This is done according to the Greek sources' favourite fashion, that is, in terms of accounts of royal families or heroes or would - be conquerors or groups pretending to rights of possession of an area or a throne, all of them sailing from the Greek mainland to an island or from an island to another island - all of their stations lying in a south - east course to the

Levant-with a view to carrying out their ambitions or to simply fleeing from a disaster or an enemy invasion or to avoiding an oracle or for other reasons. It is therefore this chapter's goal to piece together all these disparate and widely scattered quotes from the various sources in an attempt to help make up successfully the huge jigsaw-puzzle which, once accomplished, will hopefully provide an instructive and illuminating picture of what the ancient sources have to offer about the connexions between Aegean tribes and the Philistines during the time of the Great Migrations at the close of the Bronze Age. It also has to be noticed that there will be a listing of quotes - in the course of examining the evidence of the movements of Aegean people towards the Levant - about any important information linking Aegean islands - based or derived heroes or tribes or Kings or people with the Philistines, that is a listing of whatever quotes can legitimately fit into the context of the evidence relating to the first major subject-matter and can, therefore, serve the purpose of its research.

3. X.4.15.
4. Iliad. 2. 649.
5. Odys. XIX.174 where Homer speaks of ninety cities in Crete.
6. See Vermeule, E. Greece in the Bronze Age, Chicago (1972), pp. 269-271, 274-9.
7. X.4.18.
8. I.12.
9. Eratosthenes' calculation of the fall of Troy date is the most widely accepted in terms of all those proposed in the various Greek authors' texts.
10. IX.3.1.
11. Strabo VIII.7.1. where Dorus, one of the sons of Hellen, is quoted as having united the people about Parnassus into one state having left them, at his death, named after himself (Dorians).
12. 10.4.6.

13. Odysse. XIX.172-9
14. Strabo IX.5.17 where he says that Hestiaeotis was called Doris in earlier times and that Hestiaeotis and Dolopia are called Upper Thessaly. He also says in ibid, that when the Perrhaebians took possession of Doris - The Perrhaebians, he says, had already subdued Hestiaeotis in Euboea and had forced its inhabitants to migrate to the mainland - they called the country Hestiaeotis after these Hestiaeans, because of the large number of these people who settled there.
15. Strabo, XIV.2.6.
16. Strabo is quoting Homer, Iliad. II.661-669.
17. Homer, Iliad, II.656.
18. Homer, Iliad, II.676-680.
19. Strabo, X.4.6., quoting Andron.
20. Cf. Strabo, loc.cit.; Diodorus V.80.1-2; Herodotus I.56; Diodorus IV.60.2.
21. Iliad, II.676-680.
22. Strabo, X.4.6.
23. Strabo, IX.4.10 where it is said that the King of the so-called Dorian Tetrapolis at Parnassus - composed of the cities Erineus, Boeum, Pindus and Cytinium - which, as Strabo says, was reputed to be the metropolis of all the Dorians, was Aegimius, who was driven from his throne, but was brought back again, as the story goes by Heracles; accordingly, says Strabo, in ibid, Aegimius requited the favour to Heracles, after the latter's death on Oeta; for he adopted Hyllus, the oldest of the sons of Heracles; and Hyllus and his descendants became his successors on the throne. From here it was that the Heracleidae set out on their return to the Peloponnese.

So, in this passage, it is made thoroughly clear that there were strong ties between Heracles and his descendants (the "Heracleidae" of Greek tradition) on one hand and the Dorians on the other; and since Hyllus and his descendants are said to have inherited

royal rights and, consequently, predominance... over the Dorians - Hyllos was himself said to have been adopted by the Dorian King Aegimius - we can legitimately understand that a steady and virtually uninterrupted process of amalgamation between the Heracleidae and the Dorians must have occurred resulting in the former becoming "Dorianized", as a result of which development - and of their alliance during the famous so-called Return of the Heracleidae both groups must have become interchangeable notions in the minds of the contemporary Greeks with respect to their names, presence and whatever pertained to either of them. And it was indeed so if one carries out a careful study of the writings of all Greek authors of both pre-classical and classical era, whereby one will notice that the famous "Dorian invasion" - which signalled the end of the Mycenaean era and the commencement of the so-called Greek Dark Ages - is always identified with the so-called Return of the Heracleidae and vice versa. The same holds true for the Dorians and the Heracleidae themselves, since it is well attested in all the sources that these terms are virtually substitutes for each other and are both employed to denote the tribes who invaded the Mycenaean centres at c.1200 and also some fifty years later thereby calling a halt to the already wavering Mycenaean palatial culture. Of course on this occasion, one could argue that Strabo discriminates between these two entities claiming that Rhodes was not colonised by Rhodians, but by Heracleidae, perhaps along with Aeolians and Boeotians, and that Homer does not mention Dorians by name on this occasion of the colonisation of Rhodes. However, one could legitimately think that it would be unwise to dismiss the nation-wide, deeply-rooted belief among the Greeks that Dorians and Heracleidae were inextricably interlaced and always acting in common. Strabo was based on the earlier Homeric reference to the colonisation of Rhodes and Cos where the settlers were referred to as Heracleidae only and obviously overlooked the fact that the two terms - Dorians and Heracleidae - were absolutely interchangeable, as has been stated already, and that so were the respective tribes too. So, the fact that Homer talks of Heracleidae having colonised these two islands may by no means be taken to imply a non-Dorian involvement in this development. Additionally one could also argue that the Heracleidae, both as a name and a group of people, must have been a far

better - known entity to the southern Greek World - to which Rhodes and Cos undoubtedly belonged - than the Dorians who can be reasonably conceived as not so well-known in that part of the Greek world at the time of Homer, even though they seem to have infiltrated certain parts of the south. Therefore, it was only reasonable for the southern Greeks, to call and remember any group of people in which Heracleidae were involved, by the latter name, - regardless of whether or not other tribes were also participating - owing to the involvement in that group of some (or more) descendants of their most highly-esteemed hero, Heracles. Therefore, the "Heracleidae" of Rhodes and Cos in the Homeric reference, commented upon by Strabo, are very likely to have comprised Dorians. Another argument that can be employed in favour of a Dorian involvement in the colonisation in question is provided by none other than Strabo himself in VII.I.2. where he says that it may be said that "the Doric dialect is the same as the Aeolic, for all the Greeks outside the Isthmus, except the Athenians and the Megarians and the Dorians who live about Parnassus, are to this day still called Aeolians". "So, in this quote, Strabo himself admits, in an indirect yet quite clear way, that what could be meant by the term "Aeolians" may very well have meant or included "Dorians". This inference holds good for all the Greeks outside the Isthmus-north of Peloponnese, that is - and, consequently, for the inhabitants of Thessaly. Therefore the Thessalian colonisers of Cos, led by the "Heracleidae" Pheidippus and Antiphus (Homer, Iliad, II, 676-680) are very likely to have been Dorians or, at least, to have included a number of that tribe, owing both to the above inference and to their Thessalian extraction, since Thessaly included Doris whence the main wave of the Dorians moved south (Strabo IX.5.17). And of course one should never forget that they were led by descendants of Hercules, something that automatically affords them strong ties with the Dorians who are always seen as acting in common with the "Heracleidae".

24. XIV.4.3
25. VII.91
26. In Pamphylia
27. Skymnos XI.403 ff. quoting Timaios.

28. Burn, A.R. Minoans, Philistines and Greeks, p.205.
29. Iliad V.640 where we read that Hercules came with only six ships and few recruits to claim the Trojan King Laomedon's horses - which had been promised him but never given - and ultimately raided and destroyed the city. The account is given by Tlepolemus (V.632) the son of Heracles, who speaks to Sarpedon, the Lycian King and Trojan ally, and boasts of his glorious descent, just before their duel.
30. See previous note.
31. Vermeule, E. Greece in the Bronze Age, Chicago (1972), pp. 275-6.
32. Vermeule, E. op.cit. pp. 277-8 and n.14.
33. Strabo VIII.5.5.
34. Odyssey III.249.
35. Odyssey III.251.
36. V.80.
37. IV.60, 2-4.
38. Strabo, in VIII. 1-2 makes clear what a close connexion almost to the point of identification in certain occasions existed between the Dorians and the Aeolians. It is therefore very likely that what is hidden behind the Aeolic "facade" of part of the Crete - bound expedition in Diodorus IV.60, 2-4 are a Dorian - born contingent.
39. Odyssey XIX.180-1.
40. The Sea-Peoples' raids are conceived as having occurred at Ramesses III's 8th year at c.1186 (see previous chapters) and the Trojan War is customarily believed to have happened near the end of the 13th cent. (See note 32 in this chapter).
41. Diodorus V.80.
42. Strabo IX.5.3 makes the proximity of the two areas quite clear.
43. V.80.

44. Cf. Herodotus I.56 where it is made clear that the Dorian race, which is also called "Hellenic" by Herodotus, inhabited the land of Phthia in the days of King Deucalion. Strabo in VIII.7.1. states that the people of King Hellen, son of Deucalion, inhabited the land between the Peneius and the Asopus in the region of Phthia too. Herodotus in loc.cit. also says that the Dorian race inhabited the land called Hestiaeotis, under Ossa and Olympus. So we have explicit references to the Dorians having inhabited, for a good while, the land of Phthia, in Thessaly, prior to their moving over to that of Hestiaeotis, at the time of Dorus. Now, the land of Phthia or Phthiotis was also inhabited by Achaeans as we learned from Strabo VIII.5.5. and therefore it is only reasonable to assume that these two tribes, the Dorians and the Achaeans, must have got in touch with, and influenced, each other, and, at any rate, developed friendly ties between them. (See Diodorus V.80).
45. Herodotus, I.56.
46. Odyssey, XIX. 172-179.
47. Diodorus, V.80.
48. IV.60.2-4.
49. I.105.
50. See part three, section A; quote no 1, in this chapter.
51. Amos, 9.7 and, of course, the rest of the numerous biblical quotes concerning this tribe's provenance; see previous chapters and corresponding footnotes.
52. Strabo, X.4.6.
53. Strabo, IX.5.17.
54. See quote no 5 in this section of this chapter and footnotes 15-23.
55. VII.171.
56. See idem VII.170.
57. Diodorus IV.60. 2-4. See also Odyssey XIX. 178-182.

58. Diodorus, loc.cit. (previous note) and Homer's Odyssey loc.cit. (previous note too).
59. Diodorus loc.cit. (note 57).
60. Jacoby, F. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker 2B, Berlin, (1929), no 239.
61. This Minos is no doubt the first one as the collation of the Parian Marble date for his life and the Herodotus information in VII.171 - about the Trojan War having occurred three generations after the (second) Minos - clearly bears out.
62. Herodotus VII.170.
63. Idem. I.56.
64. Idem VII.171.
65. Breasted, J.H. Ancient Records of Egypt, vol. IV. paras 59-82, Chicago 1906; Edgerton W.F. and Wilson J.A. Historical Records of Ramesses III, the Texts of Medinet Habu, pp.30-31, Chicago 1936; Stela Petrie Tanis II, pl.2 no 73, also Aswan Stela, in Kitchen K.A. Ramessid Inscriptions, vol. II, Oxford 1958-74, 290, 1-4.
66. Amos 9.7, Jeremiah 47-4 among others, see the full list of the relevant references in the previous chapter.
67. I. Samuel 30-14 among others, see previous chapter for a full list of relevant references and discussion.
68. Odyssey III. 291-302.
69. Odyssey IV. 81-84.
70. Odyssey IV. 351-586.
71. Odyssey, XIV, 246-292. See also ibid 229-245
72. Odyssey, XVII. 424-444.
73. Thucydides I.12, Plato Laws 682e - 683e.
74. Parian Marble, Jacoby F. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, 2B, no 239, 1929, Berlin.

75. II.80
76. See quote no 3 in part two, the overall discussion on it and the corresponding footnotes.
77. Plato 682e-683e; Apollodorus "Library" II.8.1-4; Pausanias II. 18.6-9, idem III.1.5.
78. V.80.2
79. In other words, from Hestiaeotis in Thessaly, cf. Herodotus I.56
80. Diodorus IV.60.2-4.
81. Diodorus loc. cit. (previous note) in conjunction with Homer Odyssey XIX.172-9.
82. Cf. Herodotus VII.171 and the overall discussion following the mention of this quote in this section.
83. Herodotus I.56 makes explicit that the Dorians were the purest Greek tribe and actually identifies the Greeks with them.
84. V.54.1,3,4.
85. Diodorus V.53.2-3 and V.84.4 says that the Carians had grown to become masters of the sea after the Trojan War and that they had settled many of the Cycladic islands in the Aegean sea at that time either in common with Cretans or just by themselves, after driving out their inhabitants - who happened to be Cretans at that time. However, it looks as though Calydna and Nisyros were settled by Carians

before the Trojan War since Diodorus V.54.1 in conjunction with Homer's Iliad, II.676-680 make it clear that, at the time of this War, these two islands were settled by those who accompanied Anthiphus and Pheidippus, two of the Heracleidae, to Troy.

86. This is the second Minos, the one who was credited with being the first Greek to have created a powerful naval force and held a maritime supremacy, see Diodorus IV.60.3
87. Iliad II.653-669 makes clear that the Heracleid Tlepolemus, King of Rhodes and his followers had joined the Achaean expedition against Troy and that they settled Rhodes prior to the Trojan War.
88. V.59.5-6
89. See previous quote as well as the discussion on the powerful connexion between Dorians and Heracleidae in previously mentioned quotes in this sub-section of part 1.
See also Strabo IX.4.10
90. Near the city of Leconia.
91. II.21-3
92. This surely must be the Lydian queen Omphale in whose court Heracles served for a while and where he developed an affair with her the result of which was Tyrrhenus (or Tyrsenus), see Dionysios of Halikarnassos I.27.1-3 and cf idem I.28.1-2

93. The inscription is very fragmentary.
94. Gurney, O. The Hittites, Harmondsworth 1969, p.56; Wainwright, G.A. AS, 9, (1959), pp.197-213; Kitchen, K.A. Ramesid Inscriptions, Oxford (1958-74), pp.90-1.
95. Herodotus I.7 and 94 speaks of a drought in Lydia, more than five hundred years before King Gyges, which drove the Tyrrheni (or Tyrseni) overseas on a migration, which eventually brought them to Italy. This information lends further weight to the thesis that these drought-stricken Tyrrheni(ans) were the Teresh of Ramesses III times and that they roamed several Levantine areas in search for better living conditions eventually attacking Egypt with the known results. The information that they ended up in Italy ought not to confuse us since Herodotus may well speak of another group of the Tyrrhenians who, having for the same reason left their homes, headed west unlike the rest of their compatriots. He may equally possibly be speaking of a development that post-dates the events of Ramesses' year 8 (1186) in the sense that after their defeat, the Teresh-Tyrrhenians or at least part of them headed north-west and finally reached Italy.
96. Ep. (=Vatican Epitome). 6.15(E), Ep. 6.15(S) -from a point onwards the text is quoted from the Sabbaitic Fragments, henceforward abbreviated in (S) - Ep.6.15a (TZ) - this paragraph is quoted from Tzetzes, scholia on Lycophron, 902, henceforward abbreviated in (TZ) - Ep.6.15b(TZ), Ep.6.16-17(E). The initial (E) signifies that the passage is quoted from the Vatican Epitome. The combination (ES)

signifies that the passage is found in both manuscripts, that is, the Vatican Epitome and the Sabbaitic fragments.

97. Ep.6.15(S).

98. Ep.6.15a(TZ). The paragraph is quoted from Tzetzes, Schol. on Lycophron, 902.

99. Ep.6.15(S), Ep.6.15b(TZ).

100. Ep.6.15b(TZ).

101. Homer, Iliad II v.v 676-680.

102. Herodotus I.56, Strabo X.4.6, Diodorus V.80.1-2.

103. Cyprus seems to have been beset by a plethora of problems between c. 1200 and 1050, such as the destruction of the Late Cypriot IIC(level VI) fortification wall of Enkomi, one of its cities, attested in the late stages of 13th cent. Among the signs of disorder and cultural discontinuity, the second destruction of Enkomi, probably a generation later than the first (Late Cypriot III A-B) and therefore assignable in the early stages of the 12th cent, stands out as of some special importance since this is the time when the Sea-Peoples are credited, in the Ramessidic records, with having overran Cyprus. Additionally, this is also the time of Phidippus' arrival at Cyprus along with what may have been a Dorian or at any rate an Aegean contingent. This combination seems to suggest that Phidippus and his followers had something to do with these destructions referred to as "Sea-Peoples'" doings in

Ramesses III's archives and perhaps with those that brought a violent end to the kingdom of Ugarit. See Catling, H. The Mycenaeans in the eastern Mediterranean (International Symposium), Nicosia 1972, Nicosia (1973), pp. 34-9, Desborough, V.R.d'A. ibid, p. 82, Dikaios, I. Enkomi Excavations 1948-58 Mainz (1969), vol. II, pp. 441-536 and table p. 496, Sandars, N.K. The Sea-Peoples, London (1978), pp. 144-8

104. VI.255, quoting Klearchos of Soloi

105. Genesis X.16.

106. Varia lectio in St. Luke VIII.26. These connexions between Cyprian Gergithes and biblical tribes with similar names have been conceded also by Burn A.R. Minoans, Philistines and Greeks, p. 156.

107. Strabo X.4.6, Herodotus I.56, Diodorus V.80 (in conjunction with Herodotus loc. cit)

108. Pausanias VIII. 15. 7

109. "Isthmian" IX. 1-4

110. Diodorus IV. 57.2 - IV. 58-4

111. Strabo IX. 4.10

112. Apollodorus II.8.2. The whole account of the attempts to return to Peloponnesse stretches from 1 up to 5 (inclusive).

113. Iliad II vv. 653-670

PART 1

A2: The evidence on the Minoan and Achæan Connexion

1. In XIV.6.3 Strabo says, speaking of the island of Cyprus: " Then one comes to Aphrodisium, where the island is narrow, for the passage across to Salamis is only seventy stadia. Then, to the beach of the Achæans, where Teucer, the founder of Salamis in Cyprus, first landed having been banished, as they say, by his father Telamon".

So we have here a reference to what seems to have been an Achæan settlement of Cyprus, led by one of the prominent heroes of Trojan War, Teucros, son of Telamon and brother of Ajax. What is important is that the founding of Salamis in Cyprus by Teucros must be envisaged as having taken place at roughly the same chronological context as that of the Trojan War. So we have in this case an Achæan expedition to Cyprus led by Teucros -or Teucer- who had set sail from Salamis in the island of Aegina. Of course the time of the founding of Salamis can be understood to be at a time when the Levant had already started serving as the stage of hectic tribal comings and goings hither and thither, of recurrent acts of buccaneering, and of the concerted inroads of "foreigners from all lands" and "Sea-Peoples" on Levantine areas. It is therefore quite likely that these Teucer-led Achæans who settled in Cyprus and founded Salamis had, at some

stage, joined in the ranks of those roaming Sea-Peoples in a widespread search for fertile lands or booty-yielding activities. What is also of some special importance to this particular issue is that what we are talking about here is a case of settlement by Achaeans in Cyprus and the period that has come to be recognized as such in the course of Cypriot history is the period stretching from 1200 to 1050, that is, the period known as Late Cypriot III (LC III) in terms of Cypriot Bronze Age chronology. (See chapter One in this work, part B, "The evidence of Mycenaean connexions" and n.126). Granted the image of overall, social unrest in mainland Greece afforded by the archaeological record there during the early stages of the 12th cent., we may perhaps be justified in assuming that this early 12th cent. Achaean settlement of Cyprus, of which we have sufficient archaeological evidence, might have been the result of a refugee movement from mainland Greece aiming to discover new, better lands for settlement after the calamities that mark the outset of the cent. made it impossible or far too hazardous for those refugees to remain in the Greek mainland (See chapter One, part B, the discussion on the matter of colonisation of Cyprus by Achaeans and n.127). It has been suggested that what can be inferred from the pattern of Cypriot history during the 12th cent. is that there seems to have been a struggle between the local Cypriots and the communities

where Mycenaeans (Achaean) had settled and exercised control (See chapter One, part B, n. 128). Desborough, the late scholar who propounded this theory, interprets the second major disaster which struck the Cypriot cities during the first half of the 11th century as part of the manifestations of the contests between the new settlers - the Achaeans - and the native Cypriots. (See chapter One, part B, The relevant discussion and n. 129'). In view of all this very interesting information one may legitimately suggest that the Teucer colonisation of Cyprus which happened at a time roughly contemporary with that of the early 12th cent. social unrest in mainland Greece as well as with that of the Sea-Peoples' activities in Levant, must be seen to belong to the time when we have sufficient archaeological evidence for an Achaean settlement of Cyprus; This should be a time between 1200 and 1050, and since Teucer was a Trojan War hero, the likeliest date for having settled in Cyprus with his contingent is some time at the beginning of the 12th cent., the Trojan War having probably occurred, as has repeatedly been stated, somewhere at the end of the 13th cent. This potential dating of Teucer's settlement in Cyprus is also that connected with the second wave of the Sea-Peoples' raids against Egypt at the time of Ramesses III and should perhaps be also connected with the destruction of Enkomi in the wake of which Dikaios dates the Achaean settlement

of Cyprus, that is, at c. 1200 (See chapter One, part B, n.127). The various pieces of evidence seem to fit in the overall situation in the Levant at the beginning of the 12th cent. quite well and perhaps well enough to allow the suggestion that Teucer's activities in Cyprus had a lot to do both with the unrest in the island, starting with the destruction of Enkomi, and with the Sea-Peoples -induced imbroglio in the Levant at the beginning of the 12th cent. After all, the Egyptian record of Ramesses III do speak of Sea-Peoples overrunning Alasiya (Cyprus) at the time when Achaean (Mycenaean) presence in that island is attested by both literary tradition (Strabo Loc.cit.) and archaeological evidence

2. In III.91 Herodotus says that the whole of Phoenice, the part of Syria called Palestine and Cyprus were in the country stretching between Posideion, a city founded on the Cilician and Syrian border by Amphilochus, son of Amphiaræus, and Egypt.

So, according to Herodotus this Posideion, said to have been founded by Amphiaræus'son Amphilochus, points to Aegean-derived people's activity. Posideion is said to have existed on the Cilician and Syrian border, a piece of information that is suggestive of Aegean people' colonizing activity in this area, an activity that may

perhaps be envisaged as having connexions with the Sea-People's migrations and activities in those territories. Amphiaraus, one of the seven chieftains who campaigned against Thebes in support of Polynikes' pretensions to the Theban throne occupied by his brother Eteokles, is to be dated at the same time as this Achaean expedition to Thebes which is dated by the Parian Marble at 1251. His son Amphiloehus, one of the Epigoni, must therefore have lived a generation later, that is, during the time spanning most of the second half of the 13th cent. (c.1250-1220). This is a pretty turbulent period in the Aegean and the Levant since it has been established as the outset of the Great land and Sea-migrations throughout the aforementioned areas. It is consequently likely that Amphiloehus had been involved in a migration movement or some kind of expedition to these areas perhaps in the course of the first wave of the Sea-Peoples' campaigns against Egypt in the 5th year of Pharaoh Merneptah (c.1220) or even in the course of the second campaign during the 8th year of Ramesses III (c.1186); this is likely if we assume that he -Amphiloehus- was quite of age and, therefore acting during the second generation after his father's time when campaigning in the Levantine areas and founding Posideion. Let us not forget that Posideion is said by Herodotus to have been founded on the Cilician Border and Cilicia - Egyptian Kode - is one of the areas said to have

been overran by the Sea-Peoples during their southward; destructions - causing course against Egypt in the time of Ramesses III, as this Pharaoh's year 8 inscription in the temple of Medinet Habu spells out.

3. In another Herodotus quote¹, the Greek historian relates how, according to an account given to him by the Egyptian priests he enquired, the Greek host that sailed to Troy to restore Helen back to her husband, King Menelaus, came to realize, after having demanded Helen back from the Trojans and received the reply that she was not there but in Egypt, that the Trojans were speaking the truth. Herodotus writes that - always according to the version narrated to him by the Egyptian priests - after the Greeks had conquered and pillaged Troy they eventually realized that Helen was not there and so sent Menelaus himself to the Egyptian King Proteus who was the one the Trojans had said was holding Helen. Menelaus went to Egypt, the story goes, was received and treated hospitably by the Egyptian King, was given back Helen and his belongings and started preparing for the return journey; however, the journey being held up through lack of favourable weather conditions, Menelaus sacrificed two Egyptian children to propitiate the gods; whereupon being pursued by the natives because of his impious deed, he fled to Libya with his fleet; at this point the Egyptian

account comes to an end.

It is interesting to note that according to this Herodotus quote Menelaus went purposely to Egypt, that is, not through being set adrift and driven there by stormy weather. The information that he ended up in Libya with his fleet and that he fell foul of the Egyptians may perhaps lead one to consider the possibility of a Greek expedition directed against Egypt with a view to capturing the land, or, at any rate, harrying its coasts and taking booty; this account furnished by Herodotus is quite similar to the one Odysseus relates in Homer's *Odyssey* ² according to which a contingent commanded by this famous Greek hero sailed to Egypt and raided part of its coasts only to be eventually stormed and outnumbered by the Egyptians troops who sold those of the buccaneers that were not killed in the battle, Odysseus himself being among those who were taken captives and ended up as slaves in foreign lands. This account, fictitious though it clearly is, may yet reflect popular buccaneering habits of post-Trojan War times ³ and the fact that we also have an account by Menelaus, true this time, regarding his adventures in Egypt⁴ seems to indicate that this country was the theatre of various kinds of operations carried out by foreigners and that the sea-route to it must have been a rather familiar one.

Consequently one may ponder over whether this account in Herodotus II. 118 - regarding Menelaus' adventures in Egypt - is a hint at the participation of Greek forces in one of the Sea-Peoples' raids against Egypt, either the first one, that is, in the fifth (5th) year of King Merneptah's reign (c.1220), or the second, in the 8th year, that is, of Ramesses' the 3rd reign (c. 1186). If we take into consideration the archaeological evidence which seems to point to a very late 13th century date for the burning of Troy VII A ⁵ - Homeric Troy in all probability - as well as the information that Menelaus fled to Libya with his fleet pursued by the Egyptians - whence he perhaps staged his counter attack aided by local tribes - we are tempted to relate Menelaus' Egyptian adventure with the first foreign attack against Egypt in which the country was threatened by a motley horde of northern allies assisted by a Libyan army and the latter peoples' neighbours, the Meshwesh ⁶. The name "Ekwesh", bearing a certain resemblance to the name "Achaens", whereby all the Greek troops that fought in Troy were known, is included in the list of the northern allies that fought against Merneptah and one may, perhaps legitimately, envisage some connexion between those raiders and the Menelaus - led troops that fell out with the Egyptian authorities. Alternatively, if we turn to literary evidence and to that in particular which seems to approximate what

seems to be the most helpful conjunction of circumstances and to reconcile such events as may work out a more balanced picture of the eventful times we are examining by helping put into place some of the pieces of the giant jig - saw puzzle - like situation in the late 13th - early 12th cent. Levant⁷ , we notice that this evidence furnished by Eratosthenes, gives us 1183 as the date of capture of Troy⁸ , a date that, give or take a few years, takes us clearly to the time of the second Sea-Peoples' attack against Egypt in the eighth (8th) year of Pharaoh Ramesses III's reign (c.1186)⁹ . In that case the Aegean culture - related Peleset (Biblical Philistines) could perhaps pose a strong candidature for the identity of any potentially Greek troops that, led by their chieftains, joined the massive "northerners" attack against Ramesses' Egypt after the conclusion of the Trojan War, whether such an action was dictated by a pre-meditated planning or was the result of poor navigation - or weather - standards having driven them to Egyptians lands or seas where they attempted minor or major - scale looting operations according to the widely -endorsed habits of the sea - faring peoples of the East Mediterranean.

4. In another Herodotus quote¹⁰ we read that the Carians used to offer sacrifices to Zeus of Armies at Labraunda¹¹ , a great and a holy grove of plane - trees.

And Herodotus adds: "The Carians are the only peoples known to us who offer sacrifices to Zeus by this name".

What we have in this quote is an indisputable Minoan connexion of the Carian culture¹² to be seen in the cult of a god of the double-axe, that is, of "Lavris" - hence the words "Labraunda" and "Labyrinthos" which is the one from which the English "Labyrinth" derives, meaning originally "the shrine of the double-axe" - a cult obviously so prevalent among that Asia-Minor tribe as to have survived down to the time of Persian suzerainty in the Near-East, in the wake of which the Greek-Persian War came (5th cent.) The symbol of "Lavris", the Double Axe, is of course the one that typifies the Minoan culture most of all and its appearance as the emblem of the god of the Double-axe among the Carians must be, in all probability, due to a certain amount of cultural intercourse they are likely to have had with the Minoans who arrived at Asia-Minor under the leadership of Rhacius¹³. These Cretans are said to have colonized the territory of Clarus in Asia Minor at the same more or less time as that of the destruction of Thebes in Greece by the so-called "Epigoni"¹⁴. The Carians are said¹⁵ to have been inhabiting the same territory as that eventually claimed by the newcomers from Crete, even Clarus itself, before it was snatched from them by the Cretans. It is only feasible, therefore, that

the Carians took up the cult of the god of the double-axe -which had of course by that time already spanned many centuries of religious prevalence in Crete-through the cultural intercourse they are only likely to have had with the newcomers from Crete. However, the most important information gained through Pausanias VII.3.1. and VII.3.2. is that we have Minoan presence in Asia Minor at a time characterized by the high tribal mobility all over the Aegean and the Levant, culminating in the Sea-Peoples' raids against Ramesses the III. It is to be borne in mind that one of the most prominent of those Sea-Peoples, the Philistines, are unanimously, at least so far as the biblical sources are concerned, envisaged as having come from Caphtor, that is Crete in all probability, a view that may tempt one to assume some kind of connexion between those Minoans who travelled to Carian lands in Asia Minor at the time of the Great Land and Sea Raids and the Egyptian Peleset of the Ramessidic records. It seems by no means unlikely that part of those Peleset were "recruited" from the ranks of those Minoans who colonized Caria maybe in search of better, more fertile lands for settlement.

