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PREFACE

The present monograph on ethnicity in Mediterranean protohistory may well be regarded as the main and final result of the project on the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples as set up by Wim van Binsbergen as academic supervisor and worked out by Fred Woudhuizen who, in the process, earned himself a PhD from the Erasmus University Rotterdam (2006). In the course of the supervision, Wim van Binsbergen had already drafted his views on the theory and method of ethnicity in the Mediterranean Bronze Age, as a complement to the supervisory discussions and the available published literature; after the completion of the dissertation, he found that he also had specific things to contribute on the details of Sea Peoples ethnicity. We decided to join forces and produce a manuscript which combines the desired market edition of Fred Woudhuizen’s dissertation with a fully worked out version of Wim van Binsbergen’s ideas on the topic.

It will soon be clear to the reader that the two authors differ considerably in their view on the matter, largely as a result of their different background and disciplinary allegiance. Thus Wim van Binsbergen (Parts I and III) – apart from providing an elaborate theoretical framework –, as a historicising anthropologist is focusing on long-term processes and cultural features, whereas Fred Woudhuizen (Part II) as of origin a historian is more occupied with the reconstruction (however difficult, in the protohistorical context) of the petty historical incidents. But however much the two authors may differ in detail and in overall disciplinary orientation, in the end they offer the reader a balanced synthesis, co-authored by both of them (Part IV), in which their respective views turn out to be complementary rather than diametrically opposed, and in which also a further methodological and linguistic vindication is offered for the more controversial points contained in the present book.

Notwithstanding the serious divergences in opinion, what the two authors have in common – and what sustained their close and enthusiastic co-operation over the years – is their uncompromising effort to turn data from the margins of prehistory, which effectively means from protohistory, into history. In this manner they flatter themselves to have retrieved knowledge of otherwise long forgotten episodes of human civilization, more specifically, in this particular case, the eastern and central Mediterranean in the Bronze Age.

The authors’ thanks are due to the editors of BAR / British Archaeological Reports, David Davison and Gerry Brisch, for their patience and unflagging support of the project, which in the end turned out to be much more time-consuming than originally planned.
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PART I. ETHNICITY IN MEDITERRANEAN PROTOHISTORY

EXPLORATIONS IN THEORY AND METHOD


BY WIM M.J. VAN BINSBERGEN
To my brother Peter, my first scholarly role model

Tell-tale signs of long-range connections: The newly opened tomb of Tutankhamun (1341-1323 BCE), revealing numerous parts of spoked-wheel chariots (at the time a relatively new technology in Egypt, invented c. 2000 BCE in Kazakhstan), and leopard-skin motifs (e.g. on the stools – centre – and on the animal figurines);
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CHAPTER 1. INTERDISCIPLINARY CO-ORDINATES,
METHODODOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL ORIENTATION,
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, AND SUMMARY, FOR PARTS I
AND III

At the beginning of this study, I wish to situate my work in the intermeshing disciplinary commitments that have made up my academic work since the 1960s; briefly define my overall methodological and theoretical perspective; and acknowledge my indebtedness to a considerable number of people and institutions without which it would never have come into being.

1.1. Interdisciplinary co-ordinates and acknowledgements for Parts I and III

In several respects, this is the work of a Mediterraneanist-manqué.

Douwe Jongmans, with the assistance of Klaas van der Veen, competently and passionately introduced me to Mediterranean anthropology, and (with the assistance of Marielou Creyghton and Pieter van Dijk) intensively supervised my first anthropological and historiographical research (on popular religion in North-western Tunisia), 1967-68, under the aegis of the Department of Anthropology and Development Sociology, Amsterdam University. My debt to these colleagues is hardly smaller than that to the Musée des Arts et Traditions populaires, Tunis, and to the villagers of Sidi Mḥammad and Mayziya. It is these villagers’ hospitality and trust which made this fieldwork a crucial reference point for everything I was to undertake as an anthropologist, historian and intercultural philosopher throughout my career. Jeremy Boissevain supervised (1968-71) the academic work I wrote on the basis of this fieldwork, and, as a Mediterraneanist, was largely responsible, in the end, for me not becoming one, but an Africanist instead. André Köbben, the leading Dutch Africanist anthropologist of the mid-1950s to early 1970s, was my main teacher of social-science method and theory, and this book (in its confidence that modern anthropology, as a social science, offers insightful models of socio-political organisation often superior to what alternatives circulate among historians, archaeologists and linguists) owes more than meets the eye to the intellectual seed he sowed; yet much of what I attempt to do in the present study would be anathema to this role model of my intellectual youth (I still vividly remember the utter contempt and ridicule with which André Köbben lectured on such early-twentieth-century CE diffusionists as Elliot Smith and Perry, whereas their approach, however obsolete, theoretically barren, and one-sided, here yet appears in a more positive light). Wim Wertheim was my inspiring guide into Asia, socio-political history and scholarly political and ideological self-reflexivity, and thus a life-long inspiration. As my early teachers, Anton Reichling and Simon Dik laid the linguistic foundations, and R.A.M. Bergman the physical anthropological foundations, that made my excursions in the present book, however defective, not blind sallies into totally unknown territory. The Palestinian refugee Muhammad Suudi taught me principles of Arabic (1966-67), without which I would never have felt at home, as a researcher, on the southern shores of the Mediterranean. Half a decade earlier, my excellent teachers at the St Nicolaaslyceum, Amsterdam (Mssrs van Buren S.C.J., Bank, Hamann, and Huurdeman), taught me to read, and to love, classical Greek and Latin, and kindled my delight in the Homeric epics and in Ovid, which has proved an essential asset for the present study.

At the same time, however, this book is very much the work of a passionate Africanist, who even when temporarily turning his gaze to the northern, Mediterranean fringes of the African continent, cannot help pressing the emerging regional insights into service for the elucidation of major problems of long-range African pre- and protohistory. Without the present research, I would never have discovered the considerable evidence for Niger-Congo and other, now exclusively African, linguistic macrophylla in the Mediterranean realm; would not have realised the affinity between Ancient Greek and Bantu, in the linguistic field but also in the socio-political field; would not have critically assessed Stephen Oppenheimer’s Sunda theses (probably red herrings as far as the Ancient Mediterranean is concerned, yet valuable insights for the protohistory of sub-Saharan Africa); would not have insisted on the occurrence and significance of Flood myths of large parts of Africa, and many other significant African-Eurasian continuities in
the field of comparative mythology; would not have engaged in a lexical reconstruction of the proto-Bantu life world with its indications of a homeland in a well-watered temperate climatic zone – nor would I have felt the need for a detailed statistical assessment of Niger-Congo >Bantu as a possible reflex of *Borean hence as a specific sub-macrophyllum cognate to Eurasiatic and to the majority of other modern macrophylia of the world; and, to crown it all, I would never have found the inspiration nor the need to formulate the Pelasgian Hypothesis as a viable alternative for Martin Bernal’s Black Athena thesis, reversing his facile and seemingly politically-correct Afrocentrism for a more subtle appreciation of what sub-Saharan Africa, and Egypt, brought to the wider world and what they derived from it to begin with – especially from a belt of seething cultural innovation extending, in the Neolithic and the Early Bronze Age, from the fertile Sahara to China. Work on the present project since 2000 spawned and fertilised all these Africanist projects of mine now coming into fruition in the form of book manuscripts and articles, while this book’s final result in itself could not be attained without the additional theoretical, methodological and factual advances made in these Africanist projects.

As far as the Ancient Near East (including Egypt) and its connections with the Aegean and with Europe as a whole are concerned, my present argument seeks to bring to maturity many of the themes that I explored from 1996 onwards in the context of the collection I then published as a guest editor in TaAanta (Proceedings of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society), under the title Black Athena Ten Years After (now reprinted as Black Athena comes of age). I thank all contributors to that collection, and all participants in the preparatory 1996 conference, for their continued inspiration. I am indebted to my sometime PhD student Fred Woudhuizen, for sharing with me, in the first place, his exciting struggle to discover ‘the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples’, and, more in general, his vast knowledge of Mediterranean archaeology and linguistics.

Although I must take full responsibility for the sections that appear under my name, I am thankful to Fred Woudhuizen for making extensive and constructive criticism of my contributions, and for reading their proofs.

I am also indebted to Frans Wiggermann, for bringing up this topic at the beginning of Woudhuizen’s PhD trajectory, in 1998; and to him and the other members of the 1994-95 Working Group on Magic and Religion in the Ancient Near East, Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, Wassenaar, for offering a context in which my long-standing anthropological and historical interest in the modern Mediterranean could find a suitable addition from Assyriology and Hebrew Bible / Old Testament studies. I wish to thank my brother, Peter Broers, during many years the Hon. Secretary of the Netherlands Association for the Study of Hebrew, for introducing me, at a tender age, to scholarship in general, and more recently to the rudiments of Biblical Hebrew, through his didactic method Qol devarim, and through many specific discussions. It is fitting that my contributions to this book should be dedicated to him, in recognition of a great and life-long indebtedness.

Through the years, the African Studies Centre, Leiden, the Netherlands, has formed a context where my explorations at the fringe of African Studies have found a stimulating and supportive environment. I wish to thank my colleagues there, especially those in the Theme Groups on Globalisation, and on Agency in Africa. Some of them have graciously commented on earlier drafts of this study; others have contributed by driving home to me the counter-paradigmatic nature of this kind of work, and forcing me to face up to the consequences of such an intellectual stance. The first notes towards the present study were jotted down during plane flights and at airports between the Netherlands and Benin, and back, in January 2004; the bulk of the work was done during a sabbatical period at the end of the same year – although the need to get a much better grip on the comparative mythological implications of the few scraps of cultural evidence we have on the Sea Peoples (boat symbolism, aquatic bird symbolism, dress and headgear, mirror symmetry); in combination with the increasingly opening up opportunities of identifying a substantial, consensual ethnic basis for the Sea Peoples’ effective military exploits in the genetic, ethnographic and literary evidence for a Black Sea / Mediterranean, Pelasgian identity from the Neolithic onward; and the development of a long-range comparative perspective on the Biblical Flood and the figure of Noah (Hebrew Nū’âh or Akhilleus).1 delayed the finalisa-

---

1 In my primarily historical and ethnic contribution (Part I) I have avoided burdening the reader and myself with attempts at specialist philological transliteration – except where I specifically quote from specialist linguistic sources such as Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008. My extensive experience in scholarly writing on Arabic and African topics has convinced me that true consistency in transliteration is impossible to achieve unless at the pain of total illegibility. In the case of well-known Greek and Biblical names, which have become an integral part of today’s North Atlantic, Judaean–Graeco–Roman–Christian heritage, I am loath to introduce the element of estrangement associated with a formal, scholarly transliteration, and I will follow, instead, the standard anglicised transliteration – hence Noah and Achilles instead of Nū’âh and Akhilleus or Akhilleus. This will also allow me to make extensive
tion of my contribution by a few years – until a new and conclusive sabbatical period early 2011.

The Africanist context will be manifest throughout my argument, and often makes for interesting and illuminating perspectives, or so I like to think. This work is one instalment in a continuous effort, in which I have engaged since 1990, to explore the very great extent to which Africa has always, in the course of past millennia, been part of the wider world, contributing to the other two continents of the Old World as much as deriving from them. It is my firm belief that the results of this kind of long-range intercontinental and interdisciplinary research will contribute significantly to redressing the negative stereotypes that have surrounded Africa during the past few centuries, and will break down the boundaries of otherness within which Africans, and their descendants in the North Atlantic region, have been increasingly imprisoned, as a result of economic exploitation and intellectual condescension, on the part of inhabitants of the North Atlantic region.

Much of the theoretical and comparative inspiration for the present argument derives from my work as professor of ethnic studies in the Free University, Amsterdam, 1990-98; with gratitude I recall the stimulating exchanges with my colleagues and students in that connection.

Peripherally inspired by the work of the French-German Armenologist Joseph Karst, my approach to use of standard English translations of the two ancient texts that will serve as our case studies (the Homeric Achaean Catalogue of Ships, and the Biblical Table of Nations in Genesis 10). In the rendering of other names including Ancient Egyptian ones I will usually employ a common-sense transliteration that betrays my lack of philological pretensions. Names whose etymology plays a certain role in my argument may be rendered in more specialised transliteration the first time they occur, like Noah’s name here. When the precise orthography of Egyptian words is at stake, I may employ an Egyptian transcription font. Certain consonants are habitually underlined in Egyptian transliteration, a practice also followed in the present book. When quoting from the Tower of Babel etymological database, I usually stick to its Arial Unicode MS rendering of reconstructed linguistic forms. Only occasionally (and then mainly the first time a proper name appears in the text) will the original non-Latin (e.g. Chinese) script be used for the rendering of proper names – even though I am fully aware of the fact that the anti-hegemonic, non-Eurocentric stance that is advocated throughout my argument, would be better served by inclusion of the original scripts. My co-author Fred Woudhuizen has, in Parts II and IV, a more centrally philological argument, hence in the sections authored by him will apply different conventions on these points.

2 By a regrettable Eurocentrism implied in the common usage, I will designate the continents of Africa, Asia and Europe jointly as the Old World, and North and South America as the New World.

3 A reassessment of Joseph Karst’s (1931a, 1931c) work on Mediterranean ethnicity in protohistory was originally part of the pre-Mediterranean protohistory postulates, throughout this region, a five-tiered linguistico-ethnic system, where complex and protein identities, as well as regional linguistic, cultural and linguistic continuities, breed thorough hybridity, as a result but also as a precondition for incessant transregional maritime contacts. This is in fact a model of protoglobalisation, which owes a debt of intellectual inspiration and debate to my fellow members – especially Peter Geisler, Bonno Thoden van Velzen, Peter van der Veer, Peter Pels, Birgit Meyer, Rijk van Dijk, Arjun Appadurai, Partha Chatterjee, Seteney Shami, Jacqueline Bhabha, Ulf Hannerz and Cora Govers – of the WOTRO Programme on Globalization and the Construction of Communal Identities (1993-99), and of the associated International Network on Globalization.

A comparable inspiration I have derived, since 1998, from my work as professor of intercultural philosophy in the Philosophical Faculty, Erasmus University Rotterdam; the present argument contains many echoes of the discussions on interculturality, epistemology and the philosophy of historiography, conducted in that context. As a predominantly methodological and theoretical argument, with a fair input of empirical linguistic, archaeological, comparative mythological, and ethnographic, empirical data, I feel that the present study’s modest philosophical relevance lies particularly in the reflection on the following topics:

- the nature of proto- and prehistorical modes of thought and their specific substantive contents, which while setting the scene for a hermeneutical approach to the Sea Peoples’ world, and to our two preparatory case studies (the world of the Iliad and of Genesis 10), also constitutes a contribution to the transcontinental protohistory of thought in general, hence to the history of philosophy
- the meta-reflection on the nature of historical knowledge construction as a negotiation between enic (hermeneutic) and etic (objectifying analytical) approaches, and

sent argument, but has now been relegated to a separate publication (van Binsbergen 2011d), so as to retain a critical distance from the inspiring, but methodologically stylistically muddled, and largely obsolete, work of the Lotharingian, French / German specialist in Armenian languages; his work moreover is, inevitably, permeated with his time’s reliance on the concept of race, even though in his hands this led not to the usual adoration of the blond-and-blue-eyed somatype, but, refreshingly, to the celebration of a genetically, somatically and culturally hybrid ‘Mediterranean race’ (also cf. Sergi 1901).

4 Netherlands Foundation of Tropical Research, a division of the Netherlands Research Foundation NWO.
• the meta-reflection on the historian’s knowledge-political role as producing a narrative that explodes the myths of others, and at the same time lets the empirical evidence constrain, to the greatest extent possible (which is yet depressingly little), our own production and circulation of scholarly myths.

A critical epistemological perspective also opens up when I repeatedly discuss the geopolitical, Eurocentric and other paradigmatic ideological pitfalls in the context of the study of protohistory. There is a further, implied relevance for the history of philosophy: as an investigation into the processes that (according to the dominant view of the Sea Peoples Episode among specialists today) were decisive in putting an end to the Levant as the westernmost epicentre of cultural initiative in the Old World (where nearly three millennia of specialist proto-scientific thought preceded the Ionian Pre-Socratics even though the latter are alleged to be the founders of scientific rationality...). It appears to be the demise of the Hittite empire and the weakening of Ancient Egypt by the end of the Bronze Age, which caused the focus of cultural and intellectual initiative to shift even further westward, toward Greece, Carthage and Rome. The present study, therefore, addresses a crucial moment in global cultural history, as a precondition for the rise of the Western philosophical tradition. In fact, the philosophical content of this argument is considerably more extensive, and includes (Chapters 2 and 3) explorations into the foundations of the philosophy of history and of the social sciences, with practical methodological implications for the study of ethnicity in the Mediterranean Bronze Age.

The work thus reflects major critical topics in intercultural philosophy. My detailed analysis of the historical actors’ handling of ethnic and toponymic onomastica allows us more than a glimpse of ancient, and enduring, modes of thought, and helps us to understand what transformations and distortions are involved when, upon this material, we project our present-day scientific rationality. However, from the perspective of intercultural philosophy the main relevance of my argument is that its long-range perspective on world-wide continuities in space and time brings us to realise that cultural difference and ethno-cultural boundaries are, largely, the effect of transformative localisation working upon a surprisingly inert, i.e. constant, cultural heritage going back to the Upper Palaeolithic Old World, – a heritage whose core may well be deemed to have been common to Anatomically Modern Humans (today’s variety of humans, to which all present-day human populations belong), for 60,000 years (60 ka) or more, as part of the ‘Out of Africa’ cultural package.

1.2. Overall methodological and theoretical perspective for Parts I and III

This overview of my personal intellectual intinerary now allows me to characterise, in a few words, my methodological and theoretical orientation in the present study.

My argument situates itself at the interaction between a theoretical inspiration and several bodies of empirical data. From my extensive protohistorical work in North and South Central Africa, I derive an awareness of the crucial role a theoretically informed model may play in making the best of the typically defective data out of which protohistory is to be made. In the process, models must be used in a creative and flexible manner, yet if they are to lead to explanation, such models have to be applied explicitly, consistently, and with methodical rigour, – and they have to be applied to all available data, regardless of the specific disciplines that have produced and that manage these data in the first place. Hence protohistorical research is inherently interdisciplinary. Although protohistorical reconstruction on the basis of oral tradition has constituted a large part of my published work, I was initially trained as an anthropologist and development sociologist, and this has made me particularly conversant with two kinds of data that seldom play a central role in protohistorical reconstructions:

(a) ethnographic distributions through space and time,
(b) the inspiring light that intensively studied contemporary7 ethnographic situations may cast on even the distant past of a culture area.

Initially a specialist on North African Islam and African religion, in the 1970s-1980s my work on modes of production and precollonial state formation increasingly brought me to consider models and theories of ethnic identity, state formation and political conflict that have considerably informed the present argument. Over the past twenty

\[6 \text{ ka = kilo years, millennia; BP = Before Present; BCE, BC = Before the Common Era; } \]

\[7 \text{ The word ‘contemporary’ is ambiguous since it can mean: from our own present time, or from the period under study. Invariably, in my argument, I will use the word in the latter sense.} \]
years, this orientation of earlier decades was enriched with the long-range problematics emanating from my comparative and historical, increasingly transcontinental, study of African divination systems, games, myths, and other highly formal complexes of symbolic production. This forced me to subsequently apply such historised transcultural hermeneutics as I had acquired when studying religions not my own, and as I had further developed in the field of ethnicity, to narratives, sign systems, and their attending iconographies. My contributions to the Black Athena debate helped me to focus, once more, on the Mediterranean; to familiarise myself somewhat with the civilisation, language and script of Ancient Egypt; to critically review Egypt’s relevant connections with sub-Saharan Africa and with the Aegean; and to specifically tailor, for the Mediterranean and to its Late Bronze Age protohistory, the epistemology and the politics of transcultural knowledge construction which constitute (my particular brand of) intercultural philosophy. Meanwhile, with the help of additional reading in population genetics and in long-range linguistics (especially Sergei Starostin’s *Borean Hypothesis), I increasingly engaged in explorations into prehistory, in a bid to define the geographically most extensive, and the historically most remote, context of ‘knowability’ (cf. Renfrew 2000) for the transcontinental connections which my comparative work on formal cultural systems had brought to light. My leading concern in all this was to establish more solid empirical and theoretical grounds for what had increasingly come to dominate my approach to intercultural philosophy and ethnic studies: the hope (rather, the certainty, based on my own extensive and prolonged personal transcultural experiences in Africa and Asia) that behind the multiplicity of worldviews, logics, religions, aesthetics, definitions of the human person, and ethnic identities, the underlying fundamental unity of humankind could be established and, from a theoretical position looking back at the distant past, could be developed into an ethics of globalisation for today and tomorrow. In this way I have sought to contribute, as a prehistorian of philosophy, to the reconstruction of humankind’s oldest traceable forms of thought (for which myth and language are our richest sources of information). Specifically for this purpose I adopted, on the risky authority of others, such tools as Cann, Stoneking, & Wilson’s Out-of-Africa Hypothesis,8 Starostin’s *Borean Hypothesis, and Karst’s hypothetical five-tiered ethno-linguistic model for the Mediterranean Bronze Age. But finding these tools, inspiring and illuminating though they proved be, not quite sufficient to account for the rich texture and the manifest connections in the historical data at hand, I personally developed, as further background for the present argument, several additional comprehensive hypotheses:

1. The Aggregated Diachronic Model of Global Mythology,9 i.e. a systematic reconstruction of such embryonic mythemes (‘Narrative Complexes’) as were already present in Middle Palaeolithic cultural heritage (‘Pandora’s Box’) of Anatomically Modern Humans prior to their exodus out of Africa; the subsequent innovation and transformation of that heritage in the context of a series of specific ‘Contexts of Intensive Transformation and Innovation’ mainly on Asian soil, and the subsequent feed-back of the innovated and transformed product into sub-Saharan Africa in the context of the ‘Back-to-Africa’ movement (from c. 15 ka BP on), which geneticists10 have recently discovered.

2. The hypothesis11 according to which the Eurasian Upper Palaeolithic saw, in the consciousness of the contemporary historical actors, the succession of two cosmogonic schemes: first the horizontal Cosmogony of the Separation of Water and Land (implying a creator goddess as ‘Mother of the Primal Waters’, virginally producing her son and subsequent lover, the Land), then the Cosmogony of the Separation of Heaven and Earth. The latter persisted as the dominant world-view to the present time, and spread to the other continents, while from the Neolithic on this dualist scheme was revolutionised into a dialectical, triadic one, with the junior third member serving the reconnection, one way or another, of the traumatic Separation of Heaven and Earth on which the cosmic order had come to depend.

3. The Pelasgian Hypothesis,12 which identifies as a Neolithic and Early Bronze Age cultural seedbed (yielding dozens of specific cultural traits) the region between the fertile Sahara, the Northern shore of the Mediterranean, and Western Central Asia; throughout the Bronze Age this Primary Pelasgian realm gradually expanded, to finally ramify into all four directions by the Late Bronze Age according to a ‘cross-model’

8 Cann et al. 1987.
9 Van Binsbergen 2006a, 2006b.
12 Van Binsbergen 2011b; and the present volume, Chapter 28 and passim.
tion.
14 The nomenclature of linguistic macrophylla is inconsistent and
somewhat mystifying. Thus the name Khoisan is based on a com-
bination of two names, Khoi / Khoe and San, which identify two
Southern African groups, the former historically consisting of pas-
toralists, the latter of hunter-gatherers. However, the common ten-
dency among linguists is not to highlight this background by
hyphenating the two names, but by contracting them into Khoisan,
thus in a way reifying the linguistic unity argued to underlie these
groups despite very different modes of production. Although my
anthropological background would bring me to perceive Khoi and
San as different ethnic groups, I shall follow the common (though
not universal) linguistic usage. By the same token, it will be
Afroasiatic and not Afro-Asiatic, Eurasian and not Eur-Asiatic,
etc.; but the name Indo-European will stand, mainly because the
succession of three vowels would cause confusion without hy-
phenation.

1.3. Acknowledgements for Parts I and III continued

Working away from main-stream paradigms, a long-ranger
is often a lone ranger, with all the dangers of delusion and
idiocyrracy, of straying far from the discursive negotiation
of intersubjectivity that is the hallmark of scientific re-
search; and also with the risk of disciplinary and institu-
tional isolation not to say ostracism. The transdisciplinary
and counter-paradigmatic approach pursued in the present
argument and in my other current work has come at a cer-
tain price. On the other hand, however, I have been fortu-
nate that my path has crossed that of others pioneering a
similar approach and sharing their vast knowledge: Martin
Bernal, whose insistence on Aegean / Egyptian continuities
was a revelation a quarter of a century ago, and although
meanwhile far more impressive continuities in space and
time have opened up in the light of which his own, simplis-
tic pioneering position is less and less tenable, my contri-
butions to this book would never have been written without
his initial inspiration; John Argyle, whose daring compara-
tive linguistic explorations13 (however the work of a dile-
tante, like my own) have greatly helped me to formulat
my own ideas concerning the place of the Niger-Congo and
Khoisan14 linguistic families among the world’s languages;

bringing a transformed Pelasgian heritage to Central
and Western Europe (the Celtic world), Northern
Europe (the Uralic and Germanic world), the Eurasian
Steppe with extensions into East, South and South
East Asia, and to the Niger-Congo > Bantu speaking
world of sub-Saharan Africa.

‘Data reduction and interpretation through hermeneuetic
pattern recognition in an explicit and theoretically-
informed, yet speculative, long-range historical perspec-
tive’ covers much of this cargo, and that is a characterisa-
tion that may appeal to the archaeologist, even though
much of the data and the methods I employ here would at
first glance not be readily recognised as archaeological.
Thus I bring to the study of ethnicity in the Late Bronze
Age the methodology of a long-range spatial and temporal
scope that does not usually inform the analysis of the Sea
Peoples, the Homeric poems and Genesis, but of whose
illuminating effectiveness the reader will be the judge.
of the editorial board of the journal *Quest: An African Journal of Philosophy* / *Revue Africaine de Philosophie*, has gone out of her way to facilitate my scholarly work by bibliographical and other library services, which I appreciate all the more since I have seldom been able to remunerate her financially.