5. In some other Herodotus quotes¹⁶ we read about Trojan Paris - Herodotus calls him Alexandrus - wanderings along with Helen to Egypt where he, having reached the

"mouth of the Nile called the Canopic mouth and the salting - places", was arrested by Thonis, the warden of the Nile mouth and presented to Proteus, the then King of Egypt whose royal court was in Memphis. Proteus, upon hearing the whole story, pronounced judgement that both Helen and the stolen wealth which Paris carried with him be kept in Egypt for Menelaus to come over and claim them back, whereas Paris should depart Egypt within three days otherwise he would be dealt with as if he were an enemy. Herodotus goes on in ibid to maintain that Homer knew of this account but he chose the one that suited best the spirit of the epic saga he wanted to relate;¹⁷ he goes on to produce quotes from Homer in support of his claim¹⁸, stating that in these quotes there are clear hints that Homer knew about Paris having wandered off to Egypt. It is true that the Homeric verses explicitly speak of Helen having been offered magical herbs by Thon [is]' wife, Poludamna in Egypt, Thon [is] being the warden of the Nile mouth who arrested Paris on Proteus' command¹⁹. The other Homeric quote is the already quoted passage about Menelaus being weather-bound in Egypt through having failed to propitiate the gods with the required rituals²⁰.

So we have here yet another reference to one more famous Homeric figure, Paris, having wandered off to Egypt just prior to the Trojan War at a time, that is, marked by the

hectic tribal comings and goings in the Levantine sea basin and this information should of course be seen and interpreted in the same context as that about Menelaus and Odysseus wanderings to the same country and perhaps as a hint to Aegean peoples being involved in island-hopping, coast-hugging buccaneering operations off the fertile Egyptian lands and other nearby areas.

6. We read in another Herodotus quote²¹ that as a retaliation for the abduction of Io, King Inachus' daughter - Inachus was the legendary King of Argos - by Phoenicians who had come to Argos and there carried out their foul deed (the account is given in I.1), afterwards making their way to Egypt, certain Greeks landed in Tyre in Phoenicia and carried off the King's daughter Europe. Herodotus presumes these Greeks to be Cretans a view that may very well be an attempt to reconcile the above version - furnished to him by Persians - with the Greek one which says that Europe was carried off by Zeus to Crete. Although both these abductions belong to a chronological framework which is far earlier than that of the Sea-Peoples' activities ²² one may ponder over the possibility of those stories reflecting memories of later events such as the large-scale population movements at the end of 13th and the outset of the 12th centuries, which came to be sanctioned as the Great Land and Sea Raids or

Sea-Peoples' raids in later folk-memory: if so, perhaps later folk-lore associated them with earlier legendary accounts such as the Europe's story in order to bestow some special glamour on them. Of course, should this account furnished by Herodotus in I.2 be really a reflexion of a movement that constitutes a later development one cannot but detect common aspects in the Philistines case and that of the "Cretans" mentioned by Herodotus in loc. cit. The Philistines - Egyptian Plst - are said to have come from Caphtor (Crete most probably) and are connected with entities that seem to bear strongly upon Crete (Cerethites, Caphtorim) while the Herodotus account has also Cretans sailing to Phoenice. The Philistines, additionally trekked over to the Levant and, after raiding many areas there, finally settled in Palestine; the "Cretans" in Herodotus I.1 are also said to have gone over to Phoenicia, a land not far from Palestine and certainly - at least to the minds of overseas peoples such as later Greeks - belonging to the same broad ethnic "horizon". Thirdly both Philistines and the Cretans in Herod. I.1 are recorded as having travelled over to the Levant as aggressors, with the view, that is, to causing some trouble to the peoples of these areas. Perhaps these similarities can go some way towards rendering the connexion between the case in Herodotus I.1 and the Peleset raids more feasible.

7. In a Diodorus quote²³ we read about the story of Althaemenes, son of Catreus - who was son of Minos II the so-called "first Greek master of the seas"²⁴ - and cousin of Idomeneus who fought at Troy; the story, obviously set at about or a little after the Trojan War as can be inferred from Althaemenes's kinship with Idomeneus²⁵, has it that Althaemenes fled Crete in an attempt to avoid the grim fate disclosed to him by an oracle which designated him as a patricide; he came to Rhodes along with "considerable company" and made his home at the city of Cameirus; however, the oracle was fulfilled when he accidentally slew his own father upon the latter's arrival at Rhodes in the thick of the night owing to which he and his men were mistaken for invaders.

This account may well be a memory of a Greek²⁶ influx of population from Crete into Rhodes at the time of the Trojan War or a short while after and it is interesting to investigate whether it can be coupled with other information pointing to migration movements or raids further eastwards. Indeed there is evidence for a Mycenaean settlement in Cyprus c.1200²⁷ and of course we have the royal correspondence between the King of Alashiya (Cyprus) and Hammurabi, the last King of Ugarit before its destruction at a time that seems to be that of Ramesses III's war against the Sea-Peoples (c.1186) since

the situation described in the letters immediately precedes the destruction of Ugarit, probably by the 'Sea Peoples' coalition²⁸. In this correspondence both overlords speak of enemy shipping sightings and of enemy vessels having put out to sea from Cyprus as well as of naval raids on Ugarit with disastrous effects²⁹, the whole situation suggesting an eastward course of raiding flotillas, setting out from, most probably, Cyprus. Considering that the Althaemenes' story is set roughly at Trojan War times and that the latter War's most popular dating is just before the end of the 13th cent.³⁰, one may conceive a picture of masses of Aegean-Greek in all probability in the case of Althaemenes' migration - population moving out of Crete at about the end of the 13th cent., coming over to Rhodes, then, after a while perhaps, sailing over to Cyprus (where we have archaeological evidence of Achæan people settling there at c. 1200, as has already been stated) planting a colony there and then taking to buccaneering activities thus raiding the Ugaritic Kingdom, as the Royal correspondence, speaking of those times and stated before mentions, and, finally attempting a more concerted offensive against Egypt at the time of Ramesses III as the Ramessidic scribes record. The dates of all the above mentioned fall within the same, roughly chronological framework, (end of 13th, early 12th cent.) and the overall chain of the

events marked by them seem to make up a feasible sequence.

8. In another Diodorus quote³¹ we read about a contingent of Dryopians sailing over to Cyprus and settling there, after they had been driven out of their land by Heracles following their defeat by him over "an act of impiety" committed by Phylas, their King.

In this quote the involvement of Heracles in the story makes it datable to his time, that is, at a time roughly one hundred years before the Trojan War³². Consequently the Dryopian migration to Cyprus may also be dated at the same time which means that there were Greek mainland people in Cyprus almost a century before the Trojan War, that is, before the end of the 13th cent. and therefore that they were, in all possibility, still there when the Sea Peoples raids of Ramesses III's year 8 (c.1186) took place. This assumption in view also of the information in the royal correspondence between the High Steward of Alashiya (Cyprus) and the King Hammurabi of Ugarit just prior to the destruction of the latter Kingdom probably by the Sea Peoples - that is, a little before the latter attacked Ramesses' Egypt³³ - seems to make it likely that these Dryopians, or part of them, joined up the Sea-Peoples' confederacy, attempting raids against not-far-off Ugarit and nearby Levantine states and

eventually against Egypt. Let us not forget that the Sea-Peoples and the Philistines in particular appear to bear a strong, Aegean profile with prominent Mycenaean features and that the Dryopians in question must have been of Mycenaean stock. At this point it should be remarked that it is not at all unlikely that these Dryopians were of Dorian origin since Herodotus³⁴, speaking of their land says that it was a narrow tongue of Dorian land about thirty stades in breadth stretching between Malis and Phocis and that this was Dryopis in ancient times. He rounds off by saying that this area is the motherland of the Dorians of the Peloponnese.

So, it may well be that there were Dorians among those Dryopians who migrated to Cyprus and perhaps later were, in one way or another, involved in the Sea-Peoples' raids. However, one should be sceptical about attributing to them a Dorian origin because they are said to be fighting against Heracles in the quote we examine, this latter hero being of course the most prominent figure to which all Dorians, especially their Kings, traced back their origin. So it is difficult to envisage Hercules - whose offsprings, the so-called Heracleidae, always backed the Dorian cause and vice versa - fighting against a tribe of Dorian stock, although the possibility can by no means be ruled out, since it may perhaps be argued that any alliance between

Heracles and the Dorians can by no means be considered as of a fixed and standard nature at this early stage, that is during Heracles' time which certainly precedes that of the cause championed in common by Dorians and Heracleidae later on, during their invasions of Greek south.

Whatever the case we do have a reference to a Greek mainland tribe sailing over and settling in Cyprus at a time which allows speculations over their potential involvement in the ensuing Sea-Peoples' raids.

9. In another Diodorus quote ³⁵ we read about the colonisation of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Cos and Rhodes at a time which, from all indications, seems clearly to be prior to the Trojan War. The peoples that set up those colonies were Pelasgians, Ionians and Aeolians. This information is important since it speaks of Aeolians, - a tribe with very strong Achæean connexions ³⁶ -, being settled in the easternmost Aegean islands - Chios, Lesbos and Samos are just off the western Anatolia coastline - at such a time as makes it very likely that they would be still there at the time of the Sea-Peoples' advancement against the Levantine states and that therefore they were perhaps involved in those raids, that is, either suffered from them or even joined in. The latter case is by no means unlikely if we consider the

strongly pronounced Achaeae characteristics of the Philistine material culture.

10. In another Diodorus quote ³⁷ we read about the way the settlement of the Cycladic cluster of the Aegean islands evolved; In the beginning, we read that the first Minos settled these islands with colonists from Crete, hence the designation "Minos" - which is what name many harbours in Crete come under - of many a harbour in those islands and on the coast of Asia Minor where Cretan colonists also settled. These events, remarks Diodorus, took place before the Trojan War; In the second stage and "after Troy was taken", he continues, the Carians took over from the Cretans as masters of the sea and settled Cyclades, in a number of occasions "expelling the Cretans who had their homes on them". This last information acquires some special importance since this dislodgement of Cretans from the Cyclades is said to have happened after the fall of Troy, that is, at the time which can be seen as the chronological framework of the Sea-Peoples' activities. So, bearing in mind that the Peleset-Philistines are envisaged as coming "from the midst of the Sea" and from the land of Caphtor (Crete most probably) in the Ramessidic and Biblical sources respectively, we may maintain that these Cretans are likely to have joined the rest of the Sea-Peoples' confederacy.

- after being driven out of Cyclades by the Carians and when in the course of searching for new lands - and to have become part of the "Peleset" of the Ramessidic inscriptions; after this stage it is possible that they have submitted to the influence of the Mycenaean prototypes - inspired culture of the rest of the Peleset - who are likely to have been Achaeans and "Achaeanized" Dorians - the result being that the overall picture of the Peleset material culture was a uniform one, exuding characteristics of the late Mycenaean culture; this culture was after all, the dominant one in the Aegean at the time of the Sea-Peoples' raids and therefore more likely to have influenced other trends in pottery et al. than vice versa.

11. In a Pausanias quote ³⁸ we read that Agapenor - the son of Ancaeus the son of Lycurgus - who succeeded Echemus to the throne of Arcadia led the Arcadians to Troy. After the capture of Troy, the account continues, the storm that overtook the Greeks on their return home carried Agapenor and the Arcadian fleet to Cyprus and so Agapenor became the founder of Paphos and built the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Palaepaphos. Later on, goes on the account, Leodice, a descendant of Agapenor, sent to Tegea a robe as a gift for Athena Alas.

So we have a reference here to a settlement in Cyprus of Arcadian population right after the Trojan War, in other words to an Achaean colonization of Cyprus which led to the founding of Paphos. The reference to this Achaean settlement of Cyprus is quite consistent with the archaeological record attesting to such a settlement in this island at c.1200³⁹ and of course, granted that this is also the Sea-Peoples' time of raids in the Levant as well as that there is word in the Ugarit - Alashiya royal correspondence of Cyprus - based hostile flotillas raiding both states⁴⁰, one should ponder over the strong possibility of those (Achaean) Arcadians having become some of those Sea-Peoples that may take the blame for the aforementioned raids and perhaps even others.

12. In another Pausanias quote we read⁴¹ that the Greek hero Podaleirius as he was returning from the sack of Troy was carried off his course and reached Syrnus on the Carian mainland in safety and settled there.

Thus, here is another reference to a Greek hero settling in an Asia Minor territory after the Trojan War, a situation that suggests that Podaleirius was there when the Sea-Peoples' campaigns broke out at the early stages of the 12 cent. and since these peoples are said to have destroyed a number of Anatolian and other Near Eastern

states in their southward course there is always the possibility that any peoples who were settled in these areas, like Podaleirius and his followers, had been involved in these raids, either by having suffered from them or even joined them.

13. We read in another passage from Pausanias 42 that a big colony of Cretans under Rhacius came over to Clarus, an Asia Minor Lydian territory under Carian sovereignty, and settled there. We also read that a Theban contingent, made up of prisoners of war following the conquest of their city, Thebes, by Thersander - the son of Polyneikes - and the Argives ⁴³, were given the oracle that they should found a colony and hence crossed over in ships to Asia. When they came to Clarus, the account continues, the Cretans upon learning who they were and the goal of their undertaking allowed them to settle in the land with them. Rhacius married Manto who was one of the prominent figures of the Theban colony - being the late diviner's Teiresias daughter - and Mopsus, their son, cleared the land from the Carians altogether.

So, we have in this quote a reference to a double migration of Aegean people to Anatolia, Cretans and Thebans (Cadmeians), that is we are told that the Thebans went over to Anatolia soon after the conquest of Thebes by

Thersander, the son of Polyneikes. Since the latter fought against Thebes in the first Argive expedition against the city, said by the Parian Marble to have happened c. 1251, it follows that the second victorious campaign against Thebes, since it was conducted by his son, was a generation later, that is c.1221.

This is then roughly the date for the Theban migration to, and settlement in, Anatolia, spoken of in the quote in question.

We are told that the Thebans were allowed to settle the land in common with the Cretans who were already there⁴⁴. So from this time onwards we are to envisage the land of Clarus as being settled in common by Thebans and Cretans and these two tribes as being involved together in whatever activities the population of Clarus embarked upon thereafter. This latter inference is very important since the quote states that Mopsus, son of the Cretan King Rhacius and the Cadmeian Manto, cleared the land from the Carians. Yet the most important information about Mopsus is that concerning his southward campaigns at a time which can be easily understood to be a generation later than that of his parents and, more specifically, a generation after Rhacius' marriage with Manto an event which can be seen, as has been stated above, to have happened at

roughly the time of the second Argive campaign against Thebes at c.1221. Consequently Mopsus' expeditions occurred at c. 1190 and lasted, since they are understood to have ranged far and wide, for a short while after that. More specifically, Strabo, quoting Callinus⁴⁵, writes that the peoples led by Mopsus passed over the Taurus and that, though some remained in Pamphylia, the others were dispersed in Cilicia and also in Syria as far even as Phoenicia. The date of his wanderings and the areas his followers are said to have reached afford his campaigns a strong connexion with those of the Sea-Peoples. It is interesting to see whether there is further evidence connecting him, more specifically, with the Philistines. And indeed there is. Greek tradition tells us how he captured the Philistine city of Askalon⁴⁶; also there may be a connexion between Mopsus and the Philistine title "seranim" which was given to the Lords of the Philistine Pentapolis. "Seranim" is accepted as being the same word as the Greek "tyrannos"⁴⁷ which is accepted as being of Lydian origin⁴⁸. The area between Clarus and the Calycadnus river⁴⁹ which was called, at least in Roman times, "Prostanna" and was part of Pisidia may have a bearing on the Philistine immigration since its name can be broken down into the native forms "prustta-(a)nna" and the first component seems to have some connexion with the Egyptian "prst" or "plst" (the word for Philistines in

Ramessid records). The location of "Prostanna" makes it likely to have been a stage on Mopsus' route. The above reference from Strabo XIV.4.3 to Mopsus and his followers having passed through Cilicia may be corroborated by two towns in Eastern Cilicia which seem to have been named after him, that is "Mopsouestia" and "Mopsu krene". Finally, Mopsus seems to form a link between Philistines and Denyen, another tribe of the Sea Peoples who menaced Ramesses III's Egypt. From Karatepe in Eastern Cilicia we get the information that he was the progenitor of the royal family of the "Dananiym"⁵⁰.

Let us not forget that the Sea-Peoples - and, possibly the Philistines, though it is far from certain that these tribes were acting in common from the very beginning⁵¹ - are said to have overran such areas as Hatti (the Hittite Kingdom), Kizwatna (Cilicia) and Arzawa, all of which are in Anatolia and may have been involved in Mopsus' southward course. At least so far as Cilicia is concerned, we do have the indications quoted above to this effect, particularly the reference in Strabo to Mopsus having reached Cilicia. This author also claims in loc. cit that Mopsus and his people reached as far afield as Phoenicia and Syria and certainly what was known by those names in Strabo's times did comprise ancient Philistia.

So, we do have, quite a good deal of information linking Mopsus with the Sea-Peoples and, particularly, the Philistines, and it looks as though his expedition southwards - involving most probably both Cretans and Thebans from Clarus, see the discussion above - has much to do with the contemporary Sea-Peoples expeditions which were also following a southward course from Anatolia. But the most important of all this information is that both Mopsus and part at least of his contingent may quite legitimately be said to "have come from Caphtor", the former in terms of his descent on his father's side, owing to the latter's Cretan origin, the latter because they had come to Clarus from Crete, that is, Caphtor in all probability. So, Mopsus and the people with him who trekked southwards were people who had come from Caphtor like the contemporary Philistines. Although it very much looks, in view of the rest of the evidence, that Mopsus and his people, if indeed were part of the Philistines (which is very likely), were not the only Philistine contingent to have ventured out as far as Syria and Palestine at least since there are many indications that there were other also groups that came from the Aegean to the Levant and finally became Philistines, still he and his followers have a right to be called "people from Caphtor" on the aforementioned grounds. Finally, these Cretans who settled in Clarus - and consequently Mopsus and

his followers- may very well have been of Greek and not Minoan (eteocretan) stock, since the settlement of Clarus took place in the late stages of the thirteenth century, just a short while before the second Argive expedition to Thebes (see above) and by that time Crete was settled by "Greeks", among other peoples according to Herodotus⁵² who writes that this island was peopled by Greeks after it had been left desolate subsequent to the two disastrous campaigns to Sicily. The combination and careful study of Herodotus VII.170,171 and Homer XIX.172-9 makes it understandable that the first Cretan campaign to Sicily was attempted by the second Minos and also, granted that the Trojan War happened in the third generation after this second Minos (this is made quite clear), that the Greek settlement of Crete occurred sometime during the first generation after the second Minos, that is, two generations roughly before the Trojan War, in other words somewhere in the first half of the 13th cent. All this argumentation makes it clear that by the time Clarus was settled by Cretan immigrants in the late stages of the 13th cent., there were already Greeks in Crete and therefore there may also have been among the ranks of those who settled Clarus in Asia Minor. This thesis seems to suit the overall image that we have of the Philistines even better in as much as if Mopsus and his followers had come from Caphtor (Crete), as the O.T. maintains about the

Philistines, but were ultimately of Greek origin (Mycenaean or even Dorian) and if they eventually had become Philistines, then they would, along with the rest of the Sea-borne Philistines, fulfill both the prerequisites always attached to the Hebrews' traditional and much-hated adversaries: they would have come from Caphtor and their material culture would reflect, as the Philistine one does, Mycenaean affinities. (Mycenaean appearing to be the predominant Greek culture in the Aegean at those times.)

14. In an Apollodorus quote ⁵³, quoted from the Sabbaitic fragments (S), we read that, in the course of his wanderings, Agapenor put in at Cyprus and settled there. This action is well attested in Pausanias ⁵⁴ as having taken place soon after the fall of Troy, in the course of the Arkadian King Agapenor and his fleet wandering owing to stormy weather conditions. It is there said that once settled in Cyprus, Agapenor founded the city of Paphos and a sanctuary of Aphrodite at old Paphos. So some kind of connection may perhaps be sought between those Cyprus-settled Arkadians and the contemporary Sea-Peoples who raided Cyprus, and perhaps Ugarit as well as attacked Ramesses III's Egypt. The Philistines are the tribe most likely to bear a connexion with those Arkadians owing to their Aegean-derived culture and their derivation from the Aegean area of Caphtor (Crete or/and major Aegean

area).

15. In another Apollodorus quote⁵⁵ we read that Demophon put in at Cyprus and settled there. Now Demophon was son of Theseus⁵⁶ and therefore of Athenian origin, that is, Mycenaean in terms of material culture. Additionally, since Attica's unification by Theseus is said to have occurred c.1259⁵⁷, Demophon can be conceived as having lived a generation later, that is, at roughly the late stages of the 13th cent. Therefore his settlement in Cyprus is not far off the chronological mark of both Sea-Peoples attacks against Egypt, that against Merneptah and that against Ramesses III and there is always the possibility of having been involved in either of them.

16. Apollodorus also writes⁵⁸ that Orestes, son of Agamemnon, was driven in a storm to the island of Rhodes. This must have happened after the Trojan War of course and may be seen as a reflexion, in later folk-memory, of cross-Aegean eastward movements of prominent figures-led groups of people in post-Trojan War times, that is, in roughly Sea-Peoples' times.

17. In a Strabo quote⁵⁹ we read that one of the places where Orestes and Iphigenia were rumoured to have come on

their way from the Crimea was Comana in Cappadocia where Orestes was said to have introduced the worship of Artemis Tauropolos and to have shorn his hair in token of mourning whereby the city acquired its name (Komana, from the Greek word "come" meaning hair). Again these Orpheus activities in Cappadocia are certainly dated after the Trojan War and therefore may be seen to reflect memories of a movement of Mycenaean immigrants to Asia Minor at a time when we have the well-attested Sea-Peoples raids which are actually said to have started in Asia Minor, the Hittite lands being among those prominent Anatolian states which were overrun by them, as well as Arzawa and Kizuwatna (Cilicia).

18. According to Tzetzes⁶⁰ Orestes was driven by storms to that part of Syria where Seleucia and Antioch afterwards stood; and mount Amanus, on the borders of Syria and Cilicia, was so named because there the matricide was relieved of his madness (Amanos, from "mania"=madness plus a' privative). This is very important information, since it brings Orestes, a Mycenaean, even nearer to what areas are explicitly connected with Philistine raids - conducted in the course of this people's southward thrust against Egypt - and also settlement later on. It also seems to indicate that Syria was the conclusion of Orestes' wanderings which are said to have involved, Rhodes, the island of Sminthe⁶¹,

Crimea, Cappadocia, Syria, perhaps in this very order.

19. In the Cypria⁶², a work belonging to the Epic Cycle and ascribed to either Stasinus of Cyprus or Hegesinus of Troezen, we read that Helen's (the well known Helen of Trojan War) third child was Pleisthenes and that she took him with her to Cyprus. Now the name "Pleisthenes" involves the same consonantal structure as "Pist", the name for the Philistines in the Ramessidic records and his therefore, Cypriot connexion being of such a date -he was Helen's son- as to entail his presence at this island at about a generation after the Trojan War, makes a speculation about a possible association of him with the Peleset-Philistines who appear at the same, roughly, time, hardly untenable and seems to call for further investigation.

CHAPTER FOUR

PART 1

A2

Notes on the Text

1. II.118
2. Odyssey XVIII. 424-444
3. Strabo III.2.13 has an explicit reference to both Greeks and Trojans having taken to buccaneering activities after the Trojan War, the former because they were not content with the amount of booty fallen to each one's lot after the fall of Troy, the latter because, their properties being forcefully wrenched from them by the victors, they resolved piracy was the only practice they could live on. Thucydides I.12 gives a similar, albeit not quite the same, account speaking of a period of unrest and insecurity in Greece following civil strifes that broke out after the conclusion of the Trojan War and resulting in repeated acts of migration and settlement, situations, that is, which may well, one may contend, have involved acts of piracy.
4. Odyssey, IV. 351-362 and 581-584.
5. See Vermeule, E. Greece in the Bronze Age, the University of Chicago Press, (1972), pp. 274-9, particularly pp. 277-8.
6. Breasted, J.H. Ancient Records of Egypt, Chicago (1906), vol. III. pp. 251-351.

7. See Vermeule, E. op.cit. (n.5), p.277.
8. Clement of Alexandria Stromata I.138.1-3, quoting Eratosthenes' calculations.
9. Breasted T.H. op.cit. (n.6), vol.IV paras 59-82; Edgerton W.F. and Wilson J.A. Historical Records of Ramesses III, The Texts of Medinet Habu, Chicago, (1936), pp. 30-1.
10. V.119.
11. In n.1 of the respective page in the Loeb Classical Library edition of Herodotus the translator writes that this was the site of the cult of a war-god whose emblem was the "levris" that is, "the double-axe"
12. The information quoted in this passage, in V.119 that is, is furnished upon the occasion of the mention of a battle in ibid involving Carians and Persians by the river Mersyes across the river Maeander; the Carians were routed and those that escaped were driven into the precinct of Zeus of Armies at Lebraunda.
13. Pausanias VII.3.1.
14. Pausanias VII.3.2. From a careful study of Herodotus V.57 and V.61 it can be inferred that the War of Epigoni - the descendants of the Seven Achæan Chieftains who campaigned against Thebes to restore Polyneikes to the throne which was usurped by his brother Eteokles - against Thebes occurred about sixty years after the fall of Troy, that is, at about the end of the first quarter of the 12th cent.

(c. 1175-1180), if we take the Trojan War to have taken place sometime during the three or four last decades of the 13th cent. according to a compromise between Blegen's calculations and those which bring the dating further down and closer to the end of the 12th cent. (See Vermeule E. Greece in the Bronze Age, Chicago, (1972), pp. 277-8). Now this time, 1175-1180 that is, belongs to the same chronological context as the Sea-Peoples raids against Egypt and one may ponder over the possibility of a Minoan contingent having trekked to Asia Minor, as Pausanias in VII.3.1 states, out of reasons similar to those that forced other Aegean people to migrate and appear as Sea-Peoples, as is likely, on Egyptian soil after having sought a better destiny through other Levantine areas.

15. Pausanias VII.3.1.
16. II.113-7.
17. II.116.
18. Odyssey IV.225-230, 351-3.
19. Herodotus II. 113-115.
20. Odyssey IV. 351-3. The account on the magical herbs which were given to Helen by the Egyptian princess is in Odyssey IV. 225-230.
21. I.2
22. Europe's abduction can be seen to belong chronologically to the latter half of the 16th

- century, a dating easily arrived at by means of the Parian chronicle's date for her brother Cadmus' arrival at Thebes, that is, 1518. See Jacoby, F. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, Berlin (1929), 2B, no 239.
23. V. 59. 1-4
24. See Diodorus IV.60.2-4.
25. The information leading to the establishment of this kinship between these two figures is furnished by the pedigrees provided by Diodorus IV.60.2-4, V.59.1-4 and Odyssey XIX.172-9.
26. Althaemenes is obviously made out to be of Greek origin in as much as he is said to be grandson of the (second) Minos who is said, in turn, to be a Greek, see Diodorus loc.cit (n.24).
27. See Catling, H. "The Achæan settlement of Cyprus" in Acts of the International Symposium The Mycenaean in the Eastern Mediterranean, Nicosia 1972, Nicosia (1973), pp. 34-9.
28. See Nougayrol, J., Laroche, E., Virroland, C. and Schaeffer, C.F.A. Ugaritica, vol.V, Paris (1968); pp.83-6, 105, 701-3
29. See chapter Three, notes 185, 187, 189.
30. See Vermeule, E., Greece in the Bronze Age, Chicago, (1972), pp. 277-8.
31. IV. 37. 1-4.

32. Diodorus VII. 1. 1 where we read that both Heracles and Orpheus lived one hundred years before the period of the Trojan War.
33. See previous quote and notes 28, 29.
34. VIII. 31.
35. V. 81
36. Strabo VIII. 1. 2 writes that the Achaeans are of Aeolic stock.
37. V. 84. 1-4
38. VIII. 5. 2-3
39. See Catling. H. op.cit., (1973), pp. 34-9 (n.27).
40. See quote no. 7 and notes 28-9.
41. III. 26. 10.
42. VII. 3. 1-2.
43. These Argives are none other than the so-called "Epigoni", the sons, that is, of the seven chieftains who attempted the famous "Seven Against Thebes" campaign which had disastrous results for the aggressors. The Epigoni attempted another campaign against Thebes a generation later than that of their fathers as is inferred from the information in the quote in question that Thebes was taken by Thersander, the son of Polyneikes, the latter being one of the warlords who attacked Thebes in the

first campaign.

44. It is obvious that Clarus was settled by Cretans not long before the Thebans arrived, since the Cretan leader Rhacius is said to have still been in power when the Theban contingent arrived, at a date shortly after the second Argive campaign against Thebes at c.1221.
45. Strabo XIV. 4.3.
46. Athenaeus VIII. 37 (C. and T. Muller Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, 1-38, fragment 11); Askalon and Philistia had many connections with Lydia most of which are dealt with in Wainwright's article "Some Early Philistine History" in Vetus Testamentum, 9 (1959), 79 ff. See also Burn A.R. Minoans Philistines and Greeks, pp. 151-4.
47. Macalister, R.D. The Philistines, p.79, Hastings Dictionary of the Bible S.V. Philistines.
48. Radet, G. Le Lydie et le monde Grecque (1893), 146-147. Clarus actually belonged to Lydia.
49. This is a river in Western Cilicia, the so-called Cilicia Tracheia, see Wainwright J E A 47 (1961), p. 78.
50. Callaghan, O. Orientalia, 18 (1949), 177-9 and 199 ff. for the discussion; Barnett in JHS, 73, (1953), 142.
51. See Ramesses III's year 8 inscription stating that the Sea-Peoples were "scattered in war" in the beginning

but "united lands" just prior to the attack on Egypt.

52. VII. 171.

53. Ep. 6. 15(\$).

54. VIII. 5. 2.

55. Ep. 6. 16 (E)

56. Ep. 6. 16, n.2 in L. CL. Library; see also Apollodorus E. 5. 22

57. Parian Marble, Jacoby, F. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker 2B, Berlin (1929), no 239.

58. Ep. 6. 27 (S).

59. XIII. 2-3

60. Scholia on Lycophron, 1374.

61. Otherwise unknown. The information is quoted by Hyginus, Fabula, 120.

62. Op. cit., fragment 9, quoted by the Scholiast on Euripides' Andromache, v.898.

PART TWO:

The Evidence On Various Activities Of Aegean People(s) In The Levant And On The Various Levantine Tribes Or/And Heroes' Movements To, And Various Patterns Of Action In, The Aegean At Roughly The Time Of The "Great Land And Sea Raids" And On Their Activities Subsequent To The Hectic Times Towards The Decline Of The Mycenaean Sovereignty.

A: The Evidence From The Greek Sources.

1. In a Strabo quote we read¹ "Be that as it may, Boeotia in earlier times was inhabited by barbarians, the Aones and the Temnices, who wandered thither from Sunium, and by the Leleges and the Hyantes. Then the Phoenicians occupied it, I mean the Phoenicians with Cadmus, the man who fortified the Cadmeia and left the dominion to his descendants. Those Phoenicians founded Thebes in addition to the Cadmeia and preserved their dominion, commanding most of the Boeotians until the expedition of the Epigoni. On this occasion they left Thebes for a short time, but came back again. And in the same way, when they were ejected by the Thracians and the Pelasgians, they established their government in Thessaly along with the Arnaei for a long time, so that they were all called Boeotians. Then they returned to their homeland at the time when the Aeolian

fleet near Aulis in Boeotia was now ready to set sail, I mean the fleet which the sons of Orestes were despatching to Asia. After adding the Orchomenian country to Boeotia (for in earlier times the Orchomenians were not a part of the Boeotian community, nor did Homer enumerate them with the Boeotians, but as a separate people, for he called them Minyae), they, with the Orchomenians, drove out the Pelasgians to Athens (it was after these that a part of the city was named "Pelasgikon", though they took up their abode below Hymettus), and the Thracians to Parnassus; and the Hyantes founded a city Hyas in Phocis".

So we have here a reference to a two-way migratory action spanning the Aegean sea at about the time of the Sea-Peoples' raids. First we read about the "Phoenicians of Cadmus" who came to Greece and occupied Boeotia, being the fifth race in order to have done this, only to be forced to desert this area twice, once by the Epigoni, the second by the Thracians and the Pelasgians. We read that after the second expulsion they migrated to Thessaly and settled there for a while and then returned to Boeotia at the time when the Aeolian fleet under the leadership of the sons of Orestes was about to set sail for Asia. One really may wonder about the possibility of those Phoenicians having joined - part of them, that is - either or both of the expeditions, the one undertaken by the

Dorians of Doris (Hestiaetis) in Thessaly² - an expedition that settled Crete with Dorians³ - and/or that undertaken by the Aeolians led by the "Sons of Orestes". Now Tectamus is made out to have lived six (6) generations before the Trojan War⁴, therefore the Dorian expedition which he is said to have led to Crete from Thessaly happened a good while before that war, even allowing for a certain margin of error which is always a strong likelihood when it comes to genealogies - based calculations of dates. The Aeolian expedition to Asia must have happened roughly two generations after the Trojan War, as it was led by Orestes' sons. If those Phoenicians joined the first expedition to Crete we must envisage them as being there at a time prior to the Trojan War and as likely to have joined any potential Dorian expedition to the Levant at the time of the Sea-Peoples' raids. If, alternatively, they joined the Aeolian expedition which of course happened a long time after the one led by Tectamus to Crete then they should be envisaged as migrating or, at any rate, sailing to Asia, at a time which can be conceived of as roughly contemporary with that of the Sea-Peoples' raids referred to in Ramesses III's records, since the sons of Orestes lived roughly two generations after the Trojan War which we know of as having probably occurred, according to archaeological research, sometime in the late 13th cent. Therefore, a date of two generations after it

takes us just a little off the chronological mark required for making this Aeolian expedition contemporary with the "Ramessidic" Sea-Peoples, and, again allowing for the lack of precision always accompanying genealogies - based calculations of dates we can conceive the two events as roughly belonging in the same broad chronological context. In either case we may be justified in contending that a potential Phoenician expedition to the Levant may perhaps be conceived as contemporary with others involving various Greek tribes who might have sailed to that area anxious to find new, better lands for settlement, at a time when the Eastern Mediterranean seems to be stormed by foreigners who had set out from, among other areas, "lands in the Midst of the Sea", or "the Great Green", that is, the Mediterranean, as it is poetically and customarily referred to in the Egyptian records speaking of the Sea-Peoples' raids at the time of Ramesses III. If this possibility is granted, we must envisage those Phoenicians as one of the Sea-Peoples and perhaps as part of the Denyen if the latter are a disguise for the Homeric Danaans, a people in the ranks of which later Greeks and the literary evidence as a whole envisaged all the non-Dorian population of Greece. In this very important respect, the Dorians would qualify as Peleset if they indeed had joined the Levant-bound migrations, rather than Denyen, a contention which would lead one to look upon the

Dorian-Danaan expedition as a Peleset-Denyen alliance in Egyptian record terms.

The second leg of the overseas, Levant-bound movement referred to in this quote concerns the fleet which "the sons of Orestes were despatching to Asia" from near Aulis in Boeotia. We have already stated above that the sons of Orestes' involvement in this action should date it two generations after the Trojan War. Such a date would make this expedition of the Aeolian fleet from Greek mainland to Asia roughly contemporary with the Sea-Peoples' raids commented upon in Ramesses III's records. Whether or not the Phoenicians referred to in this quote joined the expedition, what we have here is a reference to an overseas, premeditated, east-bound expedition of Aeolians from mainland Greece which is to be dated at a time when well-attested tribal mobility cut a swath of destruction and desolation in various Levantine areas in the early stages of the 12th cent. only to be eventually foiled by the Egyptian army and navy of Ramesses III. It is likely that these Aeolians who set out on that expedition to Asia, using Aulis in Boeotia as their base, joined in the massive Sea-Peoples' expedition referred to in Ramesses' records, even though they had not planned such an action in advance, and are to be seen in the case of some Aegean-borne invaders-according to the Egyptian records

- such as the Peleset or the Denyen who, in view of the rest of the evidence propounded in this work, seem to pose a stronger candidature for a Greek-mainland or islands - derived invaders' identity and activity in the Levant during the turbulent times in the outset of the 12th century.

2. In a Herodotus quote we read⁵ "Now about this same time Theras (who was a descendant of Polyneikes, through Thersander, Tisemenus and Autesion) was preparing to lead out colonists from Lacedaemon. This Theras was of the lineage of Cadmus and an uncle on the mother's side of Aristodemus' sons Eurysthenes and Procles; and while these boys were yet children he held the royal power of Sparta as regent; but when his nephews grew up and became kings, then Theras could not brook to be a subject when he had had a taste of supreme power, and said he would abide no longer in Lacedaemon but sail away to his kinsfolk. There were in the island called Thera, but then Calliste, descendants of Membliarus the son of Poeciles, a Phoenician; for Cadmus son of Agenor in his search for Europe, had put in at the place now called Thera; and having put in, either because the land pleased him, or because of some other desire so to do, he left in this island, among other Phoenicians, his own kinsmen Membliarus. These dwelt in the island Calliste for eight

generations before Theras came from Lacedaemon".

Now, according to this passage the island of Thera was being inhabited, at least partly by Phoenicians - brought over by Cadmus - from the time of Cadmus all the way down to that of Theras. Since Cadmus is considered as having arrived at Thebes at 1518 (Parian Marble), and since Theras, according to the pedigree given in the above passage, must have lived during the latter half of the 12th cent.⁶, it follows that the island of Thera (modern Santorini in the Aegean cluster of Cyclades) was inhabited by Phoenicians at the time of the Sea-Peoples, because the Herodotus quote states explicitly that the island was inhabited by Phoenicians for eight generations even before Theras' time, and we know that the Sea-Peoples raids are today seen as having occurred during the eighth year of Pharaoh Ramesses III, that is during the first half of the 12th century.

3. In another Herodotus quote we read ⁷ "But I in what I write follow the Greek report, and hold that the Greeks are right in recording these kings of the Dorians as far back as to Perseus son of Danae, wherein they make no mention of the god ⁸ - and in proving the said kings to be Greek; for by Perseus' time they had come to be reckoned as Greeks. As far back as Perseus, I say, and I take the

matter no further than that, because none is named as the mortal father of Perseus, as Amphitryon is named father of Heracles. It is plain then, that I have right reason on my side when I say that the Greek record is right as far back as to Perseus; further back than that, if the king's ancestor in each generation, from Danae, daughter of Acrisius upward, be reckoned, then the leaders of the Dorians will be shown to be true-born Egyptians".

The belief that the Dorian leaders were ultimately true-born Egyptians, as Herodotus maintains, can only be explained away through the unanimous view that one of the main figures that the Dorians and, in particular their kings, traced their origin back to, was Heracles⁹. Heracles was great-grandson of Perseus¹⁰ who was a descendent of Danaus¹¹, son of king Belus - who ruled at Chemmis in the Thebaid - and Anchinoe, and also twin brother of Aegyptus and brother of Kepheus¹². Aegyptus, to whom fifty sons were born and who was ruler of Arabia and Egypt - naming this country after himself - and Danaus, who fathered fifty daughters - called the Danaids - and was ruler of Libya, argued over their inheritance upon their father's death. Aegyptus proposed a mass-marriage between the fifty princes and the fifty princesses, but Danaus, having his fears of a plot against his daughters' lives confirmed by an oracle, turned down

the idea, fled from Libya¹³, and sailed, with his daughters, towards Greece by way of Rhodes. There Danaus dedicated an image to Athene in a temple raised to her by the Danaids, three of whom died during their stay in the island; the cities of Lindos, Ialysus and Cameirus are called after them¹⁴.

From Rhodes they sailed to the Peloponnese and landed near Lerna¹⁵, where Danaus, his pretensions to the throne of Argos having been aided by a wolf-involving incident read by the locals as an omen that he would forcibly take the throne if he were opposed, became King of Argos and so powerful a ruler that all the Pelasgians of Greece called themselves Danaans. He is also credited with having erected the citadel of Argos and his daughters are reputed to have introduced the mysteries of Demeter - the goddess of husbandry and fertility - the so-called "Thesmoforia" into Greece, having brought them from Egypt, though tradition has it that since the Dorian invasion the "Thesmoforia" are exercised by the Arcadians alone in the Peloponnese¹⁶.

After the Danaid Amyone and god Poseidon-involving incident resulting in the creation of the spring Amyone whereby the Argos-plaguing drought problem was solved¹⁷, that legend says that Aegyptus sent his sons to Argos in

order to punish Danaus and his whole family. Upon arriving at Argos, the Aegyptus' sons requested of Danaus to reverse his former decision and arrange a mass-marriage between them and his daughters. Upon receiving a negative reply they laid siege to the city and Danaus, seeing that thirst would soon force the city to surrender, promised to grant their requests¹⁸. During the wedding feast Danaus meted out sharp pins to his daughters and at midnight each of them drove it through her husband's heart. Only Hypermnestra spared the life of Lynceus, because he had spared her virginity and helped him to flee to the city of Lyncea, sixty furlongs away. Hypermnestra was consequently tried for her life over ignoring her father's instructions, but she was acquitted by the Argive judges¹⁹.

Now although the gods Athene and Hermes purified the Danaids in the Lernean Lake, the judges of the Dead condemned them to the endless task of carrying water in jars perforated like sieves²⁰. Lynceus and Hypermnestra were re-united and Danaus married off the other daughters through arranging a marriage race for locals, the winner having first choice of a wife and the others the next choices in their finishing order. All descendents of these marriages rank as Danaans. Lynceus later killed Danaus and ascended the throne of Argos. Although he also wished to kill his sisters-in-law in order to avenge his brothers'

death he was thwarted in this by the contrary wish of the people of Argos²¹.

Meanwhile Aegyptus had come to Greece but upon learning of his sons' fate fled to Aroe where he died and was buried at Patrae in a sanctuary of Serapis²².

Nauplius, Amynone's son by Poseidon, discovered the art of steering by the Great Bear and became a famous navigator. He founded the city of Nauplion where he settled the Egyptian crew that had sailed with his grandfather. He was the ancestor of Nauplius the Wrecker who used to mislead hostile ships into the wrong course and eventually to their ruin by using false beacons²³.

Besides the importance of the overall Danaus' legend with respect to what may well be a disguised reference to the arrival at Greece of colonists from Egypt and perhaps other Levantine areas sometime towards the opening stages of the fifteenth cent.²⁴ what can be of some special interest to this study is that the Bible has it that the Philistines had come from Casluhim whose father was Egypt²⁵. Since this reference comes from the Table of Nations it should be treated as perhaps the most clear-cut information on the origins of the Philistines to date. In view therefore, of the great deal of evidence, both literary

and archaeological, pointing to an Aegean extraction of this people, this work holds that a sensible and perhaps satisfactory way to account for this thesis propounded by the Biblical scribes in the Table of Nations is by means of the Danaus legend.

The overall argumentation can develop thus:

There was a widespread belief throughout the entire course of Greek antiquity - and, actually the entire Mediterranean - that the Dorians credited their kings with being offsprings of Hercules himself²⁶, a concept that soon grew to comprise the overall Dorian race. Now this belief which was wrong of course in as much as the Dorians had no blood relationship with Hercules²⁷, was nevertheless prevalent in ancient Greece and the rest of the ancient world throughout the overall prehistoric and historic era. The Dorians, arrogated to themselves the right to be called Hercules' descendants in order, obviously, to impress a commanding and respect - inspiring image on the rest of the Greeks with a view no doubt, to claiming a significant role in the later Greek society and, at any rate, an indefeasible right to have a say in all important developments which were to come in later stages of Greek history, as they indeed did. They achieved this Hercules-derived race image through their forming an

alliance with the Heracleidae, Hercules' offspring, that is, when the latter planned to return to Peloponnese - whence they had been expelled by Hercules' step-brother and nemesis, Eurystheus, King of Mycenae - and exact revenge from their illustrious ancestor's task master who was still holding the throne of Mycenae²⁸, to which they strongly pretended²⁹. So although the Dorians cannot be considered to have derived from Hercules himself in the first place - although a good deal of an intermarrying and intermingling, generally, process must have ensued at a later stage from the well-attested co-existence, throughout the already-mentioned alliance, of them with the Heracleidae - two reasons seem clearly to connect them with the Heracleidae; firstly that they appeared together with the descendants of Heracles at the time of their invasion of southern Greece, during the battles fought against the inhabitants of the disputed lands and secondly that they apportioned the conquered territories among themselves and settled them in common.

All these caused the ancient world to consider these two tribal entities as virtually inseparable and, actually, as one and the same entity. Consequently, the Dorians like the Heracleidae were traditionally traced back to Heracles and, ultimately, through him, to Perseus and Danaus whose Egyptian connexions, as has already been stated and discussed, were unquestionable.

It seems therefore that it was absolutely legitimate for the ancient world to hold the Dorians to be originally

of Egyptian beginnings, as Herodotus states in a quite clear manner in VI.53. At this point, mention should be made of the equally clear reference in the Table of Nations - Genesis X.13-14-to the Philistines as being of Egyptian extraction. This common belief about these two tribes in view of the multiple information referred to in this essay and pointing to the possibility of the involvement of a Dorian element of population in the Levant - bound tribal movements at the end of the 13th cent. and/or the outset of the 12th - at a time shortly after the Trojan War-and in the eventual settlement of these groups in Palestine, perhaps enhances the likelihood of a connexion between Dorians and Philistines.

The other tribe which can be related to Danaus' legend and help establish a connexion between biblical Philistines and prehistoric - Mycenaean age-Greek tribes is the Danaans, the offspring of the daughters of Danaus, the Danaids, and in this people's case the connexion with Danaus and his Egyptian beginnings is, of course, indisputable. Danaus is said to have come from Egypt with his daughters and, once the overall matter of his daughters' marriage with his brother Egyptus' sons was so tragically resolved, he married off his daughters with the winners of a race which he had announced in order to attract suitors, the descendants of these marriages henceforth

ranking as Danaans, a name which came to be customarily applied to all non-Dorian population of Mycenaean (c.1600-1050) Greece³⁰. Consequently, since we have archaeological and literary evidence attesting to Mycenaean culture - related people both moving towards Levantine areas - at the end of the 13th cent. as well as the outset of the 12th, see this and previous chapters - and being settled in Palestine at the time of the Philistine - Hebrew struggle - this is the case of Philistines, Caphtorim, Cerethites, Pelesthites all of them being peoples with an invariable, if elusive Aegean image in the biblical narrative - we could legitimately look upon the Danaans as a very good case, as people, that is, who are very eligible to have been those who appear under the disguise of some of the Sea-Peoples who trekked to the Levant and finally settled, after their defeat by Ramesses III, in Palestine only to come under the name of Philistines in the biblical passages. The Danaans are actually even likelier candidates for the actual tribal identity of those of the Sea-Peoples who seem to have Aegean beginnings in as much as they are clearly made out to be the same as the inhabitants of what we understand today as Mycenaean Greece and, in view of the evidence pointing to a very strong Mycenaean connexion in the Philistine culture, the Danaans, the typical, standard, that is, Mycenaean Greeks seem to pose a stronger case

than the Dorians who cannot rank as the majority of the people of the Mycenaean south(see discussion in this chapter).

So, if the Danaans are actually to be seen in the case of the Philistines and perhaps the Denyen - the resemblance between the two names is unmistakable³¹ - it is only natural that the biblical Table of Nations should hold the Philistines to be of ultimately Egyptian origin, since the Danaans, as has already been stated time and again, are traced back to Danaus, brother of Egyptus and son of Belus and Anchinoe who was daughter of Nilus; many of Danaus' daughters were of Egyptian origin and of course their descendants the Danaans had unmistakable Egyptian beginnings.

4. In a Herodotus quote³² we have what probably is a vague tradition connecting the Hyksos with the Philistines. We read that there was a shepherd whose name "Philitis" has been taken to indicate that the Philistines were part of the invaders. However, owing to the high date of the Hyksos movement (some five-hundred years earlier than the Sea-Peoples' raids during Ramesses III's Egypt) and to the lack of any mention of the name "Philistines" in any Levantine sources prior to Ramesses III's times, it is very difficult to consider seriously any connexion between the

12th century Philistines and the entry in question in Herodotus loc.cit. Perhaps the only "Philistines" to stand any chance of some connexion with Herodotus "Philitis" are the Patriarchal Philistines who were living at Gerar and carried out some transactions with Abraham and Isaac³³ .

CHAPTER FOUR

Part Two

A.

Notes on the Text.

1. Strabo IX.2.3.
2. Strabo X.4.6, Diodorus V.80.1-2 coupled with Herodotus I.56, Diodorus IV.60.2
3. Odyssey XIX.172-9, Diodorus V.80.1-2 coupled with Strabo VIII.5.5.
4. Diodorus IV.60.2-4 coupled with Odyssey XIX.172-9.
5. IV. 147
6. Theras is made out to be, in this quote, fourth in descending order from Polyneikes, the legitimate King of Thebes who campaigned against the city to claim the throne which was usurped from him by his brother Eteokles. This campaign, known throughout Greek tradition as the so-called "Seven against Thebes" campaign by virtue of the seven Achaean chieftains who teamed up with Polyneikes in his aforementioned bid, is dated by the Parian Marble at 1251 (see quote No 2 and the relevant discussion in sub-division A2, section A, part 1 of this chapter). Therefore, Theras' time can be worked out as being roughly that of the second half of the 12th cent.
7. 6. 53

8. Zeus; on the origin of Perseus and the story as to how he was born, saved and eventually washed up with his mother Danae, Acrisius' daughter, in the island of Seriphos where he was reared by King Polydectes, see Hyginus: Fabula 63; Apollodorus: II.4.1; Horace" Odes III. 16.1
9. Herodotus, VII.204, where Leonidas, the gallant Spartan King - the Spartans were the most prominent Dorian tribe in the Peloponnese and even in the whole of Greece - who died such a dramatic death in the famous battle at Thermopylae c.480 fighting against the invading Persian army, is traced -along with a long list of other Spartan Kings who preceded him - back to Heracles.
10. On Heracles' pedigree, particularly on his mother's side, as well as on how Amphitryon's and Alcmene's fates - the people who were later to become his parents - came to be interlaced, see Apollodorus 11.4.5-6; Tzetzes On Lycophron, 932; Hesiod: Shield of Heracles, 11 ff.
11. On Perseus' pedigree and on the developments which spared him his gruesome destiny and drove both him and his mother to the safety of the Aegean island of Seriphos and under the Patronage of its King Polydectes, see Servius on Virgil's Aeneid III.286; Scoliast on Euripide's Orestes, 965; Apollodorus: 11.2.1 and 4.7; Hyginus: Fabula 63; Apollodorus 11.4.1; Horace: Odes III.16.1
12. Herodotus II.91; Euripides, quoted by Apollodorus II.1.4.

13. Apollodorus II 1.5; Hyginus, Fabula, 168; Eustathius on Homer, p.37.
14. Hyginus, loc.cit.; Apollodorus II.1.4.; Herodotus, II.234; Diodorus Siculus V.58.1; Strabo XIV.2.8.
15. 1510 B.C. see Parian Marble (264 B.C.), in Jacoby F. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, 2B, Berlin, 1929, no 239.
16. Pausanias II.38.4 and 19.3.; Euripides, quoted by Strabo; VIII.6.9; Strabo loc.cit.; Herodotus, II.171.; Plutarch: On the Malice of Herodotus, 13.
17. Hyginus: Fabula 169; Apollodorus II.1.4.
18. Hyginus: Fabula 168; Apollodorus II.1.5; Strabo VIII.6.9.
19. Apollodorus loc.cit.; Pausanias II.25.4, 19.6, 21.1
20. Apollodorus loc.cit.; Lucian: Marine Dialogues VI; Hyginus: Fabula 168; Ovid: Heroides XIV; Horace: Odes III.11.30.
21. Pindar: Pythian Odes IX 117 ff.; Pausanias III.12.2.; Hyginus: Fabula 170; Servius on Virgil's Aeneid X.497.
22. Pausanias VII.21.6
23. Apollonius Rhodius I.136.8; Theon on Aratus' Phenomena 27; Pausanias IV. 35. 2
24. The Parian Marble (264 B.C.) envisages the arrival of

Danaus in Greece from Egypt at c.1510, see Jacoby, F. Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, 2B, no 239, Berlin, 1929.

25. Genesis, 10.13-14 This is the reference to the Philistines in the Table of Nations in which the Caphtorim are mentioned apart from the Philistines as brothers of the Casluhim and, of course, sons of Egypt. (loc.cit.)
26. Herodotus VII. 204; Tyrtaeus, Fragment XI. 1-2, cited from West, M.L. Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati, 2, Oxford (1972); Pindar, Pythian, I.60-5.
27. Strabo, IX.4.10, where it is made clear that Aegimius, King of the Dorians who inhabited the so-called Dorian tetrapolis - made up of the cities Erineus, Boeus, Pindus and Cytinium (all of which formed a confederacy quite comparable to that of the Philistine pentapolis in Palestine in biblical times) and reputed to have lain round the mountain Parnessus, (idem IX.3.1) and to have been the metropolis of all the Dorians (idem IX.4.10) - adopted Hyllus, the eldest of the sons of Hercules in return for Hercules having restored him back to regal power, the result being that Hyllus and his descendants (the other Heracleids) became his successors on the Dorian throne. Strabo rounds off this account by saying that it was from this Tetrapolis that the Heracleidae - and the Dorians - set out on their return to the Peloponnese.
28. Strabo, loc.cit (previous note); see also Tyrtaeus, cited from West, M.L. Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati, 2, Oxford (1972) fragment II.12-5

where it is stated that the inhabitants of windy Erineos - one of the four towns of the Dorian Tetrapolis which was called the "metropolis of all the Dorians" (see Strabo loc.cit in this and the previous notes) and said to have stretched round Parnassus, (see Strabo IX.3.1)- left this town along with the Heracleids and came with them to broad Peloponnese.

29. Diodorus Siculus, IV.57.2 and IV.58.4; see also Herodotus IX.26.2-4. It looks as though the Heracleidae formed an alliance with the Dorians with the view to succeeding in their bid to return to the Peloponnese and claim the throne and the land they looked upon as their own, after they had taken their revenge on Eurystheus by defeating him and killing him, with the aid of the Athenians, in a pitched battle that took place at Marathon, a suburb in modern Attica, see Strabo VIII.6.19. Since on the occasion of the clash with Eurystheus they are reported to have been aided by the Athenians alone who were the only tribe to have afforded them sanctuary at a time when Eurystheus was trying to banish them from the whole of Greece, - see Diodorus Siculus, loc.cit. in this note - we can only envisage the Heracleidae's alliance with the Dorians as taking place at a later stage; perhaps at the time the former people attempted, a full scale military operation against Peloponnese. We could also envisage this alliance as starting perhaps with their first attempt to do so in which the issue was resolved through a single combat between champions, the Tegean Echemus - defending the cause of the Peloponnesians - emerging victorious over Hyllos, the son of Heracles and leader of the Heracleidae's army, see Herodotus loc.cit. in this note. For other

references to the attempt to invade southern Greece and settle there, undertaken jointly by Dorians and Heracleidae see Pinder, Isthmian IX.1.4, Strabo VIII.3.33 in conjunction with Plato, Laws , 682e-683e, Apollodorus Library , II.8.1-4 in conjunction with Plato Laws , loc.cit. in this note and Strabo loc.cit. in this note, Pausanias II.18.6-9 - who, speaking of the Dorians Temenus and Kresphontes (see Plato; Laws , loc.cit. in this note) labels them "Heracleidae" thus making clear how inseparable the two groups must have become in the minds of the inhabitants of ancient Greece - idem III.1-5, IV.3.3-6 and VIII.5.1 (if taken in conjunction with Diodorus Siculus IV.57.2-4, 58.4 and Herodotus IX.26.2-4 as well as with Apollodorus Library II.8.1-4 strengthens very much the possibility of the Dorians - Heracleidae alliance having first occurred during, as has already been stated, the first Heracleidae' attempt to invade Peloponnese in which their plans were foiled through Hyllos' defeat and death in his combat with Echemus see above) Eusebius Preparation of the Gospel, V.20.1-3

30. Pinder, Pythian odes, IX.117 ff Pausanias III.12.2; Hyginus Fabula 170; Servius on Vergil's Aeneid X.497
31. Oren, E. The Northern Cemetery at Beth Shan, Leiden (1973), chs 5 and 6. Dr Oren seems to prefer Denyen - Danuna to Peleset at Beth - Shan.
32. Herodotus II.128
33. Genesis 20 and 26.

CHAPTER FOUR.

PART 2.

B: The Evidence from Manetho and Josephus.

1. In a Manetho quote¹ we hear that Sethos - son of Amenophis - came to royal power, a King that was also called Ramesses² and whose power lay in his cavalry and his fleet. The king appointed his brother Harmais viceroy of Egypt and is said to have invested him with all the royal prerogatives "except that he charged him not to wear a diadem, nor to wrong the queen, the mother of his children and to refrain likewise from the royal concubines". The quote continues by giving an account of Sethos' conquests abroad and by stating that a good while after he had left Egypt Harmais grossly encroached upon his brother's injunctions whereupon the warden of the Egyptian clergy served notice upon Sethos (called Sethosis here) regarding Harmais' wrong doings. Sethos returned to Pelusium³ and soon took possession of his Kingdom⁴. The land was named Aegyptus after him. And the account in question concludes by saying that "it is said that Sethos was called Aegyptus and his brother Harmais, Danaus"⁵.

So what we have here is the Egyptian version of the Aegyptus and Danaus legend which forms so prominent a saga in Greek mythology. This saga which is of course seen to have had far-reaching repercussions on later mythical - or even factual - developments and situations ⁶ is focused on the tradition that Danaus, a king of Egypt, was expelled by his brother and fled to Argos with his fifty daughters and there, the tradition states, the sons of Aegyptus having followed them were slain by the daughters of Danaus. The legend appears to have existed in Egypt as well as in Greece⁷. It is really interesting to see what further evidence on this matter Manetho's writings have to offer. It should be always borne in mind that the Egyptian beginnings of Danaus are very likely to lie at the bottom of an Aegean - wide tradition that held the Dorians - one of the tribes that may well be envisaged among the ranks of the Philistines - to be of ultimately Egyptian origin ⁸.

2. In another Manetho quote which is the immediate continuation of the previous one ⁹ we read: "Such is Manetho's account ¹⁰, and, if the time is reckoned according to the years mentioned, it is clear that the so-called Shepherds, our ancestors, quitted Egypt and settled in our land 393 years before the coming of Danaus to Argos".

Now since the king during whose reign the expulsion of the Shepherds - which is made out by Josephus to be the same as the Hebrew Exodus - took place is said by Manetho to be Tehmosis¹¹ who is sure to be Amosis¹² the founder of the XVIII dynasty which is commonly understood as having commenced c. 1580, we can reach a date c.1187 for the coming of Danaus to Greece by deducting 393 from 1580. However, the particulars regarding Danaus in Manetho's writings vary and lead the researcher to different datings of his life. According to some of them, since Sethos, also called Aegyptus and known to be Danaus' brother, is found to be the same as Ramesses II¹³ it follows that we are talking in terms of a 13th century situation¹⁴. Thus, it seems possible that Danaus also lived in the 13th century. The data leading to a c.1187 dating of his coming to Greece have already been mentioned and this dating of course gives us the former half of the 12th century as well as the late stages of the 13th as the period spanned by his life.