While I am most grateful for these various essential contributions, the responsibility for the views presented in the present argument is entirely mine.

I am not sure, even, whether I can bear that responsibility. This work, inevitably, intrudes on a considerable number of disciplines for which I have no specialist training. I have done my very best to limit the inevitable damage and blunders that such a situation invites, yet every specialist will find enough cause here for distress, infuriation, or worse still, ridicule. I can only repeat here the disclaimers that I have planted at strategic places throughout the text. My principal aim, with this study, is theoretical and methodological – which is where I do have some claim to authority. However, I found I could not make a theoretical and methodological argument up in the air, but needed to consider the available empirical material in great detail in order to bring out crucial theoretical and methodological implications. I am an old hand at the protohistorical handiwork, including the analysis of oral tradition and myth, when it comes to illiterate or semi-illiterate societies of South Central Africa and peasant North Africa in the second millennium CE. Over the past decade, I have entered into current debates on Ancient Mesopotamian magic, ancient boardgames, divination, astronomy, writing systems, myths, other formal and symbolic systems, and on the merits of the *Black Athena* thesis. Against this background I just could not bring myself to entirely refrain from taking sides in the interpretation of the controversial Sea Peoples material, and in the preparatory case studies (the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, and the Biblical Table of Nations) on which I have sought to sharpen our theoretical and methodological tools for the study of ethnicity in Mediterranean protohistory. However, my readers will have understood my intentions if they heed – or, even better, dismiss on explicitly argued and empirically supported grounds – my theoretical and methodological admonitions, while taking my empirical pronouncements with a pince of salt.

### 1.4. Summary of Parts I and III

The use of ethnonyms, and even the reliance on an argument that situates cultural continuity or difference primarily in equivalence or distinction between ethnonyms as representing significant socio-cultural complexes, is one of the most conspicuous features of cultural, historical and proto-historical studies of the Ancient Near East, Ancient Egypt, and the Aegean. The ethnic model, variants of which were already utilised by the Ancient writers from Herodotus to Caesar and Tacitus, is so much taken for granted that we scarcely realise that behind this model there is a, *far from self-evident*, theory of how societies and cultures are organised, individually and in mutual contact, what keeps them together and what makes them change. Ethnicity is one of the inveterate blind spots of Ancient Studies. This is all the more remarkable, because the vast majority of authors contributing to these studies, both in Antiquity and in Modern times, have been citizens of complex states and have not identified themselves, primarily, in ethnic terms but in terms of social and professional class, universalist ideals, religion, and citizenship.

In the present project, Fred Woudhuizen and I have sought (each in our own specialist way and without necessarily agreeing with each other) to challenge the uncomfortable lack of sophistication surrounding the use of ethnicity and ethnonyms in Ancient Studies. Woudhuizen, as an ancient historian and linguist, has tackled the protohistory of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples, bringing to bear upon his strongly empirical analysis all relevant documentary, linguistic and archaeological material that more than a century of Sea Peoples studies have considered, and adding much material that hitherto has not been drawn into the orbit of such studies; his analyses, which have earned him a PhD from the Erasmus University Rotterdam, constitutes Parts II of the present volume. My individual contribution to the project, making up Part I and Part III, has been to concentrate on the theoretical and methodological sides of studies in Ancient ethnicity (Part I) – although, in the process, I found that it was impossible to make the necessary theoretical and methodological points without extensive and critical discussions of the empirical data, and even without taking sides in major or minor debates concerning specific empirical issues (Part III). But however much Woudhuizen and I may differ in detail and in overall disciplinary orientation, I am extremely pleased that in the end we can offer the reader a balanced synthesis, co-authored by both of us (Part IV), in which our respective views turn out to be complementary rather than diametrically opposed, and in which also a further methodological and linguistic vindication is offered of the more controversial points in our book.

In this way, the present study reflects and combines...
my long-standing interest in a number of topics:15

- the theory and methodology of ethnicity (the designation of my chair at the Free University, Amsterdam, 1990-98);
- ethnic processes in the Mediterranean region in the Bronze Age as well as today;
- the struggle to critically explore the conditions for valid intercultural knowledge production across spatial and temporal boundaries;
- long-range research into world cultural history, in an attempt to assess whether there are any fundamental transcontinental currents of cultural history, and whether it is possible to make out any fundamental and universal features of human thought, symbolisation, religion, and culture;
- and finally (as the most long-standing, constant, and intense of these personal passions): the theory and methodology of protohistory, i.e. creating history where previously no history yet existed, notably at the borderline of prehistory, where documentary sources are absent – and at the borderline of myth.

My approach to ethnicity in protohistory is not simply invented from first principles as a purely theoretical exercise, but has been developed in the course of four decades in the concrete research practice of investigating

1. oral history in a practically illiterate peasant society in North Africa (18-20th century CE)16 and
2. formalised oral traditions as confronted with fragmented individual oral historical accounts in South Central Africa (16th-20th century CE).17

Meanwhile, the specific argument that follows would never have been written unless as a by-product of my supervising Fred Woudhuizen’s PhD project on ‘The ethnicity of the Sea Peoples’ (cf. Woudhuizen 2006a). It was in response to Woudhuizen’s historically and archaeologically rich draft texts that I realised the need for an application, to the Late Bronze Mediterranean, of such conceptual, theoretical and methodological sophistication as the study of ethnicity has reached with regard to both present-day Africa and the multicultural societies of the North Atlantic region today. I have been greatly inspired by Woudhuizen’s data and arguments, and I have gratefully acknowledged so at various points in my text. My present study therefore is an attempt to make, fully written out on paper, the translation from Africa-inspired ethnic studies to Mediterranean Bronze Age studies.

This study has the following structure:

Mainly on the basis of my Africa-based expertise in ethnic studies, I shall first briefly present, in Chapter 2, an abstract general discussion of ethnicity within the scope of social science research. This will introduce some of the important concepts and theoretical insights I will appeal to for an approach to ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age. We will see that ethnicity is much more than the classification of human individuals in terms of an ethnic label; *ethnicity is in the first place a way of creating a wide-ranging, supra-local socially (politically, religiously, economically) structured space as a context for social, economic, political, military and ritual interaction over a relatively vast area.

To highlight these aspects I shall repeatedly stress how ethnicity has at least three constituent aspects: *ethnicity is

1. a system of mental classification into a finite number of specific, named ethnic groups,
2. a socio-political structure, notably a device to turn the overall, neutral geographical space into an ethnically structured space accommodating a number of concrete named groups in interaction, and
3. a process, involving both the interaction of these ethnic groups over time, and the dynamics (emergence, maturation, change, decline, replacement, etc.) of the overall ethnic space they constitute together; if this process we distinguish at least two important movements:
   a. ethogenesis,18 amounting to the redefinition (through changes in the classification system) of the overall ethnic space so as to accommodate a new ethnic group (often with repercussions for the other groups already recognised within that space)
   b. ethnicisation, as the internal process of ‘taking consciousness’ through which members of an essentially non-ethnic category in the socio-economic-political space redefine their

---

15 For bibliographical details, in general, and specifically on my output on these topics, see the cumulative bibliography at the end of this book.
17 Especially van Binsbergen 1992a, and further 1987b, 2008b, 2010c.
identity increasingly in ethnic terms (usually under the influence of a local elite).

In Chapter 3 I shall approach ethnicity in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age as a specific research problem, entering into a discussion of the specific empirical, methodological and theoretical problems that arise in this situation of protohistory (characterised by a paucity of empirical data) and suggesting possible solutions. Here I will especially address historians’ well-known and understandable reluctance vis-à-vis systematic theorising.

Before we then proceed to two case studies that will highlight the specific methodological and theoretical difficulties of the study of ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, Chapter 4 presents, as prolegomena, themes in long-range linguistics. Here we will familiarise ourselves with the *Borean Hypothesis which reconstructs hypothetical parent forms of the lexica of most of today’s languages, in the form of an Upper-Palaeolithic hypothetical language to which the name *Borean has been given. Against this background we will try to identify, in addition to the obvious and recognised languages available on the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean scene, uninvited guests so far largely overlooked by scholarship: mainly Niger-Congo-Bantu, a language macrophyllum now exclusively spoken in sub-Saharan Africa, whilst in the Egyptian context we shall highlight indications of the Uralic phylum (and of the shamanism that is often associated with that phylum). Finally we will draw these elements together in the formulation of a hypothetical five-tiered linguistico-ethnic model for the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, according to which that region by that time was already subject to conditions of proto-globalisation, under which linguistically homogeneous populations were not the rule, but every area typically displayed a plurality of language phyla, in an hierarchical socio-political arrangement where the dominant strata predominantly spoke Indo-European and / or Afroasiatic (linguistically relative newcomers), whereas the subaltern strata spoke older scions on the *Borean tree, often relegated to the status of submerged substrate languages.

In Chapters 5 and 6 I shall seek to apply at least some of the principles outlined in the preceding chapters, to two well-known texts from the Early to Middle Iron Age which scholars have since long recognised as important pointers to ethnic structures in the Late Bronze Age: the Homeric Achaean Catalogue of Ships, and the Biblical Table of Nations in Genesis 10. A close reading of these texts specifically with the aim of identifying aspects of ethnic classification, structure and process will reveal some hitherto unnoticed ethnic traits; will help us to test out some of the methodological and theoretical notions developed more in general in the earlier chapters; will remind us of the fact that often the protohistorical situations we seek to interpret in ethnic terms, are in great measure merely mythical; and will help us prepare for what Fred Woudhuizen and I have chosen as our pièce de resistance: the question of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples.

The two case studies have a parallel composition. They first situate the document under study (Achaean Catalogue of Ships, and Table of Nations) in its specific historical context, seek to understand its place in the longer work (the Iliad, the Bible) in which the document is incorporated, and try to understand the document as a text, against a necessarily brief overview of the abundantly available scholarly literature. Both documents turn out to have, indeed, a strongly mythical and cosmological orientation which we first need to appreciate before the document can be used as a historical source on Late Bronze Age ethnicity. I address the question of how to use Early to Middle Iron Age data in a bid to reconstruct ethnicity in the, immediately preceding, Late Bronze Age. The treatment of both documents concentrates on the question of the identification of the onomastic material (ethnonyms and toponyms) they contain. For the Achaean Catalogue of Ships we arrive at a coherent view, which adds a few new minor points to the study of ethnicity and political organisation in the Homeric Age. I also discuss the relevance, for Sea Peoples Studies, of the Homeric images of the Greeks before Troy. For the Table of Nations however, the problems of onomastic identification turn out to be truly dramatic and, to judge by the extensive literature reviewed, virtually insurmountable, even if an extensive discussion of the genealogical format of the Table of Nations equips us with additional analytical tools.

Some of the underlying questions that inform an attempt at ethnic analysis of the Table of Nations turn out to be:

- must the document be considered the work of the integrating conscious mind of Early to Middle Bronze Age Syro-Palestinian actors, and be interpreted in terms of their own specific historical knowledge and experience, or can it be considered an accidental sediment of very disparate and heterogeneous onomastic, ethnohistorical and especially mythical fragments from all over the Ancient World, with possibly
a much deeper time scale?
• may we expect pure, monolithic linguisto-ethnic
groups, or is hybridity the standard format of ethnicity
already by the Late Bronze Age – as it is today under
globalisation? is such hybridisation a sign of proto-
globalisation, already in the Late Bronze Age?

After these more general discussions in Part I, Fred Woud-
huizen will take the floor in Part II with his deta-
iled, state-
of-the-art specific discussion of the ethnicity of the Sea
Peoples, on the basis of the few available primary docu-
ments and of the vast secondary literature.

When he has presented his well-argued and well-
documented case, the theoretical and methodological view-
points developed in Part I will allow us to raise one funda-
mental ethnicity-related question that remained unanswered
in his otherwise impressive synthesis: how was it possible
that the Sea Peoples, coming from such geographically
dispersed origins, could identify sufficiently with one an-
other to form a formidable force capable of dealing a le-
thal blow to the Hittite empire and of permanently
weakening the Egyptian state? Woudhuizen’s answer is in
terms of a shared Indo-European identity and of Urnfield
expansion pressure, engendering an adventurous motiva-
tion to go and plunder the wealth of very distant kingdoms.
In Part III I question this solution, and I offer an alternative
interpretation of the Sea Peoples data, in terms of relatively
peripheral and archaic segmentary groups seeking to
counter, by a combined eastbound and westbound move-
ment, encroachment by the nearby states of Hatti and
Egypt. From this alternative perspective the Urnfield and
Indo-European factors appear less than exhaustive and
conclusive as an explanation for ethnic identification
among the Sea Peoples (also in view of the non-Indo-
European linguistic elements I will identify in Chapter 4).

Thus, I propose to attribute such ethnic identification to the
Sea Peoples’ conscious affirmation of an extended circum-
Mediterranean identity that, I submit, had existed since at
least the Early Bronze Age – an ethnic awareness for which
‘Pelasgian’ is proposed as a suitable analytical term, even
though the polysemy of this term throughout the nearly
three millennia of its use inevitably invites confusion and
misunderstanding. From what few scraps of factual in-
formation we have concerning the Sea Peoples’ culture and
worldview, I argue that these manifest a Pelasgian orienta-
tion. I make this claim against the background of a very
extensive list of Pelasgian traits. My Extended Pelasgian
Hypothesis sees the Pelasgian cultural substrate (after de-
veloping in the Neolithic and Early Bronze Ages in a re-
gion extending from the fertile Sahara to Central Asia)
expand in all four directions – Central and Western
Europe; Northern Europe; the Eurasian steppe and beyond;
and sub-Saharan Africa. This process effectively carried
Pelasgian traits across half the globe, using the technolo-
gies of chariot and seafaring as main vehicles of spread.
My discussion makes it possible to reconsider alter natives
for the eastbound movement as propelled by the Urnfield
expansion, which modern scholarship (cf. Kimmig 1964)
has favoured in the last few decades, and which also
Woudhuizen adopts as his main explanatory model.

After this extensive second opinion, we two co-
authors will come back in Part IV in order to clinch this
book’s argument, anticipating major criticism especially
from the linguistic side, and demonstrating that our appar-
ently so divergent views are yet complementary and even
largely overlapping.

19 Cf. van Binsbergen 2011b.
CHAPTER 2. ETHNICITY WITHIN THE SCOPE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

2.1. Zooming in on ethnicity by means of a case study: Current views concerning ethnicity in Africa

Considering that 20th-century CE sub-Saharan Africa has been a major growth point for the study of ethnicity, and that here my greatest empirical experience with ethnicity lies, let us begin our exploration by looking at aspects of ethnicity in the African continent.\(^{20}\) This will acquaint us with a number of salient aspects of ethnicity. It will also alert us to the fact that much of the structure and dynamics of ethnicity depends on the framing of local communities into wider organisational settings, be they states, regional cultic networks, or commercial networks. In a very different way (which the distinction between emic and etic – to be discussed below – will help us appreciate), also scrutiny under the specialist analytical gaze of modern scholars may be a case of such framing, which results in (the scholarly perception of) ethnicity. The last point is not without interest, for one of the discoveries of recent African ethnicity research has been that the ethnic distinctions non-African scholars imposed in their early 20th-century CE pioneering analyses of African ethnicity, were often subsequently appropriated as objective truth by African actors, and became a basis for their modern ethnic distinctions, which have played such an important, and often destructive, role in postcolonial African states. It is as if the Gauls, from a state of fuzzy ethnic boundaries and fluid ethnic distinctions, subsequently adopted the clear-cut ethnic distinctions employed by Julius Caesar in his *De bello gallico*, – and for all we know that is what actually happened when the Gauls of (modern) France and Belgium were increasingly incorporated in Roman imperial state structures.

One of the most inveterate popular misconceptions concerning Africa today is the idea that the population of that continent would, in the first place, have to be classified into a large number of ‘tribes’; each tribe would be characterised by its own ‘culture’, art, language, somatic features, political organisation, including ‘tribal chief’, and its own ‘tribal homeland’ or ‘tribal territory’; the latter would cause the African continent to appear as a large patchwork quilt of adjacent, non-overlapping, fixed ‘tribal areas’, between which ‘tribal wars’ are postulated to go back to remote antiquity, and to be incessantly revived in modern African politics.

The tribal model for Africa has sprung from a number of sources, most of which have to be situated not in Africa itself but in the North Atlantic region:

- the preference of European-dominated colonial governments (such as ruled most of Africa from the end of the 19th-century to c. 1960 CE) for clear-cut administrative divisions each coinciding with mutually exclusive territories in the landscape;
- the preference of such colonial governments for a model of inexpensive indirect administration, that assumed the existence, in the landscape, of local, indigenous administrative territories coinciding with colonial territorial divisions;
- European views concerning the ‘natural’ coincidence of ‘culture’, language, territory and the state – the Early Modern, particularly Romantic (c. 1800 CE) origin of modern nation formation in Europe;
- the rationalising need, not only among colonial governments but also among industrial enterprises, among the Christian missions, and gradually also among Africans, to unequivocally label the multitude of cultural and linguistic identities at the local, regional and national level;
- while the above factors led to the crystallisation of clear-cut classifications of the African population – mainly on a territorial basis – , also African leaders (traditional chiefs involved in indirect rule, early converts to world religions, African entrepreneurs, and first generation modern intellectuals and politicians) seized the opportunity to transform these new labels and classifications into self-conscious units (‘tribes’,

---

in the absence of other social and religious distinctions, these ethnic classifications, and the local and regional contradictions they suggested by virtue of their being bound to a territory, became the incentives for group formation and for competition in national politics;

• formal politics along ethnic and regional lines also led to networks of patronage along which the elites, in exchange for political support, could offer specific advantages to their ethnic and regional followers; the latter had all the more need for these advantages given the increasing failure of the formal institutions of the post-colonial state;

• even so, ethnicity in contemporary Africa has retained a situational nature: some situations are far more ethnically marked than others; an increasing number of situations are, by the people involved in them, primarily constructed in terms of identities other than ethnic, notably in terms of religion, gender, class, professional group, the national state. Also, it frequently occurs that people in situations that are emphatically ethnically marked (such as the situation of migrants in the ethnically heterogeneous context of the modern city) operate alternately, and with success, in more than one ethnic identity. Or, at a given moment in life, one sheds the ethnic identity that one has had from birth – exchanging this identity for another ethnic identity that has greater prestige or for one that represents a local majority. Finally, people may opt for a different, more universalist kind of identity (for example Muslim, Christian-Pentecostal, or socialist) in the light of which the particularist ethnic identity becomes irrelevant. Here, a central thesis of contemporary ethnicity research meets the post-structuralist philosophy of Derrida: the idea of the self as forming a unity onto its own, is only a myth21 – albeit the most powerful myth of the North Atlantic region in the Modern era (i.e. the period that succeeded the Renaissance), and albeit that myth, rather than being separable from the truth, is an integral aspect of how we live our human truths – a point that will come back repeatedly in the present study.22

This brings us to the question as to the existence, and the specific nature, of pre-colonial identities in Africa. In pre-colonial Africa a great diversity of languages, cultural customs, modes of production, systems of domination, and somatic traits could be discerned. In local contexts, identities (in the sense of named categories for specific sets of humans) may have been defined along each of these cross-cutting dimensions. These categories often had a perspectival nature: one could identify ethnic otherness in terms of ‘the northerners’, ‘the forest dwellers’, ‘those who seek to dissociate from the state’, depending on the opposite position occupied by the speaker herself or himself. Many ethnonyms are rooted in the freezing and fossilisation of such perspectival designations, e.g. in Zambia, South Central Africa, we find, as examples of this phenomenon: Mbwela (‘Northerners’), Nkoya (‘forest dwellers’),23 Kwanga (‘tired, notably of being oppressed by the – precolonial, regional, African – state’), and Tonga (‘shunning control by the – again, precolonial – state’; Tonga is also the designation24 of four other groups in South Central Africa that, apparently, lack all recent historical connections with one another). But in other cases, ethnic designations have derived from localised clans, which (because localised

---

22 Van Binsbergen 2009b.
23 The Nkoya people of Zambia, South Central Africa, have formed the focus of my ethnicity research since the early 1970s (van Binsbergen 1981, 1992a, and numerous articles cited there). Speaking a Central Bantu language, the Nkoya (numbering c. 100,000) emerged (under the effect of the ethnic dynamics of the colonial state as mediated through the indirect rule of Barotseland, with local Christian intellectuals as major ethnic brokers) as a comprehensive self-affirming ethnic identity in the first half of the 20th century CE, as a bundling of a great many smaller identities each characterised by their own name, clan affiliation, areas of residence, royal and chiefly leaders, dialectical variations, historical traditions, etc. (van Binsbergen 1992a, 2003a). According to local tradition, Nkoya was initially the name of a forested area near the Zambezi / Kabompo watershed, then the name of a royal dynasty associated with that area and owning the Mutondo royal title, and finally the name of the extended ethnic group as a whole. The Nkoya knew male initiation rites including male genital mutilation, but these were discontinued as a result of a complex process spanning several centuries (van Binsbergen 1992a, 1993), in the course of which Nkoya distinctiveness was asserted vis-à-vis the kingship and culture of the Lunda under the royal title of Mwati Yamvo / Mwaat Yaamv in Southern Congo (whose overlordship used to be acknowledged across many hundred of kilometres into what is today Zambia and Angola), and vis-à-vis the cluster of circumcising peoples in that region: Chokwe, Luvale, Mbunda and Luchazi.
clans – even though often exogamous in themselves – tend to more or less coincide with the spatial core area of a local gene pool) furthered the essentialist suggestion of a fixed, biologically anchored identity acquired by descent from a common ancestor. Pre-colonial states, such as occurred in Africa during the last few millennia, always displayed a plurality of languages, cultural orientations, modes of production, and somatic features among their subjects, and, besides the statal forms of domination, they tended to loosely incorporate such local forms of authority (e.g. authority within kin groups, territorial groups, cults, guilds, gender organisations) as constituted organisational alternatives to statehood. Not so much control over demarcated territories, but control over people (by means of courts of law, exclusive rights of the natural environment, and by the extraction of tribute in the form of produce and people), was the central theme of these states. Therefore pre-colonial boundaries in Africa must be understood in terms of areas of (often overlapping) spheres of influence, and not as sheer lines on a map, like in modern North Atlantic bureaucratic rationality.

The nomenclature of colonial and post-colonial identities in Africa derived to a limited extent from the extensive and complex repertoire of pre-colonial identities. However, it would be totally erroneous to claim (as African ethnic ideologues, many Western journalists, and a declining number of researchers have done) that twentieth-century ethnicity in the African continent has merely been a continuation of pre-colonial patterns of group formation and group conflict. It has been amply demonstrated that many colonial and post-colonial ethnic designations in Africa have no roots in the pre-colonial past, being only very recent. The characteristics of twentieth-century ethnicity in Africa as listed above hardly obtained before the colonial state had established itself with its bureaucratic, mutually exclusive unequivocally defined and named territorial divisions.

In the contemporary ideological construction of Africa by intellectuals, politicians and in the media both in Africa and in the North Atlantic region, as well as in the daily societal practice of many Africans themselves, ethnicity is to a large extent conceived as holistic and as bundled: language, cultural customs, modes of production, somatic features, territory, political leadership are then assumed to form one integrated package, a whole, in such a way that a person’s ethnic identity (that person’s ‘culture’) is claimed to determine the total mode of social being of that person. Such bundling is a direct reproduction of the bureaucratic rationality that forms the framework for the political in post-modern North Atlantic society. The various cultural orientations involved in a local situation are hierarchically ordered in such a way that one cultural orientation is privileged above the others, is essentialised, and is considered to be eminently constitutive for the person or group involved. Thus ‘culture’ functions primarily as a performative boundary marker. By contrast, it was characteristic of pre-colonial identities that the various dimensions along which they could be defined remained detached from one another, were not mutually integrated, and as a result no single identity was capable of developing into a claim of totality that was publicly mediated. Instead, the various identities within a region criss-crossed in a gaudy confusion, now reinforcing now eclipsing one another.

All this allows us to understand what is perhaps the most striking contradiction of African ethnicity today: the fact that in their own personal vision of social life, many Africans have come to consider as an unshakeable reality the very tribal model that professional Africanists are rejecting today. Politicians can appeal to this reified and distorted, mainly ideological, image of social reality in order to lend an ethnic dimension to economic and political contradictions, thus essentialising these contradictions.

Given these historical and political backgrounds, it is difficult to offer a useful definition of ethnicity in the African context and beyond. However, the following is an attempt in that direction. In the course of this study our definition of ethnicity will gradually somewhat evolve from the following basic position which however remains valid: Ethnicity, then, is the totality of processes through which people, by reference to the ethnic groups which they distinguish, structure the neutral geographical space in which they are involved so as to transform it into an ethnic space.

And, to address another misunderstanding in the study of ethnicity, we must appreciate that ethnic studies focus on ethnicity as a comprehensive phenomenon that structures the social space at large, and that it is this process of structuring, rather than the resulting classification in ethnic groups, that constitutes our prime research subject in the study of ethnicity. Considering the many uncertainties of emic and etic classification (see below, Section 2.5); the

25 Below, in Section 2.8, I shall very selectively explore the question whether today’s ethnic conflicts could have a time depth of centuries, even millennia.

manipulation of boundaries, and of membership; the ideological processes by which historical actors politicate and transform the package (of language, culture, somatic traits, name) out of which their ethnicity consists; – considering all of this, ethnic groups are too elusive to serve, in themselves, as units of analysis in ethnic studies. Ethnicity is not an effect of the existence of ethnic groups; on the contrary, it is ethnicity which produces ethnic groups, in a historical political process that will be slightly or massively different for every ethnic group.  