In fragment 4 we are told that Amosis (the founder, as can be made out, of the XVIII dynasty) was contemporary with Inachus who, in transl. n.4 on this fragment is said to have died twenty generations before the Trojan War. Taking this War to have occurred in the closing stages of the 13th cent - as has been stated time and again throughout this essay - we reach a date c.1810 as that for

the death of Inachus something which would make him out to have lived in the generation immediately preceding that date (c. 1810 - 1840), that is, during the latter half of the 19th century, a span also attributable to Amosis. Coupling this information with the one having Danaus coming to Greece 393 years after the time of Hyksos' expulsion¹⁵ (after the time of Amosis, see n. 12 in this section, written supra) we reach a date within the second half of the 15th cent. for the coming of Danaus to Argos (Greece).

Finally, according to the tradition having Danaus and Aegyptus fifth in descent from Inachus¹⁶ we reach a time spanning the first half of the 17th cent. as the one attributable to the life of Danaus. So we have three different dates for Danaus' life furnished by Manetho and one - deriving from the information that Danaus was fifth in descent from Inachus - provided from what must have ultimately been a Greek source. In other words we have a late 13th - early 12th cent. date, a 13th cent date (somewhere within the first half of it preferably but also possibly covering part of the second half), a date within the second half of the 15th cent. and also a date - covering the first half of the 17th. To these must be added the most explicit reference to the date of his arrival at Greece, furnished by a Greek source, the Parian Marble (or Chronicle), that is, c. 1510¹⁷.

Now what can be made out of the study of this list of dates regarding Danaus is that the first and second are in all probability untenable in view of the Danaans being directly linked with the Mycenaeans and fused with them in Greece proper, a development which certainly led to a virtually complete identification of these two entities, hence the reference to both of them as one and only tribe in folk-memory. Consequently the Danaans - Danaus and his followers - are not likely to have come to Greece long after the Achaean (Mycenaean) civilisation had been established and spread otherwise they would be certain to have been discriminated from the Mycenaeans in folk-lore. Thus the Danaans as such should be considered as old an element of Greek population in Mycenaean times (c. 1580 - 1050) as almost the local Achaean population was and since the Mycenaean (Achaean) period commenced in the early 16th century, the 13th cent. dates postulated by the first two theories should be dismissed as too late.

The last but one date in the list furnishing the first half of the 17th century as the time spanned by Danaus' life seems too early in view of the argument put forward just above but it must not be turned down altogether. The exact date of the commencement of the Mycenaean era is not as yet established, c. 1580 or 1570 being only viewed upon as the likeliest dates for the initiation of this era.

However, the so-called "Royal Shaft Graves" at Mycenae are almost certain to have been in use in the late stages of the 17th century¹⁸, though that time has not yielded any further evidence of characteristic Mycenaean activity. Thus, although the early 17th cent. date for Danaus' life precedes the commencement of the Mycenaean era proper, yet since the date of the exact commencement of that era is still in the melting pot and the "Shaft Graves" - which are accepted as the standard cultural entry that marks the beginning of the Mycenaean period - cannot be exactly dated and indeed point to a certain overlap of the closing stages of the 17th cent (and of Middle Helladic era in the Greek Mainland) and the opening ones of the 16th (beginning of Late Helladic or Mycenaean), one may feel inclined to reserve judgement on a 17th century date for Danaus.

And now we come to the date having Danaus coming to Greece in the second half of the 15th cent. This is not far too late a date yet it falls wide of the chronological mark required for affording sufficient weight to this date, that is, of a time near the beginning of the Mycenaean era (first half or middle of the 16th cent.) Alternatively if one wishes to work out an average dating from all the Danaus dates quoted by Manetho one will get a time c. 1394 for his coming to Argos from Egypt, which

again cannot satisfy folk-lore and general literary evidence demands.

Therefore we only have the Parian Marble date to examine. This source furnishes a date c.1510 for Danaus' arrival at Greece and this date belongs to the so-called Late Helladic I era (L H I) stretching from 1570-1500¹⁹, that is, the period which marks the beginning of the Mycenaean era. Therefore it does fulfill the essential requirements for being an eligible one. According to this date the Egypt-derived Danaans come to Greece at a time when the Mycenaean civilization was in its incipient stage and therefore the fusion between locals and newcomers rendered both virtually indistinguishable to the eyes of contemporary folk and to its oral and written tradition.

There is a very interesting passage in Diodorus Siculus²⁰ about Danaus and his followers. It reads thus: "Now the Egyptians say that also after these events a great number of colonies were spread from Egypt over all the inhabited world. To Babylon, for instance, colonists were led by Belus who was held to be the son of Poseidon and Libya; They say also that those who set forth with Danaus, likewise from Egypt, settled what is practically the oldest city of Greece, Argos and that the nation of Colchi in Pontos and that of the Jews, which

lies between Arabia and Syria, were founded as colonies by certain emigrants from their country; and this is the reason why it is a long-established institution among these peoples to circumcise their male children, the custom having been brought over from Egypt".

Now the reference to both Colchis and the country of the Jews having been colonised by "emigrants from their country" can be clearly understood to denote Egypt as the country from which these emigrants set out. Thus, it is understandable from the reading of the text that what is really meant by this reference to the settlement of the country of the Jews by emigrants from Egypt is the Hebrew Exodus from Egypt and that it is roughly contemporary with the settlement of Argos in Greece by Danaus and his followers. This latter inference would give a date at an early stage of the 16th cent. as that of the coming of Danaus to Greece since the Hebrew Exodus is seen, in Manetho's writings, to have occurred during the reign of Amosis, the founder of the XVIII dynasty which is commonly understood as having commenced at c. 1580²¹. This date for Danaus' arrival at Greece, translated into Aegean Bronze Age terms, is put at the beginning of LHI (c. 1580 - 1500) and chimes in fine with the arguments put forward *supra* suggesting that both Danaeans and Mycenaean must be seen as belonging to the same broad chronological

framework and, therefore, as making their appearance together at an early stage of Mycenaean civilisation otherwise the folk memory and later literature continuous reference to them as virtually one and only tribal entity cannot be accounted for.

PART 2.

B.

Notes on the text.

1. Fragment 50, parg. 98 - 102, quoted by Josephus, Contre Apionem, i.15. 16.
2. In transl. n. 3 regarding fragment 50, parg. 98 where there is this reference to both names being attributable to the same King, we read: "The margin of the Florentine MS. has a note here: "The following reading was found in another copy: "After him Sethosis and Ramesses, two brothers. The former with a strong fleet, blockaded his murderous (?) adversaries by sea. Not long after, he slew Ramesses and appointed another of his brothers, Harmais, as viceroy of Egypt". This is intended as a correction of the text of Josephus, but it contains the error of the Florentine MS. in the reading "Sethosis and Ramesses". Sethosis is the Sesostris of Herodotus, II. 102, where his naval expedition to the Red Sea is described. Meyer (ed.) Aegyptische Chronologie, (1904) (Nachtrage, 1907 : Neue Nachtrage, 1907. French translation by Alexandre Moret, 1912), p.91, considers the words "also called Ramesses" an addition to Manetho. In fragment 54, parg. 245 we read: "As for his five year old son Sethos, also called Ramesses after his grandfather Rapses, he (his father, King Amenophis) sent him safely away to his friend". In n. 1 about this reference (fragment 54, parg.245) the transl. says: "Rapses: doubtless an error for Rampses. There is confusion here: the grandfather is Ramesses II. See Meyer (Aeg. Chron.

p. 91) who considers the words "Sethos also called", an interpolation (cf. parg. 98) intended to identify a Sethos son of Amenophis and a Ramesses son of Amenophis". Back again to transl. n. 3. p. 103 (fragment 50, parg. 98) we read also: "W. Struve ("Die Ara apo Menophreos und die XIX. Dynastie Manethos", in Zeitschr. für äg. Sprache, Bd. 63 (1928), pp. 45 - 50) would here amend Sethos to Sesos which was a name of Ramesses II: according to the monuments he reigned for 67 years - cf. fr. 55, 2 (2nd entry in the list) - and his triumphant Asiatic campaigns were told by Hecataeus of Abdera. (Osymendyas in Diodorus Siculus I. 47 ff).

3. In transl. n. 1 on fragment 54, parg. 274 we read that Pelusium was "the celebrated eastern Sea port and Key to Egypt," the famous frontier fortress in ancient Egyptian Snw. A scarab of the late 12th dynasty or early thirteenth published by Newberry in J. Eg. Arch. 18 (1932), p. 141 shows the place-name written within the fortress-sign. The name Pelusium is from "pelos" meaning "mud" in Greek: cf Strabo XVII. 1. 21 for the muddy pools or marshes around Pelusium.
4. With the return of Sethosis to a country in revolt cf. Herodotus II. 107 (return of Sesostris and the perilous banquet), Diodorus Sic. I. 57. 6 - 8. The tale appears to be a piece of folk-lore (Mespéro, Journ. des Savants, (1901), pp. 599, 665 ff.). See Wainwright Sky-Religion, p. 48.
5. In fragm. 54, parg. 231 we read: "...For Tethmosis [i. e. Amosis] was king when they set out [the shepherds, i. e. the Hyksos]; and according to

Manetho the intervening reigns thereafter occupied 393 years down to the two brothers Sethos and Harmæus the former of whom, he says, took the new name of Aegyptus, the latter that of Danaus. Sethos drove out Harmæus and reigned for 59 years.

6. See part Two, section A, quote 3 and notes 7 - 31.
7. See Diod. Siculus I. 28. 2, 97. 2. For attempts to explain the story in terms of Aegean prehistory, see Myres, T. L. Who Were the Greeks, (1930), pp. 323 ff. ; Nilsson, M. P. The Mycenaean origin of Greek Mythology (1932), p. 64.
8. Herodotus VI. 53
9. Fragment 50, parg. 103 quoted by Josephus, op. cit (n. 1) I. 15 - 16.
10. Josephus speaking.
11. Fragment 50, parg. 94, quoted by Josephus, Contra Apionem, I. 15, 16, also fragment 54, parg. 231. See also fragment 51 quoted by Theophilus Ad. Autolyicum III. 19 where it is said that the Jews were expelled from Egypt by Pharaoh Tethmosis.
12. Translator's n. 2 on fragment 50, parg. 94. Also in n. 2 on "Misphregmuthosis", fr. 42, parg. 86, the transl. says: "Misphregmuthosis i. e. Menkheperre (Tuthmosis III) and his son Thummosis i. e. Tuthmosis IV are here said to have driven out the Hyksos. In Fr. 50: parg. 94, Tethmosis is named as the conqueror. In point of historical fact the victorious King was Amosis.... The genuine Manetho must surely

have given this name which is preserved by Africanus and Eusebius as also by Apion in Tatian "Adv. Graecos", parag. 38. See transl. n. 2 (Frag. 50, parag. 94) and cf Meyer, Aeg. Chron., pp. 73 ff..... Breasted (C A H II, p. 83) holds that since with the catastrophic fall of Kadesh on the Orontes before the arms of Tuthmosis III, the last vestige of the Hyksos power disappeared, the tradition of late Greek days made Tuthmosis III the conqueror of the Hyksos. He points out that the name "Mispthagmuthosis" is to be identified with the two cartouche-names of Tuthmosis III : it is a corruption of "Men Keperre Tuthmosis". Additionally, if the passage in Frag. 51 from Theophilus Ad Autolyicum, III. 19 (see previous note) as well as the whole list of the reigns of the Dynasty in this fragment is coupled with the list of reigns of the 18th dynasty in fragment 50 parag. 94 - 102 it follows that this Tethmosis, during whose reign the Hebrew Exodus took place, is the founder of the XVIII dynasty, that is, Amosis, the King who drove out the Hyksos. See also fragment 4 (quoted in Excerpta Latina Barbari) in which we read that Amosis was the second King in the list of the reigns of the demigods. About him - we read in the same passage - Apion the grammarian who composed a history of Egypt, "explained that he lived in the time of Inachus who was King at the founding of Argos.... for 67 years". Now in n. 3 on this fragment (4), Manetho's translator says that the quotation from Apion "appears to derive in part from the History of Ptolemy of Mendes : see Tatian Or. Adversus Graecos parag. 38, in Migne, Patrologia Graeca vi. 880 - 882 and in Muller F. H. G. iv. p. 485 (quoted in F. H. G. II. p. 533). He goes on to say that Ptolemy of Mendes dated the Exodus to the

reign of Amosis. Now this King is made out to be the founder of XVIII dynasty, see transl. n. 5 on fragm. 4, and its reference to Fragm. 52, 1 (that is, first entry in the list of Kings of XIII dynasty) in Syncellus quoting Africanus.

13. See fragment 50, parg. 98 and transl. n. 3.
14. Either 1279 - 1213 which is the lowest date or 1290 - 1224 which is the middle one, see Sanders N. K The Sea Peoples, London (1978), Introduction n. 2.
15. Fragm. 50, parg. 103, in Josephus Contra Apionem, I. 15, 16.
16. Cf fragment 4, from Excerpta Latina Barbari and transl. n. 4.
17. Jacoby F. Die Fragment Per Griechischen Historiker, Berlin (1929), 2B, no 239.
18. There is a wide bibliography on the "Royal Shaft Graves" at Mycenae, see, among other publications, Wace. A. "The Grave Circle", B S A 25 (1921 - 23), 103, idem Mycenae (1949) 59 and also B S A 49 (1954) 244. ; Aberg, N. Die Chronologie der Bronze und Fruheisenzeit III (1932), 113.; Mylonas G., and Papademetriou, J. "The New Shaft Graves at Mycenae", Archaeology 5 (1952), 194, idem "The New Grave Circle at Mycenae" Archaeology 8 (1955), 43.
19. The beginning of L H I has not as yet been specifically determined. Some scholars would bring it down to 1550, see Higgins Minoan and Mycenaean Art, London (1974), p. 13.

20. I. 28. 1 - 3

21. See notes 11 and 12 in this section (B) of part two..

Part THREE:

The Evidence Suggesting Aegean Connexions In Cultural Matters, Daily Life Practices, Appellations And Various Attitudes Of The Philistines

A. The evidence from the Greek sources.

1. Strabo says¹ : But Ithome (which he had said to belong to Hestiaeotis in Thessaly earlier in IX.5.17, along with Tricce²) belongs to the territory of the Metropolitans (Strabo makes it thus clear that the territory of Metropolis belongs to Hestiaeotis too, that is, to a territory which was at a time called Doris and was wholly inhabited by Dorians who later set out to colonize various other Greek areas). Strabo goes on in ibid as follows: "Metropolis in earlier times was a joint settlement composed of three insignificant towns; but later several others were added to it, among which was Ithome. Now Callimachus, in his lambics, says that "of all the Aphrodites Casnietis surpasses all in wisdom, since she alone accepts the sacrifice of a swine"³. And surely he was very learned, if any other man was, and all his life, as he himself states, wished to recount these things,⁴. But the writers of later times have discovered that not merely one Aphrodite, but several, have accepted this rite; and that among these was the Aphrodite of Metropolis, and that one of the cities included in the settlement transmitted to it the Onthurian rite⁵. Pharcadon also is in Hestiaeotis".

Now this is a very interesting passage in view both of the likelihood of the Philistines having worshipped Aphrodite as one of their deities - whether she came under the name of Derketo, or Atergatis or Ashtoreth or Aphrodite⁶ or Vritomartis⁷, granted the habitual, almost inevitable process of amalgamation which most divine figures as well as religious

concepts and practices undergo in periods of hectic tribal mobility (like the closing stages of the Aegean Bronze Age) and its consequent intercourse of ideas, often truncated, distorted, tempered with alien elements⁸ - and also in view of the well attested Hebrew aversion to the swine and the consumption of pork, due to which was and still exists the well - known abomination in which this people hold this animal⁹. In other words, it is possible that the Philistines had brought Aphrodite's cult from the Aegean and that it was the Aphrodite of Metropolis cult that they had transplanted to Philistia; this is quite likely if part of them are those reported by Strabo in X.4.6., quoting Andron, as having gone to Crete (Caphtor) from Doris in Thessaly, that is, from a territory comprising the settlement of Metropolis, as is made clear by *idem* in IX.5.17, where the local Aphrodite cult had accepted the rite of the sacrifice of the swine (*ibid*). On the ground of the above hypothesis it is quite likely that this ritual habit of theirs would provide the Hebrews, who considered by virtue of their religion the swine an abomination even in terms of merely touching it¹⁰, with yet another reason for holding the Philistines in contempt and envisaging them as unclean and barbarians. So we have here a reference to a Dorian religious practice that just might have been carried and exercised by the Philistines in Palestine - particularly in view of the possibility of part of the Philistines being ultimately of Dorian extraction as the already mentioned evidence and that which is yet to be set out, indicates, and in view of that biblical tribe being very likely to have been worshipping Aphrodite or a version of that deity. Such a religious habit fits in very well with the gentile, abominable habits-related people image that the Hebrews had of the Philistines.

2. In a Pausanias quote ¹¹ we read about what perhaps is a certain religious connexion between the Philistines and the Dorian's national hero and legendary ancestor Heracles, in the case of the latter hero sacrificing in Olympia to Zeus Averter of Flies as a result of which action the flies which were plaguing him were diverted to the other side of Alpheius and the Eleians adopted this habit as the most effective means of getting rid of flies causing trouble to Olympia. The Philistines worshipped Baalzebub, the Philistine deity with the Semitic name meaning "Lord of Flies" and this god seems to have played an important role in Philistine life, according to Macalister R.A.S. who says that otherwise, the use of the name in the gospels to denote the Prince of Devils ¹² would not be accounted for ¹³. Theodor Gaster furnishes the information that modern scholars interpret the name as that of a god who drove away infectious pests and goes on to say that it is similar to "Zeus Apomyius", the "Averter of Flies" ¹⁴, that is, the god to whom Heracles is said in the aforementioned quote to have sacrificed. Bearing in mind the very strong possibility of the Dorians having adopted the religious beliefs of their highly-revered national hero, we then perceive a connexion between them and the Philistines, provided by the common worship of Zeus and Baal Zebub, the "Averters of flies".

3. In another Pausanias quote ¹⁵ there is a reference to the cult of Heavenly Aphrodite being first exercised by the Assyrians, then by the inhabitants of Paphos in Cyprus and the "Phoenicians who live at Ascalon in Palestine".

Since the quote clearly speaks about the very first peoples to have practised this cult it is understandable that it refers to the early inhabitants of the areas it mentions. Consequently the Paphians of Cyprus may well be those Achæean immigrants who settled the island c. 1200 ¹⁶ while the "Phoenicians" of Ascalon in Palestine are more likely to have been the Philistines who of course settled the city earlier than the Syro-Phoenician population that colonized it well after the Hebrew-Philistine dispute was over. Actually the Greek mainland people who established the cult of Aphrodite in the major Paphos area in Cyprus are said by Pausanias ¹⁷ to have been those Arcadians who, led by Agapenor, the son of Anceus, were steered off their course on their return from Troy because of stormy weather conditions and thus ended up in Cyprus where Agapenor founded Paphos and built the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Palaepaphos. Pausanias makes clear in ibid that the worship of Aphrodite in Paphos dates from that time onwards until up to that date the goddess was being worshipped in the district called Golgi. It follows then that since the exercise of Aphrodite's worship by the

inhabitants of Ascalon is dated by Pausanias I. 14. 7 in the same chronological context as that by the Paphians of Cyprus and since, as has been stated, these Paphians were the Arcadians who settled there soon after the Trojan War, (end of 13th cent.), the people of Ascalon were in all probability the Philistines who after their defeat by Ramesses III were settled by him in Palestine in the early stages of the 12th cent. Actually it is very likely, in view of the aforementioned evidence and of that regarding the raiding of Ugarit by Cyprus-based vessels at the time, most probably, of the Sea-Peoples' inroads upon the Levantine states¹⁸ (and just prior to their final defeat by Ramesses III), that these Paphians and the Philistines were one and the same entity; in other words it is very likely that these Paphos-based Arcadians raided Ugarit, attacked Egypt and after they were vanquished they were settled in Palestine where they became the biblical Philistines, a development that of course did not prevent them from sustaining certain at least of their habits and traditions such as the worship of Heavenly Aphrodite in Ascalon, a worship that is well-attested by the most prominent Greek historian, Herodotus¹⁹. Finally, the order that Pausanias I.14.7 employs to denote the transmission of the goddess worship seems to suggest that the Paphians exercised it first whereas the Askalonites did likewise right afterwards, something that lends

further credibility to the above-propounded thesis.

4. In an Apollodorus quote²⁰ we read that Alcmaeon, upon going mad through being haunted by the Fury of his mother's murder, first repaired to Oicles in Arcadia and then to Phegeus at Psophis. He was purified by him and then married Arsinoe daughter of Phegeus. However later on, the ground became barren on his account, just like it had happened to the whole of Greece -on account of a treacherous murder committed by Pelops-, and to Thebes -said to be visited with barrenness of the soil, of cattle and women because of the presence of Oedipus who had slain his father and married his mother. The notion that the shedding of blood, especially that of a kinsman, is an offence to the earth which consequently refuses to bear crops, seems to have been held by the ancient Hebrews as well, as it is still apparently held by some African peoples²¹. One is tempted to consider the possibility of the Hebrews having adopted this concept through their coexistence with the Aegean-borne Philistines who may well have been, at least to a good extent, none other than Mycenaean and Dorian Greeks -and/or even Minoan Cretans - who had migrated to the Levant, carrying their traditions, habits and moral attitudes with them.

5. In a Pausanias quote²² we read that the suitors of

Helen took the oath that they would defend the favoured bridegroom against any wrong that might be done him in respect of his marriage, while standing on the severed pieces of a horse. As to the custom of standing on the pieces of a sacrificial victim or passing between them at the making of solemn covenants, there is evidence that it was also known and exercised in O. T. Palestine²³. This makes it likely that the O. T. peoples had taken it from Aegean-derived tribes such as the Philistines, something that further connects the latter people with the Mainland Greek population.

6. In Pausanias²⁴ we read that Orestes, driven mad by the Furies of his murdered mother, recovered his senses upon biting off one of his own fingers whereby the anger of his mother's ghost was supposedly appeased. Such beliefs seem to have also existed in O. T. Palestine²⁵, something that again suggests the propagation of this concept to the O. T. tribes through their living together with Aegean style-bred tribes, such as the Philistines.

7. The connexions between Philistines and Minoan Crete - Caphtor, in all probability, which is thereby even further associated with Crete - are further corroborated by the city of Gaza, a prominent Philistine city, being said to have been called Minoa after Minos, the legendary

king of Crete 26 .

A god called Marnas who was popularly identified with the Cretan Zeus was also worshipped in Gaza and, although his cult dates from later times than the Philistine period, it may very well have stemmed from an earlier Cretan religious tradition regarding a deity in one way or another related to this Marnas. His name was thought to derive from a Cretan word Marna meaning maiden, hence it was thought to signify "young man". The worship of Marnas, the Cretan Zeus persisted at Gaza till 402 A.D. when it was finally suppressed and his sanctuary, the Marneion, destroyed 27 . We also know that Marnas was regarded as the lord of rain, and that prayer and sacrifice were offered to him in time of drought28 .

8. In a work attributed to Homer²⁹ we read:

"So they sat silent in their craft for fear, and did not loose the sheets throughout the black, hollow ship, nor lowered the sail of their dark-prowed vessel, but as they had set it first of all with ox-hide ropes, so they kept sailing on" 30 .

Further on we read: "...But the well-built ship would not obey the helm" 31 .

Further on : " There came then a strong, clear west-wind by ordinance of Zeus and blew from heaven vehemently, that with all speed the ship might finish coursing over the briny water of the sea" ³² .

And again further on: "Why rest you so and are afraid and do not go ashore nor stow the gear of your black ship?" ³³ .

And finally: "First they unfastened the sheets and let down the sail and lowered the mast by the forestays upon the mast-rest. Then landing upon the beach of the sea, they hauled up the ship from the water to dry land and fixed round stays under it" ³⁴ .

All these verses refer to those Cretan sailors whom Apollo appointed as his ministers in the Delphic oracle ³⁵ . It is interesting to note that, according to the verses mentioned above, they appear to have employed a type of ship very similar to those used by the Sea-Peoples in the reliefs at Medinet Habu concerned with Ramesses III' war against them, as well as those appearing on the 16th cent. frescoes on the Aegean island of Thera ³⁶ . The Sea Peoples' vessels as well as the 16th cent. Aegean vessels, to judge from the Thera frescoes, employed a large sail which, N.K. Sanders, an authority on the Sea-Peoples, has

said it could only be used for running before the wind; now the Cretan ships in the Pythian hymn are said to have had such a sail. (vv. 404 - 408) which could power the ship along with the help of the wind (vv. 433 - 5). The reference to the helm on the Cretan ships is also an interesting one. The Sea-Peoples ships - some of them at least and one which is manned by the feathered-headgear invaders, this appendage being associated with the Peleset attire³⁷ - also bear a helm. It is also obvious that the Cretan sailors' ships bear a central mast something which is also attested on the Sea-Peoples' vessels. The mention also of a mast-rest on the Cretan ships seems to suggest some sort of a superstructure which is a distinct feature on the Sea Peoples ships too. The overall rigging, finally, of the Sea Peoples' vessels might very possibly have involved sheets like the Cretan ships did. So, all considered, we have here another common feature regarding the Sea-Peoples and the sea-faring Cretans and this ties in fine with the image of the Caphtor (Crete)- connected Philistines and actually further strengthens the connexion between Minoan Crete and Philistines.

Part Three

A.

Notes on the Text

1. IX.5.17
2. Strabo in IX.5.17 says that in earlier times Hestiaeotis was called Doris and idem in X.4.6. speaks about Dorians in Crete, quoting from Homer, Odys. XIX.172-9 and Andron who says that these Dorians came to Crete from Doris (Hestiaeotis in later times) in Thessaly and that it was from Doris too that the Dorians set out to found three of the four major and famous cities of the Dorian Tetrapolis near Parnassus.
3. Fragment 826, Schneider.
4. The editor says in n.4 on ibid in the Loeb class. Lib. text: "The text is probably corrupt". We should expect either "wished to tell the truth about matters of this sort", or, as Professor Capps suggests: "preferred this branch of learning".
5. Says the Editor in n.5 on ibid in op. cit. (see previous note): "Onthurius was a Thessalian city near Arne" (Stephanos Byzantios s.v.)
6. Diodorus Siculus II.4 has it that Derketo, a Syrian goddess whose shrine is not far off Ashkelon, having offended Aphrodite was doomed to furious love for a young votary of hers with whom she bore a daughter. However, being ashamed at her fault, caused her lover to disappear, exposed the child in certain desert and stony places and finally cast herself in shame and grief into the sacred lake, situated close by her temple. The form of her body was changed into a fish, "...wherefore the Syrians even yet abstain from eating this creature and honour fishes as gods" (idem in ibid). This legend is told to the same effect by Pausanias (ii.xxx.3). The importance of this legend lies, *inter alia*, in the Philistine element detectable in the Shrine of this goddess being close to Ashkelon, and most importantly, in the appearance and decisive role of Aphrodite - who, Herodotus in I.105 informs us, was called "Heavenly Aphrodite" ("Aphrodite Ourania") and was goddess of Ashkelon, a prominent Philistine city-in the overall narrative.

7. The Vritomartis legend is quoted in Callimachus "Hymn to Artemis" and in the "Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis", ch.30 . In both versions Vritomartis is a virgin who desperately tries to save her virginity from King Minos of Crete and, upon despairing of ever escaping her royal swain, she seeks refuge in fishermen's nets whereupon she is re-named by the locals to Dictynna (from the Greek word for net "diktion"). In Liberalis version she appears to be daughter of Zeus and Carme who was, in turn, child of Cassiopeia and Phoenix, the son of Agenor, King of Phoenicia. She is quoted as perpetually fleeing the male courtship and thus, firstly going to Argos, subsequently to Cephalonia (=Greek island in the Ionian Sea) then to Crete, where the aforementioned development occurred, and finally to Aegina (a Greek island in the Saronic Gulf) where, subsequent to an incident similar to that regarding King Minos, she finally vanished whereupon the local population re-named her Aphaea and erected a temple to her.

What are common points in these narratives are the connexion with water, the desperate maiden's drive to avoid having sexual intercourse and the involvement of the island of Crete as, partly or wholly, setting of the drama. The element of water and a dolorous love story are also involved in the Diodorus Siculus story as well as in that of Pansanias. In view of the Strong Cretan connexions of the Philistines, one could but notice the similarities in these legends and ponder over the possibility of this myth having been conveyed to Palestinian regions through the Sea-People's migratory trek to the Levant at the time of Ramesses III. If so, the Plst - Philistines could, legitimately perhaps, qualify as the "carriers" of that legendary story, granted their connexion with the cult of Aphrodite - see the information from Herodotus in previous note - and their conspicuous extraction from Caphtor (Crete in all probability, see discussion in previous chapter) where, if we take it to be Crete, Vritomartis' drama was played.

8. For a reference to Ashtoreth's (or Ashtaroth) cult among the Philistines, see I. Sam. 31.10.
9. Lev. XI.7-8, 26.
10. Lev. IX.26.

11. V.14.1
12. Matt. XII.24 e.t.c.
13. Macalister R.A.S. The Philistines, p.91.
14. Gaster, T.H. "Baalzebub", The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible.
15. I. 14.7.
16. Catling H. "The Achaean settlement of Cyprus" in The Mycenaean in the Eastern Mediterranean, Nicosia, (1973), pp. 34-9.
17. VIII. 5.2.
18. See notes 28-9 in Part 1, section A₂.
19. I.105 where we read that the goddess of Askalon was called "Heavenly Aphrodite".
20. III.7.5
21. See Folk-lore in the Old Testament, i.82 sgg.
22. III.20.9.
23. Op.cit., (n.21) i.392 sgg.
24. VIII.34.2.
25. Op.cit., (n.21) iii.240 sg.
26. Stephanos Byzantios, s.v. Gaza.
27. For the worship of Marnas in Gaza see Mark the Deacon's Life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza, 64-71, pp.73-82, G.F. Hill's translation, Oxford (1913).
28. Mark the Deacon, op.cit. (previous note), ch.19, p.24 Regarding the god Marnas and his relation to Crete, see G.F. Hill's introduction to his translation of Life of Porphyry, pp. 32-38.