A recognised ethnic identity is not ‘a culture’, and a national or international political system is not in the first place an ‘arena of cultures’; it only becomes just that, if the local actors (and notably their politico-ideological elite, in control of local communication media) have publicly declared that culture is to be the major bone of contention within the domestic political space – an exceptional situation prevailing in the North Atlantic postmodern society of the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century CE, but otherwise, comparatively, very far from standard. An ethnic group is nothing but an explicitly named set of people within a societal system dealing with the classification and ranking of groups. Within the social space (for example a society, a nation-state), the social actors distinguish, collectively, a limited number of such named sets of people, – always more than just one, and always intersubjectively, i.e. beyond one person’s, even beyond one group’s, individual idiosyncrasy. Membership of such a set is publicly considered to be acquired by birth and hence is in principle immutable, but in fact the acquisition of a new ethnic identity later in life is a common occurrence. Invariably more than one identity is invested in one person at the same time. Within each set of people, the members identify with one another, and are identified by others, on the grounds of a number of historically determined and historically mutable, specific ethnic boundary markers. Such ethnic markers include the ethnic name itself, and moreover language, forms of leadership, modes of production, other distinctive cultural features, occasionally also somatic features. The ethnic groups that exist and that are recognised within one country, or more in general within one extended ethnic space, often differ from each other only with respect to a very limited selection of cultural features functioning as boundary markers.

Concretely this may mean the following (but, as we shall see, only under one very specific type of ethnicity which, although widespread, is by no means the only type). From a Nkoya village in the heartland of Zambia one may trek (partly on the trail of the great explorer, missionary and physician, David Livingstone, in the middle of the 19th century CE) three to five hundred kilometres towards the north, east, west and south, without noticing remarkable changes in the cultural, man-made landscape (the villages, the royal courts, the fields, the pastures, the fishing grounds, the hunting groups, shrines), and also without conspicuous changes in the local people’s ideas about kinship, law, witchcraft, kingship, birth, maturation and death, the world, life after death, God. On one’s journey one yet traverses a large number of so-called ‘tribal areas’ and ‘language areas’ such as used to be distinguished in the colonial period – one crosses from one ethnicity’s area into the next, and into another, and yet another; however, one largely remains with the same, widespread, South Central African overall culture. Most local inhabitants will turn out to be multilingual. The languages of the Bantu phylum appear similar, as do Dutch, German and Swedish as branches of the Germanic subphylum of the Indo-European phylum. It will only be after a few hundred kilometres that one can no longer effectively communicate using the Nkoya language even to non-Nkoya speakers – but this will only be the case long after one has effectively left behind the recognised ‘Nkoya tribal area’ as defined in colonial times.

In this and similar cases, in western Zambia as elsewhere in Africa, the great regional continuity of cultural orientations is an empirical fact; in a process of essentialisation, ethnonyms and other aspects of official classification have imposed deceptive boundaries upon this continuity – more or less in the way one cuts out nicely shaped biscuits with a biscuit mould, from a large flattened slab of dough that has virtually the same constitution throughout. Yet in other periods and regions, ethnicity may take a very different shape.

2.2. Ethnicity: General aspects

From this initial acquaintance with the empirical study of ethnicity in one part of the world, Africa, let us now try to arrive at more systematic and general pronouncements concerning ethnicity.

A perennial and probably universal aspect of the hu-
Such nomenclature is often vague, but it brings about a dramatic structuring within the wider, initially neutral and amorphous, geographical space which various communities share with one another. On the logical plane, projecting onto another grouping a distinct name which does not apply to one’s own grouping, denies that other grouping the possibility of differing only gradually, scarcely, or not at all, from one’s own. Through the expression in words which make up the name, the opposition between groupings is rendered absolute, and is in principle subjected to the relentlessness of the dendrogram, of binary opposition which plays such an important role in human thought. By calling the other category ‘A’, one’s own category in any case identifies as ‘not-A’. The latter is usually also given a name, ‘B’, by those which it has called ‘A’; and third parties within the social space can either adopt this nomenclature or replace it by one of their own invention. With the naming, a classification system is imposed. Obviously, it is impossible for a fully-fledged ethnic system to comprise only one ethnic group – plurality of subsets is a precondition for ethnicity. Still, many social groups throughout the world and throughout the centuries have called themselves – as in a rudimentary ethnic system comprising only one group – by a name that means, in their own original language, ‘people, human beings’. But, as we shall see, such a semantically transparent name often continued to cling to that group once it was incorporated in a wider ethnic space encompassing other such groups.

Every society comprises, among other features, a large number of named sets of people: for instance local communities, kin groupings, production groupings, parts of an administrative apparatus, cults, voluntary associations, etc. We would call such a named set of people an ‘ethnic group’ only if certain additional characteristics are present:

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

As defined above, ‘ethnicity’, then, is the totality of processes through which people, by reference to the ethnic groups which they distinguish, are actively structuring the neutral geographical space in which they are involved so as to transform it into an ethnic space.

The nature of the additional characteristics listed is gradual and not absolute. They constitute a particular package that may vary from situation to situation, and this contributes to the essentially kaleidoscopic character that ethnicity, whenever and wherever, tends to present to the outside academic observer. The formulation and application of that package is in the hands of the members of a society, in the first place; the social scientist and the historian try to identify these socially constructed characteristics through empirical research. In order to be socially effective and enduring, the relationships which people enter into with one another, have to be not only systematic but also flexible and contradictory. The social process creates boundaries, but it does so not only in order to separate but also in order to articulate difference as a precondition for cutting across such boundaries. For instance, most ethnic groups include a minority of members who have gained their membership not at birth but only later in life, in a context of marriage, migration, language acquisition, adoption, the assumption of a new identity and a new lifestyle, religious conversion, etc. Ethnic spaces turn out to be differently structured at different places in the world and in different periods of human history; there is a great variation.

---

29 Cf. Genesis 2:19. Modern philosophy has advanced considerably in regard of philosophers’ perennial fascination with definitions and names, especially proper names: from J.S. Mill’s (1843 / 1950) denotative or descriptivist theory of names to the descriptivist approaches of Russell, Frege and Searle, more recently supported by Donnellan and Kripke (cf. Wettstein 1999; Stalmaker 1999; Stanley 1999).

30 Fardon 1987 however denies the existence of universals in the study of ethnicity, stressing the kaleidoscopic nature of the phenomenon, as we did in the preceding section.


32 Many inhabitants of the North Atlantic region can explain that Inuit (which is what ‘Eskimos’ call themselves) means ‘people’, which is a good example of such an incorporation process.

33 Cf. Salamone 1975; Schultz 1984. In Zambia, the few migrants from Kaoma rural district who are socially successful in the country’s distant towns sometimes seek to pose as members of a more prestigious ethnic group: Bemba or Lozi. Such posing (‘passing’) is a much studied aspect of ethnic and race relations in North America; e.g. Drake & Cayton 1962: 159 f.
in the way in which people demarcate ethnic groups through distinctive cultural attributes (for instance, language) and through historical consciousness.\textsuperscript{34} Therefore, it would be \textit{prima facie} wrong to take any particular package of language, immaterial culture, material culture, and religion as an automatic, self-evident indicator of ethnicity, whenever and wherever.

Ethnic groups may often have a subjective historical consciousness, but what they always have is an objective history open to academic enquiry, from their emergence to their disappearance.\textsuperscript{35} and this history cannot be understood unless as part of the history of the genesis, and subsequent changes and decline, of the encompassing ethnic space as a whole (which involves several ethnic groups in their changing interrelations).

It is analytically useful to make a clear distinction, by reference to strategically chosen characteristics, between ethnic groups and other ascriptive groupings such as castes and classes, but we must not expect that such analytically-imposed distinctions stand in a clear-cut one-to-one relationship to analogous distinctions in the consciousness of the social actors themselves. For the distinction between such ethnic groups as exist, side by side, within the same social space is not limited to the logic of nomenclature (which in principle, on the logical plane, merely entails co-ordinative relationships as between equal items, without hierarchy), but tends to assume a \textit{subordinative} nature. Within the overarching ethnic space, the participants do not just distinguish one ethnic group from another, they also tend to evaluate one ethnic group as higher or lower than another on a hierarchical scale of prestige, purity, religious orthodoxy, closeness to a somatic ideal, higher degree of autochthony, the extent of the control they exercise of the state, etc. In other words, the social actors tend to articulate political, economic and ritual inequalities between ethnic groups in a way which the analyst would rather associate with classes and castes.\textsuperscript{36} In practice, the relation between any two ethnic groups will never be totally equal, and an element of subordination and hierarchy usually creeps in from the subjective point of view of the historical actors themselves.

Ethnic nomenclature (the process of how historical actors name themselves and others in concrete settings) is a complex social process which deserves specific research in its own right. This is a position which anthropology has only adopted in recent decades. Until the middle of the twentieth century CE, anthropology used ethnic names as labels marking apparently self-evident units of culture and social organisation: within the units thus demarcated, one defined one’s research, but the demarcation in itself was hardly problematised. As the twentieth century CE proceeded, the card-index boxes and book shelves of the maturing anthropological science filled with an overwhelming production of ethnographic material which almost invariably was presented by reference to an ethnic name intended to identify a ‘people’ or, especially, a ‘tribe’. Projecting the organisational and logico-definitional features of its own internal organisation onto the African social landscape, the colonial states produced a nomenclatural fragmentation of social spaces in the colonised areas, with the implied assumption that each of the units so identified (as so-called ‘tribes’, ‘peoples’, ‘nations’, ‘ethnic groups’) possessed absolute boundedness and internal integration, characteristics which allegedly were inescapably underpinned by century-old tradition. Such was the unit of analysis within which individual careers of classic anthropologists could come to fruition, each researcher intimately tied to her or his ‘own’ ‘tribe’.

It was only in the 1960s that the concept of ‘tribe’ was subjected to profound criticism\textsuperscript{37} as an ethnocentric and reified designation of an ethnic group \textit{within the global ethnic space but outside the politically dominant civilisation} – in other words in the so-called ‘Third World’.

Since then much has been written about the rise and fall of the concept of tribe especially in Africa, in the context of political and economic processes in this continent since the end of the nineteenth century.

In a nutshell this body of literature revolves on:\textsuperscript{38}

- \textit{colonisation} (in the course of which the state created administrative units which were presented as ‘tribes’ –

\textsuperscript{34} As stressed by, \textit{e.g.}, Horowitz 1975, 1985; Fardon 1987; Prunier 1989; cf. Vansina 1985.


\textsuperscript{36} A famous example of such ambiguity is Leach 1953, dealing with two contrasting and complementary, in fact contradictory, modes of identity in Highland Burma (now Union of Myanmar). Further \textit{cf.} Barth 1969a, 1969b; Doornbos 1978; Mitchell 1956, 1974; Lemarchand 1983.

\textsuperscript{37} Gutkind 1970; Helm 1968; Godelier 1973, especially pp. 93-131: ‘Le concept de tribu: Crise d’un concept ou crise des fondements empiriques de l’anthropologie?’.

\textsuperscript{38} In addition to the Africanist literature already indicated, seminal anthropological approaches to ethnicity and identity include Barth 1969a, 1969b; Cohen, A., 1969, 1974, 1996; Cohen, R., 1978; van den Berghe 1983; Banks 1996; Govers & Vermeulen 1997; Bailey, F.G., 1996; Eriksen 1991; Proschan 1997; Schein 1975; Appadurai 1991.
an optique which the Africans soon took over in their own perception and political action);\footnote{E.g. Ranger 1982; Vail 1989a, 1989b.}

- the implantation of the capitalist mode of production by means of cash crops and migrant labour (which eroded local systems of production, reproduction and signification, and at the same time produced regional inequalities which soon came to be interpreted in terms of an ethnic idiom);

- urbanisation (in the course of which a plurality of ethnic groups, and their members, engaged in urban relationships which, through a process of selective transformation, referred less and less to the traditional culture of their respective region of origin);\footnote{Among many studies I only cite the classic Mitchell 1956.}

- decolonisation (the rise of a nationalism which exposed ethnic fragmentation as a product of manipulation by the state); and, notwithstanding the previous point,

- the ethnic overtones of political mobilisation and networks of patronage in the post-colonial states;\footnote{For an excellent analysis, see Bayart 1989, especially pp. 65-86: ‘Le théâtre d’ombres de l’ethnicité’.}

- the vicissitudes of military and one-party regimes which often presented themselves as the solution for ethnically-based domestic political problems; and, in the last few decades,

- the rise of democratic alternatives which despite their emphasis on constitutional universalism would yet seem to offer new opportunities for ethnic mobilisation.\footnote{Cf. Buigenhuijs 1992; Buigenhuijs & Rijnierse 1993; Salazar et al. 2002; vanBinsbergen 1986, 1995b.}

A common term in the context of ethnicity and ethnicity research is that of ‘identity’.\footnote{\textit{Cf.} Buigenhuijs 1992; Buigenhuijs & Rijnierse 1993; Salazar et al. 2002; van Binsbergen 1986, 1995b.} We may define ‘identity’ as the socially constructed perception of the self as conceived in terms of group membership. Everybody plays various different roles in various groupings, and therefore everybody has a plurality of identities, as acquired in the course of one’s socialisation to becoming a member of these groupings. In the scope of this study I can only deal very cursorily with the vast, and rapidly growing, literature on identity.

The rise of an ethnic group (in other words, \textit{ethnogenesis}) consists in the modification of the overall ethnic space, so as to include, in addition to the ethnic groups already distinguished there (and often in replacement of some of the latter), a \textit{new} ethnic category. For the installation of a new ethnic group in the overall ethnic space it is necessary that \textit{other} ethnic groups more or less recognise the new ethnic group and adjust their own socio-political classification and action accordingly.

Often such recognition is the crowning result of a more internal process among the specific set of social actors (inhabitants of a region, speakers of a language, members of a profession, producers pursuing a particular mode of production, etc.): a project of identity formation, aimed at the launching of a new identity and at the installation of that identity in the personalities of the ethnic group’s prospective or intended members – after which the wider world is to be persuaded that this new identity has to be recognised and admitted to the overall ethnic space. The internal project of \textit{ethnicisation}, which is often initiated and monitored by a local elite, tends to present the \textit{ethnic} identity (as expressed by a group name) as the ultimate, all-encompassing and most deeply anchored identity, which is then supposed to incorporate all other identities which one has acquired as a member of the local society.

Not by accident, such an ethnic identity reminds us strongly of the concept of \textit{culture} in classic anthropology, often defined as: \footnote{\textit{E.g.}} ‘everything one acquires as a member of a society’. However, the local culture need not in the least be limited, in place and time, to a specific named ethnic group; often it has a much wider distribution.\footnote{We have already seen how, in the savanna belt of South Central Africa, scores of ethnic groups have been distinguished, in the discourse and writings of colonial civil servants, missionaries, industrialist, and local people, one next to the other since the nineteenth century CE; yet, despite this apparent fragmentation, if one were to concentrate on the distribution of patterns of production, reproduction and signification (in short, on \textit{culture}) one would perceive such an underlying unity, throughout South Central Africa, that there is every reason to speak of one large cultural area in}

\cite{tyle1871}
this part of the world.\textsuperscript{46} Within this far-reaching regional continuity, specific ethnic groups have distinguished themselves. Among those sharing in this regional cultural continuity, self-perception will be anchored in ethnic names (which scarcely define effective cultural boundaries under this particular type of ethnicity), and moreover, rather diffusely, in references to kin groups and local groups at various levels of inclusiveness and scale, in a landscape, a language, a poly-ethnic state system, etc. So in South Central Africa the ethnic space takes a particular form, which we could characterise as:

\textit{1. nominal ethnicity within a continuous cultural space, i.e. an essential cultural continuity which, at the levels of state administration and local people’s own conscious ethnic distinctions, is broken up into a number of nominally distinguished specific ethnic groups, each ethnic group deliberately set apart from the other by specific attributes or boundary markers which constitute separate entities without destroying the overall cultural continuity. Such boundary markers tend to include:}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. a distinct ethnic name
\item b. a distinct home territory (although many members of the ethnic group in question may have taken up residence, temporarily or permanently, outside that home)
\item c. associated with the home territory, a distinct language or dialect (although many will be at least bilingual)
\item d. distinct traditional authorities (kings, chiefs, headmen)
\item e. distinct details of custom, especially in the sphere of expressive, ceremonial and ritual production (music, dance, puberty rites, other life crisis ritual, patterns of scarification, hairstyle and clothing, royal ritual) which may be taken as distinguishing ethnic markers\textsuperscript{47} between adjacent ethnic group even though in fact the spatial distribu-
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{46} Such continuity was especially stressed by Vansina (1966) in his pioneering work on the history of the southern savanna in Africa; de Craemer \textit{et al.} 1976, Janzen 1992, and van Binsbergen 1981, were attempts to explore the religious dimension of this continuity.

\textsuperscript{47} C\textit{f. van Binsbergen: 1993, and 1992a: ch. 1.}

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Cf. Dumont 1982; Karpat 1982; Kucukcan n.d.; Quataert 2000; Shaw 1977.}
5. The colonial plural societies of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the 19th and 20th centuries CE, which **mutatis mutandis** are rather similar to the millet system, but whose top-ranking ethnic groups in terms of political power (the European civil servants, agricultural settlers and industrialists, with their secondary entourage from the distant metropolitan colonising country) in fact function as an example of the conquest model (3).

6. The melting-pot model of the urban society of North America in the late 19th and the 20th centuries CE, where very heterogeneous sets of numerous first-generation immigrants rapidly shed much of the cultural specificity of their society of origin, although it is true to say that the descendants of many of these immigrants group, rather than disappearing in the great melting pot of Americanness, continue to stand out with a distinct ethnic identity, to inform especially the more private, intimate aspects of life (family, reproduction, diet, recreation, religion); such a partial ethnic identity in the melting pot is maintained by a selection of language and custom and a tendency to endogamy.

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

More models could easily be added to this list. Each of these models displays a different mix, a different package of cultural, linguistic and ritual elements, with differing degrees of explicit ethnic consciousness at the level of the social actors involved. It is therefore important to repeat that the specific composition of the distinctive package in a concrete ethnic situation in space and time, can never be taken for granted and needs to be established by empirical research in each individual case.49

The various models listed above also display different degrees of subordination and inequality, although it would be true to say that, in none of these models, the ethnic classification is purely a logical, horizontal distinction as between equals. Differences in power; in length of local residence; in ritual status vis-à-vis the local land; in degree of accordance or of deviation as compared to some somatic ideal or ideal of ritual or genetic / somatic purity50 represented by the ethnic group with the greatest power; in professional prestige; – all these factors tend to make ethnicity in fact into a structure for the articulation of inequality between local groups.

Ethnicisation comprises the process of taking consciousness (which for many people means *being actively persuaded* to take consciousness, by ethnic leaders and brokers), in the course of which a plurality of diffuse, accumulated, often cross-cutting, identities are brought under the denominator of one ethnic identity, which is then

---

49 *Contra* Woudhuizen (this volume) who in his analysis of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples yet tends to advocate a particular, more or less constant and fixed package of cultural, linguistic and archaeological features as markers of ethnicity.

50 *Cf.* Hoetink 1967: an apt example of ritual purity is the superiority of Brahmans under Hinduism, allowed to give food to all members of society whereas they can only receive food from fellow-Brahmans.
marked by a specific name. The ethnic name is constructed so as to mark a cultural boundary, and therefore pre-existing culture (or at least a selection of items from that culture) has to be partly reconstructed so as to fall within that boundary and to offer distinctive cultural attributes. In the bundling and reshuffling of identities the personal experience of self and of the world is transformed: the discovery of ‘I am a – Greek, Jew, Phoenician, Egyptian, Sardinian, Etruscan, Nkoya, etc.’ offers a structuring perspective in which power, wealth, and command over the ideological mechanisms of society, or by contrast – as the case may be – powerlessness, deprivation and estrangement such as one has experienced earlier on in all kinds of situations, suddenly appear in a new light: as if the collective historical experience suddenly makes sense of the specific experience one shares with one’s fellow-members of the ethnic group, and as if there is reason for hope that these negative experiences will be turned into their opposites through ethnic self-presentation. Viewed in this way, ethnicity has many parallels with other ideological phenomena such as nationalism, xenophobia, racialism, the awakening of class consciousness, religious conversion and religious innovation.

Ethnicisation displays a remarkable dialectics which I am inclined to consider as its engine. On the one hand, the binary opposition through nomenclature offers a logical structure, which is further ossified through ascription and which presents itself as unconditional, bounded, inescapable and timeless; on the other hand, the actual procesual realisation (through the construction of a culture coinciding with the group boundary, through distinctive cultural symbols, through a shared historical consciousness, through that part of membership which is non-ascriptive but acquired) means flexibility, choice, constructedness and recent change. Both, entirely contradictory, aspects of ethnicisation belong to ethnicity; we may even maintain that the essence of ethnicity is the suspension of the contradiction between the ideology of essentialised, immutable primordiality, on the one hand, and the actual social practice of manipulation, choice, process and change, on the other hand. This dialectics renders ethnicity particularly suitable for the negotiation, in processes of social change, between social contexts that are each of a fundamentally different structure, and particularly between the local level on the one hand, and the state and wider economic structures on the other.

The ethnic name and the principle of ascription produce the image of a bounded set of people. Therefore integration between the local level and the national and international level, which poses such bewildering problems of structural discontinuity, under conditions of ethnicisation no longer remains a challenge which the vulnerable individual must cope with on his own, using his inadequate individual skills and strictly local perceptions; on the contrary, such integration becomes the object of group action, and as such can extend all the way to the regional, national, even international level. Internally, a set of people is restructured so as to become an ethnic group by designing a cultural package which, in its own right (i.e. not just because of its symbolising more abstract power relations such as exist between the local level and the more global levels) constitutes a major stake in the negotiations between the emerging ethnic group and the outside world. One takes a distance from rival ethnic groups at the local and regional scene through a strategic emphasis on cultural and linguistic elements; and on a more comprehensive, national level of socio-political organisation one competes for the state’s political and economic prizes (primarily: the exercise of power and the benefit of government expenditure) by means of the state’s recognition of the ethnically constructed cultural package.

In this process, the ethnic group more and more articulates itself as just that. But although all persons involved in this process are in principle equals as carriers of the same ethnic identity, yet the contact with the outside world, precisely if it shapes up successfully, causes new inequalities not only between groups, but also within the group. The mediation takes place via political, economic and ideological leaders: by and large, brokers who

---

51 This is very much the Nkoya situation in Zambia, summarised in a footnote above.
53 Ascription is anthropologist’s term for a situation where an individual’s particular placement within the overall system of social (including: ethnic) classification derives from a birth right.
54 Early researchers of ethnic phenomena in Africa have been persuaded, precisely by this aspect, to analyze ethnicity in terms of primordial identity – a view exploded by Doornbos 1972.
55 Marxist anthropology analyses the mediation between such fundamentally structured social sectors in terms of the articulation, or linking, of modes of production: cf. Geschiere 1982; van Binsbergen & Geschiere 1985; and references cited there. Although the study of ethnicity demonstrates (as does, indeed, the study of religion) that the symbolic domain cannot be regarded as clearly subordinate to production and reproduction, the articulation of modes of production perspective remains inspiring in the field of ethnic studies – cf. van Binsbergen 1985c.
(through greater knowledge, better education, more experience, better political contacts and more material means of sustaining such contacts) are in a position to exploit the opportunities offered by the outside world. These brokers develop ethnic leadership to an instrument of power formation which works in two directions:

1. externally, towards the outside world, where these leaders claim resources in exchange for an effective ordering of the local domain;  
2. and, internally, within the ethnic group itself, where the brokers trade off a limited share of their outside spoils, against internal authority, prestige and control at the local level.

The leaders negotiate both with the outside world and with their potential followers in the local society. In any situation of the local community being increasingly incorporated in the outside world, that which constitutes one’s own local identity risks becoming problematic; ethnic leaders, therefore, have the task of regulating the locals’ contact with the outside world, both facilitating and imposing constraints on such contacts. In the process, asserting the ‘traditional’, ‘authentic’ (but in fact newly reconstructed) culture appears as an important task and as a source of power for the brokers. Ethnic associations, publications treating ethnic history and customs, and such manifestations as festivals, under the direction of ethnic brokers, constitute widespread and time-honoured strategies in this process.

The insistence on ethnic identity produces powerful ideological claims, which, in today’s globalised world where an ideology of tolerant multiculturality has become politically correct, tends to be met more with sympathy than with analytical understanding. These claims may not be recognised as the recent, strategic, and rhetorical product that they are, but may be idealised (in the first place by the ethnic brokers themselves) as, for instance, ‘...the courageous expressions, worthy of our deepest respect, of an inescapable identity which these people have acquired in childhood socialisation and which takes a desperate stand against the encroachments of the outside world’... In today’s thinking about intercontinental development cooperation a fair place has been reserved for the sympathetic thought condescending accommodation of such claims and for the associated cultural expressions, often of a folkloristic nature (i.e. consisting of – partly re-invented – selections of decontextualised, formalised and ceremonialis ed expressive culture). All the same, over the past decades students of ethnicity have learned to recognise that such a public claim of an immutable, self-evident, non-negotiable identity is very much part of the politics of ethnicity, making ethnic identity appear more as the result than as an initial, independent variable to begin with.

Our discussion so far has brought out the threefold nature of ethnicity as

- a system of mental classification into a finite number of specific, named ethnic groups,
- a socio-political structure, notably a devise to turn the overall geographical space into an ethnically structured space accommodating a number of concrete named groups in interaction, and
- a process, involving both the interaction of these ethnic groups over time, and the dynamics (emergence, maturation, change, decline, replacement, etc.) of the overall ethnic space they constitute together; of this process we have distinguished at least two important movements:
  - ethnogenesis, as the redefinition (effect ed through changes in the classification system) of the overall ethnic space so as to accommodate a new ethnic group (often with repercussions for the other groups already recognised within that space)
  - ethnicisation, as the internal process of ‘taking consciousness’ through which members of essentially non-ethnic categories in the socio-economic-political space redefine their identity increasingly in ethnic terms (usually under the influence of a local elite).

More in general, and with applicability also outside

---

57 The central role of this type of brokers is discussed in an extensive anthropological literature, in which Barth 1966 features as a classic.

58 In ethnic mediation, the outside world does not merely consist of the state and nothing more. Peel 1989 describes Yoruba ethnicity as a nineteenth-century project in which an early church leader played a leading part – just as was the case among the Nkoya (van Binsbergen 1992a). Vail 1989 mentions, besides local politicians and church leaders, also academic researchers as mediators in many ethnicisation processes in Southern Africa; cf. Papstein 1985; van Binsbergen 1985c. The mediation process is also a theme in Ranger 1982. Studies of Afrikaners or Boers in South Africa have also elucidated the role of creative writers, and in this respect there are numerous parallels with other parts of Africa, e.g. Okot p’Bitek as a champion of Acholi ethnicity in Uganda (van de Weer 1980).