29. Hymn to Pythian Apollo . The Hymn to Apollo consists of two parts, both attributed to Homer, which beyond any doubt were originally distinct, a Delian Hymn and a Pythian Hymn, see the Introduction to "Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica" volume in the Loeb classical Library Series, p. 36 ff., written by the translator H.G. Evelyn-White.
30. Homer, op.cit., (previous note), vv. 404-408.
31. Op.cit. (previous note) v.418.
32. Op.cit., vv.433-435.
33. Op.cit., vv.456-7.
34. Op.cit., vv.503-7.
35. The whole account regarding the developments leading to this appointment is narrated in the Hymn to Pythian Apollo, vv. 388-546.
36. See Sanders, N.K. The Sea-Peoples , London (1978), p.27, ill II, where she says, describing a 16th-century Theran wallpainting ship, that it is "square-rigged..... with a large sail that could only be used for running before the wind". See also ill.80-5 in op.cit. (this note).
37. Sanders, N.K. op.cit. (previous note) ill.84.

PART THREE

B. The Evidence From Manetho and Josephus.

1. In a Josephus quote¹ speaking of Joshua allocating among the Hebrew tribes territories proportionate to the size of the various tribes we read that the half tribe of Manasseh had from the Jordan to the city of Dor² and in breadth as far as Bethesane³, now called Scythopolis.

Now, the city of Dor is reported as being inhabited by one of the Sea-Peoples who launched the concerted offensive against Ramesses III in his eighth year, namely the Tjeker⁴. The information regarding Tjeker and Dor comes from the so-called Wenamon's Report⁵. They were there in about 1100 as we learn from the roughly contemporary story of Wenamon and they clearly appear to practise buccaneering habits. Wenamon was commissioned to procure timber for ship-building from the Phoenician Prince of Byblos; On his way there he had problems with the Tjeker from Dor; this tribe appeared to be in control of some at least of the seaways followed by navigators setting out from Egypt and heading for northern ports; Wenamon was pursued by Tjeker to Byblos and the audience he had there with Zaker-Baal, the city-prince, shows just how

little weight Egyptian prestige carried with overlords of Zaker-Baal's time (.1100). The conversation between the Egyptian Wenamon and the Phoenician Zaker-Baal also shows that the latter was in undisturbed possession of the throne of his grandfather, something that traces his family's royal authority at least to the mid-12th century, that is, the time that followed the Ramesses III Land and Sea Raids⁶. Now in view of the information linking Tjeker with Dor where they must have settled after their defeat by Ramesses III, one wonders who these people really were. The Tjeker have been identified with the Teucrians⁷ named after Teucer or Teucros, their leader. A twofold choice can be made regarding this identification, one linking the Tjeker with the Teucrians from Troy named after Teucer who was an immigrant from Crete and named mountain Ida in the Troad after a mountain by the same name in his native Crete⁸, the other linking them with the followers of Greek Teucros who settled in Cyprus soon after the Trojan War and founded the city of Salamis there⁹. It looks as though both options are strong in view of both peoples bearing a name very similar to Tjeker and also because they are connected with areas that, in one way or the other, bear upon the Sea-Peoples' movement during Ramesses III's times. The Trojan Teucrians being inhabitants of an area not far off Arzawa in Asia Minor, that is, a territory which was

raided by the Sea-Peoples according to Ramesses' inscription of year 8; and the Greek Teucrians arriving and settling in Cyprus at a time which, being after the Trojan War, takes us almost headlong in that attributable to the Sea Peoples' raids which, by the way, did involve Cyprus, (Alashiya) according to the same source. However, it seems as though the Trojan Teucrians may put up a somewhat stronger case in as much as we have the case of Mopsus' campaigns from Clarus in Colophon, the latter person being of half-Cretan and half-Cadmeian stock¹⁰, something that may make him a Teucrian since the Teucrians were reputed to be immigrants to the Troad from Crete¹¹. Additionally, there is evidence that Mopsus and his followers - who were also Cretan settlers in Clarus since obviously he set out from this area on his expeditions - had passed over the Taurus and that "though some remained in Pamphylia, the others were dispersed in Cilicia and also in Syria as far even as Phoenicia"¹². Now these areas form an itinerary which strongly reminds one of that followed by the Sea-Peoples of Ramessidic times. Cilicia is mentioned in the year 8 inscription as having been overrun by them, Pamphylia is almost certain to be next, after Arzawa, in one's southward course towards Amurru and ultimately Egypt (and Arzawa was overrun by the Sea Peoples as we read in ibid). All this information renders Mopsus and his peoples likely to have joined the Sea People's ranks in

their bid to overrun Egypt, and of course the Teucric element in them renders them likely to have ultimately become the Tjeker but one should not forget that Mopsus and his followers may just as possibly qualify for the Peleset identity on the grounds that in both groups the Cretan connexion is unmistakable.

The somewhat fanciful suggestion by Macalister R.A.S. that Justin XVIII.3.5 should be amended so as to clearly convey the notion that it was the Tjeker who raided the Phoenician town of Sidon and not the people of Askalon¹³ might find some support in Strabo XIV.4.3 speaking of Mopsus' people (perhaps Teucricians as has been suggested above, that is, a people who are connected with Tjeker) reaching as far south as Phoenicia by which time they might have attacked Sidon. To round off, it is worth stating that what names are customarily associated with the Sea Peoples through the Wenamon's report are Badyra, king of Dor, Warati, a merchant's name and Macamaru, also a merchant's name. Yet only the first, being that of the king of Dor, can be said to belong to a Tjeker.

Finally, the rendering of Dor in such a way in the Septuagint as to strongly remind one of the name "Dorian", should perhaps set one off wondering whether there is a connexion between this Tjeker city and the prominent tribe

of Dorians in Greek tradition. In this respect, what data may be of some avail are the theory that links the Tjeker with Zakro, a palatial centre in eastern Crete¹⁴, by virtue of the linguistic connection conceded between the two names; we also have the information that there were Dorians in Crete at the time of the Trojan War¹⁵ something that might cause one to consider the possibility of those Dorians having migrated eastwards some time after the Trojan War in search of a better, perhaps more spacious and fertile land for settlement particularly since Crete is reported as over-populated in Trojan War times¹⁶ and as afflicted by famine and pestilence after the Trojan War as a result of which the inhabitants left the island¹⁷. In view of all these factors a migration of part at least of the Cretan population seems likely and if the Dorians were among these people perhaps they sailed eastwards only to become known as Tjeker after Zakro in Crete. However it looks again as though the Philistines (Peleset) are more likely to qualify as those who probably set out from Crete to come to the Levant, by virtue of the explicit connexion of them with Caphtor, a connexion stated in O.T. texts, as opposed to the doubtful connexion of the Tjeker with Zakro in Crete.

It is finally interesting to hear that Beth-shan was perhaps included (it is not made clear in the text) in the

territory allocated to the half-tribe of Manasseh Bath-shan was a Philistine city ¹⁸ and the fact that it is mentioned along with Dor in this Josephus' reference in a way suggests that these cities were likely to have maintained some kind of contact, a view that may be supported by these cities having been inhabited by former allies, Philistines and Tjeker, that is.

2. In another Josephus quote ¹⁹ we read of a certain Zoilus who was the local ruler of the city of Dora ²⁰. He also seems originally to have been ruler of Gaza, cf parag. 334, thus bringing about a connexion between these two cities which is of course already well-known through their inhabitants, the Tjeker and the Philistines, having been allies during the Sea-Peoples' attack against Ramesses III. Yet, what is important about this Zoilus is that the Greek text employs the term "tirannos" for the expression "local ruler" attributable to him, thus forming a vague connexion between his authority and the pattern of political administration of the Philistines who were governed by their "seranim", their five overlords, that is, the rulers of the Philistine pentapolis. The word "seranim" may perhaps be connected with the word "tirannos" on the grounds of the similar vocalization and associated meanings. Therefore, if this pattern of political administration in the Philistine pentapolis

hints at some remote connexion between them and the political administration of the Greek so-called city-states. then this connexion may perhaps be transferred to the administrative system of Dor through the latter city's ruler being also referred to as a "tirennos" in the Greek text, that is, by a term so strongly reminiscent of the authority exercised by local rulers in ancient Greek cities²¹.

3. In another Josephus quote 22, where the subject regards the Philistine lords taking counsel together over the problems besetting them since they captured the Hebrew ark, we notice the text's keenness on trisection and the involvement of number "three" in its references to matters in it. Thus, although we read in parag.8 that the lords of the five cities of the Philistines met to find a solution to the problems, we are later (parag. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) confronted with a situation in which three different views only are heard, one of them eventually prevailing²³. Moreover, the keenness on number three also comprises details, that is, the division of the five cities into 3+2 (parag.8), and the three roads-meeting point (parag.11)²⁴.

The insistence of the text on the number 3 in matters directly pertaining to Philistines may remind one of a similar connexion of the Greek tribe of the Dorians with

the same number. The Dorians are repeatedly linked with the number "three" in later Greek tradition, where they appear to have a three-fold tribal division - involving Hylleis, Dymanes, Pamphyloī²⁵ - by virtue of which they are almost unfailingly reported as "trichaikeis" ("of three-fold division") and as dividing each land they settled in three sections or as living in three different cities²⁶. Pamphyloī are a tribe that should perhaps attract special attention by virtue of the word "phylai" (=tribes) being one of the two components of this word (the other being "pan" meaning "all") and also because of the rendering of the term "Philistines" as "allophylai" in the Septuagint, the second component being the same as that in "Pamphyloī". What is worth noting at this stage and may be of some importance is the Septuagint rendering of the name "Philistine" as "Hellen", that is, "Greek" in Isa. ix.11 (English ix.12) something which if coupled with Herodotus' identification of the Dorian tribe as "Hellenic" in I.56 forms, an obvious, strong connexion between Dorians and Philistines.

4. In a Josephus quote²⁷ we read that there was a temple of Apollo in Gaza at the time of its siege and destruction by the Jewish forces of Alexander Jannaeus c.100 BC. It should be borne in mind that there was also a temple of Zeus "the Cretan - born" in this city²⁸ which

was also called "Minoa" - see Stephanos Byzantios s.v. Gaza - There is also evidence for another Greek deity having been worshipped in another Philistine city, namely Ashkelon; this is "Heavenly Aphrodite" and was being worshipped at Ashkelon ²⁹ and there is also literary evidence for Ashteroth - most probably a deity related to Aphrodite - having been worshipped by the Philistines ³⁰ . All these seem to further strengthen the Aegean connexion in the Philistine culture and in this context it may perhaps be not unfitting to place an interesting situation appearing in the quote in question and in parag. 360, 362, 363, 364 in particular where we are impressed when reading about the profound hatred exhibited by both adversaries (Gazans and Jews) during the battle in Gaza. Perhaps the most striking example of the intensity of this mutual hatred comes from parag. 363 where, speaking of the Gazans, the text recounts that "some of them being left alone, set fire to their houses in order that nothing might remain in them for the enemy to take out as spoil". In the same paragraph we also read: "Others with their own hands made away with their children and wives, this being the means by which they were compelled to deliver them from slavery to their foes".

One wonders if so 'utter a hatred could only be accounted for by the traditional, really proverbial,

hatred which existed between the Jews and the Philistines, a thought that is given support by the fact that Gaza was once a prominent Philistine city and by the likelihood that it was inhabited, in later times, also by gentiles, people, that is, who were most probably descendants of its early Philistine inhabitants and therefore likely to nurse their ancestors' traditional aversion to the Jews. If so, then the religious concepts entertained by them and regarding Apollo and Zeus may well reflect earlier similar concepts, that is cults concerning deities closely akin to these, which paved the way for the later, clearly Aegean-derived gods. This of course would mean that the early Philistines worshipped, as is likely, deities strongly related, even though coming under Semitic names, to Aegean ones. Whatever the case though, the information on those gods being worshipped at Gaza even at considerably later times, coupled with its inhabitants' whole-hearted aversion to the Jews seem to point to a long-standing religious and moral tradition ultimately stemming perhaps from Philistine times.

5. In another Josephus quote³¹, an account is given of the armour of Goliath which is said to have consisted of a breastplate, a helmet, greaves of bronze, a spear and a shield carried by a servant, the latter appendage given only by the Biblical account whereas Josephus' text only

speaks generally of many following him carrying his armour. There is also mention of a sword used by him in Antiquities VI.188.190 Now this description of the armour reminds one of that of the Homeric heroes ³² .

6. In another Josephus quote.³³ Gaza, Gadora and Hippos are said to have been among the Greek cities which Caesar detached from the territory obedient to a certain Archelaus and added to Syria.

This reference must be coupled with quote no 4 mentioned above regarding the worship of Apollo in Gaza and its inhabitants profound hatred against the Hebrews.

7. In another Josephus quote ³⁴ we read that the Philistines had pitched their camp - as he had said before - and were reviewing their forces by nations, kingdoms and satrapies ³⁵ .

It is interesting to read that the Philistine army involved different nations, something that reminds one of the multi-racial tribe of the "Pamphyloi", one of the three Dorian tribes ³⁶ . This reference in Josephus should be coupled with idem Antiquities VI. 113 - 4 (I. Sam. XIV. 12) speaking of Jonathan, Saul's son, and his armour bearer catching the Philistines (see also Antiquities VI.

105 - 7 - I. Sam. XIII. 16) off their guard and throwing them into disarray whereupon the Philistines " not recognizing their comrades, because of the many nationalities of which their army was composed, and taking each other for enemies - for they did not suppose that there had come up against them two only of the Hebrews - they turned to fight one another".

8. At another point of Josephus' narrative³⁷, we read that when Samson was led by people from the tribe of Judah to the Philistines in order to be delivered to his enemies, he and his captors came to a spot where the Philistines waited for Samson to be delivered. However, he burst his bonds and seizing a jaw bone slew one thousand of them, " routing the rest in dire dismay ". Hence the spot, says the text, is to-day called Jawbone " by reason of the exploit there performed by Samson³⁸". In a note on this quote the translator says that there is information that a similar name was given to a promontory in Laconia.

So we have here a common place-name in Palestine and in Laconia in Peloponnese (southern Greece). In view of the Philistines being likely to have been immigrants, partly at any rate, from the Greek mainland, one should consider Diodorus V. 80 where we read that the Achæan - Dorian expedition to Crete set off from Laconia and, in

particular, Cape Malea. If this Dorian - Achæean contingent that reached Crete came to be the one referred to by Homer in Odyssey XIX. 172 - 9 it probably is safe to envisage it as deserting the island after the Trojan War on account of the famine and pestilence then ravaging Crete³⁹. This particular development should be dated at the time of the Great Land and Sea Migrations which these Dorian - Achæeans might have joined as the influx in Cyprus of a Mycenæan culture - bearing group of peoples c. 1200 may well suggest⁴⁰, coupled with the hectic buccaneering raids on Ugarit and Cyprus referred to in the royal correspondence between the " High Steward of Alashiya " and King Hammurabi of Ugarit, dating from almost the same time as that of the Sea-Peoples' raids on Egypt⁴¹. If so, then these Achæean - Dorians, who might have become the plst of the Egyptian texts perhaps ended up eventually in Palestine like most of the Sea -Peoples and applied their traditions and general if sketchy, knowledge of their past to matters of their new life, this "jaw - bone" place - name being perhaps a reflection of a memory of their Aegean background and, more specifically, of another place called likewise in the Greek area of Laconia.

PART THREE

B.

Notes on the text.

1. Jewish Antiquities V. 80 perg. 83 - 4.
2. Transl. n. g : "Hebrew "Dor", Jos. XVII. 11 ; a maritime town 16 miles s. of Carmel (mod. "Tanturah"). " It is worth noting that in the Septuagint the word for "Dor" involves the same root as the word "Dorians".
3. Transl. n. h: "Hebrew Beth - Shean, mod. "Beisan", midway between Mt. Gilboa and the Jordan. "
4. Breasted J. H., Ancient Records of Egypt, Chicago (1906) vol IV paras 59 - 82 ; Edgerton, W. F. , and Wilson, J. A. Historical Records of Ramesses III, The Texts of Medinet Habu, vols I and II, Chicago (1936)
5. Pritchard, J. B. (ed) Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament 3rd edn, Princeton (1969), 25 - 9.
6. This inference renders Zakar - Baal likely to have been a descendant of the Sea - Peoples who were settled in Palestine by Ramesses III after their defeat at c. 1186, see Breasted, J. H. Ancient Records of Egypt, Chicago (1906), vol. IV, paras 397 - 412 The name Zakar - Baal may well mean "Lord of the Zakar (Tjeker)" and, if this is the case, then Byblos was inhabited by Tjeker at the time of Wenamon, at c. 1100, a view that dates back to early times of

scholarly research on the Sea - Peoples, see Macalister, R.A.S. The Philistines, their History and Civilization, (1913, repr. 1965), pp. 36 - 7. This author also suggests that the part of a Justin text (XVIII. 3. 5) which speaks of the Phoenician city of Sidon having been raided by the King of Ashkalon should be amended so as to read "by the king of the Tjeker". More specifically, he suggests that the expression "a rege Ascaloniorum" in the Latin text should actually read "a rege Zakaloniorum" - ("Zakalonii"- "Zakaloniorum" (in genit.) being one of the many vocalizations of T } k r w o r T } k l w, the entry, that is, standing for the Tjeker in the Remessidic inscription of year 8 in Medinet Habu). Macalister suggests this amendment on the grounds that a later copyist of the original text from which Justin drew his information changed the name "Sakaloniorum" (which was, according to Macalister, the right version) to " Askaloniorum " because the former did not make any sense to him, as it belonged to a shadowy, short-lived tribe that was, most probably, soon absorbed by the major ethnic groups of the Syro-Palestinian coast. Macalister may be right but mainly on the grounds that this raid on Sidon by the people of Ashkalon is dated, in the text, just before the fall of Troy and the Philistine settlement in their five-city league (of which Ashkalon was one) is well-attested as having taken place after their defeat at the hands of Remesses III, that is, well after the fall of Troy, see Breasted J. H.op. cit (beginning of this note), (1906), paras 397 - 412. So those who raided Sidon, according to Justin's text may indeed have been Tjeker who, although - also settled in Palestine as garrison troops by the Egyptians, may have been roaming various

Syro-Palestinian lands or sea-areas even well before the final offensive of the Sea-Peoples against Ramesses III.

7. Macalister, R A S. The Philistines (1913, repr. 1965) pp 27 - 28
8. Strabo VI. 95. See also Diodorus IV. 75. 1
9. Pausanias VIII. 15. 5 - 7
10. Pausanias VII. 3. 1 - 2.
11. Macalister, R A S, op. cit. (n. 7), p. 28.
12. Strabo XIV. 4. 3 quoting Callinus. Since we read in ibid that Calchas - who, along with Amphilochous is said to have led a miscellaneous throng from Troy, see Strabo in ibid quoting Herodotus VII. 91 - died in Clarus, Mopsus' land, we may assume that Calchas is likely to have brought with him a contingent of those people from Troy, in other words Teucrians, and that these Teucrians perhaps joined Mopsus' southward expedition.
13. See n. 6 in this section.
14. See Jones. A. H. The Philistines and the Danites. Washington (1975) p. 97.
15. Homer Odyssey XIX. vv 172 - 7.
16. Homer in ibid (previous note).
17. Herodotus, VII. 171

18. I. Sam. 31.10
19. Antiquities XIII. 324
20. In Antiq. V. 83 note q. we read that this is the Hebrew Dor. (Josh. XVII. 11) and that it is a maritime town 16 miles s. of Carmel (mod. Tanturah). It is thus evident that it is the same city as that which in the story of Wenamon (c.1100) is said to be inhabited by Tjeker whose leader was called Badyra, see n. 5 in this section, and the discussion on quote 1 supra.
21. In note e on this quote we read: "On this meaning of "tirannos" we read in Antiq XIII. parag. 235, note a, that "tirannos" ("tyrant") and "tirannevin" are applied by Josephus to native rulers of small territories.
22. Antiquities V. 175 parag. 8,9,11
23. For a similar conflict of opinions cf. A.III. 96 ff., where, as here (parag.9) one party is for retaining composure.
24. This is the point where the cow-drawn wagon bearing the ark and the golden images-filled coffer should be left in order for the beasts to choose which way they go.
25. Skymnos XI. 403 ff., quoting Timaios. See also Burn, A. Minoans, Philistines and Greeks (1930), p. 205
26. Homer Odyssey, XIX 175-7; Diodorus IV. 67. 1 and XI 79.4-6, Homer Iliad II. 653 - 69 (the text there refers to Tlepolemus, a son of Heracles, yet the

descendants of Heracles being inextricably connected with the Dorians, the latter's presence should always be considered a possibility where the former are concerned and vice versa); Tyrtaeus Frag. 19. 7 - 8 (cited from West M. L. Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati, 2 Oxford (1972) ; Plato Laws 682 e - 683 e ; Apollodorus Library II. 8. 1 - 4 ; Pausanias III. 1 - 5. In all the above quotes number " three " recurs unremittingly in various occasions connected with time spells, ways of settlement, religious habits e.t.c.

27. Antiquities XIII. parag. 364

28. Stephanos Byzantios S. V. Gaza. This is the god called Marnas, popularly identified with the Cretan Zeus. His name was thought to stem from the Cretan word " marna " meaning " maiden ", see G. F. Hill's translation of Mark the Deacon's Life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza, 64 - 71, (Oxford, 1913) pp. 73 - 82, where it is stated that Marnas (the Cretan Zeus) worship persisted at Gaza till 402 A.D when it was finally suppressed and his sanctuary destroyed. From this work (ch. 19, p. 24) we learn that Marnas was regarded as the lord of rain; regarding his relation to Crete see Hill's introduction to this work's translation pp. XXX II - XXX VIII. Gaza is also reported to have been called " Minoas ", after "Minos", See Stephanos Byzantios S.V. " Gaza ".

29. Herodotus I. 105

30. I. Sam. 31. 10

31. Antiquities vi. 170. and 171 (I. Sam. XVII. 1).

32. Homer, Iliad, III. 330 - 368, XVIII. 478 - 482 ,
609 - 613.
33. Antiquities XVII. 320
34. Antiquities VI. 351 (I sam. XXIX. 1)
35. In n. b on this quote we read : " Suggested by the
LXX " satraps of the " allophyloi " " = Heb. "sarne
Pelishtim" (A. V. " Lords of the Philistines "). cf.
I. Sam. XXIX. 2 " And the lords of the Philistines
passed on by hundreds and by thousands ". "
36. See quote no 3 above and n. 25 in this section.
37. Antiquities V. 300
38. In n. b on this quote : " bibl. " Lehi " = "Jaw-bone",
as translated here and in the LXX. Probably the name
was originally given to some hill or ridge on account
of its resemblance to a jawbone (Burney, adducing the
similar name " onou gnathos " given to a promontory in
Laconia ").
39. Herodotus VII. 171
40. See Catling H. Acts of the International Symposium
The Mycenseans in the Eastern Mediterranean, Nicosia
1972, Nicosia (1973), pp. 34 - 9.
41. The very letters bearing this information are quoted
by Sanders N. K. The Sea Peoples London (1978),
pp. 142 - 3.

PART THREE

C. The Evidence from the Biblical Sources.

1. We read in the Book of Judges¹ that Judah took Gaze " with its territory " and Ashkelon " with its territory " and Ekron " with its territory ". Since the passages from the beginning of the book of Judges² up to that point are concerned with the Israelites' war against the Canaanites³ it looks as though the aforementioned territories - references to other tribal entities are lacking - were most probably inhabited by Canaanites. Since these same territories, these cities actually, are clearly known to be inhabited by Philistines⁴ one may presume a strong connexion between the Philistines and the Canaanites all the more so because the biblical narrative does refer to Canaan as the land of the Philistines⁵ .

Further on, in the Judges narrative⁶ we read that although Judah " took possession of the hill country", he " could not drive out the inhabitants of the plain " because the latter used chariots of iron. We are confronted with the same geographical designations earlier on⁷ where we read about the Canaanites who dwelt in the hill country, in the Negeb and in the lowland ("plains"

is meant here in all probability). Thus, it seems that the iron chariot - users of the plain referred to in Judg. I. 19 must have been Canaanites.

It is interesting to note that it can be inferred from a biblical quote⁸ that the Philistines possibly had an easier access to metal ores (perhaps even iron) having forbidden the Jews to make any use of them.

This reference is also quoted to this effect by Josephus⁹ and also turns up in a slightly earlier stage of this author's narrative in the same book¹⁰, where we read that the Jewish peasantry, in the face of the absolute shortage of base metal, would go to the Philistines to have their agricultural instruments repaired. This strong connexion of the Philistines with base metal, if coupled with Judg. I. 19 and I. 10 pointing to a connexion of the Canaanites with base metal through the use of base metal chariots, an inference that is confirmed through Judg. IV. 2 - 3 and 13 (speaking of the Canaanite host of Sisera consisting of nine hundred chariots of iron) and granted the connexion between Philistines and Canaanites through Zephaniah 2.5, perhaps further strengthens the links between Philistines and Canaanites. Now in Josephus Antiquities¹¹ we read that one of the 11 sons of Chananaeus¹², the son of Ham, was Gergesaeus. The account is borne out by the bible which employs somewhat different names for all persons concerned¹³. This

"Gergesaeus" (biblical "Gergasites") has been seen to be connected with the Gergithes, a tribe said to have been brought over to Cyprus by Teucros - the famous Homeric hero, brother of Ajax¹⁴ and founder of Salamis in Cyprus¹⁵ - and to have ultimately been of Thessalian origin¹⁶. Now this tradition having Teucros coming to Cyprus from his native Aegina after having been expelled from this island (just off Athens) by his father Telamon¹⁷ recounts developments which postdate the Trojan War;¹⁸ this is because it is made clear that Teucros' travel to Cyprus occurred after his return from Troy, that is, at some time in the end of the 13th cent. or the early stages of the 12th. Granted that in the case of Teucros we have a case of settlement in Cyprus at the aforementioned time, we have a development which may well have upset the standard sequence of social life locally and generated a certain unrest such as is attested by the archaeological record in Cyprus at almost the same time as that in which tradition places Teucros' coming to this island¹⁹. Additionally there is the royal correspondence between Alasiya (Cyprus) and Ugarit dating to the same time and speaking of contemporary events concerning piratical raids on both Kingdoms (see chapter Three, part 1, section B, the relevant discussion) and of course the Ramessidic inscriptions furnishing an eloquent account of the Sea - Peoples leaving a trail of

desolation explicitly (see Ch. Three, part 1, section B) involving Cyprus, while on their way against Egypt at c. 1186. So one could legitimately maintain that there seems to be a connexion between all these developments. The chronological proximities established by the evidence available and the reasonable sequence which these developments seem to make up are too strong factors to allow dismissing the whole thing as coincidence. Teucros' settlement in Cyprus must, in all probability, be connected with the Achæan settlement there at c. 1200 attested by the archaeological finds. It is also likely that these Achæans - perhaps Teucros and his followers - took to buccaneering activities thus making inroads upon Cyprus and Ugarit which finally proved fatal for the latter Kingdom. Moreover, there is no ruling out the possibility that these newcomers from the Aegean or at least part of them somehow joined the ranks of other land - and - sea - roaming hordes and, after carrying out raids against adjacent areas, finally attacked Egypt only to be thwarted by Ramesses III and settled by him in Palestine. In such a case, it should be remembered that the Gergithes were part of those who came with Teucros to Cyprus and finally established the Achæan settlement there. The Gergithes may be connected, as has already been stated, with the O.T. Girgasites who are held to be descendants of Canaan who, being the progenitor of all the Canaanites²⁰,

automatically links the Girgasites with the Canaanites.

The Canaanites now can be seen to bear a rather strong connexion with the Philistines²¹, in which case the next inference is that the Philistines may be connected with the Girgasites, who are perhaps related with the Gergithes who are of Aegean origin and colonized Cyprus with Teucros c.1200. Now these Gergithes may reasonably be presumed to be of Aegean origin, yet the information furnished by Athenaeus²² that they were of Thessalian origin affords them also Dorian connexions since Hestiaecotis, a Thessalian territory, was a well-known Dorian land, also called "Doris" in earlier times and was held to be a typical Dorian area from which those people set out to colonize other territories²³. Therefore these Gergithes are not unlikely to have ultimately been of Dorian stock and to have come to Aegina, Teucros kingdom, where they eventually joined Teucros' expedition to Cyprus. Greek tradition does speak actually of a Dorian expedition to Aegina²⁴ so it is likely that among those Dorian settlers there were "Gergithes" from Thessaly. So, all considered it looks as though there may have been a "Gergithes" element among the Philistines in which case both the Achaean and also the Dorian connexion in this biblical tribe is corroborated even further.

2. At another stage of the Judges narrative²⁵ we read a list of areas from which the Hebrews did not drive out their inhabitants. Among these names we read Beth - Sheen, Dor, Megiddo. It is also said that "The Canaanites . . . persisted in dwelling in this land".

So we perceive here a corroboration of the connexion between the terms "Canaanites" and "Philistines" by means of what we know to be a Philistine city, that is, Beth-sheen (or Beth-shan)²⁶ being referred to as a Canaanite city. What can also be of some help towards establishing a strong link between Canaanites and non-Jewish, that is gentile, tribes, is the reference to Dor as one of the Canaanite cities which posed problems to the Hebrews because of their chariots of iron. Dor is known to be a city inhabited by one of the Sea-Peoples, that is, the Tjeker as we learn from Egyptian Wenamon's report²⁷. The Tjeker are of course connected with the Philistine through having been former allies and the involvement of their city in the list of Judg. I. 27 perhaps lends further credit to the notion that these "Canaanites", who were so troublesome a presence to the Hebrews comprised alien, Sea-Peoples' areas in all probability. Perhaps prior to the Sea-Peoples becoming known and familiar to the Israelites as different tribal entities coming under different names, they were just a

gentilic, alien group of nationalities to Hebrew eyes who applied the term "Canaanites" to all of them.

3. Later on in the Judges book²⁸ we read : " And the Lord sold them [the Israelites] into the hand of Jabin King of Canaan, who reigned in Hazor; the commander of his army was Sisera who dwelt in Harosheth - ha - goim "

Now Sisera, a figure that turns up in Deborah's song where he holds a leading role²⁹, is said in Psalm lxxxiii. 9 to have a town of his own, namely : "Harosheth of the Gentiles " more than a day's journey from Hazor; Harosheth is generally identified with the modern Harathiyeh in the bottle neck which forms the mouth of the plain of Esdraelon - a region entirely in Philistine hands, at least at the end of Saul's wars. Not far off from Harosheth was a village with the name Beth-dagon, the latter name being that of a chief Philistine deity³⁰. Harosheth itself is distinguished by the appellation " of the goyim " or " foreigners ". In Joshua XII. 23 " the king of the goyim in Gilgal " is mentioned in noteworthy juxtaposition with Dor which is so explicitly referred to in the Wenamon's report³¹. Now this piece of information stands out as of some importance. Since Gilgal is so clearly connected with Dor one cannot rule out the possibility of both of them being inhabited by more or

less affiliated tribes. This speculation is all the more backed up by the information that both were inhabited by foreigners, Gilgal by "goyim" and Dor by Tjeker - as is made explicit in Wenamon's report - who (Tjeker) were part of the Sea-Peoples and thus related to the Philistines who may, therefore, be the "goyim" ("foreigners") inhabiting Gilgal, the inhabitants of these two cities giving the impression, as has been stated, that they were somehow akin to each other. Macalister has said that the aforementioned passage from Joshua may be read differently so as to bear the meaning "King of nations belonging to Galilee ". He also accepts that this reading admits of another interpretation, that is, of the "Galilee of the Gentiles" ³² , and also of the expression " The Galilee of Philistia " ³³ which in Joel III.V (= Hebrew IV. 4) is mentioned immediately after the Philistine territory. If this latter view be coupled with the reference in Psalm. lxxxiii. 9 to Harosheth, Sisera's city as being also inhabited by Gentiles, may lead to the conjecture that these gentiles of Harosheth were Philistines too, something that is corroborated by this city's geographical position (in a Philistine area, see supra).

4. Later on in Judges and in the immediate, actually, continuation of the previous quote, we read ³⁴ " The

people of Israel cried to the Lord for help; for he (Sisera) had nine hundred chariots of iron and oppressed the people of Israel cruelly for twenty years".

Now, through the explicit reference to iron technology used for military purposes by the Canaanites of Sisera we have yet another point of interest to this study since, if taken in conjunction with what has been stated just before (commentary on previous quote no 3) it further associates Sisera's people with the Philistines, the latter being noted for running a base metal (iron?) monopoly³⁵.

5. In the book of Sam. we read³⁶ that the Philistines inquired of diviners what they should do about the captured ark of the Covenant. Also in the second book of Kings³⁷ we read that Ahaziah sent messengers to the Shrine of Baal-Zebub, "god of Ekron", to inquire, on his behalf, whether he would recover from an injury he sustained when he fell through a lattice in his house.

In both cases we have explicit references to the art of divination practised by the Philistines (Ekron being unquestionably a Philistine city³⁸), that is, to a practice which is typical of Aegean and particularly Mycenaean (Achaean) and Dorian people³⁹ . Therefore we have another Aegean and, more specifically, Achaean - and

Dorian - connexion of the Philistine culture.

6. Through a quote in the Genesis Table of Nations stating Cush, Egypt, Put and Canaan as the sons of Ham⁴⁰ a very interesting connexion between the Philistines and the Girgasites can be established, an association that can branch out into also other directions taking us headlong into the realm of the various strands of the Aegean tribal traditions.

Casluhim whence came the Philistines is said to be a son of Egypt⁴¹ who was a brother of Canaan who beget, among others, the Girgasites⁴². We therefore perceive a strong relationship between the Girgasites and the Casluhim, the sons of the two brothers, Canaan and Egypt. It follows that quite a strong relationship is formed between the Girgasites and the Philistines who derive from Casluhim. We therefore notice that both Girgasites and Philistines have a strong Egyptian connexion, the former through their father being brother of Egypt, the latter through their grandfather being Egypt. This unmistakable Egyptian connexion shared by both Girgasites and Philistines can be of some use at a later stage of the discussion, so it had better be borne in mind.

Let us now turn to the Girgasites: They have been

connected with the Thessalian Gergithes who were reputedly brought over to Cyprus by the Homeric leader Teucros⁴³ after the latter's return from the Trojan War and his expulsion by his father Telamon from his native island of Aegina in the Saronic gulf off Athens⁴⁴. It has already been argued, in the course of discussing earlier quotes listed as no 1 in this section, that these Gergithes may legitimately be held to have been involved in the hectic situation in the Levant and more specifically Cyprus, Syria-Palestine and Egypt at the time of the Sea-Peoples' raids in those areas; they may well, it was argued, have finally been a part of those roaming Sea-Peoples who finally were defeated and settled in Palestine only to become the G. T. Girgasites⁴⁵ who are connected with the Philistines so that there may ultimately have been a Gergithes element in the Philistine ranks. Let us now see if these Aegean Gergithes tradition may be employed otherwise with a view to affording the same ultimate connexion.

The Gergithes have a Thessalian origin element attached to them and this may qualify them to hold Dorian connexions since part of Thessaly, Hestiaecotis actually, was considered a standard Dorian territory⁴⁵ and since we have traditions speaking of Dorians founding the city of Aegina in the island⁴⁶ - where Gergithes are said to have

been living - and therefore making it clear that there was a strong Dorian element of population in the island; this situation of course suggests that these Dorians may well have joined any overseas expedition such as that to Cyprus undertaken by Teucros along with the Gergithes in question.

Now, if these Gergithes claimed a Dorian descent, as is likely, they would of course nurse the traditionally - held concept of all Dorian people tracing their descent back to Heracles, through the belief -unanimously shared- that both Dorians and the offsprings of Heracles were actually one and the same people⁴⁷. But Heracles was great-grandson of Perseus⁴⁸, who was a descendant of Danaus⁴⁹ who, according to Greek tradition came to Greece from Egypt with his fifty daughters, pursued by his brother Aegyptus over their disagreement regarding the Aegyptus-proposed mass-marriage involving his fifty sons and his brother's fifty daughters⁵⁰.

It therefore becomes clear that if the Danaus legend be employed, an ultimately Egyptian element of extraction is attached to the Dorians and, consequently, to the Gergithes owing to the latter's strongly possible Dorian connexions.

We see now that Gergithes and O.T. Girgasites can be connected through them both sharing unmistakable ties with Egypt. But the Girgasites are of course also connected with the Philistines, both because of the strong Egyptian connexion evident in both tribes' pedigree (arrived at through the study of the Genesis table of nations, see above the beginning of the discussion of no 6) and also because of them both sharing a strong Canaanite background (as is argued in the discussion of quote no 1 in this section). It therefore follows that the final conclusion in this overall reasoning is the connexion of the Aegean-derived Gergithes with the Philistines, a connexion which falls in line with the rest of the evidence suggesting Aegean affinities for the Philistines. At this point it should be noted that even if the Dorian connexion in the Gergithes be dismissed and an Achaean origin be afforded to them such as would have been feasible had they derived from Achaean Phthiotjs in Thessaly⁵¹ still the claim for a Danaus - involving origin could not be dismissed in as much as all the Achaean population of Greece were called "Danaens" and therefore would be reasonably held to have Egyptian connexions through their Egypt-derived ancestor. Actually even Achilles, a true-born Phthiotian from Thessaly, does not differentiate between his Phthiotian Myrmidons and the rest of the Achaeans when addressing them and he calls them all either "Danaens" or

"Achaean" interchangeably⁵².

7. There is also other evidence leading us to a connexion between Sea Peoples and Girgasites. Sidon is named as the first-born son of Canaan⁵³ something that forms a connexion between him and the Girgasites, both being sons of Canaan, and in turn between Sidon and the Philistines by virtue of the ties between the Girgasites and the Philistines (see previous quote). The connexion between Sidon (ians) and Philistines is strengthened by that involving the Sea Peoples and the Phoenicians⁵⁴ which in turn, if coupled with the aforementioned one regarding Sidon (Phoenicians) and Girgasites clearly brings about a connexion between Sea-Peoples and Girgasites. One may go even further and single out the Philistines from the rest of the Sea Peoples as the tribe that may bear stronger connexions with the Girgasites than the rest of the Sea-Peoples group since both Girgasites and Philistines have strong Canaanite affinities, the former through being sons of Canaan, the latter through being looked upon in the Scriptures as the inhabitants of Canaan per excellence⁵⁵ and through being clearly conceived as a Canaanite tribe⁵⁶.

8. There is a prophecy in Zechariah⁵⁷, speaking of the sons of Zion finally prevailing over the sons of

Greece and there is the possibility of these "sons of Greece" implying the Philistines in view of:

- a) The strong Aegean connexions of the Philistines, pointing above all to an Achæan (Mycenaean) and/or. even Dorian background of theirs, that is to a background with strong Greek connexions.
- b) The denunciation of Philistia in IX. 5 - 7 and the involvement of Judah as the eventual conqueror in both IX. 5 - 7 and IX. 13 (where the text in question about the sons of Zion and sons of Greece).
- c) The reference to the Lord who championing the Israelite cause, will "march forth in the whirlwinds of the south" (IX. 14). The Philistines are considered as occupants of South-western Palestine, under the lords of their five cities during most of Hebrew History.
- d) The future routing by the Jews of the "slingers" which may be a poetic synonym for "archers", the Philistines being noted in biblical texts for their proficiency as archers ⁵⁸.

PART THREE

C.

Notes on the text.

1. I. 18
2. I. 1
3. See Judg. I. 1, 2, 3.
4. I. Sam. VI. 17 - 18.
5. Zeph. II. 5
6. I. 19
7. Judg. I. 10
8. I. Sam. XIII. 16
9. Antiquities VI. 105
10. Antiquities VI. 96
11. I. 139
12. Four of them have already been mentioned in Antiquities 1. 138 and 139 speaks of the seven outstanding.
13. Gen. X. 15 - 18
14. Iliad VIII. 267 - 8, 281 - 2.

15. Strabo XIV. 6. 3
16. Athenæus VI. 255, quoting Klearchos of Soloi. The connexion of "Gergithes" with the biblical Gergasites can be found in Burn. A. Minoans, Philistines and Greeks (1930), p. 156. There is also a suggestion in op. cit. that these Gergithes might even have had some connexion with the N.T. "Gergasenes" (*Varia lectio* in S. Luke VIII, 26).
17. Pausanias VIII. 15. 7
18. Ibid
19. Catling H. Acts of the International Symposium the Mycenæans in the Eastern Mediterranean, Nicosia 1972, Nicosia (1973), pp. 34 - 9.
20. Gen. X.1518
21. Canaan is called "land of the Philistines"
see Zephanian 2.5
22. See n. 16 above.
23. Herodotus I. 56, Diodorus IV. 67. 1, idem v. 80. 2 in conjunction with Herodotus loc. cit.
24. Pindar "Isthmian" IX. 1 - 4 where it is said that Aegina was founded, under the god's dispensation, by the coming of Dorian host of Hyllos and Rigimius.
25. I. 27
26. I. Sam. 31. 10

27. Pritchard, J. B (ed.) Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, 3rd edn. Princeton (1969), 25 - 9.
28. Judg. IV. 2
29. Judg. V. 1 - 31
30. I. Sam. 5. 1 - 5 where we read that the temple of Dagon - where the Hebrew Ark was brought and placed as spoil - was in the city of Ashdod.
31. See discussion of previous quote (no 2) and n. 27
32. Isa. IX. 1 (= Hebrew VIII. 23)
33. Josh. XIII. 2 and Joel III. 4 (= Hebrew IV. 4).
34. Judg. IV. 3
35. I. Sam. 13. 16; Josephus Antiquities VI. 105, ibid. VI. 96
36. I. Sam. 6 - 2
37. II Kings. 1. 2
38. Josh. XIII. 3
39. In Iliad A vv. 62 - 64 Achilles convenes a general meeting of the Achaeen leaders of the army and suggests that a diviner be inquired of the reason of the epidemic ravaging the Achaeen army. See also Apollodorus "Library" II. 8. 1 - 4 where the Heracleidae and their Dorian allies consult the oracle

three times regarding the fate of their much-sought-for return to the Peloponnese or developments which they couldn't account for. A similar case turns up in Eusebius "Preparation of the Gospel" V.20.1-3 where we read in a passage concerned with the Return of the descendants of Heracles that Aristomachus consulted the oracle regarding the Return and perished in a battle afterwards having misinterpreted the oracle he received. Also in ibid his son Temenys is said to have also consulted the oracle for the same reason.

40. Gen. X. 6 ; see also I. Chronicles. 8
41. I. Chronicles. 1. 11 - 12 and Gen. X. 14.
42. Gen. X. 15 - 18.
43. Athenæus VI. 255, quoting Klearchus of Soloi. See also n. 16 in this section.
44. See notes 17 and 18 in this section.
45. See n. 23 in this section.
46. See n. 24 in this section.
47. Pindar "Pythian" I. 60. 5 coupled with Strabo IX. 4. 10. ; Herodotus VII. 204 recounting the pedigree of Spartan (Dorian) King Leonidas and tracing him all the way back to Heracles. See also Herodotus IX. 26. 2 - 4 in conjunction with Pausanias VIII. 5. 1, where the names of Dorians and Heracleidae (descendants of Hercules) are absolutely interchangeable though involved in exactly the same incident.

48. See n. 10 on quote 3 in section A of Part Two.
49. See n. 11 on quote 3 in section A of Part Two.
50. See quote 3 in section A of Part Two for the detailed account of Danaus' coming to Greece and its further developments.
51. See Strabo VIII. 5. 5
52. Iliad A vv. 84 - 91.
53. Gen. X. 15; I Chronicles. 1. 13 - 14
54. See Macalister, R. A. S. The Philistines (1913, repr. 1965) pp. 36, 69 and Jones A. H. The Philistines and the Danites (1975), p. 107.
55. See Zeph. II. 5 calling Canaan "Land of the Philistines".
56. See the discussion on this matter in quote 1 in this section.
57. IX. 13 - 15
58. I. Sam. 31. 3

A P P E N D I X I

The Philistines of the Bible :

Their probable origin, their relations with the peoples of the Aegean Sea, the conditions of their coming into the limelight of history.

Foreword

The Philistines appear in the Old Testament as a people fond of war, living in the area stretching from Gaza proper up to the frontiers of Egypt. They had been there since the 12th century B.C., in continuous quarrels with the Israeli people; a marked incident of these quarrels is the duel between David and Goliath. The references of the Bible to the Philistines and their country are studied in another chapter of this doctoral thesis. But, in this particular chapter, we try to give an answer to reasonable preliminary questions that can be summarised as follows :

- a. Who were the Philistines and where did they come from ?
- b. Which exterior circumstances drove the Philistines to the country where they settled between the Israelites of the Bible and the Egyptians ?
- c. Which interior circumstances of this region assisted the penetration of the Philistines between two great powers of the time : the Hittites to the north and the Egyptians to the south ?

I believe that we should advise the reader-critic that at that time (end of the 13th - beginning of the 12th

century B.C.) the following changes took place in the greater area of the Balkans - Asia Minor - Near East -

Eastern Mediterranean :

a. Movements of peoples (Illyrians) from the north of the Balkans pressing other peoples (Greek tribes) to the south of the peninsula and to the beach-heads of the southern Aegean Sea (Crete) and eastern Mediterranean (Cyprus).

b. The same movements from the north of the Balkans push the Thracians to the NW Asia Minor with respective diversions from Asia Minor to the south-eastern passages leading to Syria and even more southernly or to the southern coasts and eastern Mediterranean, through Cyprus.

c. The Egyptian inscriptions of this time mention invasions from the sea, with emphasis to the "sea peoples". These references may also have a relation with the two "axes of moving" above-mentioned (from the NW Balkans to the south of Greece and the islands up to Cyprus and the coasts of Phoenicia - Palestine - Egypt or from the NE Balkans to NW Asia Minor and in turn from the south of Asia Minor to the coasts of Phoenicia - Palestine - Egypt with a halting place in Cyprus).

d. Perhaps the most important point of our subject (moving - appearance - settlement of the Philistines) is that at the beginning of the 13th century B.C., just after 1300 B.C., a hard and bloody battle took place between the two great powers of the area of Anatolia and Near East, that is, the Hittites and Egyptians, the battle of Cadesh

(1286 B.C.). Independently of its issue, that is, how much this was decisive for the predominance of one or the other of the two rivals, it is certain, according to the historians' view, that this conflict caused the decay of both and weakened them so much, that it was made possible for other peoples to penetrate the territories of the two empires or those territories that remained without any strong presence of the state between them.

More particularly :

a. In the 13th century B.C., a great Immigration of peoples took place from the Hungarian lowland to the western Balkans. This is also a decisive transfer from the time of the bronze age (till that time prevailing also in the Mycenaean world), to the iron age. The reason for this immigration is unknown, but it had a marked effect on the peoples that were superseded. The Illyrians who came from Hungary gave their name to the country where they settled and which since that time maintained its historical name of Illyria. But they superseded the Thracians and pushed them to the east. The Thracians in their turn pushed the Phrygians who found a shelter to the other side of the Hellespont, in the NW Asia Minor. There is a suggestion that these were the first invaders against Troy. These movements of Thracians and Phrygians to the Asia Minor took place towards the end of the 13th century B.C. and the beginning of the 12th² and they are the cause of chain-movements to the south of Asia Minor. At this time the information on the empire of the Hittites stops. Peoples of the southern Asia Minor moving with all their holdings to find a new home have been blocked by Ramesses III c. 1186. In Medinet Habu, the commemorative reliefs show

women, children, ox-carts and also vessels accompanying in parallel the whole enterprise from the sea. The Philistines may have been among these peoples who settled in the coasts of Palestine, as this region has been named after them.³

b. The pressure of the Illyrians reached the Dorians⁴ too who had settled down in northern Greece, may be in the Pindos area. Their running away to the south was recorded in the Greek Mythology as "The Descent of the Dorians". The old Archaic civilisation in Greece had started to decline before the arrival of the Dorians. The heroic era of the Mycenae had passed away. Thus the descent of the Dorians who had a heavier weapons (iron?) was facilitated. The destructive consequences of the Dorian immigration are obvious in the continental and insular Greek area.⁵

During the final stage of the Dorian immigration, the Dorians were driven to the Cyclades and Crete with the old inhabitants of the island being removed to the eastern edge (eteocretans = the genuine Cretans). May be some of them left the island and fled to the coasts of Asia Minor or the eastern coast of the Mediterranean.

c. This can be an interpretation of the fact that the Jewish sources consider the Philistines as having their origin from Crete. According to the Old Testament, the Philistines are named Pelishtim and their country Peleseth. Crete is mentioned as Kaphtor in the Old Testament and Egyptians called it Keftiu. Evidence existing in the Old Testament (Kings B' - k'7, 23, r' - a' 38, IS 0'3, Jer. 47'4⁶ and elsewhere) are deemed to be

sufficient to support the view that identifies Kaphtor, and in turn Keftiu with Crete. The Philistines are then likely to have landed from Crete to the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean and settled in the land named after them Philistia.

From the last excavations in Palestine, it is likely that the Philistines were using iron tools-weapons. The Dorians have probably had a similar advantage when they reached the south of Greece and superseded or subjugated the Achaeans then wearing copper tunics.

d. Either from the one axis of moving (Eastern Balkans - Asia Minor - Cyprus - Syria and more southernly) or from the other (Western Balkans - Greece - Crete - Asia Minor - Cyprus and more southernly), the Philistines seem to have arrived at the area between the Gaza and the Nile - as invaders, intruders or refugees chased out of their home. They may have formed one of the successive arrival waves that the Egyptian inscriptions mention as "sea peoples". It is probable that they settled in this area either because the older forces had progressively decayed after the great fight in Cadesh, or because they had a certain weapon that was more effective. And they entered History as local but keen rivals of the historic peoples of this area.

e. It may be of importance to connect the movements and the settlement of the Philistines with a more general turmoil prevailing about 1200 B.C. or later in the Aegean coasts and the sea zone of eastern Mediterranean, as we know from Homer's Odyssey. This epic poem is dominated by sea adventures where the shipwrecked struggle to survive

and the visitors everywhere are asked by the natives if they are bandits. It is within this atmosphere of confusion and lack of safety that the appearance and settlement of the Philistines in Palestine may be interpreted, the country, that is, that offered them shelter albeit marred by continuous discords with the previous inhabitants.

Notes

1. Wilcken, U. Altes Griechisches Geschichte (transl. by John Touloumakos from the 9th German Auflage of Griechische Geschichte) Athens 1976, "Papazissis" publications, p. 71.

Sandars, N. K. The Sea Peoples, Thames and Hudson, London 1978, p.33; History of the Hellenic Nation, Athens Ekdotiki, vol. A', p. 286.

2. Bengston H., Geschichte des Altes Griechenland, 4th Auflage of Griechische Geschichte, pp. 25-31. (In the Greek translation by Gavridis A., Athens 1979, "Melissa" publications, pp. 52-3; Wilcken, op. cit. p. 71.

3. Wilcken, op. cit., p. 72.

4. Bengston, op. cit., p. 53 (Greek Edition).

5. Bengston, op. cit., p.53 (Greek Edition).

6. New Greek Encyclopaedia, entry Philistines.

A P P E N D I X II

SOME CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE HISTORICAL RELIABILITY OF
THE INFORMATION FURNISHED BY MANETHO AND JOSEPHUS AND
APPEARING IN THIS DISSERTATION IN CONNEXION WITH THE ISSUE
CONCERNED.

1. Some preliminary biographical information
 - a. Josephus lived in the 1st century A.D. (he was born in Jerusalem in the year 37 or 38 A.D.) and partook of the dramatic events of the Jewish uprising and struggle against the Roman Empire; he wrote the History of the Jewish War (alias, about the Conquest) one of his two chief works (the other is Jewish Antiquities) in seven books during the years 66-70 A.D., published between 75 and 79 A.D. and covering events from 170 BC to his own time; in this latter respect Josephus may perhaps be likened to Thucydides, the ancient Greek historian who also wrote about events of his own time in his Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC).
 - b. Even though his narrative in the History of Jewish War is driven by patriotic bigotry and has a touch of a memoirs-writing technique owing to the writer's personal involvement in historial action, Josephus seems to have felt the need for a painstaking elaboration of the information he uses in order that it approximates closely to the historical truth and thereby bestows credibility on his account.

In order to underline the antiquity of his people and to defend their rights Josephus felt the need to write a second treatise entitled Jewish Antiquities, in twenty books, written at c. 93-4 A.D. He was well-versed in Greek language and historiography and it is certain (evidence of that will be set out below) that he had

tackled the problems related to the substantiation of historical narrative both in theory and in practice.

- c. Josephus, in his work entitled The Life writes his own biography and informs us that "I am not of negligible descent, but of a sacerdotal one; it therefore follows that, just like other people have different pretensions to noble descent, I pretend to it through my priesthood affinities. In addition I am of a royal lineage on my mother's side". This information - otherwise insignificant as it seems - is a sign of Josephus having had access to the most reliable records of his time, that is, to material that was recorded by the clergy.

- d. This Jewish historian used the writings of the Egyptian historian Manetho - a much earlier figure - as his source. Manetho lived in the third century B.C. and wrote such works as A history of Egypt or Aegyptiaca, An Epitomy of Physical Doctrines, The Sacred Book on Egyptian religion, On Festivals et.al. Josephus had special reasons for drawing upon Manetho's work Aegyptiaca, since it was in this source that Jews in general sought and found information for their own history.

- e. Manetho's writings have been utilized by both Jews and Egyptians in their mutual polemics; during their dispute a certain number of addenda occurred in Manetho's works, as a result of which his reliability was affected; moreover rationalistic critique of his writings was put forward by a Greek scholar (see Manetho. Loeb ed, p. xviii), which seems to have been taken into account by Josephus as a means to enhance his own material's historical reliability.

- f. This last piece of information stands out as of some special importance in view of the fact that Manetho, an Egyptian who belonged to the high-ranking clergy and had been well-educated in Greek literature, had a unique chance to write a well-attested history of Egypt; he had free access to all the archives of his time, such as those of the temples, the kings lists, the countless inscriptions, the wall sculptures e.t.c. (Op. cit, Loeb, p.xx). Moreover, Manetho entertained a certain knowledge of the methodology of historical research by virtue of his Greek education, all the more so because he criticises Herodotus' works on many an occasion, over inaccuracies in connexion with the history of Egypt which the Greek historian had visited two centuries earlier.
2. Even though the aforementioned remarks have no direct bearing on the information derived from the two authors under examination (Manetho, Josephus) and employed in support of the points propounded in this dissertation, they nevertheless indirectly allow us to lend further credibility to their overall writings and, in turn, to individual parts of them (e.g. Manetho's fr. 50, from Josephus' Contra Appionem, I, 15,16, §§ 93-105). It is within this spirit which is connoted or presupposed by these remarks that an attitude of persistent seeking of historical truth, so evident in Josephus' writings, is fashioned. If we take his work Contra Appionem as a starting point in a bid to bear out this contention, the following excerpts from his writings can be picked out and quoted as indicative of the aforementioned attitude.
- a. Contra Appionem, A.I.3: "I deemed it wise to write about all these in brief with the view both to exposing the rancour and calumnies of those who revile us and to

dispelling the ignorance [of those who still don't know] as well as to teaching all those who wish to learn the truth about our own [Jewish] antiquity" (in this respect Josephus reminds one of the ancient Greek historian Thucydides who also aspired of writing in such a way as to convey both the historical truth underlying the material he was using as well as the moral messages which could possibly be gained through the proper presentation of the issue concerned).

- b. Op. cit A.I.4 : "I will therefore use such people in order to bear witness to my account as have been deemed by the Greeks themselves as the most trustworthy on all matters of antiquity, and I will, in addition to that, prove wrong all those who have written slanders and lies about us, by using their own writings"

- c. Op. cit A.II.6 : "And first of all I can't help wondering a great deal at those who think that one should only consult the Greeks regarding matters of great antiquity". This statement makes it evident that Josephus makes much of matters of historical reliability and maintains that he himself draws upon more reliable sources of information on the matters he treats than those customarily employed and even than those used by Greek historians.

- d. Op. cit A.II.11. Here Josephus propounds a thesis which might perhaps be envied by many historians as a norm of critical, unprejudiced scholarly approach; he writes, speaking of the Greeks of the campaign against Troy: "There has been a lot of doubt and controversy as to whether or not they used [some sort of] writing signs; and the prevalent view seems to be that they did not possess any knowledge of the present kind as well as

usage of writing". Josephus is of course right in making this point.

- e. Op. cit A.XII.68: "The reason why they [certain historians] do not know the truth is the lack of communication and the reason why they write false information is their desire to give the impression that they are capable of furnishing a better account of events than others". The overall phrasing here is reminiscent of the strain in which Thucydides as well as Aristoteles wrote when they embarked upon an attempt to demonstrate a thesis.

- f. Op. cit A.VII.36 In this quote Josephus, trying to enhance the trustworthiness of the historical information provided by the Jewish clergy in connexion with the age-old habit of the priests to compile new lists of information from the old records - and in this particular case with reference to the method of certifying the Jewish origin of the women who survive a war - writes as follows: "... and the greatest proof of this policy is that our own high-ranking priests are known and referred to by their father's name".

- g. Op. cit A.IX. 47 "... I have furnished an account which is borne out by the facts, because I was present in all the event concerned".

- h. Op. cit A.IX.52 "All these people (referring to numerous Romans on whose side he had fought - or under whose orders he had served, such as Vespasian and Titus who were commanders in chief - and to certain Jewish people who were well versed in Greek literature and philosophy - such as Julius Archelaus, Herod who he calls a most dignified man and Agrippas, who he calls a most

admirable king - see previous quotation A.IX. 51 in the Loeb. ed.) have testified to the great pains I took to record the historical truth, even though they did not avoid to pick me up on cases I distorted or omitted something from the things that happened, out of ignorance or prejudice".

- i. Op. cit A.X.54-55 "... Because I have construed the Antiquities (he refers to his Jewish Antiquities in a bid to refute criticism against the reliability of his sources in his major works), as I have stated, using our sacred records, since I myself had been a priest, descended from a hieratic family, and had been initiated in the philosophy of those records. And I have written the history of the War (he refers to his other major work, the History of the Jewish War), having acted in many occasions [related to that War] myself, having witnessed most of the actions of it and having ignored none of what has been reported or come to pass [about it]".

- j. Op. cit A.XI. 58 "... And having, as I believe, proved to a good extent that recording ancient events is a longer-established tradition among barbarians than among Greeks ..."

3. The above quoted excerpts from Josephus in which he presents evidence of the authenticity of his own writings, reveal a good deal of perspicuity regarding problems related to scholarly research as well as methodology in connexion with historical matters and show him to be a historical researcher who is well-versed in the study of the history written by Herodotus as well as of the principles governing it (cause of events being the most prevalent of them), the history

written by Thucydides and its main principles (close scrutiny for the discovery of historical truth) and finally the history written by Polybius and the high morals governing this author's historical research and way of thinking.

A P P E N D I X I I I

EVIDENCE IN VINDICATION OF THE LITERARY MATERIAL BEARING
UPON THE PHILISTINE QUESTION

The following information is used with a view to underpinning the material coming from the literary sources and drawn upon in the 4th chapter as a means of strengthening the main thesis of this dissertation.