---

39
The socio-political stance may have a bearing on her or slave status; then I was proclaimed a Nkoya king’s sister’s son of my first Nkoya landlord (a courtier of client / ethnic consciousness: first I was ceremonially adopted as 1970s on, I was irresistibly drawn into the folds of Nkoya publicly confirmed as one of his heirs. On many occasions involving the national state and its officials (which had often reduced the Nkoya to despised outsiders) I was called upon, not as an informed outsider, but as a high-ranking fellow-Nkoya (cf. van Binsbergen 1984, and 2003a: ch. 2). In such a situation there are very firm limits to which one can go, as an academic analyst, in the deconstruction of local ethnicity as a mere strategic construct and ideology – and even the unmistakably deconstructive analysis as appeared in my book Tears of Rain (with a cheap and widely circulating edition for the Zambian market) was misread, by the actors, as a celebration of Nkoya identity rather than as its annihilation!

Two further examples could be adduced from the specific context of the study of the Bronze Age Mediterranean. Sea Peoples studies have become a major archaeological industry in the state of Israel, which was founded in 1948 CE; beyond the fact that major sites for Sea Peoples archaeology are situated on Palestinian / Israeli soil, the ideological motor behind such a national industry seems to be the structural analogy between autochthonous and immigrant groups, where emphasis on the immigrant nature of Philistines allows the Israeli researchers to reply, three millennia later, something of the ideological underpinning of the view of Canaan as the Hebrew’s home par excellence. 

A final example concerns the dean of British archaeology Colin Renfrew, Lord Kaimsthorn. His approach to the Aegean and to European archaeology in general has been characterised, for forty years, by the insistence on (local, regional, or intra-continental) autochthonous dynamics as opposed to interpretations in terms of translocal / trans-regional / transcontinental influences, notably those stipulated by the Ex Oriente Lux thesis (of which the Black Athena debate is an offshoot). Renfrew’s work is of the highest quality, incomparably profound, and has constantly explored new fields (genetics, cognitions, symbolism, mathematics, long-range linguistics) which thus became available for state-of-the-art archaeology. Yet it seems legitimate to ask the following question: is this insistence on autochthony not, beyond its author’s splendid scientific stature, the typical response one might expect from a British high-ranking aristocrat, for whom the guardianship of local and regional (ultimately European) tradition, and the privilege of birth right accorded by that tradition, are second nature? We will come back to this question in Chapter 28, and there offer an unexpected answer that will confirm

---


61 Cf. Ball 1899; Childe 1934.
the balanced and responsible nature of Renfrew’s stance.

2.3. Ethnicity as kaleidoscopic: The dynamics between toponyms and ethnic designations; and the perspectival element of social distance

We have already encountered, in passing, several indications of the contradictory, unsystematic, flexible and manipulative nature of ethnicity in many concrete situations. Ethnicity is often of a highly kaleidoscopic nature, constantly changing in shape and difficult to pin down to specific, general analytical formulae. In the present section, I will explore some further dimensions of this phenomenon: in the first place the tensions between spatially-based and descent-based designations, in the second place the role of perspective and social distance in ethnic designations. Finally I will present the ‘emic’ / ‘etic’ distinction as a methodological tool for the description of such emic kaleidoscopy at the level of the historical actors, by what yet remains a controlled, consistent, and transparent etic conceptual apparatus at the analyst’s level of discourse.

2.3.1. The oscillation between a spatial idiom and a descent idiom

Very often, nations and ethnic groups are characterised by means of an ethnonym that is, in fact, a toponym, in the double sense that,

- initially, it is tied to a particular part of the earth’s surface and that
- it does not at all carry the suggestion of shared common descent for all the people thus designated.

Once such a toponym has effectively turned into an ethnonym, however, it is quite common for it to assume connotations of a common descent.

**THE ETHNIC TRAJECTORY OF A ZAMBIAN TONONYM.** Thus the Nkoya people were named, in a process of ethnic articulation and state incorporation in the course of the nineteenth century CE, after a forested area near the confluence between the Kabompo and Zambezi rivers. However, once the fairly heterogeneous population of Kaoma district (situated at several hundred kilometres distance from the Zambezi-Kabompo confluence) had come to identify massively as Nkoya (mainly after 1900, and especially after 1950), an ideology of common descent arose, initially only for the royal families of the Nkoya (who have been super-imposed, as immigrants, upon local populations in the course of the last few centuries); but gradually (especially from the early 20th century onwards) the same ideology of shared descent was also applied to the local commoner populations themselves, even though these – as the archaeological analysis of local pottery finds indicates – seemed to have remained fairly stationary since the beginning of the Common Era.63

It is not only at the national and regional level that such dynamics operate. It may also manifest itself at a lower level, even within ethnically homogeneous local communities:

**TOPYNOMIC DYNAMICS IN AN ETHNICALLY HOMOGENEOUS NORTH AFRICAN COMMUNITY.** In the highlands of northwestern Tunisia,64 much of the dynamics of social organisation revolves on the constant oscillation between toponyms associated with valleys and parts of valleys, on the one hand, and descent-implying names of local groups (ideally considered to be segments of patrilineages), on the other. We are operating here at a level that is usually well below that of the ethnic group, but in fact the underlying mechanism is the same as that discussed above: the composition of the effective local community is based on sharing the same geographical space (as structured by the toponyms), but it is locally conceptualised in terms of descent, which lends an extra force of immutability, legitimacy and inescapability of intra-community relations between groups and between individuals. Such relations are in fact only recent, ephemeral, and constantly manipulated through people emigrating away from, and immigrating into, the local geographical space. Yet they are represented, by the local social actors, in terms of a (largely fictitious) genealogy whose apical ancestor lends the legitimation of times immemorial to these recent patterns.

In the course of this book’s argument we shall have repeatedly occasion to apply this principle of the oscillation between a geographically-based and a descent-based idiom

---


64 Van Binsbergen 1970, 1971, 1980, 1985, and forthcoming (a). Although this is a present-day society, many of the traits that, in Chapter 28, I will identify as ‘Pelasgian’ turn out to be applicable here – but merely on second thought, for during the main fieldwork over forty years ago all I could do was to notice in surprise – but with such early writers as Berthon & Chantre 1913 – the Homeric parallels (e.g. the cattle sacrifices to local shrines built on prominences in the landscape and conceived as temenoi and as sanctuaries for sacred wild animals amidst the surrounding woods), without any access yet to an explanatory theory. I would not have been able to formulate the Pelasgian Hypothesis without the real-life experience of what I now, decades after the principal fieldwork, realise can be considered more or less a Pelasgian revival, with ancient gods now disguised as Islamic saints, but still with a parcelled-up sacred landscape punctuated by numerous local shrines, segmentation (as a form of recursion) as the principle of socio-political organisation, a remarkable affirmation of nature’s life force as mediated through women, etc.
of group identity.

2.3.2. The perspectival element of social distance

In addition to this oscillation between a spatial and a descent idiom, anthropologists studying social organisation have noticed another tendency, adding to the kaleidoscopic nature of ethnicity: the tendency towards the situational use of a perspectival designation whenever social actors discuss the internal segmentation of their social (including ethnic) space. Very fine distinctions tend to be reserved for situations involving the interaction with people whose social distance vis-à-vis the speaker is small: people sharing the same valley, village, or ward. People living in different, not-adjacent, valleys or even further away, in different regions, countries, islands, continents, are (until the globalising technological revolution of the late 20th century CE) unlikely to interact very closely and frequently, considering the technologies of communication which until the later 20th century CE were standard throughout most of the world (locomotion on foot, horseback, quadruped traction, or by man-powered or wind-powered boat). Therefore the social distance between such people is usually large (cases of recent migration excluded). In such cases of relatively great social distance, people tend to refer to each other in broad general categories, ignoring the finer distinctions of subgroups and family segments at the lower levels, and classifying each other in broad terms, as members of different clans, ethnic groups, tribes, somatic categories, etc.

This tendency for ethnic nomenclature to be used situationally and depending on perspective, introduces a factor of great uncertainty in any attempt to utilise contemporary documents for a reconstruction of ethnic relations: for distant people that one only occasionally or merely potentially interacts with, far broader, and far less precise, ethnic and toponymical designations tend to be used than for groups with which the speaker is in daily interaction on the basis of a very small social distance. Below, we shall apply these insights when looking at ethnic space as depicted in the Biblical Table of Nations, and as a background for the intercontinental ethnic space in which to situate the Sea Peoples.

The problem is even more serious because the conventions of perspectival and situational nomenclature are implicitly opposed to those of scholarly writing, which aspires to objectivity and impersonal generalisation – ideals which simply may be impossible to achieve when rendering the ethnic distinctions of historical actors who only left us, in their contemporary documents, their distorted ethnic designations, from their specific (but inherently shifting) perspective which we, often, can only begin to reconstruct on the basis of little else than these very documents...

The contradictions between the blurred fuzziness of the ethnic categorisations of historical actors, versus the artificial strictness with which scholarly investigators tend to impose their own distinctions, will constitute another refrain throughout the present study.

2.4. Mechanisms of transformation affecting onomastic material (ethnonyms and toponyms)

Since ethnicity revolves on named social groups, much ethnic analysis consists in the consideration of onomastic material attaching to social groups; to persons symbolising or representing social groups; and (by virtue of the common oscillation between spatial and descent idiom) to localities associated with social groups. If we are able to explicitly structure the tasks of onomastic analysis, our approach to ethnicity will have greatly gained in lucidity and scientific intersubjectivity. In the analysis of ancient onomastic material, I propose to discern the following typical situations, processes and mechanisms:

1. Allophyly versus Autophyly:65 There are broadly speaking two basic kinds of ethnic labels. The allophylous type states what people call themselves, the allophyllic type state what people are called by others, including their neighbours. Among autophylous names we expect to find those meaning (or obliquely deriving from a meaning) ‘man’, ‘person’, ‘descendant’, ‘descent group’, and those evoking striking features of the group’s home landscape or of the group’s collective history; whereas allophylous names are typically those meaning (or obliquely deriving from a meaning) ‘stranger’, ‘outsider’, ‘settler’, ‘colonist’, ‘non-native speaker’, etc. Nicknames and insults projected by ethnic others onto a particular set of people are always allophyllic, but they may be adopted by the group thus addressed or designated, and then become autophyllic. A famous example is the word gueux, ‘beggars’, by which, at the eve of the Dutch-Spanish Eighty Years War (1568–1648 CE), a senior member of the Brussels court of Margaretha of Parma dismissively described the members of a protest demonstra-
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65 I derive this terminology from Karst 1931a: 368 f., 395 f., 582 f.
tion, and their cause; soon, the word Gueux, localised Geuzen, became the self-chosen designation of the people’s guerrillas rising in revolt against the Spanish state. In the same way, allophyllic ethnic designation often takes into account, more or less, how the members of the other group identify autophyllously; hence the English allophyllic designations ‘Germans, French, Dutch, Italians’, for groups that call themselves die Deutsche (atavistically: ‘Germanen’), les Français, Hollanders / Nederlanders (atavistically: ‘Dietsen’) and Italiani.

2. Polynymy: Different ethnonyms may apply to one and the same human group as defined in time and place. Such polynymy may be more than just a manifestation of free variation. As we shall see, the interplay between the entire range of possible ethnic mechanisms leads to all sorts of contradictions and non-sequiturs, not only in the eyes of today’s academic analysts, but also for the historical actors themselves. Polynymy may be one of the latter’s strategies to resolve or dissimulate such contradictions.

3. Homonymy. The same ethnonym, or apparently the same ethnonym, may be applied to different human groups as defined in time and place; similarly, the same toponym may be attached to a number of different spots on the earth’s surface. Table 2.1. gives a few examples.

4. Personification: Many ethnonyms actually appear in the form of the personal name of an eponymic ancestor, phylarch, king, culture hero, demiurge, or god, and the epic or mythical exploits of such a person are likely to reflect, in some oblique way to be painstakingly decoded, some of the historical migrations and exploits of the people for which that person symbolically stands.

5. Chorism: A specific human group’s ethnonym may attach to a place, and from there again it may attach to subsequent, different human groups supplanting the original group in that place. In combination with other ethnic mechanisms outlined in the present list, this may lead to a repeated to-and-fro movement (for which the technical term ‘choristic oscillation’ could be coined), between ethnonym and toponym, where the connotations of an ethnonym are transferred to a place, to a new group settling there, to a new place where this group migrates to, to a new group living in that new place, etc. Far-fetched and against Occam’s Razor as this model would appear to be, it yet pinpoints one of the most characteristic phenomena in onomastic history. Above we have already encountered two examples of this process, when briefly considering the ethnonym Nkoya and the pattern of group naming in the highlands of North-western Tunisia, with their characteristic oscillation between a spatial and a descent-based discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>multiple referents</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Havila</td>
<td>1. Garden of Eden, traditionally associated with Mesopotamia (&lt;i&gt;Genesis&lt;/i&gt; 2:12) 2. son of Cush (&lt;i&gt;Genesis&lt;/i&gt; 10:7, 29; 1 &lt;i&gt;Chronicles&lt;/i&gt; 1:9, 23): Gulf of Aden 3. son of Joktan (&lt;i&gt;Genesis&lt;/i&gt; 10:7, 29; 1 &lt;i&gt;Chronicles&lt;/i&gt; 1:9, 23): Arabian desert 4. associated with Tarshish (cf. Table 6.15 below)</td>
<td>Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>1. West Asia: Eastern Georgia 2. Iberian peninsula, i.e. modern Spain and Portugal</td>
<td>Karst 1931a; Hoffmann &amp; Artemidorus 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kola</td>
<td>1. West Asia 2. Lower Congo 3. extreme North-western Russia 4. South Asia (Munda language’s Austric)</td>
<td>cf. our discussion in Section 4.4 and references cited there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. A few ancient toponyms with multiple referents

---

66 Characteristically, in the Late Modern Age, both Germanen and Diets / Dietsen were almost exclusively used, as autophyllic ethnic expressions, in the context of fascist ultra-nationalism of Nazism.

67 Homonymy is in principle an Aristotelian concept, cf. Shields 2002.

68 From Greek khorós, ‘place, space’.
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6. **Migrancy**: Although few cultures explicitly identify as migratory, and although most human groups emphatically identify with their present place of settlement and justify their presence there in ideologically-mythical terms cultivating images of ‘home’, yet migration, whether at the level of individuals, small groups, or more comprehensive groups, is the perennial human condition.

7. **Relational Projection**: In the process of migration, the ethnic and toponymical arrangements characteristic of an earlier place of settlement (i.e. arrangements involving the interrelation between a number of names at the same time), tend to be projected onto the later place of settlement. For instance, in the West of the Netherlands, since medieval times, the city of Haarlem was flanked by the city of Amsterdam (c. 15 km east of Haarlem), while c. 20 km south of Amsterdam the village of Breukelen was to be found. In the second half of the seventeenth century CE, this geographical layout was projected onto the Manhattan region on the eastern seaboard of North America, where the newly founded city of New Amsterdam came to be flanked by the suburbs of Harlem and Brooklyn.

8. **Inertia**: Most modern scholars derive from societies where scientifically induced and literacy-based technological and social innovation has been the order of the day for several centuries. We therefore tend to take cultural change and cultural drift for granted. We know from our own societies’ history that most artefacts, institutions and linguistic forms undergo noticeable alterations within decades, and tend to change beyond recognition in a matter of a few centuries. However, we have to take into account the possibility (well attested, *e.g.*, in Palaeolithic lithic industries) that human artefacts may remain virtually unchanged through thousands, even tens of thousands of years. Under pre-modern conditions, a comparable inertia may attend institutions and language forms, as is brought out, for instance, by the wide spread and similarity, hence temporal inertia, of Indo-European kinship terms, by the even wider distribution of similarities in basic counting practices (*cf.* below, Section 6.5.4), and the existence of human near-universals such as marriage, cat’s cradles, and the four-based symbolism of the earth. I propose that such universals do not simply spring from the identical innate structure of the human brain all over the world (although there is a neurobiological argument claiming just that), but that they belonged to the cultural package with which Anatomically Modern Humans left Africa 80-60 ka ago: some of the elements of this package became sacred, deeply ingrained in human institutions and virtually immutable, however much these institutions were, in other respects, affected by localising transformation. By the same token, ethnonyms and toponyms have been recognised by scholars to display very high temporal inertia. Yet in the course of history their retained formal near-immutability may be applied in very different social and cultural settings, in other words may undergo radical changes in function. As a result very different groups in different places may be called by the same ethnonym, while in the same place the same ethnonym may be applied, over time, to a succession of local groups that may considerably differ in language, culture, economic specialisation, and political history.

9. **Transfer of Ethnonyms**: Nominal continuity in name, in combination with discontinuity in the specific
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70 *Cf.* van Binsbergen 2006a, 2006b.
identity of the bearers of that name. The idea of ethnonymsic and toponymsic inertia, in combination with the process I described as Chorism, means that extant ethnonyms may also be inherited by peoples which have only a superficial association in time and place with the more original bearers of that ethnonym. The above enumerated onomastic mechanisms work largely irrespective of any meaning a toponym or ethnonym may have. Yet toponyms are part of the linguistic context in which they first emerged, and usually have some original meaning there. Given the constant merry-go-round of ethnonyms and toponyms as a result of the various mechanisms already listed, it is often impossible to tell which application of such a name in which specific context of time and space was the original one. However, when an ethnonym can be argued to have a convincing specific etymology in a specific, identified language, along some of the usual semantic lines (‘descent group’, ‘offspring, seed’, ‘person’, ‘salient feature of the landscape’, ‘professional specialisation’), it is tempting to claim that ethnonym’s origin to have been in that specific language context, which often may also point to a specific region. Many ethnonyms, however subject to cultural Inertia in their traceable historical functioning, turn out to be reducible, in the last analysis, to an etymon ‘man, woman, person’ or to one of ‘descent group, gens’ in an older, more original language than the language context in which we find that ethnonym functioning.

10. Transformative localisation: The combination of Chorism, Migrancy and Inertia in the terms defined above, means that, like most other cultural items, also ethnonyms are typically involved in a continuous process of transformative localisation. This process may be described as follows. Despite the above-noted element of Inertia, human culture tends to be specific in both time and space; if it were not, we would only have cultural universals, and cultural inertia would not have to be pointed out as a condition easily escaping our modern attention. Migrancy in the sense of spatial displacement therefore usually involves the transition from one specifically structured cultural (including technological and linguistic) realm to one differently structured. One of the great discoveries of the social sciences in the first half of the twentieth century CE was that of the integration of culture:

in a specific time and space, cultural items tend to fit together as parts of a whole, hence structural themes (for instance hierarchy, complementarity, the specific implications of material and immaterial prestations rendered by one individual or group to another) informing one sector of socio-cultural life in that space and time, tend to be repeated in other sectors, so that, much like a book or an artist’s life’s oeuvre, a rather unique and unmistakable all-pervading style would be recognised to be characteristic of that spatio-temporally specific cultural arrangement.

The structural-functional discovery of the integration of culture initiated the period of prolonged local field-work in anthropology, as a means to imbibe and chart the local and present cultural arrangement in its totality. It also meant, as good news, the end of classic diffusionism (the dominant anthropological paradigm from the late 1800s to c. 1930), which had no theory of culture and therefore only managed to consider fragmented cultural items to be analytically treated in isolation, detached from the other integral parts of the same spatio-temporally specific cultural arrangement. But the bad news was that, with the discovery of the integration of culture,

72 Perhaps the mutation of Libyan into ‘Nubian’ may be taken as a case in point, cf. Berens & Brechhaus-Gerst 1985.
73 I introduced and developed the term ‘transformative localisation’ in van Binsbergen 1996-97a and 2003a.
anthropology became obsessed with presentism and localism to an extent that eclipsed all considerations of wider cultural continuities in space and time. At the same time as the rise of structural functionalism, archaeology (which, although with comparable localising tendencies, at least had no option but to explore temporal continuities and discontinuities) inevitably split from anthropology in most parts of the world with the exception of the USA. Half a century later, the 1990s brought considerable relief from the one-sidedness of mid-20th century presentist and localist anthropology, with the emergence of long-range approaches in the study of linguistics and myth, and the re-emergence of a more sophisticated, culture-sensitive neo-diffusionism in globalisation studies. The reader will find that also the present study manifests a marked affinity with such a revived appreciation of diffusion as an aspect of innovation and social circulation, not just (as is a truism of today’s globalisation studies) of state-of-the-art technologies such as the motorcar, the video, the microcomputer and the cell phone, but also of much older and less spectacular items of culture, from the bra and the menstrual pad to the flying gallop and the animal style of Eurasian art mobilier.

The recognition of a tendency to cultural inertia (not only in toponyms and ethnonyms, but basically in all formal cultural systems, such as kinship terms, technology, writing systems, games – e.g. the universal cat’s cradles / string figures –, myths and ritual, made us aware of the existence of a considerable class of cultural items that were by no means specific to one local ‘culture’ at any moment in time, but that easily retained their basic features and structure even though extending across centuries, even millennia, and across hundreds if not thousands of kilometres – capable, in other words, of crossing cultural including linguistic boundaries. However, what is important in this little excursion into the recent history of social science is that, with all limitations as briefly indicated, we yet recognise the continued validity of the notion of integration of culture. People P who in the context of Migrancy pass from the spatio-temporally specific cultural arrangement X to a different spatio-temporally specific cultural arrangement Y, bring a multitude of cultural (including linguistic) items that were more or less integrated in X, and that are now inserted, as relatively alien cultural bodies, into Y, which prior to the intrusion must also be considered to have been more or less integrated. As indicated above in the discussion of the melting-pot model, it is theoretically possible for the migrating group to partly retain their X-based cultural and linguistic specificity (a situation known from many first-generation immigrants, and for much longer time-spans from typical migrating and outsider groups such as Jews and Gypsies). But even so, a minimum change is needed, on the part of Y, in order to somehow receive the new immigrants in its overall texture, and on the part of the new immigrants, in order to accommodate to the overall structure of Y in selective (often primarily economic) terms. Such adaptations in what P brought from X in order to fit into P’s new environment Y I have called transformative localisation. Transformative localisation, of a massive kind, is also at hand in the, quite common, case that after a few generations the immigrant group largely dissolves into the new environment. Transformative localisation means that, even when in a cultural process whose overall features could be broadly described in terms of cultural inertia, items newly introduced from the outside develop local, adapted versions of their original system of origin, as fit the specific cultural (including linguistic) host environment to which they have difused. The history of the world religions Islam and Christianity, of games, of the alphabet as a writing system (Diringer 1996), is full of instances of transformative localisation, and so is the history of toponyms and ethnonyms. It is important to realise that the transformative localisation of ethnonyms and toponyms often involves a linguistic adaptation, where an imported or borrowed name with the typical phonological, morphological and semantic features of its original environment, ends up in a linguistic environment where these morphological features no longer convey an interpretable obvious semantic message (hence the detachment, replacement, or popular etymological reinterpretation of such features), and where the original phonology is so different from the locally prevailing one that the name inevitably undergoes often drastic phonological adaptations. Inevitably the details of this process, if identifiable in empirical data, contain important

77 For a dismissively critical discussion of this aspect of my current work, viewed from the perspective of mainstream social anthropology, cf. Amselle 2001.
clues as to the original linguistic environment of a name, and the direction and time of borrowing.

11. (Proto-)Globalisation: Technology sets specific limits, both to the speed with which Migrancy can take effect, and to the geographical destinations to which a migrating individual or human group has access. The technological explosion of modern times has had a profound effect on the field of human transport and communication, hence we tend to characterise the last few decades as the era of globalisation. However, proto-globalisation has always been with us. We may recognise walking as a basic human technology of locomotion, and the most elementary maritime travel as a Middle Palaeolithic achievement. Since the late 1980s, palaeoanthropologists and population geneticists have developed an increasing consensus concerning the ‘Out of Africa’ scenario of Anatomically Modern Humans: this sub-species, to which all present-day humans belong, probably emerged in Africa c. 200,000 BP, and is reconstructed to have spread to other continents, initially South and South East Asia, c. 80-60 ka BP. Although it is likely that the Suez isthmus played a role in this out-migration, specialists favour the Bab al-Mandab, at the southern end of the Red Sea, as the place where this migration (not necessarily all in one go, and involving no more than just over a thousand women, or so geneticists tell us) crossed into Asia. At the time the Bab al-Mandab was a sea strait only 5 kilometres wide (Flemming et al. 2003). Similarly, considering the Australian archaeological record, Anatomically Modern Humans must have crossed from Indonesia into New Guinea and Australia more than 60,000 BP, while geologists assure us that at no time in the few million years of human history less than 75 kilometres of open sea separated these regions. The evidence for very early navigation is therefore overwhelming. The conclusion is inevitable that, in principle, since that very remote period of the Middle Palaeolithic (when Europe, for instance, as far as human population is concerned was still inhabited not by Anatomically Modern Humans but by Neanderthaloïds), any migratory process from anywhere on the globe may lead to and may end up to anywhere else. For reasons of the manageability of data and the fragmentation of scholarship in numerous academic sub-disciplines we may be well advised to limit our analyses to one historical period and one region, but this is merely for convenience’s sake, and tends to obscure long-range connections which may well contain fundamental clues to an understanding of more local and temporary limited contexts. Here we hit on another one of the characteristic features of the present argument. The study of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean is usually in the hands of scholars who combine one regional and one disciplinary specialism (e.g. Egyptologist / historian, Assyriologist / epigrapher), and who seldom have the time or inclination to peep beyond the specific period, region and discipline of their specialisation. Here the institutional organisation of modern academic scholarship tends to impose, on the reality we study, boundaries that may well be, in reality, meaningless (considering the above justification of mankind’s spatial unboundedness since at least the Middle Palaeolithic). The present study has a more global and interdisciplinary perspective – even though the price to be paid for such a wide perspective is, inevitably, considerable amateurism and superficiality when it comes to local and period-specific details (as my critics from other disciplines will no doubt point out), as well as a measure of ostracism on the part of one’s original discipline. Any attempt to reveal and understand the dynamics of a particular historical period and region, inevitably implies a conceptual and analytical apparatus that (if it is at all to be conducive to explanation, i.e. to a form of explicit, systematic intersubjective generalisation) is in principle applicable to the whole of humanity, the entire span of human history, and the entire globe. And any such attempt invites the intrusion of other regions and other periods, in the first place because human culture tends to conservation and inertia, as far as the temporal dimension is concerned, and to unbounded global interaction when it comes to space. Of course, this must not be misunderstood to mean that any specific theory is capable of explaining the whole of human history. What I mean is that one cannot have local and regional explanation unless by reference to (possibly merely implied) more general principles that would also apply elsewhere and to other periods. Rostovtzeff’s (1957) specific theory seeking to explain the collapse of the Roman Empire by the building of the Chinese Great Wall (so that the population
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excess of Central Asia could no longer be absorbed in an easterly direction and had to move West, as the basis for the barbarian invasions that were the scourge and ultimately the doom of the Roman Empire) is not just about China and Rome, and least at all about monumental construction work: it is about human mobility, rationality, maximisation strategies, the inventiveness with which the human mind perceives alternative solutions to a practical problem (e.g. lack of space and food), the capability for human communities to translate and bundle individual concerns and motivations into collective actions such as massive migrations, and the comparative effectiveness of two different imperial systems, one with a clearly demarcated and reinforced territorial boundary and a largely mono-ethnic base (China, with a massive Han Chinese majority), the other largely without these features (the Roman empire).

12. The fundamental unity of mankind (at least in the sense of Anatomically Modern Humans): The above implies that onomastic mechanisms similar to those outlined are likely to be at work, in principle, all over the world. Specific cases of onomastic manipulation could then be argued to have echoes, parallels and feed-back effects in other parts of the world and (because of the finite nature of the earth’s globular surface) – like in some Einsteinian relativist universe – may come back to their origin in disguised, transformed form after a tour around the world. This means that both in terms of the mental capabilities required for such onomastic manipulation, and in terms of genetic make-up, mankind (at least in the sense of Anatomically Modern Humans, from c. 200,000 BP on) must be considered to possess a fundamental unity, and all differences in nomenclature, somatic appearance, and location to be in principle relative and more or less ephemeral. If in this context we introduce the genetic notions such as ‘clade’, ‘gene pool’, ‘population’, descent group, etc., this is only to take into account undeniable biological variation as an empirical clue to the details of human migratory history, and does not imply any deterministic view of socio-cultural differences or inferiority.

2.5. Emic and etic

2.5.1. Introducing emic and etic

To elucidate the ethnic dynamics treated in this chapter we would greatly benefit from a distinction anthropologists often make, that between

- **emic analysis**, which takes into account such conceptualisation as the historical actors themselves have consciously applied, and
- **etic analysis**, which constitutes the analyst’s imposed conceptualisation regardless of that of the historical actors:

‘emic and etic express the distinction between an internal structuring of a cultural orientation such as is found in the consciousness of its bearers, on the one hand, and, on the other, a structuring that is imposed from the outside. Etic has nothing to do with ethics in the sense of the philosophy of the judgement of human action in terms of good and evil. Pike’s terminology is based on a linguistic analogy. In linguistics one approaches the description of speech sounds from two complementary perspectives: that of phonetics (hence – etic), which furnishes a purely external description, informed by anatomical and physical parameters, revolving on the air vibrations of which the speech sounds consist; and the perspective of phonology, whose basic unit of study is the phoneme (adjective: ‘phonemic’, hence –emic): the smallest unit of speech sound that is effectively distinguished by language users competent in a particular language, basing themselves on the distinctive features of that speech sound. (...) Pike thus codified the two-stage analytical stance (both etic and emic) of the classic anthropology that had emerged in the second quarter of the twentieth century with such proponents as Malinowski, Evans-Pritchard, Fortes, Griaule and Leiris.

In ascertaining the emic dimension of ethnicity in a specific period and region (i.e. how the historical actors themselves consciously perceive their ethnic space and its components), it is often useful to determine whether these actors have an explicit term to denote ‘ethnic group’, ‘tribe’, ‘people’, ‘nation’, etc.; and whether they have, in their language, specific morphological features by means of which human collectivities may be designated. For instance, in Chapter 5 we shall discuss the Homeric Catalogue of Ships. Early to Middle Iron Age Greece, in which context ‘nation, group’ is designated by the word éthnos;
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here we also encounter the Greek suffix *-oi*, designating the personal plural form of nouns of the masculine gender, producing, *inter alia*, ethnonyms such as Akhaioi, Danaoi, Dardanoi, etc. Likewise, in Chapter 6, dealing with the Biblical Table of Nations (*Genesis* 10), from Early to Middle Iron Age Palestine, we read the form בְּנֵי, goyim, 'nations', while the suffix בְּנֵי-im returns in many of the names listed there not only to indicate the personal plural form of a noun, but specifically to turn a name into a group name: *Caphthorim, Kittim*, etc.

Historical actors are usually inconsistent in their classifications and do not normally have an analytical distance vis-à-vis their own situation. This means that their views of their own ethnicity cannot tell us the whole story, and cannot self-reflectively analyse the vagueness, contradictions, and dynamics that attend their own ethnicity. However, before analysing their aspects objectively with a distinct, analytical gaze (*etically*, in other words), we need to know how the ethnic experience is structured in the actors’ own conscious discourse, in terms of their own explicit terms, *i.e.* *emically.*

### 2.5.2. The various dimensions of emic and etic in ethnicity studies

It is essential to realise that emic ethnic thought combines a number of dimensions and functions:

1. **social** (social classification and placement of individuals and groups, also with an eye to their professional specialisation)
2. **political** (the differential power and prestige associated with the groups thus distinguished)
3. **cosmological** (the symbolic underpinning of these power relations by projecting them onto the non-human world of the landscape, the animal and plant world, the heavens, and vice-versa)

4. **mythical** (the explanation and legitimisation of these cosmological and political distinctions through traditional narrative structures)
5. **ritual** (the enacting of these cosmological and mythical structures in public or private ritual, including rules of avoidance, etiquette, intermarriage, notions of pollution, incest, etc.).

Because ethnicity is, among other things, a form of emic classification, we should not be surprised to find it associated with other forms of emic classification, notably with:

- genealogies
- colour distinctions,
- with specific gods selected from among a pantheon, or
- with broad general classifications of the natural world in terms of animal and plant species, natural phenomena, etc.– the kind of distinctions that early anthropology treated under the heading of totemism.

The interplay between these varieties of classification can be quite intricate and fascinating. If we do not lose sight of the fact that it is classification of human groups, not representation of the empirical world, that is our primarily object of attention in the analysis of ethnicity, we will avoid the pitfalls of reading a somatic type in common ethnic classifications in terms of White, Black, Red or Blue; or of seeing expressions for human groups in terms of natural phenomena as proof that the actors involved lack the mental capabilities to distinguish between humans and their environment (a common misconception in the racialist, colonialist times of the late 19th and early 20th century CE, *e.g.* Lévy-Bruhl 1910 / 1928, 1922). As a form of classification, these distinctions are eminently comparable (*cf.* Lévi-Strauss 1962a, 1962b) to, *e.g.*, the Periodic Table of Elements, – they are signs, not of defective powers at thought, but of the same relatively advanced mental capabilities all Anatomically Modern Humans have in common.

When (as is usually the case) the overall ethnic system that is in use at a specific time and place, encompasses a considerably larger number of ethnic groups than just two, then the coupling of ethnic classification with a different system of classification (colour, religious, but most typically totemic) makes it possible for the actors to create, and thus could be subjected to analysis in terms of the standard astrological symbolic correspondences.
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80 Thus Karst (1931a: 430 f.) shows how the name of *Boeotia*, in addition to serving as a toponym for ‘flood land’ in a variety of West Asian and Aegean contexts, was also projected onto the heavens, as designation of the northern celestial region. As far as Ancient Egypt is concerned, in recent years a lot of media attention has been given to the apparent celestial projection of the Giza landscape (the river Nile and three aligned pyramids) onto Orion’s Belt and the Milky Way, or *vice versa* (*cf.* Bauval & Gilbert 1994). The example of astrology could also be cited, where (at least in the Western tradition from Late Antiquity onwards) the entire known world, each nation, country, region, major town, profession, etc., had its own specific (but, given the limited number of asterism, far from unique) correspondence with an asterism,
within the overall systems, specific sets of dyads or triads of ethnic groups that have a very special relation with one another, a relation not extended to the many other ethnic groups within the overall system. Totemic classifications are common to the ethnic structure of many peoples in South Central and Southern Africa. Here simple aetiological narratives are invoked to link two or three specific ethnic groups, e.g. those named ‘Firewood’, ‘Smoke’, and ‘Bees’. The aetiological narrative would stipulate how Smoke means the final, fatal transformation of Firewood, at the same time as chasing the Bees from their hives so that their honey can be appropriated by humans. The special relationship between these groups extends beyond social joking (often with extensive sexual overtones, connotations of impunity, and the obligation to share property), to obligations of shelter, support, protection, and funerary services, also in pluralist or transnational contexts where the representatives of either group may be total strangers to one another.

These African conceptions of transformation have formal parallels elsewhere in the Old World: the Five Elements / Phases (五行 Wu Xing) doctrine of Chinese Taoism which is essentially a cycle of transformation; the, apparently less dynamic, Four Elements doctrine of Empedocles; Ancient Egyptian cosmogonic myth where both the Heliopolitan and the Hermopolitan system can be argued to imply likewise a transformational cycle of elements. I believe that, transcontinentally, all these cyclical transformation systems share a common origin, which lies not, of course, in early Greek philosophy, but in a Pelasgian substrate stretching from the fertile Sahara to Central Asia, ultimately to China, and dating from the Neolithic / Early Bronze Age. The Aegean shared also other aspects of this substrate system: myths, rites and prohibitions are full of systematic floral and faunal oppositions and transformations that, without necessarily being totemistic in the antiquated sense for which modern scholars are over-allergic, at least manifest deep-seated forms of creating cosmological meaning through classification of the natural world.

The point is of considerable significance: towards the end of the present study we will use one particular application of such a natural classification system, notably the Sea Peoples’ bird symbolism, to reveal a comprehensive symbolic system that will considerably add to our understanding of Sea Peoples’ cultural affiliations and their resources for mutual cultural identification.

Below (Sections 6.5.4 and 6.5.5) I will try to establish a specific historical context for the emergence of dyadic and triadic classifications. For our present discussion of the emic dimension of ethnic classification, let it suffice to point out that the classificatory aspect may be limited to a binary opposition (what early anthropology called a ‘ moiety system’), where the local ethnic system essentially comprises only two ethnic groups, ‘A’ and ‘not A’.

With all these forms of classification, emic ethnic thought constitutes a total world-view, that informs and reflects not just simple ethnic classifications, ethnonyms and toponyms, but sums up a total historical way of life, with its contradictions and power struggles, its inconsistencies, tendencies to change, and un-integrated remnants from the past as well as alien elements introduced from distant places.

In fact, any emic ethnic system implies a mythical or fantastic geography, of the kind that became such a fertile literary genre in the European Middle Ages, when selected information from Plato, Pliny, and other authors from Graeco-Roman Antiquity, coupled with the reports and fantasies of early travellers into Asia and Africa, filled the, to them, peripheral parts of the known world with mythical beasts and anatomically monstrous humans. Typical is not so much the flight into the imaginary, but the combination of such a flight with elements that are unmistakably rational, tangible and correct: Western and Southern Europe, and the historical Jerusalem, feature in such mythical geographical along with Prester John, animal-headed or headless humans, and other figments of the imagination. Hic sunt leones! Again, therefore, a typical mechanism of oscillation: now not between toponym and ethnonym (as in choronic oscillation), but between the real and the imaginary (let us call this mechanism ‘mythical oscillation’).

As a playful element in this otherwise serious analysis of ethnic mechanisms, let me include, from recent world politics, the evocation (evidently referring to medieval mythical geographies) of one such mythical worldview that sums up – in, who would doubt it, a scandalously biased and undeserved manner – the geopolitical conceptions attributed, by that evocation’s anonymous author, to average citizens of the USA around 2000 CE. 83

---

81 An aetiological narrative is a story that explicitly explains the origin or the background of a particular feature of the natural or social reality as known to the narrator and the audience.

82 Cf. van Binsbergen 2009a, 2010b.

83 On the eve of the tragic event soon known as, ‘9 / 11’, i.e. the violent surprise attacks on various places on the USA eastern seaboard, immediately resulting in 3,000 casualties (and multiples of that number in the aftermath), and associated with the terrorist organisation al-Qaeda and taking place on 11 September (‘9 / 11’) 2001.
To pretend that this kind of world-view can be adequately represented, in academic analyses of ethnicity, by a mere one-to-one identification of which ancient name corresponds with which modern, academic label, is absolutely naïve and a source of endless misunderstanding. And this playful example contains a lesson for the study of ancient world views, which may be supposed to display a similar ‘mythical oscillation’.

2.6. Imposing scientific rationality upon ancient geographies

This raises the question of the proper procedure to proceed from the historical actors’ emic views, to etic ethnic analysis – in other words, the methodological problem of reconciling, in ethnic description and analysis,

1. the expectations of an academic analytical rationality, which looks for unequivocal, clearly defined and consistently applied one-to-one relationships, with

2. the mythical poetics of historical actors’ emic use of ethnic nomenclature and classification – which is almost invariably contradictory, multidimensional, inconsistent, and plural.

Of course, given such mechanisms as Polynymy, Chorism, Transformative Localisation, Relational Projection, one scarcely expects to find a one-to-one relation between, on the one hand, an emic name (ethnonym or toponym) as used by historical actors, and, on the other hand, the modern academic interpretation of that name.

The problem is very well comparable, in fact a particularly application, of the central problem attending the description of so-called ‘indigenous knowledge systems’, which became a major, and richly funded, industry in anthropology and development studies from the 1980s onwards. Indigenous knowledge systems are easy to describe and easy to peddle along the corridors of the inter-continental development industry, as long as their academic description follows the utterly false assumptions that

- the non-academic, ‘indigenous’, or better: emic, knowledge to be described forms a system (‘a unified whole of integrated and mutually accommodated parts’) – an assumption that usually goes untested – and

- the basic units (‘epistemes’) in the emic complex to be described, have essentially the same format as the basic units of the academic rendition, in other words, they are well defined, consistent, unique, non-overlapping and one-dimensional. The latter assumption is commonly applied, even if the original and truly emic format, as a form of ‘wild thinking’ (Lévi-Strauss 1962a), is very similar to our own spontaneous, non-academic forms of practical thought in the modern North Atlantic (e.g. in the conceptualisation of physical indisposition as ‘a cold’, or in endowing our stubborn tools and materials in do-it-yourself activities with a will of their own, and with the capability of hearing us admonishing and cursing them).

The Format of Indigenous Knowledge. Let me give a concrete example. A tautological, partly non-verbal, multi-layered indigenous knowledge system like the aetiology of disease in the context of the Southern African ecstatic healing cult of the sangoma87 cult, may be redefined in terms of the one-to-one symptom-diagnosis aetiology of modern North Atlantic medical handbooks. Such a procedure facilitates intellectual and institutional appropriation and incorporation on a global scale (e.g. the incorporation of sangoma healers in modern health facilities conceived after the North Atlantic model; or the investigation of the pharmacological composition of sangoma herbal pharmacopoeia, and its possible efficacy in terms of

---

84 Source: Anonymous, n.d., ‘The world as seen...’.


86 Cf. van Binsbergen 2003b.

87 I.e. the regional emic term for an ecstatic, ancestrally empowered priest / diviner /therapist.
The academic description of emic systems of ethnic nomenclature and classification poses the same kind of pitfalls (somehow akin to Whitehead’s ‘fallacy of misplaced concreteness’).

It is on this point that I have the greatest quarrel with many existing approaches to ethnicity in Antiquity and protohistory: without developing a sophisticated methodological and theoretical argument, these approaches naively take their own classificatory rationality for granted, and expect to find the same exclusive one-to-one relationships in the emic manifestations of the historical actors. Under such false assumptions, the main purpose of the academic analysis of ancient ethnicity would seem to be the proper identification of the one human group, specific in time and place, that inevitably has to be the unique referent of a particular ethnonym. But such a definition of our task in ethnicity research totally misses the point, and can only produce tautological artefacts, spawned by our own scholarly misconceptions. By contrast, Karst’s (1931a) approach to Mediterranean ethnonyms (and toponyms), despite all its lack of consistency and its tendency to naiveté, is rather more sophisticated: he seeks to reconstruct the emic mythic poetics of the entire system of classification, and assumes multi-layeredness, inconsistency, polyonymy, etc. as matters of course. Such an attempt is fundamentally right and to be applauded, even if the linguistic methods and physical geography of which it makes use, are now obsolete, and even if many of the specific proposals for the interpretation of individual cases of nomenclature and classification, look far-fetched and cannot hardly be supported. Karst does not fall into the trap of assuming (as a fallacy of misplaced concreteness) that, essentially, academic etic description and the historical actors’ emic practice are of so much the same nature that the latter can easily, prima facie, be converted into the former.

In laying bare the distortive imposition of modern academic logic on ancient ethnic poetics we must go one step further. Such imposition is a clear-cut case of ethnocentrism: the naïve projection, without taking a reflective and self-critical distance, of a group’s own presuppositions, onto that group’s perception and judgement of a different group. Unfortunately, in this case the projecting group in question is not merely that of entrenched academicians, who take their own highly specialised and artificial form of rationality as standard for the whole of mankind. The great majority of academic analysts of ancient emic ethnicity tend to be White, more or less post-Christian, middle-class, and native speakers of an Indo-European language. Until 1900 CE this community of scholars was largely confined to Western Europe. Meanwhile it has expanded into North America, but mainly among people for whom the construction of European culture (as a vicarious, distant original home of North American dominant culture) may be just as important as it is for Europeans. The first, critical, most valuable phase of the Black Athena debate has convincingly – and to Bernal’s lasting merit – shown how difficult it has been for European or Europeanising scholars not to succumb to Eurocentrism. Like the ancient actors in their emic ethnic constructions, we are constantly tempted to subconsciously project the geopolitics of our own time and age onto our objects of study, thus endowing it with myth, and facilitating the acceptance and circulation of the products of our scholarship in our own wider society – acceptance, not because our products bring the truth about ancient societies which were rather different from our own, but acceptance because, from the start, our image of these ancient societies has been uncritically conceived in terms of our domestic self-evidences (cf. van Binsbergen 2003a, espec. ch. 15). A dominant ideology has constructed a sense of local belonging and specificity around what is essentially the western peninsula of Eurasia – the very word smacks of hegemony, relegating to the status of a mere appendice of Europe the much larger Asian landmass, which moreover throughout the long history of Anatomically Modern Humans has been the scene of more and more profound cultural initiatives and innovations than Europe – mythically endowing the latter with such distinctive features as Christianity, a specific somatic appearance (low levels of skin pigmentation, and more or less sleek hair texture), and the speaking of an Indo-European language with native-speaker levels of accomplishment. This ‘normal’ pattern of European-ness, of course, although dominant for centuries, has never covered the whole of Europe’s complexity, where

---

88 This is a point made repeatedly in my Intercultural encounters, 2003, where the sangoma system is described extensively (chs. 5-8).

89 Of course there have been eminent exceptions, who therefore stand out by refreshingly critical contributions: like Snowden 1970; Mudimbe 1988; Mveng 1972.
• Afroasiatic (among Jews, and in the medieval Iberian peninsula and Sicily), Uralic (Hungary, the Baltic and Finland), Altaic (Turkish on the Balkan) and Sino-Caucasian languages including Basque (Caucasus and Northern Spain),
• religious expressions such as Islam (on the Iberian peninsula and the Balkan) and Judaism (thoughout Europe),
• and much darker complexions than displayed by the majority of the local population,

have constituted sizable minority manifestations, throughout the last two millennia, whilst persistent mythical rumours and dispersed archaeological finds suggest dark-complexioned primal population elements for Europe in prehistoric times.\(^\text{90}\) In recent decades intercontinental migration has greatly increased and diversified this pluralism. Yet the socially dominant ‘normal’ pattern, with the implications of dominance and legitimacy it entails, suggest an ideological geopolitical model, which informs not only the media, popular culture, and popular political sentiment, but that also sets limits to the scholarly imagination. How are we to imagine a Europe (now seen as normally Christian, Indo-European speaking, and White), in Late Bronze Age protohistory, when Christianity was non-existent, Indo-European expansion was in full swing but far from completed in Europe, and where we can only guess at the inhabitants’ somatic type – a guess likely to be influenced by our geopolitical stance today. How are we to conceive of the same Europe at the onset of the Holocene, when organised religion around a literate priesthood and a transcendent concept of the sacred had not yet been invented, when Eurasian / Nostratic\(^\text{91}\) was going through its formative period, when proto-Indo-European had probably not yet dissociated itself from its Eurasian / Nostratic seedbed, and when Asian and African continuities in the linguistic, archaeological and genetic record suggest, for Europe at the time, a predominance of linguistic forms (Khoisan, Niger-Congo, Nilo-Saharan, and Sino-Caucasian) and somatic types (Mongoloid, Khoisanoid and Sudanoid) now predominantly associated with the other continents of the Old World: not Europe, but Asia and Africa. It takes great powers of (self-)relativism and anti-ethnocentrism to allow into one’s conscious mind such alternatives to the European geopolitical normal model. Of course, the empirical testing of such alternatives is a totally different matter, but before such testing can take place, they have to be admitted to the conscious imagination first – they have to be made thinkable.

We have already encountered a kindred phenomenon: the reading and identification of the name ‘Africa’, which today we attach uniquely to the continental land mass Southwest of Asia and South of Europe, but whose earlier association with specific spots on the earth’s surface has a most chequered history, reaching from Iran to Scandinavia! (cf. Table 2.1, above).

We must not underestimate the distortive effect of the ‘normal’ European geopolitical mind-set. Let me give one example from the context of the present study: The location of the ancient shrine of Dodona, and Eurocentric identity construction.

**DODONA AND EUROCENTRIC IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION.** The Pelasgian-associated shrine of Zeus at Dodona has long been recognised as the oldest oracular shrine in operation in Greece. From very early on its location has been claimed to be in Dodona.\(^\text{92}\) The literature on Dodona is extensive.\(^\text{93}\) Myths that came to be codified in the classical period, including Herodotus’ specific report (Historiae, II, 54–57), suggest that the Dodona shrine was a second-millennium BCE filial of the shrines of Zeus-Ammon in the West Egyptian oasis of that name; this tallies with the well-attested preponderance of oracular-deity shrines in Ancient Egypt, especially in the New Kingdom and the Late Period (Ray 1981; Cerny 1962). The link with the Ammon shrine in the

---

90 Cf. van Sertima 1985, which incidentally contains one of Bernal’s first statements on ‘Black Athena: The African and Levantine Roots of Greece’ (Bernal 1985). Also the mythical traditions of the Black Irish – often conflated with rumours of primeval unilateral, evil beings, the Fomorians (Willis 1994: 180). Moreover there is Guiseppe Sergi’s interpretation as negroid – no longer widely supported – of the dual burial at the North Italian Grotta dei Fanciulli (also known as Grimaldi). On the basis of analyses of ancient Central European place names, Karst believed he could identify a substantial Cushitic linguistic substrate, which elsewhere tends to coincides with high pigmentation levels.

Siwa oasis, northwestern Egypt, and with its tutelary god *Dedun* (Dedum), with predominantly male, Nubian, lionine, Horus and incense connotations, is illuminated in Bonnet (1952 / 1971, s.v. ‘Dedun’, p. 153). Of the authors mentioned in the above bibliographical footnote, it is only Terry who enters into a discussion of the two Dodona shrines, one in Epirus (ruins of which were excavated near Joannina in 1896), and the other in Thessaly. Terry adduces Strabo *(Geog.,* ix, 5, 19; and Fragment 15) in order to elucidate the ancient geography. It is especially Lochner-Hüttnebach (1960) who (in what incidentally is one of the seminal publications on the Pelasgians) discusses the existence of two Dodonas, the original Bronze Age one in Thessaly, and the later one in Epirus, supposedly established when this region became greacised. My impression is that the Epirus context fits best the reports by Homer and Herodotus. Although John Croft’s professional authority remains unclear, his preponderous observation on Dodona is sufficiently interesting in our present context to be cited in extenso:

‘Siwa was fortified by Merenptah and Rameses III by Dardani from the Peoples of the Sea, to guard against Libyan incursions. Hence the *dowm* of the Egyptians. It doesn’t refer to Dodona (unless there is an earlier etymological link between Dodona and the Dardanians (and the modern Dardanelles). Once again we are back into the same area as our Pelasgian = Etruscan areas. So rather than Dodona coming from Siwa, I would suggest a Late Bronze Age connection going the other way – from Dodona to Siwa at the time of the Peoples of the Sea.’ (Croft 2000).

Croft certainly has a point here, considering how close the word *Dedona* is to *douniv*, one of the names of the Sea Peoples in the Egyptian records. My own reading of the evidence is that Dodona was originally a Pelasgian, pre-Hellenic local oracle of the Mother goddess, later – as a result of specific Egyptian involvement on the soil of modern Greece in the third or second millennium BCE – to be restyled in terms of a Nubian, male, oracular god. The precise nature of the Egyptian involvement remains a matter for further research. Especially Bernal has been very vocal on the point of Egyptian colonisation of the Aegean in the second or third millennium BCE – to be restyled in terms of a Nubian, male, oracular god. The precise nature of the Egyptian involvement remains a matter for further research. Especially Bernal has been very vocal on the point of Egyptian colonisation of the Aegean in the second or third millennium BCE, but despite some genetic support which has meanwhile been established for this position (Arnaiz-Villena *et al.* 1999, 2001a, on the Greeks resulting from forced migration in pharaonic times), 94 the greatest defect of his approach is that he fails to appreciate the Pelasgian element in Egyptian religion, especially in its popular streaks, which means cognate continuity, in the first place, and only secondarily transcontinental intrusion, between Egypt and the Aegean in the Early and Middle Bronze Age. The transformation of Pelasgian goddesses to male ones took place throughout the Pelasgian realm and beyond in the Bronze Age (see Table 6.4 below), and did not particularly need an Egyptian impetus. Whether the Egyptian transformative influence effected the Dodona in Epirus or the one in Thessaly, before or after Hellenisation, is not very important, because the shrine is pre-Hellenic anyway. Epirus however seems to have the best papers. Stubbings (1987: 344 f., map) without any further discussion places the Dodona of the Catalogue of Ships simply in Epirus. The practice of creating filial shrines by solemnly bringing soil and / or sacred objects from the original shrine to the new location, is found all over the Mediterranean, and often reveals concomitant population movements *(cf. van Binsbergen 1971d, 1985a, 1985b)*.