It is to be underlined that when a piece of literary evidence is not corroborated by archaeological data, it cannot and should not be taken for granted, that is, it should not be considered strong enough to prove what it says; it must, in such a case, only be taken to be a stimulus for further investigation, as a means, that is, of triggering off further research into the matter concerned with the view firstly to discovering archaeological material which may underpin the literary source and secondly to looking into as yet unused possibilities of further illustrating as well as illuminating the original piece of information.

Regarding Pausanias VIII.5.2-3 where we read about the story of Arcadian Agapenor (chapter 4, part 1, A2, p.316) who drifted off to Cyprus on his way back from Troy and founded the city of Paphos and the sanctuary of Aphrodite at Pelaepaphos in that island, we have strong archaeological evidence following the careful investigation by Franz Maier at the site of the ancient temple of Aphrodite.¹

The tombs of the nearby cemeteries of Kaminia, Marcello, Evreti etc. have also yielded corroborative evidence². The LHIIIC1 early pottery from the cemeteries cannot by itself, being not so plentiful attest to the arrival of newcomers, yet LHIIIB - IIIC1 early material from the settlement itself is quite plentiful and evidence of potters', ivory carvers' and metal workers' workshops comes from some deep wells in the Evreti site. The enamelled cloisonne technique which can

be seen on two finger-rings discovered in a tomb nearby, is otherwise unknown in Cyprus until this time, but it is encountered once again on the famous sceptre from Kourion³, which may be an import. Thus, this technique, the ivory Carvers' workshops as well as the style of the motifs of the painted pottery suggest arrival of Achaean Greeks towards the end of the 13th century. It looks as though the Achaeans who founded Paphos first landed at the promontory of Paleokastro - Maa, situated a few miles to the northwest of that city and that they fortified it. Dikaios excavated Paleokastro in 1954 and showed that it was established on virgin soil by people using MycIIIc1 pottery of a date around 1200. The settlement was deserted a few years later something that shows that it fell out of use after it fulfilled its task, and that it served, as Dikaios had assumed, as a stepping stone for the arrival of Achaeans to Cyprus, prior to their establishing themselves in other parts of the western part of the island.

In addition, Maier has demonstrated that a specific type of pottery was recorded so far only at Paleokastro and Palaepaphos⁴. This type involves plain, hand-crafted pithoi with straight and wavy relief-bands made of a different clay than the body of the pot.

Following all these, it seems rather safe to say that Palaepaphos was settled by King Agapenor of Tegea and his followers who, after arriving at the site of Paleokastro which is near Palaepaphos, made peacefully their way into the latter place which they made their dominion.

Regarding Strabo XIV.6.3 where we read about Teucer or Teucros, who is called "the founder of Salamis in Cyprus, having first landed at the so-called "beach of the Achaeans" in Cyprus, (chapter 4, part 1, A2, p296) we have

archaeological evidence pointing strongly to Mycenaean activity at the city of Salamis. The city of Enkomi, the predecessor of Salamis, suffered c.1230 BC a grave destruction that was part of a series of catastrophes which also involved the Aegean area and the Syro-Palestinian coast. Not long afterwards a Mycenaean refugee movement found its way to that city, introduced the Myc. III c1B pottery and rebuilt the city, as the monumental buildings and the ashlar masonry (previously unknown to Cypriot civil architecture) show. In addition, there are also new architectural elements such as the hypostyle halls, also to be seen in the Argolid, and the hearth-rooms which are also reminiscent of the Mycenaean world⁵. It follows that architecture and pottery point to an Achaean colonisation of Enkomi-Salamis. Consequently, we may say, that we know who the colonists of Enkomi were and that Enkomi must be considered as the predecessor of Salamis. The town, after it received several smaller waves of Mycenaean immigrants, seems to have grown in strength, yet, owing to various calamities such as the silting up of its harbour which must have forced its inhabitants to move to the site of nearby Salamis, dropped out of political significance. The mentioned move of its inhabitants to nearby Salamis seems to have occurred in the 1st half of the 11th century, when the last wave of Greek settlers arrived at Cyprus⁶. In this way we may regard Teucer or Teucros as the Mycenaean leader who established himself at Enkomi around 1200 BC and proceeded to "hellenize" the city which was finally deserted when its people moved over to nearby Salamis.

Regarding the tradition about Dryopians emigrating to Cyprus (Diodorus IV.37.1-4 chapter four, Part I, A2, p.312), having been expelled from their land by Heracles, Gjerstand says that they mixed with the native Cypriots⁷. He suggests that after the occupation of Asine in the Argolid (Greek

mainland) by the Dryopians the former inhabitants left for Cyprus where they transplanted the name of their homeland (Asine) to their new country. However, Dimitriou A. believes that it is more natural to envisage the population of Asine as fleeing along with the Dyopians (who he believes to be of the same stock as the Asinians) over to Cyprus, in the face of the Dorian menace⁸.

The overall archaeological record in Cyprus nowadays suggests that in the last quarter of the 13th cent. BC there was a colonization movement from Greece towards Cyprus, which lasted until the early 11th cent. BC. The archaeologists' conclusions, based on customs and styles of Bronzework as well as pottery, sculpture, ivory objects and architectural styles confirm the view that what we have to do with in Cyprus at that time is a case of settlement and not mere trade activity. The newcomers brought their language with them, their technology and their new concepts for the visual arts.

It must be said, at this point, that whatever other literary evidence speaks of Achaean or Minoan presence (or such presence as points to Dorian affinities) in Cyprus at the late stages of 13th or early stages of 12th century without attaching the occasional figures concerned to a specific area, can be seen to be corroborated by the archaeological data mentioned above and suggesting, along with other evidence from different places, that there was an Achaean colonisation of the island in the time in question (late 13th, early 12 cent.). Such literary evidence appearing in this dissertation is Apollodorus Ep. 6.15 (S), Ep. 6.15b (TZ) about Phidippus and the Coans who settled in Cyprus after the fall of Troy (chapter. four, p. 278), also Apollodorus Ep. 6.16 (E) about Demophon's, Theseus' son, settlement in Cyprus (chapter four, p. 325) and Cypria, fr.

9 (quoted by the Scholiast on Euripides Andromache, v.898) about Helen of Troy's and her son Pleisthenes' settlement in Cyprus (chapter four, p. 327).

Let us talk now about those sources which speak about or hint at Dorian involvement in Levant-bound movements of Aegean people, with or without stop-overs in Aegean islands, at the time of the Sea Peoples raids in the Levant or not long before it, or those sources which refer to or hint at Dorian presence in tribal movements from the Greek mainland to Aegean islands; such sources include Strabo X.4.15 (Dorian immigration to Crete, ch.4 p. 238), idem X.4.6, Odyssey XIX 172-9, Strabo IX 5.17 (speaking about Dorian movement to Crete from Hestiaetis in Thessaly, ch. 4 p. 241), Strabo XIV 4.3, Herod. VII 91 (p. 245 in chapter Four, about Pamphylians being the descendants of a motley horde led by Amphilochous and Calchas from Troy to Pamphylia and various other places), Strabo VIII 5.5. (about Achaeans from Phthiotis taking their abode in Laconia and causing it to be called Achaean Argos, ch. 4, pp. 248-9), Herodotus I. 56 (about the wanderings of the Dorian tribe about Greece, ch. 4 p.p. 252-3), Herodotus VII 170 and 171 (about "Greeks" arriving at Crete at the third generation before the Trojan War and deserting the island owing to an epidemic, soon after this war, ch. 4, p.p. 257-9) in conjunction with Odyssey XVI 246-292 and 229-245 as well as Odyssey XVII. 424-444 (about Odysseus' account of a looting expedition against Egypt, starting from Crete, after the Trojan War, ch. 4 p.p. 263-4); they also comprise Diodorus V.80.2. possibly idem V.54.1,3,4 coupled with Iliad II 676-680 (about Dorians being the third people to cross over to Crete, having come from Olympus and having been also joined by Achaeans from Laconia, and about Nisyros, Carpathos, Kasos, Kos and Kalydna being under the sway of the Heracleids Thettalus and his sons, Antiphus and Phidippus, ch. four p.p. 270-2), Apollodorus Ep. 6.15 (S) and Ep. 6.15

b (TZ), coupled with Iliad II 676-680 (about Phidippus, son of Thessalus, son of Heracles, and his Coans being driven to Andros and thence to Cyprus where he settled, after the fall of Troy, ch. four, p.p. 278-9). Athenaios VI.225, quoting Klearchos of Soloi, in conjunction with Pausanias VIII. 15.7, Pindar's "Isthmian" IX 1-4 and Apollodorus II.8.2 (about Thessalian Gergithes brought over to Cyprus by Teucros who migrated to this island after the Trojan war from Dorian - founded Aegina in the Saronic Gulf, ch. four, p.p. 280-2).

Much as it is difficult to identify Dorian presence archaeologically, there is nowadays archaeological material which can be attached to that people and can be taken to be some sort of index of their presence in terms of ceramics-involving activity. This material is the so-called "barbarian Ware", a type of Handmade Burnished Ware (henceforward referred to as HBW) which was first found at Mycenae at 1964 in early LHIII C contexts⁹. The distinctive nature of this pottery and the fact that it turns up, all of a sudden, in the initial stages of LHIII C at a number of sites above destruction levels, triggered off a lot of discussion on the origins of this ware, who possibly manufactured it and whether it stood for a local response to changed circumstances or a foreign element in the local population directly related with the destruction of the Mycenaean palaces at the end of LHIII B2¹⁰. Sites where HBW has so far been found include Lefkandi¹¹, Tiryns¹², The Menelaion¹³, Korakou¹⁴, Aigeira¹⁵, and a number of other sites in Greece as well as at Khania¹⁶ and Kommos¹⁷ in Crete.

The fact that there is no precedent in early Mycenaean ware has made the excavators conclude that this is an intrusive ware; another factor which is conducive to this conclusion is that this is a handmade pottery at a time when the wheel was in full use. Schachermeyr attributes HBW to the

Sea Peoples¹⁸, Bankoff and Winter trace HBW back to the Lower Danube¹⁹. Yet, what is of particular interest to this study is that there is a tendency, besides others, to attribute HBW to Dorian invaders²⁰. The literary sources set out above speak, in many cases, of Dorians or Dorians-related tribes migrating to Crete from the Greek mainland (Thessaly, Parnasus, Laconia), and to other Aegean islands and reaching as far away as Cyprus in certain occasions. If all the pieces of information are put together in an attempt to harmonize the material relating to the migrating activities of the Dorian or Dorians-connected tribes, one gets the impression that in most occasions, Crete stands out as a major land-mark in the migrations in question with other smaller Aegean islands looking as minor stepping-stones in the Eastward migratory movement, and Cyprus being, in certain occasions, another major focus of those migrations. Therefore, if HBW has been recorded in those areas which seem to outline a major, jig-saw like, eastward migration that seems to have stretched, all considered, over quite a number of years, one may raise the point that these Dorian tribes are quite likely to have actually made their way through these areas, as postulated by the traditions. As we have already stated, Menelaion at Sparta in Laconia, an area from which Dorians are said to have crossed over to Crete, has yielded "barbarian" ware (HBW)²¹ in its Mycenaean settlement. "Barbarian" ware has also been recorded in Crete namely at Khandia²² and Kommos²³, and we have seen how important a role Crete holds in these migrations. Finally, we find this type of pottery in Cyprus, at such sites as Maa Palaeokastro, Kition, Hala Sultan tekke Enkomi and perhaps Apliki. Prior to commenting upon anything else, let us refer to the chronological framework of this ware recovered from those sites.

HBW appears in Greece, Crete (and Troy) without precedents roughly at the beginning of the twelfth century B.C. This pottery in Greece is reported as mostly coming from the early phase of LHIIIC²⁴, whereas it occurs for the first time there in LHIIIB:2. This dating holds for the HBW found at Menelaion²⁵, Tiryns²⁶ and Korakou²⁷; the Menelaion case in Laconia, which interests this study in particular, seems to suit most of the literary evidence speaking of Dorians or "Dorianized" people setting out from it, in as much as LHIIIB2 (c.1250-1200) Barbarian pottery points to foreign (Dorian, according to Greek tradition) presence there at a time that suits the literary evidence which speaks of that people migrating thence at about (or a little after) Trojan War times. In Crete HBW occurs a little earlier than LHIIIB2²⁸, something that again seems to match the traditions speaking of Dorian elements in Crete, not only in the beginning of the 12th cent. but also in Trojan war times. Regarding Cyprus the earliest finds occur at Kition Area I, Floors IIIA-IV when Mycenaean IIIc:1b predominates; this period is dated by the excavator to the transition between the LCIIIC and LCIIIA²⁹. One could say with a fair degree of certainty that in Cyprus HBW begins to occur at the very beginning of LCIIIA and continues to be found, always in very small numbers, down to the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Cypro-Geometric period. This dating matches the literary material of the traditions which credits various Aegean peoples with arriving at Cyprus not long after the Trojan War, that is, sometime at the beginning of the 12th cent. B.C.

Let us now discuss similarities between HBW from areas of interest to this study. The most characteristic find from Cyprus and the only complete specimen is the well-known jar from Maa-Paleokastro found on Floor I, period II, when large quantities of Myc. III C1B were in use. Very similar

specimens were found at the Menelaion in Sparta³⁰ - and this is quite important, since it points at the possibility of some cultural connexion between the people who lived at, and later fled from, Laconia, at the early stages of LHIIIIC and those inhabiting Maa-Paleokastro in Cyprus when large quantities of Myc.IIIc1b pottery are in use at the beginning of LCIIIA. Similar specimens have also been found at Korakou³¹ and also at Troy VIIIB³². Sinda in Cyprus has produced a single find from period II, a fragment from a deep bowl with a plain rim. Period II is dated to the LCIIIA period. A similar specimen was found at Korakou³³. HBW in Cyprus can be divided into two distinct fabrics, each with a set of distinctive features (brown, soft and friable fabric with a dark grey to black core, and hard grey fabric usually highly burnished to a lustre). It is interesting that a similar situation, two distinct fabrics with a set of distinct shapes, seems to appear at Troy and Korakou (southern Greece). This is something that again points to some sort of connexion between the users of those fabrics in the two areas, Korakou and Cyprus and since HBW has been attested as early as LHIIIB2 at Korakou (late stages of 13th cent.) whereas its earliest appearance at Kition is attested when LHIIIIC1B pottery is in use (end of 13 century, 1st quarter of 12th), it might be that some influence, to be seen in the HBW fabrics tradition, was transplanted from mainland Greece to Cyprus, perhaps as the result of a migratory movement of the users of the "barbarian" ware (maybe Dorians among other tribes) from Greece all the way to Cyprus at about the beginning of the 12 cent. BC, something which is supported by the traditions.

Let us now continue this discussion about the HBW with a point about the cause of its appearance in Cyprus. Trade does not seem to offer a satisfactory explanation for the presence of this pottery in Cyprus³⁴. A chemical analysis of

a few fragments from Cyprus, carried out in 1985³⁵, showed them to have been made in the locality of their findspots, but that the makers did not use material from the habitual potters' sources. Excavators hope that petrographic and neutron activation analysis may shed further light on the problem. And to conclude the HBW discussion, it is important to state that the chronological correlation of this ware in Cyprus with that in Greece, Crete and Troy, where this pottery appears without precedents roughly at the beginning of the 12th cent. BC, and its association with Myc. IIIc1b in Cyprus seems to suggest that the same events or circumstances that brought about the appearance of this type of pottery in LHIIIc levels in Greece also affected Cyprus, but to a lesser extent. This is quite important because if it was some sort of emergence in the theatre of social events of a new class of population (whether it was invaders or a downtrodden social stratum) that introduced HBW into the pottery tradition in Greece at the beginning of LHIIIc (outset of 12th cent.), then it is possible that a similar development as well as social class (maybe the same one) introduced HBW in Cyprus at the beginning of LCIIIc.

Turning to another piece of literary information, namely Apollodorus Ep.6.15 (S) and Ep. 6.15a (The paragraph is quoted from Tzetzes, Schol. on Lycophron, 902), speaking of Guneus voyage to Libya and his settlement by the Libyan river Cinyps, soon after the Trojan War and after he had been shipwrecked at Caphereus, we may say that there seems to be evidence from the archaeological point of view as some rare Mycenaean objects have been discovered at Cyrene in Libya, dating from times soon after the Trojan War and suggesting cultural intercourse or even perhaps settlement of Mycenaean elements there³⁶.

Let us now turn to those traditions which relate that

various waves of Aegean people arrived at Crete from the Greek mainland sometime before the era of the Great Land and Sea raids recorded in the Ramessidic records, or at the time of those raids, and that - in certain occasions - they later left the island and headed eastwards. Such traditions, mentioned and discussed in this dissertation, are Strabo X.4.6, Andron (Origins) (speaking about Dorians coming to Crete from Hestiaeotis in Thessaly, ch. 4, pp. 241-2, coupled with Strabo X.4.15 and Odyssey XIX. 177), Diodorus V.80 in conjunction with Strabo VIII.5.5, Diodorus IV.60.2-4 along with Strabo VIII 1-2 (all speaking of the Tectamus Dorian expedition to Crete and the involvement in it of those Achaeans who had travelled with Pelops to the Peloponnese and taken their abode in Laconia, ch. 4, pp. 248-9), Herodotus VII. 170-1 (where we read about Crete being settled by "Greeks" after the two disastrous Sicilian campaigns and again left desolate following those "Greeks" and their livestock's affliction by famine and pestilence when they returned from Troy, ch. 4, pp. 257-9); also Odyssey III. 291-302, Odyssey IV. 81-84, Odyssey IV. 351-586, Odyssey XVI. 246-292 and 229-245, Odyssey XVII 424-444, Thucydides I.12, Plato Laws 682e-683e (all of them speaking about Menelaus' and Odysseus' adventures in Egypt and other Levantine areas where they ended up either by accident or as aggressors in an attempt to acquire wealth through pillaging and after setting off from Crete in all occasions; also those references (Thucydides and Plato) speak about the social and political unrest characterizing the whole Aegean after the Trojan war, especially the civil wars ravaging various areas and forcing their inhabitants to emigrate, ch. 4, pp. 261-264), Diodorus V.84. 1-4 (about the Cretan inhabitants of the Cyclades being expelled from them by the Carians who settled these islands after the end of the Trojan War, ch.4, pp. 315-316); finally Pausanias VII. 3.1-2 and Strabo XIV. 4.3 (about a Cretan colony settling in Clarus, an Asia Minor territory and about

a group of Thebans also settling in the same territory with Manto, a prominent figure among them, marrying Phacius, the Cretan leader and giving birth to Mopsus whose southward campaigns reached as far as Syria and Phoenicia, ch. 4, pp. 318-321).

Regarding those traditions the archaeological evidence that may be drawn upon to corroborate them involves a) bronze axe-adzes; two specimens are known from Megiddo and one from Tell Qasile. All three are dated to the second half of the 11th cent.³⁷. The type was discussed by Catling who pointed out its appearance in Cyprus after 1200 and its earlier appearance in Crete and other parts of the Aegean. b) Bronze double axes known from Megiddo and Achzib, both coming from late 11th cent. contexts³⁸. The type has Aegean and Cypriot parallels. Catling, H. has pointed out the appearance of such axes in Cyprus in the early 12th century B.C. Archaeologists believe that the introduction of such tools and weapons in Cyprus has to be seen in the context of the Aegean settlement in the island³⁹. The two specimens from Megiddo come from a late 11th cent context and they bear an oval shaft, an appendage not to be seen on the Cypriot examples, yet present on Cretan specimens which thereby betray a certain connexion between the Megiddo examples and the Cretan ones. c) Writing signs of an unknown script are engraved on two seals from an Iron Age I Philistine context at Ashdod (a cylinder seal and a stamp seal). This script is most probably a local Philistine one. The signs are linear and bear some resemblance to the Cypro-Minoan script⁴⁰.

These pieces of evidence point to a possible connexion between cultural trends in Crete, Cyprus and Philistia, which were perhaps the outcome of a population movement from Crete to the other areas mentioned, such as it appears in the traditions quoted above. It also strengthens the possibility

that some at least of the immigration movements mentioned or hinted at in the traditions, headed eastwards and using Cyprus in most occasions as a stepping stone - maybe for a good while - they ended up in Palestine, exercising their cultural influence on the last two areas, something to be seen in the cases of the items listed above.

Regarding now the traditions speaking of some sort of connexion between Cyprus and Philistia, such as Herodotus I. 105 about Aphrodite's temple in Cyprus having been founded from the temple of Heavenly Aphrodite at Askalon, we have evidence in support of them in the form of possible resemblance between the Iron Age I Philistine temples at Tell Qasile and those of Kition in Cyprus, Philakopi in Melos and Mycenae⁴¹. The basic traits of the Tell Qasile temples are no doubt to be found in local traditions of temple architecture in Canaan. However, certain elements are foreign to this local tradition, such as the combination of two temples or more in a cluster, a feature which is present in all three Cypriot and Aegean examples mentioned above. Mazar, A. and Negbi, O. have suggested that the aforementioned Mycenaean and Cypriot temples were inspired from patterns of temple architecture of the Levant. This suggestion has been strengthened by the recent discovery of a temple built after the same tradition of Beth Shean, and dated to the Late Bronze IA period. So, since patterns of Levantine temples' architecture have inspired Mycenaean and Cypriot temples (such as Kition and the Aegean examples quoted supra), it seems by no means unlikely that the temple of Aphrodite in Cyprus was inspired and built by those people who erected the temple of Heavenly Aphrodite in Askalon.

Regarding the traditions speaking of Late Bronze Age Cupro-Minoan connexions, mainly in the form of population movements from Crete to Cyprus, it should be rather belatedly

added that what other archaeological evidence may be used to corroborate them comes from the number of LMIII vases contained in the Kition tombs in Cyprus⁴². Pottery recovered from Enkomi also suggests such relations⁴³.

Let us now talk about those traditions which speak of the Egyptian background of the Achaeans (Mycenaeans) and Dorian (Herodotus II.80, Plato 682e-683e, Apollodorus "Library" II. 8.1-4, Pausanias II. 18.6-9, idem III. 1.5 ch. 4, pp. 268-9, Herodotus VI.53 in conjunction with the Parian Chronicle, ch. 4, pp. 341-2) as well as those traditions attributed to Manetho and forming the Egyptian version of the Danaus-Egyptus legend which, according to this treatise, justifies the belief that Myceneans and Dorians had an Egyptian background (Manetho, fragm. 54, parg. 231, quoted by Josephus in Contra Apionem ch. 4, p. 358, Manetho (quoted by Josephus in op-cit fr. 50, parg. 103, I.15-16, idem fr. 4, quoted from Excerpta Latina Barbari, ch. 4, p. 361); evidence in corroboration of connexions between Mycenaean Greece and contemporary Egypt - an aspect which is to be explored in pursuit of vindication of the traditions concerned - exists in the form of a really substantial deposit of Mycenaean pottery found at Tell el Amarna in Egypt and being datable, for its most part, to LH IIIA2. The coming of this ceramic phase marks the beginning of Mycenaean expansion both in Egypt and other parts of the Eastern Mediterranean⁴⁴. A number of New Kingdom tombs such as those of Sakkara, Gurob, Abydos and Balabish (lying about 450 miles from the Nile Delta), have produced such individual examples of Mycenaean pottery as stirrup jars and pilgrim flasks. These seem to have been precious articles for placing in tombs. Besides the sudden and unique appearance of Mycenaean works of art of Amarna⁴⁵, constant contacts between Greece and Egypt seem to have taken place during the era of Mycenaean expansion, though not on a particularly extensive scale. However, they

seem strong enough to support the traditions holding Egyptians and Greeks to have had marked connexions in Late Bronze Age.

APPENDIX THREE

NOTES ON THE TEXT

1. Consecutive annual reports in the RDAC since 1967.
2. Maier, F., The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean (henceforward abbreviated to MEM), Nicosia 1973, p. 67ff).
3. CYPRUS, Ill 89
4. MEM, p. 77ff
5. For all this and much more information on Enkomi, see Enkomi, vol. II., pp 511-514.
6. The earliest existence of the city of Salamis dates back to this time, according to the evidence furnished by a tomb excavated there by the French and published by Von.
7. Op. Arch. 3 (1944), p.110
8. Dimitriou A. Cypro-Aegean Relations in the Early Iron Age, ch. VI, p. 93 in Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, vol. LXXXIII, Goteborg (1989)
9. French E. and Rutter, B.J. "The Handmade Burnished Ware of the Late Helladic IIIc. Its Modern historical Context", AJA 81, (1977), p.p. 111-112
10. Deger-Jalkotzy, S. "Das Problem der Handmade Burnished Ware von Mykenischen IIIc" in Griechenland, die Agais und die Levante wahrend der Dark Ages, vom. 12 bis zum 9 j H.V. Chr., in Acten des Symposions von Stift

Zwettl, Oct. 1980, edited by Deger-Jalkotzy, S. (1983), pp. 162-177. Osterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.

11. Popham, M. and Milburn, E. "The Late Helladic IIIc Pottery of Xeropolis (Lefkandi) - A Summary" BSA 66, (1971) pp. 333-352.
12. Kilian, K. "Nordwest Griechische Keramik aus der Argolis und ihre Entsprechungen in der Subapennin facies" in Atti della XX Riunione Scientifica dell'Instituto di Preistoria e Protohistoria in Basilicata, (1978), pp. 311-320. Florence.
13. Catling H. and Catling, E. "Barbarian Pottery from the Mycenaean Settlement at the Menelaion, Sparta" BSA 76, (1981), pp. 71-82.
14. Rutter, J. "Ceramic Evidence for Northern Intruders in Southern Greece at the beginning of the LHIIIc period." AJA 79 (1975), pp. 17-32.
15. Deger-Jalkotzy, S. op.cit (n. 10)
16. Palsson-Hallager, B. "A New Social Class in Late Bronze Age Crete: Foreign Traders at Khania" In Minoan Society, Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium, edited by Olga Krzyszkowska and Nixon, L. (1983), pp. 111-119, Bristol.
17. Watrous, L. "A Preliminary Report on Imported "Italian" Wares from the Late Bronze Age Site of Kommos on Crete" SMEA XXVII, (1989), p.p. 69-79.
18. Schachermeyr, F. "Die Agaische Fruhzeit IV. Griechenland im Zeitalter der Wanderungen - von Ende der Mykenischen

Ara bisauf die Dorier (1980), Vienna, p.o. 95-98.

19. Bankof, A. and Winter, F. "Northern Intruders in LHIIIc Greece - A View from the North" Journal of Indo European Studies, 2, (1984), pp. 1-30
20. Bouzek, J. "The beginning of the Protogeometric Pottery and the "Dorian" Ware" Op. Ath. IX, (1969), pp. 41-57.
21. See n. 13 in this appendix
22. See n. 16 in this appendix
23. See n. 17 in this appendix
24. Rutter, J., AJA 79, (1975), pp. 17-32.
25. Catling, H. and Catling E. BSA 76, (1981), p. 74.
26. Kilian, K. AA, (1981) pp. 149-256.
27. Rutter, J. ibid (n. 24), p. 31
28. Falsson-Hallager, B., op.cit, (1983), (n.16).
29. Karageorghis, V. Kition V, Pt.I., pp. 263-265, 273.
30. Catling, H and Catling E. BSA 76, (1981), pp.76, fig.2
31. Rutter, J. AJA 79 (1975), p. 19, ill 2.
32. Blegen, C., Rawson, M. and Caskey, J. Troy IV, (1958), Pt.I., Princeton.
33. Rutter, J. ibid (n. 31) 79, (1975), fig. 15, pl. 3

34. Pilides, D. "Handmade Burnished Wares of the Late Bronze Age: Toward a clearer Classification System" in Cypriot ceramics: Reading the Prehistoric Record, the University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, the University Museum Monograph 74, University Museum Symposium Series, volume II, (1991), edited by Barlow J., Bolger, D. and Kling, B.
35. Jones, R. "Chemical Analysis of Barbarian Ware" in Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "Cyprus between the Orient and the Occident", ed. by Karageorghis, V., (1986), Nicosia, p. 259-264 (esp. p. 259).
36. Oral communication with Dr. Aravantinos, curator of the Thebes Museum.
37. Mazar, A. Excavations at Tell Qasile. Part two. Various Objects. The pottery. Conclusions (Qedem 20), Jerusalem, (1985), p.p. 3-4
38. Loud, G. Megiddo II, Chicago (1948), Pl. 183:14-15. The unpublished axe from Achzib is exhibited in the Israel Museum.
39. See Mazar, A "Comments on the nature of the Relations between Cyprus and Palestine during the 12-11th centuries B.C." proceedings of the International Symposium The Civilizations of the Aegean and their Diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, 2000-600 B.C. Editor Karageorghis, V. (September 1989), Larnaca.
40. Mazar, A. op.cit (previous note), p. 101

41. Mazar, A "Excavations at Tell Qasile, Part One, The Philistine Sanctuary, Architecture and Cult Objects" Qedem 12, Jerusalem, (1981), p.p. 61-71. Karageorghis, V. Excavations at Kition V. The Pre-Phoenician Levels. Part 1. Nicosia 1985, p.o. 240-259. See also Negbi, O. "Levantine elements in the sacred architecture of the Aegean at the collapse of the Bronze Age", BSA, 83 (1988), P.P. 339-357, idem "The temples of Tell Qasile additional comments on their architecture and cultic affinities" Eretz Israel, 20 (1989), p.p. 220-27 (Hebrew).
42. Karageorghis, V. Excavations at Kition, I, pp. 38-41
43. Dikaios P. Enkomi. For a comprehensive study of the Cypriot Late Bronze Age Finds, almost exclusively from Kition and Enkomi, exhibiting Minoan influence, see also Popham, M. "Connexions between Crete and Cyprus between 1300-1100 BC" in Acts of the Internations Symposium The Relations between Cyprus and Crete, c. 2000-500 BC, Nicosia, (1979), pp. 178-192.
44. French E. BSA, 60, (1965), pp. 159-202.
45. See Merrilees, R. in Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean, proceedings of the International Colloquium, Nicosia, (1972), pp. 174-184.