However, a problem arises since modern archaeology has brought out that the complex associated with Hellenic ethnicity and culture (Late Helladic III) did not extend to Epirus until very late, after Dodona must already have been in operation for centuries. Rather than admitting that the shrine (with its Pelasgian connotations which by itself make it cognate to Egyptian popular religion even regardless of any specific Egyptian involvement) must be considered pre-Hellenic (thus depriving classical Greece from one of its major constituent religious features, the oracular shrine cult, on which – as I will argue at greater length, but with little originality, below, in Section 28.6.4 – much of its intra-regional political organisation was based), the existence of a more original Dodona shrine, east of the Epirus one in Thessaly, is postulated, so that the pivotal Dodona institution can be saved for Greek, and ultimately European, identity. It is quite possible that the insistence on a more original Dodona in Thessaly is simply the outcome of an open empirical mind and nothing more. But I fear that Eurocentric geopolitical constructs of the kind indicated are also at work here.

The projection of our own subconscious geopolitics onto the past leads to distortions not only of contents but also of format – just as the shortcoming of many studies of indigenous knowledge systems is that they assume a wrong format for non-western, non-academic knowledge. Like our contemporary constellation names (which no longer carry the mythical and astrological overtones they did for millennia, until only a few centuries ago), under the influence of our contemporary classificatory rationality (whose own mythical seat, in its turn, lies in the fact that science has now largely replaced religion as the central legitimating element in modern North Atlantic society), 95 our perception of toponyms and ethnonyms is now subconsciously influenced by the following assumptions, which however are absolutely not applicable to ancient onomastica: *every toponym and ethnonym must have one and only one referent, and it refers to this referent always in the same rational, classificatory manner; therefore identifying this unique referent exhausts the scholar’s task in relation to*

94 Below, we will repeatedly make reference to the genetic research by Arnaiz-Villena *et al.*, even though its credibility is somewhat marred by the fact that the linguistic explorations by this author will be found (Section 29.3) to amount to science fiction. A reader adverse to long-range linguistic reconstruction may sarcastically retort that the same applies to my own linguistic explorations in Chapter 4; however, the difference lies in my sustained attempt at systematic, methodological and intersubjective knowledge production, which admittedly may still lead to defective science, but not to science fiction.

such a toponym or ethnonym. Our own geopolitics reflects scientific and legal rationality, makes clear-cut distinctions, and thus upholds our world-view, both in a geographical sense, and in the sense of exemplifying the kind of clear-cut, consistent, immutable distinctions on which our modern rationality pretends to be based. Not realising that ancient onomastica do not work that way (but follow the mechanisms of manipulation outlined above, in Section 2.4), is an ethnocentric and geopolitical distortion of the greatest magnitude.

Regrettably, the tendency to expect, in ancient geographies, one-to-one relationships with modern nomenclature, and, thus, the projection of modern scientific rationality upon them, can also be seen in recent, otherwise daring and inspiring, approaches to ancient toponymy, such as those by Best (1996-7) and Woudhuizen (2001, 2003). Here also differences in text genres need to be appreciated. Best 1997 deals with (presumably) personal seals with, among other things, faunal and floral representations, and is therefore in the midst of an ancient poetics of imagery, where the above observations are in principle applicable – notwithstanding the fact that Best shows himself to have been eminently aware of the dangers of ethnocentric geopolitics, such as have obscured, for decades, the evidence of non-Indo-European languages on Crete (especially Afroasiatic > Semitic). Seeking to contribute to one of the major scholarly industries since Antiquity – trying to solve the enigma of Atlantis – Woudhuizen (2001; also cf. this book, Chapter 23) deals with a possible mention of the name Atlantis, and is therefore also in the midst of a mythical geography. Woudhuizen (2003), however, is an analysis of Hittite administrative texts, which (given the fact that they are meant to underpin the functioning of a complex and conflict-ridden state in real life) are likely to contain little or no mythical geography; here the search for one-to-one relationships between the toponyms appearing in such texts, and their identifications by modern academic equivalents is more justified than, for instance, in texts we shall examine in detail in the present study: the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (essentially meant as a poetic, not an administrative text), and the Biblical Table of Nations (essentially meant as a mythico-sacred, not an administrative text). Yet it is remarkable that Best’s and Woudhuizen’s arguments, whilst offering an abundance of references to studies of the Hittite or Cretan textual material, do not contain any general, methodological and theoretical reflection on the nature and dynamics of toponyms; in this respect they are only too typical of current approaches to ancient geographies and ethnicities.

2.7. Scholarship as steering a middle course between myth and the deconstruction of myth

Vansina has been one of the pioneers of creating history in the prothistorical conditions typical of Iron Age Africa. In a fascinating methodological piece provocingly entitled ‘Is elegance proof?’, he reviewed Luc de Heusch’s attempts to trace the ‘prehistory of Bantu thought’. Vansina then makes the following point:

‘All history as reconstruction of the past is of course mythical. (...) Myths are held to be ‘true.’ De Heusch is to be faulted for not using all the traditions about the past, however recent that past, and considering them myth. But, conversely, historical accounts reflect the past. The well-known problem is to find exactly how a set of data reflects the past as well as how it expresses the present. The succeeding problem, then, is how to reconstruct the past most objectively, and in doing so create a new myth. Not because the account is not true, but because it will be held to be true.’ (Vansina 1983: 342)

Lest we plunge into a form of academic agnosticism that would deprive our research from all sense and meaning, it is very important that we agree what should be understood by myth in this context. Myth is not synonymous with untruth, lie, delusion, or chimaera. Myth is, in the best Ancient Greek tradition in the first place simply a nar-
rative, and particularly one that, by the narrator and the hearer, is held to be self-evidently true as a statement about essential aspects of the human condition and of the world at large. A myth creates the impression of truth by the literary and otherwise performative process of coherent, meaningful and skillful narration. A myth (unless one is prepared to transform it into something else than a myth) cannot and need not be tested against other sources of knowledge, because its very format makes it, for the narrator and his or her receptive audience, a royal road, and a shortcut, to the experience of truth. My oblique reference to the Freudian idea (Freud 1961-1973 / 1899) of the Dream as the royal road to the unconscious is deliberate: myth generates an oniric sense of direct and total experience that makes one forget the performative artistry of narration, and makes one accept the images thus produced as profoundly truthful. If the truth of myth is beyond testing, hors concours, myth is perpendicular or tangential, rather than inimical, to any kind of scientific procedure. The latter is aimed at the painstaking and intersubjective, valid and reproducible production – hardly of Truth, but of partial and usually inconspicuous half-truths whose half-life tends to be measured in years rather than millennia. The journalistic art of scientific popularisation is to convert the products of the scientific endeavour into myth – juicy and triumphant narratives that convince and conjure up a pleasing image of a coherent and meaningful universe that just cannot help yielding to the insisting penetration of the inquisitive human mind. It is only in the form of myth (i.e., as performative, digestible narrative conveying a sense of meaning and relevance) that the results of science can be communicated at all to non-scientists. And even the persistent, relentless pursuit of scientific truth, the attempt to painstakingly report on the empirical data that have presented themselves however detrimental these prove to be for one’s pet hypotheses, can only be endured because of the mythical halo with which we as scientists surround our work, even in our own eyes. By the same token, it is largely myth that allows us to get our research funded in the first place: the success of our research applications is determined, not by the truth of our hypotheses, but by the elegance with which we write products of the literary genre called ‘research application’ – it is the narrative of whom we know, how we are organised, what we have read, what we hope to find (often with excessive display of what we pretend to already know whereas the purpose of the project is to get to know it in the first place), that, occasionally makes us emerge successfully out of the application lottery. And the closest parallel between the performative narrative, and the myth, is written and published in the scholarly product itself: presentation, balance, proper up-to-date wording, full and consistent display of bibliographical and editorial conventions, avoidance of contradiction on paper even if the facts are contradictory, persuasively (as if ‘real’ truth needed persuasiveness ...) building up the tension of an argument and consummating its effects, and in fact, in the long and painful writing process the scientist, as narrator, reiterates the myriad little and not so little steps that together have led to a coherent, reasoned project, mirrored (narrated) in an equally (or usually, slightly more) reasoned, coherent account where all parts are carefully selected and ordered in a discursive, linear path of argument. Scientific truth is produced, not in the moment of discovery, but in the months and years of painstaking writing; and the test of scientific credibility (certainly in the Humanities and the Social Sciences) lies primarily in the well-formedness (consistency, logic, elegance, originality, adequate linearisation of the line of argument) of the text, and not in the adequacy of the methodological procedures of discovery (which, anyway, the reader can only know through the author’s own, partisan account). To the extent to which science is production of text, it is narrative, and mythical – the impression of truth derives largely from literary techniques of persuasion, and only secondarily from truth – generating epistemological, including methodological procedures. In the face of this lure of the mythical in science, the real agony in science writing is to resist that lure (as Odysseus tied to the mast, while his companions were spell-bound under the Sirens’ promise of regressive gratification; Odyssey XII), and expose one’s own tendencies to myth as one writes them down. This I have tried to do in the present argument, but I have probably failed. Science writing is literature, is myth, and if we are not very careful, it risks being nothing else besides. And finally, much of science is about exposing other people’s myth – the myths of laymen as well as the ideas and findings of our colleagues with whom we happen not to agree. The whole


101 In nuclear physics, an isotope’s half-life is the characteristic period (specific to each isotope, and ranging from milliseconds to millions of years) within which (an undeterminable) half of a given mass of that isotope will have decayed under the production of radioactivity.

102 As a symbol of the task of the intellectual in a world succumbing to its own myth of scientific rationality, this image plays a central role in Horkheimer & Adorno’s (1944 / 1986) devastating critique of the Enlightenment, published in the USA towards the end of World War II.
point of science is not that it is free of myth, but that we earnestly seek to let the facts (those that we cannot control, that we did not (entirely) produce ourselves, that would (more or less) be there anyway (largely) regardless of our attempts to create science) – that let those facts dictate to us and to our critical peers a clear course, between the myths we try to avoid and the myth we seek to produce (van Binsbergen 2009b).

THE DIALECTICS OF MYTH AND TRUTH IN BERNAL’S BLACK ATHENA SERIES. The extent to which also scholarship, rather than existing on some privileged plane of unadulterated truth, proceeds from one myth to the next, may be illustrated again by reference to the Black Athena debate. When Bernal conceived the first volume of his Black Athena series, the main thrust of his argument was an attempt to explode, with excellent documentation and for excellent reasons, the mythical implications of the widely accepted view that Ancient Greece was the unique, and incomparably splendid, achievement of European-ness, without a significant historical debt to the societies of the Ancient Near East including Egypt. In stating his case, he chose to underplay the extent to which such indebtedness had long been realised at least by professional scholars, perhaps with the exception of a dwindling minority of inveterate Eurocentrists among Indo-Europeanists, Graecists, and archaeologists; such underplaying in itself amounts to the construction of myth. However, Bernal’s central myth became apparent when subsequently he presented, in Part II of his Black Athena, the archaeological and linguistic argument that was to replace the earlier Eurocentric myth: a new, Bernalian myth,103 in which Eurocentrism is replaced (with some allowance for Phoenician influences – but the mainstream conception of Phoenician culture is that of an Egyptian / Mesopotamian hybrid anyway) by Egyptocentrism (as if Ancient Greece only received cultural and religious impulses from Egypt, and not from Eurasia including the Danube Lands, the Pontic, Anatolia, Mesopotamia, the Central Mediterranean, West Central Asia, etc.) – and as if Egypt has not, to a considerable extent, received the same cultural and religious impulses as Greece had received, within the overall Pelasgian context. And lest Egypt would now appear, in its turn, as history-less and without historical indebtedness as Ancient Greece had allegedly been constructed in the earlier Altertumswissenschaft which Bernal criticised, some vague version of Afrocentricity was secondarily ushered in, so that Egypt became primarily an African achievement, notably the very channel through which the unique early cultural initiatives of Africa had been transmitted to classic civilisation and thus to the world at large.104 The point is not whether Afrocentricity, conceived as a historical hypothesis, is prima facie implausible (it really has a point, as I have repeatedly argued elsewhere),105 but that in Bernal’s hands it appears not so much as an academic hypothesis but as another myth; an ideological statement, as a suitable myth for late-20th-century times. This myth is cut to the measure of the demise of colonialism in Africa, the civil rights movement and general emancipation of Blacks in the USA, the rise of a multicultural society with vocal Black minorities in Western Europe, and finally highly intensified technological globalisation through greatly increased air travel, the Internet, the global integration of markets of goods, services, finance, etc., which posed the need of a new conception of the world, – notably one in which global interconnectedness, even shared global origins, could be argued beyond the globalisation-induced increased awareness of cultural, somatic, economic and political difference.

If I cite Bernal’s work here as an example of scholarly myth creation in order to supplant an earlier myth, it is emphatically not in order to suggest that scholarship has any alternative.106 My own work of the last decade and a half has been largely along similar lines, and I have gone out of my way107 to proclaim that, given the unavoidability of myth construction in scholarship, the kind of myths produced by the Black Athena debate and by Afrocentricity are much more sympathetic, inspiring, and (given the historical experience of and hegemonic marginalisation or exclusion of a large part of the global population today, especially in Africa) much more relevant and responsible, than any form of Eurocentrism.

Here is yet another red thread of the present study: the scholar, in trying to explode the myths of others, has no alternative but substituting her or his own, but in doing so, there is one condition that saves this exercise from becoming totally tautological and trivial: the scholar’s insistence on bringing all empirical evidence to bear on her or his argument, and to build such myths (in the sense of ‘captivating and signifying narrative’) as can be intersubjectively, before a forum of fellow specialists, be agreed to agree best with the empirical evidence at hand.

2.8. From political myth to scholarly myth and vice-versa

The study of ethnicity cannot be conducted in vacuo, and in fact is partially informed by the conjunctures of nationalism, racialism and multiculturalism in the societies to which the researchers themselves belong (cf. Poliakov 1971 / 1979; Taylor 1992).

The question of scholarly and political myths brings us to raise a question whose scope extends beyond the

103 Cf. van Binsbergen 1996-97b.
104 This tendency is particularly marked in Bernal 1997.
study of the Ancient Mediterranean. Yet the question is of considerable importance, because its discussion will serve to show how even ancient history is informed, to a considerable extent, by the concerns, conflicts, and geopolitics of today. The question is:

_Could modern ethnic conflicts in the Mediterranean region have a time depth of millennia and go back to the emergence and rise to dominance, of more recent language families, particularly Indo-European and Afroasiatic after the Upper Palaeolithic?_

It is remarkable that in the modern world, some of the greatest ethnic conflicts occur between on the one hand a dominant Indo-European (even, at a higher level of classification, Eurasotic/Nostratic) speaking group that has appropriated state power, and on the other hand residual ethnic groups whose members speak a language that belongs to the Sino-Caucasian macro-family. This formulation applies to Basques, Chechens (however, in the same part of the world, Abkhazians as a minority are in conflict with Georgians, which means that this is an intra-Caucasian conflict instead of one between Indo-European and Caucasian speakers). Extending the Sino-Caucasian macrophylum with Dené (cf. Dürr & Renner 1995), also the revival of Amerindian identity politics in the USA and Canada from the 1960s onward comes within our scope – although we should realise that languages of the Na-Dené family are spoken by only part of the Native American population, the other languages being subsumed under Amerind which is considered a branch of *Borean in its own right. The unexpected conclusion suggests itself that not only the recent history of exclusion, humiliation and violence in the modern world of the 20th century CE, but also long-ranging conflicts and confrontations across millennia, against the background of a retained sense of ethnic identity and distinctiveness, may inform these explosive and irreconcilable conflicts. One wonders to what extent some of the other ethnic hotspots in the world today (Northern Ireland, the Balkan, and Palestine) draw from a similar long-range reservoir of identity and confrontation. In this light, the identification, by a number of scholars, of the Philistines as Pelasgians, in combination with the possible, albeit partial and largely ‘invented’, continuity between the ancient Philistines and the modern Palestinian identity, makes us wonder if perhaps also in the Palestinian question, more is involved than land-grabbing in the concrete context of the creation of the state Israel, 1948 CE. Are the Palestinians, in their capacity of real, putative or imaginary, heirs to the Pelasgians, another ancient population cluster comparable with the above-mentioned Dené-Sino-Caucasian speakers, resisting incorporation in a state that is inimical to them not only politically, but also linguistically-cultural? Could similar arguments (perhaps within the Indo-European language phylum rather than between phyla) be set up for Northern Ireland and the Balkan, despite the stress on a relatively recent clash of world religions (Catholicism versus Protestantism in Northern Ireland; Catholicism, Greek Orthodox Christianity, and Islam, in the Balkan) that has dominated current analyses of these hotspots?

Or should we rather inverse the equation, and conclude that whatever scholarship has constructed as a (highly predictable and virtually irresolvable) conflict between apparently irreducible, primordially different groups, is in fact a reflection, an artefact, of the severity of that conflict in our own time and age. Two considerations make such a view less preposterous than it might seem at first glance:

1. Scholarly classifications are the product of human agency, made by people who in many respects are children of their own culture, class and ethnic group and who reflect the interests and tacit assumptions of these identity groups; moreover,
2. The Foucaultian point that ever since the Enlightenment science has taken the place of religion as the central legitimating and validating instance in North Atlantic, in increasingly global, society.

_THE SOCIETAL CONJUNCTURE OF THE THINKABILITY OF AFRICAN ORIGINS FOR HUMANKIND._ When we combine these two points, we may begin to discern the mythopoetic nature of scholarship. At a time $T_1$ (late 19th and early 20th century CE) when North Atlantic colonialism needs to justify its oppressive inequalities, scholarship produces $X$: an interpretation of cultures in terms of racial, in-born difference and inequality. By the time $T_2$ (1960s) when colonialism is no longer a viable option for intercontinental domination, $X$ gives way, first to cultural relativism ($Y$), then (at time $T_3$, from late 1980s onwards) to $Z$: the violent imposition of North Atlantic models of democracy. At $T_4$, scholarship situ-

ated the origin of mankind in West Asia (the Garden of Eden) or (taking into account early Hominid finds in Indonesia and China) in East or South East Asia, while the emergence of Anatomically Modern Humans with modern mental capabilities was reserved for Western Europe (e.g. the Franco-Cantabrian cave art). At T₂, an African origin began to be thinkable, but Anatomically Modern Humans were still considered to originate from Western Europe. Only at T₃, decades after the demise of colonialism, does it begin to be possible to contemplate Africa both as the cradle of humans in general, and as that of Anatomically Modern Humans.

Reverting to more recent historical processes, the insurgenecies attending the Palestino-Israeli conflict, the Basque conflict, various Balkan and Caucasian conflicts, the Hutu-Tutsi conflict which in 1994 led to the massive slaughter of half a million people or more, may be adorned by scholarship with a genealogy of fundamentally opposed linguistico-ethnic categories of centuries’, even millennia’s standing, but invariably an alternative argument can be constructed:

a. the ironical argument that the parties in the conflict have much more in common with each other than with most other groups in their vicinity, let alone in the world at large. The firm categories of relentless opposition, adduced by linguists, anthropologists, political scientists, students of religion, have become additional weapons in the conflict, rather than instruments to rationalise and quench the conflict;

b. mounting pressures and identifiable, interest-induced strategic manipulations in recent years and decades, fuelled and triggered the outbreak of violence in the first place.

In this connection the Basque case is very interesting. Joseba Zulaika, Professor of Basque studies at San Sebastian (Spain) and Reno (Nevada, USA), is very much aware of the epistemological pitfalls I have indicated in this section. He traces the itinerary of the construction of Basque identity in modern times. He clearly favours the deconstructivist approach that MacClancy (1993) has advocated in the Basque context, in line with general post-modernist trends:

‘Prestigious geneticists such as Cavalli-Sforza [1988, 1997] still characterize the Basques as the descendants of interbreeding between a population of Mesolithic aboriginals (overwhelmingly Rh⁺) and Neolithic farmers. By studying the geographic mapping of genetic patterns of present-day European populations, they perceive a genetic gradient that loosely fits in with the long established theory derived from archaeological and linguistic evidence. Bertranpetit and Cavalli-Sforza [1991] – WvB²¹³ – have produced synthetic genetic maps for the Iberian peninsula concluding that

‘Most probably, Basques represent descendants of Palaeolithic and/or Mesolithic populations.’

MacClancy is critical of these results. He sees a methodology framed by its own limitations, with questionable assumptions such as: there are no significant changes in genetic markers over the last thousand years or so; or that there is so much variation within the Basque population.

It is from the experience of an industrial society that Basques have recreated a prehistoric past. Archeology, anthropology, and art have played a significant role in such recreation.’ (Zulaika 2000; my italics).

The dilemma does not reside in the possibility, even attractiveness of a postmodern interpretation that relegates all scientific argument to a scholarly myth which is, in principle, equivalent to the myth of the historical actors (Basques, in this case) themselves. The dilemma is that modern scientific methods, grounded in intersubjective methods overseen by the collectivity of scholars united in a particular discipline, do not allow us (contrary to what MacClancy implies) total leeway in the extent of the myths we generate as scholars – the data always allow multiple interpretations, but provided the researchers involved are of good faith and submit their findings to the scrutiny of competent colleagues (which is often the case), the factual findings on which such interpretations are based, will be more or less the same when replicated, and cannot be considered just a modern myth and nothing more – even though admittedly there is a mythical side to the belief that science can lead to truth. Zulaika’s argument loses some of its persuasiveness in view of two recent finding – which we have already considered above:

(a) state-of-the-art, molecular genetics (to which Cavalli-Sforza largely had no access yet) have brought out

¹¹² The reference is to the well-known Rhesus-negative (RH⁻) factor, a hereditary feature of the blood that produces coagulation in contact with blood that has a different value for the Rhesus factor. Genetic studies of the Basques and of the Mediterranean have laid great stress on the RH⁻ factor, which constitutes an important ‘index fossil’ as we shall see in Chapter 28.


that the Mediterranean populations (with the exception of the Greeks) have been fairly stationary for over a handful of millennia; whilst

(b) the Basques probably have lived at their present habitat for the past 18 ka.\textsuperscript{115}

Given scholars’ tendency to explode the myths of others whilst substituting their own myths instead (cf. van Binsbergen 2009b), scholarship will never reach the truth, yet the painstaking and intersubjective handling of empirical data that are not easily distorted by whosoever’s myth, may bring us a bit closer to the truth. Basque ancient history might be just a contemporary ideological invention and nothing more, but the genetic evidence favours a different view. By the same token, the aim of the present study is not to produce a bunch of new myths about the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, nor to revive some old myths. Such myth as inevitably enters into my argument, is merely a didactic and rhetorical prop for a theoretical and methodological demonstration of what insights ethnicity research can bring us provided we exercise our minds toward greater social-scientific imagination, and steer away from accepted myth that puts blinkers to our keen perception. Although in the course of my argument I will not be able to refrain from pronouncements about the differential plausibility of certain interpretations, my main aim is not to present a better truth which would be another myth, but to help elucidate the road towards truth – the methodology and theory that prevent us from falling victims to myth too soon and too naïvely. I think that we are now sufficiently equipped on the theoretical side. But before we can try our hand at a few empirical case studies of ethnicity in the protohistorical context of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean region, there is one final hurdle to take: historians, and especially historians of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, on the average do not like, nor trust, theory or methodology. How to overcome this major problem to the reception of the present study among the audience for which it is meant in the first place?

\textsuperscript{115} Calafell & Bertranpetit 1994; Arnaiz-Villena et al. 1999, 2001b. According to Richards et al. 2000 (cf. Richards 2003) this relatively stationary character even goes back to the Upper Palaeolithic, with the Near-Eastern immigrant Neolithic component in European populations probably comprising less than 25%. The results of Scozzari et al. 2001 suggest that this, limited, Neolithic impact primarily affected the Eastern and Central Mediterranean, and hardly reached Iberia and North-western Europe. Of course, the relatively stationary pattern does not preclude intra-regional genetic exchanges, cf. Plaza et al. 2003; Rando et al. 1998. This relatively stationary genetic pattern across many millennia also constitutes a plausible context for the regional emergence, from the Neolithic onward, of the Primary Pelasgian cultural realm, and its gradual expansion especially at the end of the Bronze Age (see Chapter 28 below, where also genetic indicators of the Pelasgian complex will be highlighted).
CHAPTER 3. TOWARDS A THEORY OF ETHNICITY SPECIFICALLY FOR HISTORIANS OF THE LATE BRONZE AGE MEDITERRANEAN

In the last two decades, the study of ethnicity and cultural identity has moved to the centre of archaeological attention.\textsuperscript{116} Here, complex societies turned out to pose specific problems (Emberling 1997). The study of \textit{ethnogenesis} – the emergence of ethnic groups – became an important focus.\textsuperscript{117} The influence of specific national schools made itself felt, \textit{e.g.} in France (Demoule 1999). The shift to ethnicity and identity called for a new mode of self-reflexivity, since – as highlighted in the preceding Chapter – also archaeologists produce their work within an ethnic and national space (Hamilakis 1996), from which they may be considerably dependent for funding. Under the (neo-)colonial and imperialist conditions informing the North Atlantic region’s with other continents during the twentieth century,\textsuperscript{118} as well as in the highly contested space of the modern Middle East, these questions press all the more, as they do in regard of ideological developments of twentieth-century Germany (Veit 1989).