A P P E N D I X I V

DISCUSSION OF PUBLICATIONS BEARING ON MATTERS EXAMINED IN
THIS THESIS AND DATING FROM THE YEAR 1980 ONWARDS

The author of this treatise deemed it wiser to list the most important points of each publication in the form of a separate corpus and append it at the end of the dissertation than to interpolate their discussion in the main body of the thesis by attaching them to points they may be related to; the reason for this is that these publications were not judged to have such influence on any of the matters discussed in this dissertation as would necessitate their coupling, in the course of the main text, with the points concerned in each occasion.

1. Oren, E. "Ziglag: A biblical city on the Edge of the Negev" in B.A., Chicago, USA, (1982), vol. 45, no.3, pp. 155-166.

The case of Tell esh-Sharia is discussed in this article, an area at the Northeast of the Negev. The archaeological finds from the six archaeological campaigns (1972-78) are presented in this work which identifies Tell esh-Sharia with the Philistine city Tsiklag that was granted to David, as an area over which he could exercise his control, by the King of Gath (I Sam. 27.6). There is also an archaeological account of the area and its history, then a presentation of the archaeological activity carried out there, then an account of the stratigraphy of the area. The periods represented in the stratigraphy of the site are - in a strict upper - to - lower - level - order - the Byzantine, the Roman, the Persian, the Iron Age III, Iron Age II, Iron Age I and the Bronze Age.

2. Mazar, A. "Excavations at Tell Qasile 1. The Philistine Sanctuary: Architecture and Cult objects" in AJA,

(1983), 87, no.3, pp. 402-3. In its main and original form this work is a publication of the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Qedem 12 (1980).

This work discusses the Israeli excavations of this Philistine site which covers 2km of the Mediterranean coast, conducted by Mazar B. during 1949-51 and 1956 and repeated by the author of this work between 1971 and 1974. There is a study of the temple sanctuary and the cult objects (mainly of those made of clay). Fifteen chapters concern the topography of the site (covering 12th to 9th centuries B.C.), its exploration, its stratigraphy and the architecture of the composite culture of the Philistines; the three temples belonging to strata XII to X are discussed so as to reveal the analogies to the asymmetric (disproportionate) style temples of Lachish, Tel Mevorakh, Beth Shan as well as to the sanctuaries of Kition and Mycenae. The multisided culture of the Philistines and, generally, of the Sea Peoples is adequately underlined.

3. Dothan, M. and Porath, Y "Ashdod IV, Excavation of Area M. The Fortifications of the Lower City" Atiqot, English Series, Jerusalem, in ISR vol. 15 (1982), pp.1-175.

This work deals with Area M at Ashdod; the northeast side of the declivity of the eastern hillock of the Tel runs for about 400m. at the south-east section of side G (where the citadel lies).The work refers also to the 1970, 1971 and 1972 excavations of the area M.The level 11 is the oldest one and the agglomeration in it of the signs betraying Philistine presence is not intense. However it becomes so at level

10 which stands for the era of the apex of Philistine power. This work also shows that the city was destroyed by the Pharaoh Siamun c.967 BC., a development which can be detected at level 10, too. Level 9 shows signs of Solomonian fortifications. Later levels attest to Babylonians-induced destruction c.600. The lower city of area M was never fortified after this date. The publication also furnishes place-names information. There is also a study of the pottery recovered from levels 11 and 10, particularly of the provenance of it.

- 4) Dothan, T. "Some Aspects of the Appearance of the Sea-Peoples and Philistines in Canaan" in Griechenland, die Agais und die Lecante während der "Dark Ages", vom. 12 bis zum 9. Jh. v. Chr. (Cologne Autriche, 1980). This work can be found in Osterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Wien, vol, 10, (1983) pp 99-117.

Matters discussed in this work: the arrival of the Sea-Peoples at the beginning of the 12th cent. and their subsequent conflict with the Israelites in Canaan. The archaeological aspect of this work is based on Dothan's book The Philistines and their Material Culture, New Haven, (1982). The era the work in question refers to is marked by the fall of the Hittite Empire, the end of the city-states of Canaan, the decline of military and political power of Egypt in Asia, the coming of the Israelite tribes and the appearance of the Philistines at the Canaanite coast. Dothan also discusses the transition from the Bronze to the Iron Age. The archaeological finds discussed include scarabs, pottery, monuments and other objects which seem to form rather strong evidence of what she speaks of.

- 5) Sager, J.D. "Investigations at Tell Halif, Israel, 1976-1980" in BASOR, 252 (1983), pp. 1-23.

This article deals with Tell Halif. Points discussed: It is a hillock in southeast side of the Judaea mountains, which slopes towards Shephelah and the Philistine plain to the west and borders upon the Negev desert to the south. It is a strategic position that commands the route to Egypt and the coast. The Lahav exploration project is set out in this work, a project led by an association of archaeologists and American institutions. The stratification discussed is as follows:

Strata XV-XI : Chalcolithic era and early Bronze Age
Strata X-VIII : Late Bronze Age
Stratum VII : Iron I Age
Stratum VI : Iron II Age
Strata V and IV: Persian and Hellenistic era
Stratum III : Roman - Byzantine era
Strata II and I: Islamic and modern era

- 6) Brandfon, F.R. The Beginning of the Iron Age in Palestine, thesis submitted to the University of Pennsylvania in 1983. It can be tracked down in Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A. The Humanities and Social Sciences Ann. Arbor, Michigan, USA (1984), vol. 44, no.12 pp.3.731-3.732.

The author focuses on the transitional period from the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age, using the results of the archaeological excavations. The proposed dating is based on the Egyptian inscriptions as well as Cypriot and Mycenaean ceramics, and on Philistine ceramics recovered from Tell Beit Mirsim, Beth Shemesh, Bethel, Megiddo, Hazor, Beth-Shean, Lachish and Ashdod, where

the Bronze Age comes to an end between 1250 and 1150. Cultural aspects discussed are architecture and the typology of the ceramics of fifteen sites starting with Ai, Tell Quasile, Beersheva, Tel Masos, Tel Esdar. These sites lie in the area stretching between Galilee on one side and the Negev desert, the Jordan valley and the Mediterranean on the other. Characteristics of the villages which were established during the period of transition are also discussed.

- 7) Kelm, G.L and Mazar, A. "Timnah: a biblical city in the Sorek Valley" in Archaeology New York, NY, USA (1984), vol. 37, no 3, pp 38-9, 78-9.

The Sorek valley is the theater of Samson's adventures. Tel Batash, an artificial mound, neglected over a long period of time, is identified as the site of Philistine Timnah and has been undergoing excavations since 1977. The first city of Timnah is said to have been fortified during Middle Bronze Age. During the Canaanite period (Late Bronze Age), five occupation levels were uncovered, dating between 1550 and 1200, in all probability. The Philistine inhabitants of Canaanite Timnah tidied up the city. During the reigns of David and Solomon, an Israelite city was built on the ruins of the Philistine city.

- 8) Dothan, T. Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah Qedem Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 10, (1979). It can also be found in Orientalische Literaturzeitung Berlin, DDR, (1983), vol. 78, no.5, pp.452-4.

This work discusses the 1972 excavations of the Deir el.Balah necropolis dating from the late Bronze Age

(c.13th cent.) and situated 14km southeast of Gaza. There is also a study of the burial of anthropoids 114, 116 and 118 which were found intact in their cultural and chronological context. Pots of Egyptian, Cypriot and Mycenaean type have been recovered, as well as alabaster vases, mirrors and bronze knives, jewels of gold, amulets and scarabs in the Egyptian tradition of the XIX dynasty. The differences are also discussed between those graves of group A (in all probability these of Egyptian high-ranking officials) and those of group B (Beth Shean, Tell el-Farah) of the XII and XI cent., so far as the Philistine characteristics are concerned.

- 9) Kelm, G.L and Mazar "Three seasons of Excavations at Tel Batash, biblical Timnah" in BASOR, 248 (1982) pp. 1-36.

The excavations of 1977-79 at Tel Batash took place in the valley of Sorek river (Wadi Sarar). New historical data regarding the site of biblical Timnah (Josh. 15.10-11) are discussed. It seems to have been a Canaanite city until the 12 cent., then a Philistine and finally an Israelite city. The eight disengagement levels are divided between the Middle Bronze Age and the Persian Age. The defensive works and fortifications of the site are also discussed as well as the residences, the cellars, the canals communication system and the pottery. What seems to stand out as of some special importance among the finds are a Mycenaean pyxis (stratum VII), bronze weapons, pearls, Mitannian and Egyptian type seals (Amenophis III) as well as jars (strata III and II).

10. Brug J.F. A literary and archaeological study of the Philistines originally a thesis presented to the

University of Minnesota, USA, in 1984. Published by the University of Oxford in 1985; also in Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A. The Humanities and Social Sciences Ann Arbor, Mich., USA. (1985), vol. 45, no. 8, pp2569.

This work offers an analysis of the population and the culture of the Philistines of the early Iron Age. The author covers a wide range of literary (with particular emphasis to Egyptian and O.T. sources) and archaeological material. He claims that the Philistine culture is a hybrid, in which the Canaanite element is predominant, that is, stronger than the Aegean one which forms the other component of this culture. The percentage of Philistine objects, he remarks, which have been recorded in areas of Philistine country rarely exceeds 25% of the overall assemblage; it often ranges between 5% and 15%. The Late Bronze Age pottery types show a remarkable continuity in the Early Iron Age. Brug maintains that the study of funerary customs, metallurgy, rural cultivations, ships, minor arts, religion and language of the Philistines reveals a very strong Canaanite, or Semitic, or Levantine influence in all aspects of Philistine culture. Brug also claims that the Philistines were in Palestine before the time of Ramesses III, and that the appearance of the Sea Peoples in the Near East was a gradual process covering several centuries. Finally, this work suggests that the nature of the cultural change of the time of Ramesses III when Philistine ware was introduced neither requires large scale migration from the Aegean, nor can be considered to be the beginning of Philistine culture. It holds that what it calls "the Strong Canaanite component" of Philistine culture does not seem to have found its way into this culture by gradual assimilation only, but to

have, also, been present from the beginning, from earlier, that is, stages, dating from the Bronze Age.

- 11) Van Beek, G.W. "Digging up Tell Jemmeh" in Archaeology New York, 36, no.1, (1983), pp. 12-19.

Jemmeh is on Nahal Besor, about 12km south of Gaza, and is situated between Tell el-Fara and Tell el-Ajjul. It is identified with Yurtsa. The excavation shows that there is a period of habitation in the form of a small village in the Chalcolithic era (end of 4th millenium) which was short-lived (c.200 years) and that, after this, the site was deserted. After that, we have a period of continued habitation of the site throughout the Middle Bronze Age II (c.1800) and the following years all the way to the beginning of the 2nd cent. BC. The recent excavations have brought to light a Canaanite city, a Philistine city (a dependency of Gaza), an Israelite city, the palace of the Assyrian sovereign and spacious cereals sheds of the Ptolemaic era. The only so far known Philistine Kiln was also uncovered at this site.

- 12) Singer, I. "The beginning of Philistine settlement in Canaan and the Northern boundary of Philistia" in ISR, Tel Aviv, 12, no 2 (1985), pp. 109-122.

This work holds that the best as yet source concerning the Philistines remains the text of Ramesses III speaking of his conflict with the Sea-Peoples, that was destined, as was proved later, to protect Egyptian interests in Canaan. The appearance and role of the "monochrome" pottery of Ashdod, Ekron and Ashkelon is attributed to a first wave of invasion (of the Sea-Peoples), by this work. This work holds too that the

northern boundary of the Philistine zone of population could have been imposed by the indigenous population of Gezer (Canaanites or Amorites).

- 13) Dornemann, R.H. "The beginning of the Iron Age in Transjordan" in Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan (1982). A summary can also be found in Department of Antiquities, JOR, (1982), pp. 135-140.

The Archaeology laments the lack of documents necessary for the knowledge of Iron Age in Transjordan. This work holds that the study of alien influences is necessary, and such influence is the Egyptian one from the times between Sethos (or Sethi) I and Ramesses II, to be seen in the case of anthropomorphic sarcophagi of Iron I at Beth Shan and Dhiban and the case of Egyptian type sculpture of Iron II. The author also sees problems posed by Philistine and Midianite pottery. This work holds that archaeology proposes that the new excavations allow at last the classification of the various ceramic types, the study of connected objects and that of their architectural context.

- 14) Gunneweg, J., Dothan, T., Perlman I., Gittin, S. "On the Origin of Pottery from Tel Migne - Ekron", BASOR, 264 (1986), pp. 3-16.

The study of the Mycenaean and Philistine bichrome ware at Tel Migne offers objective data as to the origin of the Sea Peoples and their settlement in Canaan in the 12 cent. B.C. This work has carried out a method of examination of ceramics, based on the neutron activation analysis and has shown these "alien" type ceramics to have copied the originals, to have been locally made and to have been indiscernible from them during their first

appearance, a phenomenon which this work ascribes to common cultural affinities of the potters concerned.

- 15) Hesse, B. "Animal use at Tel Migne - Ekron in the Bronze Age and Iron Age", BASOR, 264, (1986), pp. 17-27.

This work claims that changes in the system of animal production underline the transition between Bronze Age and the period of Philistine influence which inaugurated the Iron Age. It goes on to say that swines and the total figure of horses-donkeys grow to the detriment of sheep and goats. There is less internal action to be noted in the (animal) production in mountainous areas. The statistics have been carried out on the bones samples, dated according to the pottery contexts.

- 16) Dothan, T. The Philistines and their Material Culture, New Haven, London: Yale University Press; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society (1982).

This is the revised English version of the 1967 Hebrew original. It defines the term "Philistine" as a collective definition applicable to all the groups of the Sea Peoples who were settled in Canaan. The first chapter examines the cultural history and various chronological information regarding the movement of the Sea Peoples. The Sherden or Sardin problem, set by the Egyptian sources, is also examined in this chapter. Thereafter the Peleset or Pelesti and the Tjekker of Ramesses III's times are discussed through the study of Egyptian and biblical sources. The archaeological aspects are also discussed (stratigraphic data, relative chronology, distribution of iron). Pottery and its typology are discussed in the third

chapter (she divides the overall ceramics evolution in three stages and holds that the Philistine ceramics seem to have copied the local variation of Mycenaean "close style"). The Philistine religion and funerary practices are also discussed. Much emphasis is laid on the fact that the Philistine culture appears at a time when important sociopolitical changes occur in the Levant, such as the collapse of the Hittite Empire, the end of the Canaanite city states, the decline of the Egyptian sovereignty, the arrival of the Israelite tribes and the appearance of the Sea Peoples on the Canaanite coast. The overlapping of the various cultural and ethnic elements in Canaan during the transition from Late Bronze to Early Iron Age illustrates the complexity of a period of dislocation and calls for the definition of the different cultural components. The sudden interruption of Sea trade - as a result of which Cypriot and Mycenaean vessels ceased to be imported in Canaan at that time - further highlights the unsettled state of affairs and it is in such a disturbed and feverishly changing cultural context that the Philistines added "new and eclectic elements" to the cultural and sociopolitical medley attested in the area.

The overall Philistine culture receives in this book qualitative treatment and is set off to advantage for the student of Palestinian archaeology.

- 17) Ollendorf A.L. "Archaeological implications of a Phytolith Study at Tel Migne (Ekron), Israel" in Journal of Field Archaeology, USA, vol. 14, no. 4 (1987) pp. 453-464.

Tel Migne (khirbet Muganna) is the largest site in Iron Age Israel and is identified as the biblical Ekron,

one of the cities of the Philistine Pentapolis. The premier objective was for the author to seek confirmation of the identification of Philistine "locus" of occupation of the area. Since only a few things regarding daily life were known, the second objective was to discover, by means of the analysis of the phytolith data, what plants were in use (the sediments samples were assembled from different contexts). The next step was to compare the plants with a collection of modern plants. The author and his research group finally explored the possibility of the use of a reed belonging to the "phragmites australis" type.

- 18) Shalev, S. "Redating the "Philistine Sword" at the British Museum: A case study in Typology and Technology" in Oxford Journal of Archaeology, vol. 7, no. 3, (1988), pp 303-31.

The famous sword which is one of the exhibits of the British Museum is the only known example of the armament of the Sea Peoples. Although the archaeological context where it was found is not known and its dating is purely typological, it is generally admitted that this sword is related to a "Shardana type" sword which was used by the Philistines too. In this case (in this work) archaeology deals again with the study of the technology and typology of objects. This "Shardana type" sword of Beth-Dagon is nothing else but a sword of local conception and production, in line with the Canaanite tradition of the Middle Bronze Age, which dates back to a thousand years before the appearance of the Sea Peoples in the history of Near East.

- 19) Mazar, A. Excavations at Tell Qasile Part Two, the Philistine Sanctuary; various finds, the Pottery,

Conclusions, Appendixes, Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1985). A summary of this work can also be found in BASOR 271 (1988), pp. 82-85

This volume is the second part of the final report of the excavations of the Philistine sanctuary of Tell Qasile. It mostly focuses on pottery issues. This work holds that Horon must be the deity which was worshipped in that shrine. The appendixes in this book are concerned with geological matters, wooden remnants, food left-overs and archaeozoology. This book is important for the knowledge of the Iron Age in Palestine.

- 20) Finkelstein, I. "The Emergence of the Monarchy in Israel: The Environmental and Socio-Economic Aspects" in Journal for the study of the Old Testament, no. 44, (1989), pp. 43-74.

The emergence of Israelite monarchy at the end of the 11th cent. was one of the most important developments of Palestinian history. The Archaeology examines, in this article, the different proposals which have been put forward for the interpretation of this development; the theory of Philistine pressure, the socio-political analysis, the various political models and their theories (put forward by Childe, Carneiro, Johnson, Oppenheimer), the application of these models to the Israelite monarchy and, finally, the archaeological data.

- 21.) Gittin, S. and Dothan T. "The Rise and Fall of Ekron of the Philistines: Recent Excavations at an Urban Border Site" BA, 50, no. 4 (1987), pp. 197-222.

Ekron is identified with Tel Migne (Khirbet el-Mugana). Excavations show that its history is longer than we held it to be. The site was already inhabited in the Chalcolithic era and later in the Bronze Age a Canaanite city-State was founded there. The arrival of the Philistines gave an impulse to a very important period of development which lasted through Iron Age I (two fortification stages, an enormous quantity of pottery, appearance of cultic objects in the kilns sector). The article goes on by saying that a decline of the state is observable in the early years of Iron II as well as a new beginning (of development) in Iron IIa, to be seen in the so-called "industrial zone" of the area, which has produced olive oil. The state is partly destroyed by Nabuchadnezzar at c. 603.

- 22) Kelm, G.L., Mazar A. "Excavating in Samson Country. Philistines and Israelites at Tel Batash" in Biblical Archaeology Review, 15, no. 1 (1989), pp. 36-49.

This article deals with the excavations at Iron Age Tel Batash (Biblical Timnah). Items thereby recorded include residences, sculptures, seals, pottery and an oil-press.

A P P E N D I X V

This appendix concerns a somewhat recently published letter from Ugarit which is the only one in the whole royal correspondence between the Kings of Ugarit, Alashiya and Hatti during the critical times of the raids of, most probably, Sea Peoples, that mentions one of those peoples by name. The people in question are the Sikels and the text is RS34:129, UF X, p. 85-6. In this letter which is addressed to the King of Ugarit the King of the Hittites demands, using a critical language, the return of a certain Lunadusu who had been taken captive by the "Sikels who live in ships". After the king has investigated the case of the territory of the Sikels, Lunadusu is to be returned to Ugarit.

The Sikels who live in ships (LU.MES. KUR.URU si-ka-la-
iu-u sa i-na muh-hi GIS. eleppati - written MA MES) is another version of the Shekelesh of the Egyptian texts. It is important that they are both associated with seafaring and also with a territorial term, KUR.URU Si-ki-la. This combination KUR.URU is a designation which is also to be found in conjunction with the name of Ugarit and other city states referred to in the texts. Lehmann, UFXI, pp. 481-494 dismisses KUR.URU as only a conventional term designating a people with some type of organization structure or unity. He envisages this text as the earliest evidence for the arrival of the Sea Peoples from the Adriatic, yet the text does not afford information in vindication of such a thesis. KUR.URU rather seems to serve as an indication that the Sikels were in possession of a territory perhaps within the major area under the jurisdiction of Ugarit. What is perhaps most important regarding the role of the Sikels, is that they seem to have been some kind of mercenaries in Ugaritic service, since the Hittite king appears to hold Ugarit responsible for their attitude and the return of Lunadusu. Indeed their case reminds one of the first letter from the "High Steward" of

Alashiya to Hammurabi of Ugarit, which might refer to the sea battle of Suppiluliumas II and so slightly predate the events of 1186. In this letter the "high Steward" of Alashiya complains to Hammurabi that it was his own men that committed what seems to be an attacking offence against Alashiya. It looks as though some subjects of the King of Ugarit had taken to buccaneering activities on their own account or that there is no connexion between the offending men from Ugarit and the "enemy" referred to in the letter. If the raiding subjects of Ugarit were some sort of mercenaries recruited from the ranks of the "enemy" (Sea Peoples in all probability) it is only natural to envisage them as defecting at some stage and acting against their former allies. As for KUR.URU, it seems that it is most likely to be a territorial designation for the land of a city state which seems to have been near Ugarit or perhaps elsewhere (possibly Asia Minor).

A P P E N D I X VI

CONCLUSIONS

This treatise has dealt with an era that has presented scholars with one of the most vexing problems in Mediterranean prehistory, namely the identification and international role of the Philistines, a target which was pursued in this work through the survey of their connexions with Aegean civilisations.

In the first chapter we presented the main aspects of the two most important Aegean civilisations, the Minoan and the Mycenaean. We saw that the Minoan civilisation and, more specifically, its Bronze Age, came into being through what might have been refugee movements from Egypt and Palestine. Middle Minoan times witnessed the erection of the great palaces at Knossos, Phaestos, Mallia and probably Zakro, while a remarkable cultural progress typifies that period too. The Late Minoan times are characterised, among other things, by the severe catastrophic action of the Thera volcano which paved the way for the Mycenaeans to storm into the island and take over. After a period of Mycenaean rule at Knossos, the palace there was destroyed by what seems was part of the manifestation of the clash between Mycenaeans and local elements. The overseas connexions of the Minoans in LM times seem to be kept at a lower key than in previous periods, owing to the Mycenaean interception and occupation of the island. However, LM Crete entertains relations with Egypt, Syria, the Aegean islands, the Greek Mainland, Cyprus and the Lipari islands. There are also a number of other areas in the Aegean, the Levant and Anatolia which are credited by the literary sources to have had Minoan connexions.

The artistic aspect of Minoan culture is to be seen in such fields as architecture, frescoes, pottery, figurines

ornamental weaponry, gold and silver plate, stone vases, jewellery and seals. It is divided in two periods, that of the purely Minoan proficiency in arts and that of the Mycenaean impact on them after c. 1450 (time of Mycenaean occupation of Knossos).

The second part of the 1st chapter offered an account of the Mycenaean civilisation. The Mycenaeans have been identified as the Greek-speaking Indo-Europeans of Mainland Greece during Late Bronze (Late Helladic) times (c. 1600-1050 BC) owing to the decipherment of Linear B script and its identification as Greek. They are considered to have been present in the Greek Mainland at least from the beginning of Middle Helladic times (c.2000 BC). The pottery that typifies the MH inhabitants of Greece comes in two styles, the Grey Minyan pottery and a matt-painted ware with unknown affinities. The landmarks of Mycenaean era are provided by the Shaft Graves, the Tholos Tombs, the era of the Mycenaean Empire (c.1400-1200), the Mycenaean occupation of Knossos, the war with Troy and the two series of destruction which afflicted Mycenaean centres (c.1200 and c.1150), customarily attributed to invaders, which brought about the end of the Mycenaean era. The network of Mycenaean connexions included central and southern Aegean, Miletus, south and west Italy, Sicily, the Levant, Cyprus, Egypt, Albania, former Yugoslavia, Asia Minor, Syria and the Ionian Islands. The main traits of Mycenaean culture have been shown to be the Shaft Graves, the Tholos tombs, the "megaron", the "cyclopean" fortifications of the palaces and the Linear B script, while minor but unmistakable features of this culture include pottery (mainly the "pattern", the "pictorial", the "close" and the "Granary" styles), the terracotta figurines, the ornamental daggers, the gold and silver plate, the relief beads, the seals and the chamber tombs. The overall Mycenaean proficiency in arts should be divided into the period when

Minoan influence is abundant and that which is free of that influence and exhibits pure Mycenaean tendencies.

The second chapter examines the appearance and evolution of Philistine culture in Palestine. The Philistine immigration to the Levant seems to have been the result of either or both of the two Illyrian people - induced axes of movement (Eastern Balkans - Asia Minor - Cyprus - Syria and further south and/or Western Balkans - Greece - Crete - Asia Minor - Cyprus and further south) which culminated in the attack of those immigrants (by then known, from the Ramessidic inscriptions, as "Sea Peoples") against Egypt. This treatise has tried to show that the possibility of the Philistines (or of the biggest number of them) having been involved in the Greece - Aegean islands - Cyprus - Egypt axis of movement appears stronger than the possibility of them being involved in the other axis, although a dual involvement of them in both axes with an eventual set up of a league with the rest of the Sea Peoples in Amuru, is by no means unlikely. Whatever the case, the Philistines and the rest of the Sea Peoples appear, after their defeat by Ramesses III, to have been settled as garrison troops in Palestine whereupon the long-lasting conflict with the Israelites for the appropriation of Canaan begins. Archaeological evidence at Tell el Farah and Deir-Alla shows that the Philistines were originally settled there some time at the early stages of the 12th cent. After their harsh clash with the Israelites and their having entered a period of decadence the Philistines suffered conquests by Egyptians, Assyrians and Babylonians until they lost their historical identity and were assimilated into the major semitic milieu.

In the third chapter the conventional archaeological and literary evidence of the Philistines was presented and showed this people's culture to be a composite one, with strong

Canaanite and Aegean elements. The Aegean aspect of their culture imitates Mycenaean trends in arts and, though superseded by the Canaanite one in certain occasions, it betrays the alien, overseas influence which was natural, after all, to be gradually supplanted by local Canaanite cultural traditions, granted that this civilisation evolved on Canaanite soil and was exposed to a lot more local influence than any other. Philistine pottery seems to have sprung from the Cypriot variation of Myc. III clb, while clay figurines, ritual vases and a type of rock-cut chamber tomb in Tell-Farah point to Aegean influences and may, perhaps, be singled out of the rest of the Philistine aspects of material culture as those with the most pronounced Aegean characteristics. Regarding the literary evidence, the biblical narratives outline a picture of a tribe with overseas (Caphtor) connexions, yet Egyptian beginnings (Casluhim). Much depends on the clarification of the ethnic identity of the Caphtorim, the Avvim, the Cherethites and the Casluhim, peoples, that is, with whom the Philistines seem to have been connected in one way or another. The Ramessidic records afford a rather vague picture of the Philistines, certainly considering them as coming from overseas, yet without separating them from the other Sea Peoples with whom the Philistines seem to share a trans-Mediterranean origin. The Hittite and Ugaritic documents do not speak of Philistines as such - only a letter from Ugarit mentions one of the Sea-Peoples by name, the Shekelesh - yet it is very likely that the "enemy" referred to in those archives must be the Sea Peoples. The Hittite King, being an ally of the King of Ugarit, calls for the latter's help and when the King of Ugarit goes to the Hittite front he leaves his country stranded. In both theaters of operations, things turn out gloomy for Hatti and Ugarit and the latter's King is forced to return, only to experience the final fatal attack of the "enemy", so eloquently forecast and discussed in the royal

correspondence between the Kings of Alashiya and Ugarit. The Keftiu representations of Thotmes' times underline the Aegean profile of that people and intensify the connexion of Keftiu with Crete. The main schools of thought on the Philistines appear to wrestle with the problem of identification of Keftiu. The old theory holding this area to be Cilicia in Asia Minor seems to give way to its opposing one, considering Crete as the likeliest candidate for Kaftor "whence came the Philistines".

Finally, in the last chapter, the thesis sets out evidence on the Philistine question from so far not-scrutinised sources in the form of later Greek traditions Josephus' and Manetho's texts and biblical quotations. From the scrutiny of the relevant sources it appears that there seems to be a possibility of a rather strong connexion between the Philistines and Late Bronze Age peoples of Aegean extraction, and, more particularly, Mycenaeans, Minoans and Dorians. The traditions, if put together and harmonized, converge towards the concept of a political and social unrest - ridden Aegean in post Trojan War times, characterised by hectic tribal mobility to be seen in the numerous cases of migratory movements of Aegean peoples or in the cases of heroes or groups being driven off their naval course during their return from the Trojan war, and ending up in Eastern Mediterranean areas. This dissertation, as well as holding on to the well-known view of Mycenaean-Minoan connexion or even affinity of the Philistines also propounds the view that the careful study of the Greek traditions as well as the biblical and the Josephus' and Manethos' texts point or hint at a Dorian connexion of the Philistines; this is one of the two main and original contributions of this treatise to modern scholarly research, the other being the suggestion that the route of the Aegean tribes to the Levant on their way to, eventually, Egypt and to becoming "Sea Peoples" was an

island-hopping Anatolian coasts-hugging one involving the Greek Mainland, Crete, the Cyclades, the Dodecanese, Cyprus and Egypt or, alternatively and less frequently, Crete, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Egypt.

Finally, the overall Aegean connexions of the Philistines can be detected, as this treatise suggests, in the following aspects: a) Migratory movements from the Aegean to the Levant b) ethnic affinities discernible in various figures or/and groups' pedigrees c) common aspects of material civilisation d) study and juxtaposition of names, habits and various concepts and attitudes attributable to the people concerned. To round off, it is hoped that the information and overall approach of this work will serve as a strong stimulus for future investigation in the Philistines and their Aegean connexions.