With regard to the specific field of the Mediterranean Bronze Age, recent decades have seen a spate of excellent studies, in which however the theoretical and definitional basis has remained somewhat weak. The Egyptologist Wainwright undertook a series of studies of Sea-Peoples-related ethnicities, to which we will turn below; he also contributed work on the ‘Keftiu’ and their Cretan identification – a recurrent theme.\textsuperscript{119} Other work on Ancient Egyptian ethnicity includes the Afrocentrist Foster 1974, where (as throughout the \textit{Black Athena} debate) ethnicity tends to be (mis-) conceived as ‘Blackness’. Astour (1957 / 1967) contributed seminal work on ethnicity in an overall Semitic speaking West Asian context. And many more excellent studies could be mentioned.\textsuperscript{120}

Although for the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean the study of ethnicity is a relatively recent undertaking, the ethnic dimension of classical studies has always been conspicuous, from the very beginnings of \textit{Alterrauts-wissenschaft} on, when K.O. Müller published his highly influential \textit{Geschichten hellenischer Stämme und Städte, I-III} (1820-24). This implicit focus on ethnicity has been largely due to the fact that also the Ancients themselves perceived their situation, and presented historical narratives, primarily within an ethnic framework of nations, tribes and named regional groups – a perspective that via the long history of secondary education since Late Antiquity (Homer, Thucydides, Herodotus, Tacitus, Livy, Caesar) was instilled and taken for granted in an unbroken chain of European, subsequently North Atlantic, intellectuals across nearly two millennia.

For the study of ethnicity in the Aegean during the classical period, the work of Jonathan Hall\textsuperscript{121} stands out. Mycenaean ethnicity was tackled by Bennet (1999), whilst methodological and theoretical reflections on this topic were contributed by Middleton (2002). Problems of ethnicity suggested by the Thera finds were explored by Marinatos (1973).\textsuperscript{122} Donlan (1985) looked at ethnicity in the ‘Dark Ages’. Mention should also be made of McInerney’s (1999) fine study of ethnicity in ancient Phokis (review: Buckler 2000). In recent decades, the study of ethnicity in Graeco-Roman Antiquity during the classical period has developed into fully-fledged contributions to ethnic studies, especially with regard to Hellenism and Late Antiqu-


\textsuperscript{117} \textit{E.g.} Karageorghis 1994; Levy & Holl 2002.

\textsuperscript{118} Cf. Given 1998; Steel 2001; Silberman-Gitin 1998, specifically with reference to the Bronze Age Mediterranean; Bernal 1987.


\textsuperscript{120} Hesse & Wapnish 1997 explored whether a characteristic food taboo (on pigs) could be retrieved archaeologically. Further ethnic studies relating to the Mediterranean Bronze Age include Garasanin 1973; Frankel 2000; Keith 1998; Kamp & Yoffee 1981; Frankel & Webb 1998; Given 1998.


\textsuperscript{122} Bronze Age studies specifically of the Aegean will also be touched upon in connection with the Sea Peoples.
In the study of early medieval Europe, the ethnic dimension has been approached with increasing emphasis and sophistication during the last decade. In these studies the *millet* and ‘melting-pot’ models of our typology surface in Greek, Roman, Germanic and Jewish trappings. Based on a wealth of contemporary documentary material augmented with archaeological and linguistic perspectives, these studies are inspiring and suggest considerable parallels with modern situations (of ethnicity in colonial and postcolonial times), — mainly because of the highly developed statal and imperial factor these situations have in common; and probably also because the authors of these studies themselves belong to societies of a similar statal and imperial signature.

However, both methodologically and typologically the situations of Hellenism and Late Antiquity are far removed from the protohistorical setting in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age, at least one millennium earlier. Although many of the ethnic identities of the latter period would nominally survive into Hellenism and Late Antiquity, they would do so as a form of Transfer of Ethnicity. The same ethnonym no longer carries the original linguistic and cultural load, and may even have become displaced spatially. As a result, Late Bronze Age identities, even if seeping through into Hellenism and Late Antiquity, would have taken a very different shape, and their genesis can hardly be reconstructed from so very late a vantage point. However, on the general principle (which we shall elaborate below) that the Early Iron Age is in certain, limited, respects continuous with the Late Bronze Age, studies of Greek ethnicity during the archaic and classical period are more enlightening for our present study, especially since for this period (where the recent work by Jonathan Hall as cited above deserves special attention) repeated attempts have been made to ‘bridge the gap’ between philological and archaeological approaches.

In John Buckler’s (2000) incisive and extremely well documented review of McInerney’s (1999) study of Phocian ethnicity in the Middle and Late Iron Age, he makes a point that has a direct bearing on our present study:

> ‘He [McInerney] insists (...) instead that (...) [Phocian ethnic identity] was a late and artificial creation, but one created before the archaic period.**128** He supports his case for artificiality by using models, some drawn from the experiences of African and American Indian tribes, instead of explaining (...)**129** why some Phokians asserted their allegiance to their own ethnicity while others preferred Dorian. (...) Models are no satisfactory substitute for careful examination of the specific evidence.'**130**

Buckler is right: while models abound in ethnic studies — a few of them were briefly considered above, in Chapter 2 it is only from the painstaking confrontation of such models with well-studied empirical data about real situations well-defined in space and time, that any growth of insight (i.e., any systematic, intersubjective and convincing avoidance of scholarly myth) may be expected. However, let us also realise that the mutual validation of models and empirical data goes both ways: models are nothing in themselves, but equally useless is the accumulation of so-called facts that, by some naïve and obsolete epistemology, are supposed to ‘speak for themselves’, but that in fact will remain mute and meaningless unless considered in the light of extensive and explicit theory — including models. Such an epistemology is a remnant, not only of British empiricism, but also of a 19th-century CE, Comtean, ‘positivism’, that hit classical studies, Biblical studies, Egyptology, and Assyriology towards 1900, to reluctantly give way to the subtler hermeneutics, social science, and postmodernism of the later 20th century — at least in most cases, but streaks of the obsolete ‘positivism’ can still be encountered.

Given the abundance of ethnonyms and accounts of ethnic conflict in the Bible, in fact a much large proportion of Biblical studies has dealt with ethnic issues than is reflected in the actual titles of published work. In fact, all

---


125 Here Cornell’s (1997) study of ethnicity in early Roman history would be more relevant; also cf. Lomas 1997 on gender and ethnicity in Ancient Italy.


127 McInerney 1999: 133–4; reference in the original.

128 McInerney 1999: 147; reference in the original.

129 McInerney 1999: 47; reference in the original.

130 Buckler 2000; my italics.
studies relating to the Table of Nations in *Genesis* 10 are implicitly ethnic studies. Among Biblical scholarship, we see again the rise of ethnicity as a central concept from the 1980s onward.\(^{131}\)

What makes it so difficult to analyse ethnicity in the Eastern Mediterranean in the protohistorical setting of the Late Bronze Age, is not so much the absence or paucity of data, but especially historians’ dislike of explicit theoretical models. As a result, what often happens is that one relies merely on an implicit model which takes for granted certain self-evidences.\(^{132}\) These derive merely from ‘common sense’, and tend to have a considerable ethnocentric, geopolitical, Eurocentric load. Usually they have not been stated explicitly, have not been tested empirically, and are not in line with the general theoretical and methodological philosophy (van Binsbergen 1999a, 1999b, 2003a: ch. 15). The following list gives some impression of the relevant work in the field of ethnicity in the Bible: Speiser 1932-33; Wannwright 1956 (Caphthor / Cappadocia); Rosel 1982 (*non vidi*); Sawyer & Clines 1983; O’Connell 1984; Herrmann 1988; Müllen 1993; Strange 1998; Knoppers 2001; Killebrew 2005.\(^{133}\) Cf. my 1999 inaugural in the Rotterdam chair of intercultural philosophy (van Binsbergen 1999a, 1999b, 2003a: ch. 15).

Without recourse to this vast fount of knowledge and inspiration, as a main-stream protohistorian would still, just like more epistemologically demanding analysts, use the concept of the state as the most obvious incorporating context giving rise to an ethnic space, but one would hesitate (for otherwise one’s approach might risk to be no longer ‘properly historical’ in the eyes of one’s disciplinary colleagues. And anyway, as a protohistorian one has little hard data at one’s disposal) to spell out in detail what are the structural characteristics, the inner contradictions, and the most likely tendencies to change, within that state. Now, when within such a deliberately implicit and incomplete model of the state, in its turn, a mere common-sense notion of ethnicity is introduced as another focus of analysis, the result could hardly be more than awkward, rigid, perfunctory, and unconvincing, from the perspective of the professional social scientist specialising in political and ethnic relations.

The following traits seems to be included in the implicit package of self-evident presuppositions concerning ethnicity in the common-sense approach:

- the structure of the social-political space formed by ethnicity is more or less the same regardless of the specific region and period under study;
- ethnic designation means more or less the same in most, or all, situations;
- therefore, to know what ethnic designation applies to a person or a group, offers an exhaustive insight in the ‘ethnicity’ of a specific period and region, even if we do not specifically address the overall ethnic classification system of which that specific ethnic designation is only a small part, and even if we do not study the social structure to which that identification gives rise, let alone the historical process by which that classification system and that social structure (in other words, the history of the ethnic space in question) were brought into being, and by which they are to change and fade away.

Our preceding Chapter 2 will have sufficiently brought out the inadequacy of such a common-sense approach to ethnicity. As an alternative, the point of the present study lies not so much in the adduction of new data, but primarily in the formulation of an interpretative model in the form of a research programme, whose value if any is in the first place meant to be heuristic. This model also amounts to the formulation of a particular method, notably one with the following steps:\(^{135}\)

1. *The obvious empirical steps*: the construction of an archaeological corpus and of a corpus of contemporary documents that both are to be as complete as possible

\(^{131}\) The following list gives some impression of the relevant work in the field of ethnicity in the Bible: Speiser 1932-33; Wannwright 1956 (Caphthor / Cappadocia); Rosel 1982 (*non vidi*); Sawyer & Clines 1983; O’Connell 1984; Herrmann 1988; Müllen 1993; Strange 1998; Knoppers 2001; Killebrew 2005.

\(^{132}\) Cf. my 1999 inaugural in the Rotterdam chair of intercultural philosophy (van Binsbergen 1999a, 1999b, 2003a: ch. 15).

\(^{133}\) Cf. Mills 1959.

\(^{134}\) However, many social scientists are also epistemologically unsophisticated (cf. van Binsbergen 2003a); moreover, when they study ethnicity, they tend to fall short in the appreciation of literary and mythical dimensions, for which they often lack the necessary humanities background.

\(^{135}\) In the division of labour upon which Woudhuizen’s and my own joint approach to the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples is based, the points outlined under (1) and (2) have been mainly Woudhuizen’s responsibility, and one which he discharged with the full deployment of his competence as an accomplished ancient historian and linguist.
2. Scrutiny of (1) in the light of:

3. A heuristic model that is as explicit and as systematic as possible, not because it already possesses the truth concerning the actual ethnic situation in the eastern Mediterranean basin toward the end of the Bronze Age, but because any model is all the more readily tested and improved, the more it is explicit and systematic.

4. That heuristic model is based on the broad social-scientific and historical ‘state of the art’, i.e.: specialists’ insights, accepted and generally shared, as to what ethnicity is, what it does, what causes and effects it may have, etc. These insights do not necessarily derive from analysis of the protohistoric situation of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, which, by definition, is poorly documented. On the contrary, such insights may derive, in the first instance, from historical periods and regions that are far better known, and from situations today that are directly accessible for empirical interactive / participatory research. Here we are reminded of the fact that it is particularly present-day Africa and the present-day North Atlantic region which have been growth points of theory and empirical research in the field of ethnic studies. On the other hand, our heuristic model will, of course, have to take in as much as possible of our increasing empirical knowledge concerning the Mediterranean Late Bronze Age.

5. Conditions for comparability. However, ethnic models from other periods and other regions cannot simply be projected onto the Mediterranean Bronze Age, not so much because that specific spatio-temporal context is relatively little known, but because it is to be expected that, as compared to other periods and regions, it will display specific, marked structural characteristics having to do with such demonstrable historical processes, throughout the course of the three millennia as separate us today from the Late Bronze Age: changes in such fields as state formation, alphabetisation, the rise and spread of world religions, urbanisation, the rise and spread of technology and science. On the other hand, as a particular form of classificatory thought, and as a particular form of power formation and management, ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean is also likely to appeal, in part, to more fundamental structural tendencies in the human mind and human social organisation which (against the background of a few million years of human history) may have remained rather constant over the relatively short period of a mere three millennia; this qualified continuity would justify comparison with present-day data even despite the obvious differences just enumerated. Moreover, we may surmise that, outside the metropolitan centres of the present-day world, in the periphery of modern states in the 19th to 21st centuries CE, still structural features may be found that are more directly and more in detail comparable with the structural characteristics of the Late Bronze Age in that region, and also in this respect present-day data and analyses have something to offer towards an understanding of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean. For instance, I shall argue that the, relatively well documented, Early and Middle Iron Age Aegean is in certain respects a reasonably acceptable operationalisation (in other words, empirical approximation) for the, much less well known, Late Bronze Age; now, the Early and Middle Iron Age in the Aegean may have had some traits in common (in terms of production and circulation, demography, leadership, cosmology) with the (not entirely unconnected) Iron Age in South Central Africa, which effectively extended into the nineteenth century CE and thus is open to direct documentary and oral-historical research. However this may be, it is important to realise that such general models as I have formulated on the basis on present-day situations and subsequently apply, tentatively and heuristically, to the Late Bronze Age, must be regarded emphatically as merely hypothetical constructs and nothing more.

6. The inevitability of rival explanations. I have already referred, at the end of Chapter 2, to the generally ac-

---

136 Also cf. Fardon 1987, who claims, with specific reference to Africa, that the scope of comparability of ethnic phenomena is quite limited.

137 In my recent research (van Binsbergen 2008b, 2010c) I highlight Scythian, Ancient Egyptian, Ancient Mesopotamian and somewhat more recent South Asian themes in modern South Central African settings, especially in such fields as kingship, court ceremony, myth, and cosmology. The unravelling of such themes is outside our present scope, but here again the Pelasgian Hypothesis proves to be of great explanatory power. Much of the same ground is covered in my globally comparative work on leopard-skin symbolism (van Binsbergen 2004-11).

knowledged insight in the philosophy of science to the effect that the same finite body of empirical data may be theoretically accounted for, not just by only one, but always by a plurality of rival theoretical explanatory models. Therefore, empirical scientific research is comparable with seeking to solve n simultaneous equations with so many (at least n+1) unknowns that never one and only one unequivocal solution will result. However, the various theoretical interpretations that may be produced as possible solutions, may differ from one another in terms of competitive plausibility.\textsuperscript{139}

a. In general, proposed solutions that draw on all available data are to be preferred over proposed solutions that are only based on a selection of the data and that leave part of the available data untouched or unexplained.

b. In the same vein, proposed solutions that are comparative and historicising in nature, and that therefore draw on a larger selection of data and theories and that appreciate the historical dynamics of social forms, are, in principle, to be preferred over proposed solutions that define, and seek to solve, the problem much more narrowly in terms of space and time, and by reference to static social scientific definitional classifications that only allow or imply a synchronic analysis. On this last point, however, the avoidance of one-sidedness and myopia is not always, and not automatically, an advantage in itself: the alternative danger here, as associated with all long-range approaches, is that one is tempted to compare what is essentially incomparable. Admittedly, wide-ranging historical and comparative gestures may come at a considerable cost, notably the risk that specialised local and regional knowledge and skills, and true state-of-the-art depth, are replaced by superficiality and sweeping generality in the approach to the central core of data; and that one loses, as a researcher, the constructive, informal and friendly\textsuperscript{140} criticism of the members of one’s own field and specialisation. Of course, I am profoundly aware that, where Mediterranean studies have not been my life’s specialisation the way they promised to become forty years ago, and where I am trespassing into disciplines where I can only be an amateur (classical studies, Biblical studies, Egyptology, comparative linguistics, genetics, ancient history, etc.), this risk applies particularly to myself and to the present argument. Hence my insistence on theory and method. Although it is impossible to present theory and method outside a concrete, empirical framework, it is all right if specialists take my empirical pronouncements in the present study simply with a pinch of salt, derive some inspiration of what seems valid or passable to them, and reject the rest. Doing so will save them much irritation, and will save me a lot of unnecessary polemics.

7. \textit{The nature of historical explanation.} Historians often adopt a reticent, even dismissive, attitude towards the application of theory, for what appear to be the best of reasons, notably: fear lest they might impose, upon reality, such concepts and relationships as are alien to the so-called historical facts and to the historical actors’ own conceptualisation of these facts. For, as a result of such alleged imposition, the historian might no longer keep an open mind vis-à-vis the data, might no longer be able ‘to let the data speak for themselves’ (as if they ever do!), and might be unable to let the voice be heard of the historical actors themselves. In this respect, historiography tends implicitly to an emic perspective. Widespread though this wariness vis-à-vis theory is among historians, much could be said against it. In the light of my above remarks about

\textsuperscript{139} Bernal 1987.

\textsuperscript{140} The \textit{Black Athena} debate has been a good example of these dynamics. As an accomplished Sinologist and modern ideological historian, Martin Bernal from 1980 onwards began to take on problemsatics and to move into disciplinary fields for which he had no obvious credentials, yet upsetting many an established apples-cart. The viciousness of the debate especially in the mid-1990s (cf. Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996) was less due to the enormities of his mistakes (which were greatly exaggerated by his critics, and insufficiently offset against his great merits also in the new fields he had entered and where he had rapidly gained publicly acknowledged competence), than to the professional isolation into which he had entered. This effect (cf. van Binsbergen 1996-97b) was only partially compensated by the long lists of – often high-ranking – international scholars that sympathised with, and had advised on, his project, and that adorned the acknowledgements of the various instalments of the \textit{Black Athena} series.
Scholarly Myth, researchers’ insistence on keeping the flow of empirical data as unimpeded as possible can only be applauded. However, modern historiography has never been satisfied with pure description, and, in fact, has always aimed at explanation. Now, explanation is nothing than the following: it is the act of framing, and commenting upon, a body of data (the kind of body of data that, in the opinion of the researcher’s peers within the historical discipline, would be deemed to be reliable and reproducible), in such a way that within this body of data relationships are highlighted which can be demonstrated to have manifested themselves also in very different situations involving very different bodies of data. In other words, explanation is always a form of generalisation. Such generalisation can, in principle, only be engaged in by virtue of an explicit conceptual apparatus and explicit theories postulating relationships between the variables that have been identified by the conceptual apparatus. (I shall shortly turn to the question as to whether historical actors can even be expected to use such explicit conceptualisations themselves, and especially to use them consistently.) The explicitness stressed here as a requirement of the analysts’ conceptual and theoretical apparatus may, acceptably, have practical limits. Much of the historiographer’s theory may be left implicit as long as the historiographer and his or her reader already share a common basis for understanding: when they produce, circulate, and assimilate knowledge against the background of a shared approach, such as Marxism, the Annales School of historiography, or any other national or local school of academic historiography, etc. Meanwhile, it is a legitimate question to ask whether the very attempt at explanation is not mere hubris on the part of the historian. For it is certainly not sheer naivety or incompetence which makes most historians wary of the kind of stilted methodologies popular in the social sciences especially in the second and third quarter of the 20th century CE.141

We may therefore advance at least two reasons in defence of the historiographer who shows herself or himself reticent vis-à-vis theory: in the first place the implications of taking an emic approach seriously (point 8), and secondly, the realisation that any emic system is subject to change over time (point 9).

8. Once more: emic and etic. Historians (just like most social scientists) are confronted in their work with phenomena that already have been subjected to human signification by the original historical actors who produced these phenomena in the first place. This is the case regardless of whether, subsequently, some scholar directs her or his analytical gaze towards these phenomena. This problematic has been first identified by Dilthey (1883), and has been popularised subsequently by Max Weber (1919 / 1985) in terms of Verstehen. Therefore, if the analyst seeks to capture the heart beat of the contemporary meaning of the historical phenomena under study, he or she is not entirely free to arbitrarily impose (‘etically’) a theoretical construct of that analyst’s own making or choice – on the contrary, it is absolutely imperative that these constructs largely reflect (‘emically’) the concepts and interpretations which the historical actors themselves utilised in their time and place. Admittedly, such reflection can never be one hundred percent, for the following reasons:

a. Lack of data. The historical actors’ concepts have been incompletely documented (this is per definition the case with regard to protohistory, including the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean).

b. Polysemy and manipulation at the level of the historical actors. Every society is a dynamic arrangement of irresolvable contradictions142 at the logical and classificatory place (contradictions based on such opposition as male / female, young / old, descent / locality, capital / labour, commoner / royal, autochthonous / immigrant, etc.). The historical actors’ concepts could only function in their contemporary historical social contexts, precisely by virtue of the polysemic and protean nature of these concepts, allowing for all sorts of semantic and ideological manipulation. This is especially the case for ethnicity: for we have already established (Chapter 2) that in the field of ethnicity we find a characteristic tension between, on the

141 Often such popularity was due to an incomplete reading of Popper, who himself, however, was very wary of claims concerning wide-ranging historical regularities and historical ‘laws’ à la Plato and Marx (Popper 1963).

one hand, the historical actors’ ideological claims of immutable historical truth (in the language of descent, blood, etc.), and, on the other hand, the demonstrable fact that such truths are often manipulated so as to suit a strategic purpose. Moreover we have noted the characteristic oscillation between a spatial / geographical and an ethnic / descent discourse. On the other hand, the scientific concepts with which we, as analysts, seek to describe the historical actors’ concepts are supposed to be transparent and unequivocal, preferably carrying always and invariably the same semantic content whenever we use them in our arguments. The fit between (a) the analytical description and (b) the historical actors’ protean and inconsistent, strategically used concepts, will always remain defective and partial.

c. Historical actors are always partly unaware of what makes their society tick. Historical actors never have a complete consciousness of their own social reality. What is more, they cannot even afford to have such complete consciousness, because their social reality is, to a great extent, constructed by virtue of collective representations (myths, in other words) that keep their society going precisely because these collective representations are not called into question, and do not even appear above the threshold of the actors’ conscious perceptions.

d. Examples of such a collective representation, for the specific case of present-day North Atlantic society, would be scientific rationality, and the formal organisation – both of them central and self-evident touchstones of social life in the North Atlantic region today. Neither is, as a cornerstone of social life, more than a few millennia old, and their actual rise to supremacy (at the expense of, e.g., the family, the face-to-face local community, and organised religion), is less than a few centuries old. Yet despite their relatively recent emergence in North Atlantic history, these two collective representations are usually held to have complete and unquestionable validity for the members of North Atlantic society today – to such an extent, even, that many of my readers will be shocked and confused by the fact that I call scientific rationality and the formal organisation collective representations, thus taking my distance from what, for many, would appear to be self-evident, meta-cultural, inescapable aspects of truth and reality, invisible as the very air that we breathe (which is how collective representations always appear to their owners). I could have taken the trodden path and have illustrated the concept of collective representation by reference to other peoples’ witchcraft beliefs or the geocentric astronomy of the European Middle Ages; but that would have been too easy. Not other peoples’ collective representations, but our own, constitute the main stumbling-block in intercultural knowledge production, including the study of ethnicity in protohistory (‘the past is another country’).143

e. Therefore, if we were to base our study of ethnicity exclusively on the historical actors’ conscious conceptualisations we can only, as analysts, explore and analyse that – relatively limited – part of these actors’ social life about which the latter have a conscious, explicit discourse themselves. Although quite a few historians tried to resign themselves to this limitation, in fact it is is utterly undesirable for us as analysts, because it would radically preclude any kind of meta-analysis in terms of concepts and theories unavailable to the historical actors themselves (for instance, in terms of political economy, subconscious motives, the general nature of the human condition, the overall constraints of the natural environment – in short, most of the insights available in modern sociological, political and ethnic theory, psychology, psychoanalysis, environmental studies, demography, etc.). So much for the undesirable limitations of an analysis that seeks to be exclusively *emic*. On the other hand, if we would exclusively engage in distanced *etic* analysis, merely imposing our own categories, we would

miss out the historical actors’ collective representations, we would fail to appreciate how these collective representations actually produce most of the historical actors’ life world, and we would remain alien to their intimate world view especially their conscious perceptions and motivations; but if we would exclusively engage in emic analysis, our emphasis on the historical actors’ collective representations would make us the slaves of their myths, and would not allow us to break out of these by virtue of our own meta-discourse, even if the latter would have mythical overtones of its own (but mythical overtones attenuated by empirical constraints). Clearly, we need to combine emic and etic analysis, but this can only be achieved by means of an explicitly and consistently theoretical stance.

9. Historical change in the emic system. The other condition that has made historiographers understandably wary of theory is that historical actors’ concepts not only have to differ, in their polysemy and protean nature, from the analysts’ scientific concepts, but also that their historical actors’ concepts are subject to a historical process of change, and can only be understood in the context of such a process, – whereas, once again, the analyst’s scientific concepts are supposed to retain the same meaning whenever applied, and therefore are supposed to have a timeless and immutable nature.

It is a very arduous task to reconcile all these, often contradictory, requirements in the production of historiography. It is therefore understandable that many historiographers propose a compromise that consists in the following. They refrain from explicit theorising. Instead they derive, selectively and eclectically, a handful of general theoretical notions from the academic fashion of the day (be it Marxist or Foucaultian, transactionalist, structuralist or postmodernist, as long as it enhances recognisability among the audience and brings editorial boards to accept one’s texts for publication). For the rest such historiographers rely on common-sense arguments, which seek to follow the practical reason of the analyst’s own everyday life, without the pretence of academic stiltedness, and often vindicating through a superior and persuasive style of writing what, otherwise, on pure methodological and theoretical grounds, would remain relatively defective and unconvincing.

Obviously, I have considerable sympathy with many historians’ reticence vis-à-vis theory. Yet my own preference is to insist on more explicit and more rigid conceptual and theoretical efforts, because I feel that this is the only way to benefit, in such a minefield as ethnic studies, from the accumulated insights of many social science specialists across the decades, and because in this way we stand a better chance of taming our own myths and keeping them from taking total possession of our scholarly work.

Could the above argument really suffice to dispel the fear, shared by many historians, that conceptual and theoretical explicitness and consistence would impose upon the historical data an alien and alienating theoretical interpretative framework? Are they not right in thinking that such an imposition would distort the historical reality (especially if that reality is as little known to us, comparatively, as the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean), and would therefore reduce historical research to an empty, meaningless exercise – the mere application of a template of already previously formulated theoretical relationships, without genuinely following the lead of clues contained in the specific data from the period and region under study and without doing justice to the historical actors’ own consciousness and discourse?

The implied correct answer to these rhetorical questions would be negative. However, the actual methodological situation is much more complex. Whatever we may derive from theory, for instance in the field of ethnicity, is not a theoretical image of reality, but a set of possible hypothetical relationships. These hypothetical relationships can only be found back and recognised in the concrete reality under study (specific in time and space), and can only be tested as to their applicability to that specific reality, provided we make the necessary operational translation – a translation that emphatically takes into account our rela-

---

144 I refrain from discussing one other analytical difficulty, which attends historising social analysis regardless of the amounts of theory invested in it. The idea of a society is predicated on the assumption that the thoughts and actions of that society’s members converge to a high degree of consensus and concerted action. Yet what we observe on the ground is not just convergence and consensus but also individual divergence. Even in the most stable and integrated society, no two individuals act exactly the same, and think exactly the same. In the light of this observation, all social life, and all social analysis, depends on a process of aggregation that may be fruitfully compared with language use: phonetically, no two mother tongue speakers produce exactly the same sound pattern, yet phonologically, the speech sounds they produce tend to a common Gestalt, a phoneme, that is recognised and produced by all within certain limits of permissible variation.
tive lack of information, as well as the fact that historical actors happen to structure, in their consciousness, their reality in a different way, – using different concepts from us analysts, as well as using the same concepts differently from the way we as analysts use them. The concepts we use in our theoretical models can only be projected onto reality after the specific act of translation that we call operationalisation: the redefinition of a theoretical concept in terms of something that is concretely, systematically, and inter-subjectively recognisable in reality, and that therefore will also be recognised, in more or less the same form, by other researchers, so as to make the results of our investigations reproducible and verifiable.

For instance, if we wish to assess, on the basis of incomplete, more or less anachronistic and aesthetically distorted and (in the course of half a millennium) heavily edited data provided in Homer, how ethnicity may have come into existence in the Late Bronze Age as an element in the structuring of their socio-political space (and such assessment will take up Chapter 5 of the present study, where many of the points here will come back), then we would work through a number of stepwise operationalisations that make the question amenable to empirical investigation:

1. We assume that the text which the bard (or the collectivity of bards, or any original written texts on which they may have based themselves) presented in the Early Iron Age, was handed down to us in essentially its original form, despite a long editorial process via Peisistratus in Athens in the sixth century BCE and the Alexandrian Hellenistic scholars of the second century BCE.

2. We assume that the Early Iron Age bard sought to emulate the image of the Late Bronze Age on the basis of incomplete, partially, anachronistic and distorted, yet not totally incorrect information.

3. We assume that our own knowledge of Ancient Greek, and scholarly skills at textual criticism, will allow us to identify those parts of the Homeric corpus that are particularly corrupt and unreliable as historical sources, leaving the rest as an increasingly purified, more or less reliable source on the Late Bronze Age.

4. Our attempts at such historical criticism will be all the more convincing if we can advance systematic reasons why the bard would have misrepresented the Late Bronze Age, for instance because of

a. a change in military technology, or

b. a radical change in social institutions and the attending collective representations (for instance, because the male-centred, patrilin- eal royal succession pattern of his own time made it difficult for him to understand and render appropriately ancient patterns of male royal succession through marriage with the previous queen’s daughter; Graves 1964); or

c. because he tried to archaise and emulate authentic Bronze Age conditions (e.g. ostentatiously avoiding all, or nearly all, references to iron) but lacked the detailed knowledge to do so perfectly.

5. In general we would be suspicious of the text as a historical source if we find that signs of contradictions have been systematically edited out of the text. On the other hand, we would be inclined to take contradictions preserved without any apparent meaning or parochial interest on the part of the bard or his contemporaries, as signs of witnessing fragments of authentic and potentially highly significant historical information. This is a general point I have made throughout my work on oral history and protohistory: contradictions in our protohistorical data are the growth points of our scholarly insight. In the present analysis we will encounter an example of this methodological principle in our assessment of the contradictory mythical sequences of Noah’s alleged sons, when discussing the Biblical Table of Nations (Chapter 6).

6. If the bard inadvertently turns out to display a particular pattern in his rendering of regional and ethnic group relations without that pattern being consciously articulated and explained by him, we would be tempted to take such a pattern – once we have managed to detect it – as revealing authentic historical information. In the present analysis we will encounter an example of this methodological principle when we bring to light, by an assessment of formal distribution patterns, the tripartite ethnico-regional structure – the distinction between a South-Central, Maritime, and Northern region – unconsciously underlying Greek ethnicity in the Early Iron Age (and probably also in the Late Bronze Age).

7. If in these data we find spontaneous designations of

sets of people in terms of proper names that are clearly ethnonyms, we would take this as signs of the contemporary actors’ conscious elaboration of the socio-political space in terms of ethnicity

8. However, if in the process we find that instead of by ethnic distinctions, the wider socio-political space happens to be structured along different structural principles such as regional oracular cults, or statehood, or aristocrat / commoner relations, or trading networks, or professional specialisation, which are explicitly mentioned, while ethnic indicators cannot be identified in the texts, then we have to admit that we have no reason to attribute great significance to ethnicity as a social-structural factor in its own right in that context.

9. Through this and similar arguments we would arrive at an operational definition of ethnic patterns in the Late Bronze Age, *i.e.* a set of concrete and explicit procedures that allow us to formulate statements on ethnicity in that period, – statements that may claim the intersubjective consent of our colleagues in the same scholarly profession on the basis of being explicit, systematic, and liable to repetition and verification – on the basis of our systematic decoding of such fragmented and partially distorted images of the Late Bronze Age as appear in the Early Iron Age text of Homer. *In short, we operationalise the Late Bronze Age in terms of the Early Iron Age,* but we do so with great care, an up-to-date knowledge of the sources and of the philological resources and procedures necessary for their understanding, and against the background of the available classicist, archaeological and comparative ethnic literature.

Such an empirical operationalisation will be concretely applied in Chapter 5, where we shall take the famous Homeric Catalogue of Ships as a key to Late Bronze Age ethnicity in the Aegean.

Meanwhile, even meticulous (and admittedly slightly facetious) operationalisation is not going to help us as long as we have no general model as to what ethnicity is and what it can do in situations such as the Late Bronze Age. Such models of ethnicity we cannot in themselves, certainly not directly, derive from Homer, or from any other ancient writer, – we can only derive them from ethnicity theory today.

In the study of ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age it is not an option for us to simply limit ourselves to what we can reconstruct from the available date with an implicit, ‘positivist’, recourse to ‘common sense’ and nothing more – we must derive inspiration from comparative theoretical models concerning ethnicity in general, and even such a careful methodology is no warranty for any greater truth of the results of our scholarship. For, to the extent to which such modern ethnic theory reflects the concerns, self-evidences, blind spots, and geopolitical mind-sets of modern society and of modern scholarship, to that extent we risk importing our own myths into the analytical exercise.

The available comparative and theoretical models offer us considerable insights into ethnicity, but we must still make the next step: we must derive specific hypotheses from these general models, confront these hypotheses with the limited concrete empirical data we have with regard to the eastern Mediterranean basin in the Late Bronze Age, and retain that particular model whose derived hypotheses survive this confrontation best. At this penultimate point, we encounter further difficulties of the following kinds:

1. The empirical data are fragmentary and provide mere surface indications (and we suspect: *haphazard and one-sided* surface indications) of possible ethnic structures and relationships. Further data, that would have enabled us to test such possible ethnic structures and relationships in depth, are not available for the time and place under study. It is here, particularly, that we will benefit from a model-orientated approach. The surface data are in a way the tip of an ethnic iceberg. If these surface data fit the model rather well, we will have some license to assume that also those other, empirically ‘under-water’ aspects of the model do apply for which we do not have the data for the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean. And by further speculating on the probable socio-political effect of these putative ‘under-water’ aspects, our sociological imagination is fed and we come closer still to an intimate understanding of ethnicity in the Bronze Age Mediterranean; in the process, scraps of data that hitherto seemed insignificant or escaped our attention, may spring to their proper place and reveal their significance, within the even more complete and coherent emerging picture.\(^{146}\) The approach revolves, therefore,

\(^{146}\) This is precisely the methodology by which, in Chapter 28, I will interpret the few scraps of factual evidence we have for the Sea Peoples of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, confronting them with my model of overall Pelasgian substrate culture, socio-political organisation, and genetics, comprising eighty traits and based on very different and more comprehensive data than we have for the Sea Peoples themselves, to conclude that the Sea Peoples fit the Pelasgian bill.
on a loosely controlled process of social-scientific imagination. This approach enables us to apply the accumulated insights of other analysts of ethnicity dealing with other periods and other regions, and yet not become the slaves of these insights.

2. Equally important is that this approach is, and must remain, a scientifically intersubjective process, ultimately aimed at persuading fellow-historians specialising on the eastern Mediterranean Late Bronze Age to accept our emerging point of view. If we do not succeed in convincing them with our explicit conceptualisation, theorising, operationalisations, analysis, and such insightful detail as our evolving social imagination may increasingly thrown light upon, then our reconstruction has not achieved anything. (But if we convince them too easily, this is a sure sign that we have stuck too carefully to the discipline’s dominant paradigms not to say myths, and to our own society’s collective representations, and have brought little that is novel, stimulating, challenging, and possibly closer to the truth. In the present study, I have taken great care to avoid at least this risk – as I have done in all my scholarly work, as my critics would only be too ready to admit.)

3. However, another part of the problem of reconstructing ethnicity in the Mediterranean Late Bronze Age is that the colleagues with whom we seek intersubjective acceptance belong to various, widely diverging disciplines, each discipline with its own, very specific, standards (and the attending intradisciplinary myths). An approach to ethnicity that satisfies the ancient historian, in itself needs scarcely satisfy the social scientist, or the linguist, or the archaeologist. The problem is difficult to solve for reasons that, partly, spring from the organisation of scholarship and academia today, and that thus have nothing to do, intrinsically, with the period and region under study. I have not been able to solve this problem in the present study: being an outsider and amateur to most of the disciplines involved (except ethnic studies, history and methodology), I can only hope that the accumulated disapproval from so many different directions, will somehow cancel out into a neutral benefit of the doubt.

Having, at this point, sufficiently cleared the methodological and theoretical ground for a protohistorical approach to ethnicity in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age, let us now try to apply and sharpen the insights gained above by applying them to two well-known Early Iron Age documents that students of ethnicity in Antiquity have often considered goldmines of data and possible insight: first, in Chapter 5, The Homeric Achaean Catalogue of Ships (Iliad II), and subsequently, in Chapter 6, the Biblical Table of Nations (Genesis 10). This will give us much food for thought and bring out many of the theoretical and methodological dilemmas that will, subsequently, keep us occupied through the other chapters of the present study.
CHAPTER 4. LONG-RANGE LINGUISTICS AS A
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY OF THE LATE BRONZE
AGE MEDITERRANEAN

4.1. Towards a linguistic framework for ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean

In the light of long-range linguistic approaches to be set out in the rest of this chapter, we will be persuaded to interpret protohistorical onomastic material, especially that appearing in our second case study (that of the Biblical Table of Nations) within a very wide context, encompassing the entire Old World and its main linguistic macrophylla. Thus we are able to highlight the processes of onomastic Inertia and Relational Projection to be set out in our general discussion of Chapter 2; by virtue of such mechanisms by which apparently the same toponyms and ethnonyms manifest themselves in very different parts of the Old World and in very different periods. Our ultimate aim is to elucidate the process of Sea Peoples ethnicity by the end of the Bronze Age, and the main aim of the present section is to create an accommodating linguistic context for this task. Even though often (e.g. Woudhuizen, the present volume) associated with the dispersion of Indo-Iranian, and of Indo-European in general, in the course of the second millennium BCE, still the Sea Peoples cannot be reduced to that one linguistic phylum such as Indo-European. Other branches of Eurasiat / Nostratic (notably Uralic, Altaic, and probably Dravidian) are likely to have been available in or near West Asia and the Eastern Mediterranean; in addition, Sino-Caucasian (notably the North Caucasian and Basque phyla) was certainly around, and we will find indications (see below) that even Austro may have to be included in this list. Against the background of emerging patterns in Sea Peoples studies claiming largely Indo-European linguistic identity for the Sea Peoples, these are all uninvited guests on the linguistic scene of the Bronze Age Mediterranean. In the present section, I will highlight the likely presence, in the Bronze Age Mediterranean, of yet another set of uninvited guests whose detection betrays my own professional status as an Africanist: speakers of Niger-Congo (of which Bantu is a branch) – one of the three now exclusively African macrophylla (the other two being Khoisan and Nilo-Saharan).

In an attempt to create order in this dazzling complexity, I will take a number of steps. In the first place I shall briefly introduce Starostin’s *Borean hypothesis as a powerful tool to explore (and largely also: demonstrate) the connections between virtually all languages spoken in the world today. This sets a context for the identification of our uninvited guests on the linguistic scene of the Bronze Age Mediterranean. This helps us to understand some of the linguistic substrates underlying the ethnic situations under review (the Aegean as depicted in the Homeric (Aegean) Catalogue of Ships, the Mediterranean world as depicted in the Biblical Table of Nations, and Sea Peoples Episode), but far from offers yet an overarching model. Such a model I propose to derive from the French-German linguist Karst, notably his hypothetical five-tiered ethnico-linguistic model of the Bronze Age Mediterranean.

4.2. Proposing a comprehensive linguistic context: Upper-Palaeolithic *Borean

State-of-the-art, long-range linguistic reconstructions, inevitably controversial and culminating in Harold Fleming’s and Sergei Starostin’s work, have led to the suggestion that (with the exception perhaps of languages spoken in Australia and New Guinea) most languages spoken today, in both the Old and the New Worlds, contain many detectable traces (‘reflexes’) of a hypothetical language, analytically designated *Borean by analogy with the Ancient Greek ethnic concept of the Hyperboraeans (i.e. the Steppe peoples living beyond the North Wind), and thought to be spoken in eastern Central Asia c. 25,000 years ago. We now possess over a thousand of proposed *Borean global etymologies for words in nearly all the major linguistic

147 Cf. the world-wide etymological database Tower of Babel (Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008), which is supported by major universities world-wide, and based on a large number of published etymological reconstructions by authoritative authors, listed in the extensive bibliographical section of that database. Also Bengston & Ruhlen 1994; Greenberg 1987, 2002.

families as attested in historical times: Eurasian, Sino-Caucasian (with Sino-Tibetan, Caucasian, Burushaski and Basque, and most probably spilling over in the Na-Denë languages of North America), Afroasiatic, Austro, and Amerind. Also the now exclusively African languages (Nilo-Saharan, Niger-Congo and Khoisan) are finding their place within the "Borean scheme.

Original caption: 'Peopling of Eurasia. Map of Eurasia and northeastern Africa depicting the peopling of Eurasia as inferred from the extant mtDNA phylogeny. The bold black arrow indicates the possible 'coastal' route of colonization of Eurasia by anatomically modern humans (ca. 60,000 - 80,000 ybp.). This 'Southern Coastal Route' is suggested by the phylogeography of mtDNA haplogroup M, the virtual absence of which in the Near East and Southwest Asia undermines the likelihood of the initial colonization of Eurasia taking a route north around the Red Sea. Therefore, the initial split between West and East Eurasian mtDNAs is postulated between the Indus Valley and Southwest Asia. Spheres depict expansion zones where, after the initial (coastal) peopling of the continent, local branches of the mtDNA tree (haplogroups given in the spheres) arose (ca. 40,000 - 60,000 ybp), and from where they were further carried into the interior of the continent (thinner black arrows). Admixture between the expansion zones has been surprisingly limited ever since. We note that while there is no obvious need to introduce the 'northern route' - from northeast Africa over Sinai to the Near East - to explain the initial colonization of Eurasia, the spread of some mtDNA and Y-chromosomal haplogroups implies that the 'northern' passage might have been used in a later period (Underhill et al. 2001; Reidla et al. 2003).'

Fig. 4.1. 'Out of Africa' – according to Metspalu (2004: Fig. 5)
© Metspalu et al. 2004, with thanks

High proportions of the reconstructed "Borean vocabulary can be argued to have reflexes in the protovocabulary of such macro-phyla as Eurasian / Nostratic (with such branches as Indo-European, Altaic, Uralic, Kartvelian, Dravidian, Chukchee-Kamchatkan and Eskimo), Afroasiatic and Sino-Caucasian (with such phyla as Sino-Tibetan, North Caucasian, Yeniseian, Burushaski and Basque, and at some distance the North American Na-Denë). But also of such macro-phyla as Austro (spoken throughout South East Asia and the Pacific, with the two main phyla Austroasiatic and Austronesian), Amerind, and the three African phyla Niger-Congo, Nilo-Saharan and Khoisan, in their reconstructed protovocabularies show many arguable reflexes reconstructed "Borean vocabulary (for overall percentages of overlap, see Fig. 4.3 below). Although it is virtually impossible to identify prehistoric languages if these have left no systematic traces in modern languages, and although therefore our picture of the very remote past remains very dim and simplified, molecular genetics has offered a simple explanation for much of this pattern:

1. the Out-of-Africa migration of Anatomically Modern Humans, c. 60,000 years ago, followed by


151 Spoken by such North American groups as Haida, Tlingit, Navaho, and the Athabaskan cluster including Apache.

152 Cf. Oppenheimer 2004; Forster 2004; Metspalu et al. 2004, 2005 (our Fig. 4.1). Interestingly, in the specific and somewhat incestuous context of the Black Athena debate, the phrase 'Out of Africa' has obtained a very different meaning, against a very much compressed time scale. There it refers, not to the spread of Anatomically Modern Humans beyond the African continent from c. 60,000 years ago – but to the alleged Egyptian origin of classical Greek cultural features, in the Late Bronze Age and later; cf. Lefkowitz 1996. My Pelasgian hypothesis (see Chapter 28, below, and van Binsbergen 2011b) offers something of a compromise in that it affirms distant, "Borean-based communality between Afroasiatic speaking Ancient Egypt and the Indo-European speaking Aegean, yet attributes the many specific parallels between Ancient Egypt and Ancient Greece not in the first place to such "Borean communality (which is too distant, goes back to far in time, for that purpose), nor primarily to Egyptian colonisation of the Aegean (contra Bernal), but to a Pelasgian substrate developing between the Fertile Sahara to Central Asia from the Neolithic onwards, and therefore informing both the Aegean and Egypt from an older source they have in common (contra Lefkowitz). Meanwhile the genetic research by Arnaiz-Villena et al. seems to add a piquant further dimension to this argument. If, of all (otherwise so remarkably stationary) Mediterranean peoples, only the Greeks show significant affinities with present-day sub-Saharan African populations, would not this suggests that the miracle of classic Greek culture (contra Lefkowitz, and to the apparent triumph of Bernal and other Afrocentrists) did come 'Out of Africa', after all? However, the matter is more complicated than that. In the first place, Arnaiz-Villena et al. were working in the late 1990s, when the Black Athena debate had already largely taken place – their
2. the Back-to-Africa migration\textsuperscript{153} from Central, West and South East Asia back into Africa, from c. 15 ka BP onward.

Fig. 4.2a. ‘Back into Africa’ – according to Underhill (2004)

The process listed as (2) might conceivably have involved, specifically, an influx of East Asian and South East Asian genes into sub-Saharan Africa in pre- and protohistoric times. In his 2004 paper, Peter Underhill rendered this process as a transmission of haplo group M from Eastern Eurasia to sub-Saharan Africa, yielding haplo group M – complementary to the transmission of Western Eurasian haplo group U to sub-Saharan Africa, in the form of haplo group U6.

Forster\textsuperscript{154} renders essentially the same process in a geographically more explicit and detailed form. Although the complexities of the U haplo group in Western parts of the Old World during the Upper Palaeolithic are notorious,\textsuperscript{155} it may not be impossible to read the transmission of Eurasian U to sub-Saharan African U6 as corresponding with the cultural transmission of Scythian, Uralic, or otherwise West Asian / Pelasgian traits into sub-Saharan Africa from the Late Bronze Age onward, partly as a result of the rise of chariot technology in Central Asia c. 2000 BCE.


\textsuperscript{154} Forster 2004: Fig. 2b (80-60 ka BP), 2c (60-30 ka BP); and 2g (15-2 ka BP; ka = kiloannum = 1,000 years; BP = Before Present.

East Asian connotations of haplo group M (as a gradual transformation, along the South coast of Eastern Eurasia, of haplo group M brought to South West Asia (the Arabian peninsula) in the Southern Route ‘Out of Africa’ (from 60 ka BP on) – while another offshoot of M was transmitted to East Central Asia and eventually became ancestral to part of the population of the Americas.

This bears directly on Martin Bernal’s Black Athena thesis, and suggest that thesis should be revised very considerably. Old Greek (as a scion of the Indo-European branch of the Eurasatic / Nostatic macrophyllum) and Old Egyptian (as a branch of the Afroasiatic macrophyllum – although in the case of Old Egyptian linguists’ preferred cladistic, dendrogram model seems particularly inapplicable, cf. Kammerzell 1994) have largely a common origin in *Borean; probably (cf. Fig. 4.3) the dissociation of the two macrophylla only took place in Early Neolithic times. Therefore, communality of Greek and Egyptian should not only be attributed, as Bernal does (1987-2006), to Egyptian pharaonic state – such forced migration was a proto-Bantu culture was apparently available.

EXAMPLE OF A GLOBAL ETYMOLOGY: THE COMPLEX ‘EARTH / BOTTOM / HUMAN’ The following example, although excessively long, may serve to indicate the relevance and the power of the *Borean hypothesis as a long-range approach. Remarkably, the root -ntu, ‘human, person’, although only one of many of hundreds of reconstructed proto-Bantu roots (cf. Guthrie 1948, 1967-1971: *ntu, Guthrie no. 1789; Meeussen 1980: *ntò, found in many or all languages of the large Bantu family (a division of the Niger-Congo or Niger-Kordofan phylum), was so conspicuous in the eyes of Bleek (1851 – the first European linguist to subject these languages to thorough comparative study), that he named them ‘Bantu languages’ after that root (t- being a common form of the plural personal nominal prefix). However, -ntu is not exclusive to the Bantu family. This is already clear from proto-Austronesian *teŪ, human, raw’ (Adelaar 1995). Looking for an etymology of the puzzling Greek word antírhopos ‘human’, the Dutch linguist Ode (1927) had the felicitous inspiration to see this word as a reflex of what he claims to be proto-Indo-European *ntò, ‘under’ (cf. the more consensually established proto-Indo-European: *mòno ‘under’ cf. Pokorny 1959-69: I, 323) – thus proposing an underlying semantics of humans as ‘ground or underworld dwellers’. This, incidentally, also offered Ode an interesting etymology of the long contested Ancient Greek thēn Athena as an underworld goddess.156 Along this line, many more possible (pseudo-) cognates from many language phyla come into view. The background assumption in this kind of historical linguistic reconstruction is that standard methods of historical and comparative linguistics allow us, with intersubjective scientific plausibility, to reconstruct progressively older levels of parent forms, right up to the oldest possible reconstruction, *Borean; nearly all linguistic macrophylla spoken today contain, among an admixture of forms of unidentified provenance, also reflexes from *Borean. Against this background, (pseudo-) cognates of Bantu -ntu seem to be proto-Afroasiatic *tVʔ ‘a kind of soil’ (cf. Old Egyptian t / t3, ‘earth’, with cognates in Central and East Chadic and in Low East Cushitic), from *Borean *tVHV, ‘earth’, a reflex of this root is also found in Sino-Caucasian notably as tǔ (modern Beijing Chinese), tǔ (Classic Old Chinese), ‘land, soil’, Karlgren code: 0062 a-c, suggested to be of Austroic origin:

notably proto-Austroasiatic *tvUrflaj ‘earth, soil’, proto-Austroasiatic *te / *te ‘earth’, Proto-Miao-Yao *Ctaw (cf. Bengston & Ruhlen 1994: 60, tak, however the latter two authors – according to Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008 ‘Long-range etymologies’ s.v. *TVHV, ‘earth’ – seem to confuse the reflexes of *Borean *TVHV with those of *TVHKV. Considering the remarkable similarities between Southern and Eastern African Khoisan and North Caucasian, one should not be surprised that also some Khoisan language families seem to attach to the very old and very widespread earth / human complex which we have identified here: South Khoisan (Taa): *tvr, *tvz ‘person’; North Khoisan (proto-Zhu) *tv ‘person’ – Central Khoisan has *tvho, etc. ‘person’, which might well be a transformation of *tv. (Note that here, too, like in Bantu, it is the word for ‘human’ which produces the ethnonyms Taa, Zhu and Khoi, or Khoekhoe / Khoikhoi!) Further possibilities are contained in the reflexes of another *Borean root *TVHV, ‘bottom’, which however is both semantically and phonologically so close to *TVHV ‘earth’ (however, in *Borean reconstructions, the vowels, indicated by *-v-, had to remain unspecified and therefore could differ) that we may well have to do with one and the same word: proto-Sino-Tibetan *aunt ‘bottom’ (e.g. Chinese 役 *ŋul ‘bottom’ Karlgren code 0590 c; 役 *ŋul, ‘root, base’, Karlgren code 0590 d) from proto-Sino-Caucasian *TVHV, ‘bottom’; from the same *Borean root *TVHV, ‘bottom’, also Afroasiatic *dbhr-, ‘low’ (e.g. Egyptian: *dr (21) ‘low’, East Chadic: *awar ‘down’) as well as proto-Austroasiatic *tvj (also *tvj ‘tail, vagina’), proto-Miao-Yao *tξB ‘tail’, Proto-Austroasiatic: *tvdr ‘buttocks’ (not in Proto-Austroasiatic B) (also *tξdr ‘last, behind’ – the latter, Austric forms being predicated on a semantics of ‘lower part of the rump’, cf. English ‘bottom’) (cf. Peiros 1998: 157, 165; Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008).

4.3. A cluster analysis of the world’s *Borean-associated linguistic macro-phyla

In this connection it is relevant to summarise the outcomes of a linguistic analysis I have recently undertaken. I attempted a statistical cluster analysis of today’s linguistic macro-phyla (Eurasianian, Afroasiatic, Sino-Caucasian, Austric, Amerind, Niger-Congo, Nilo-Saharan and Khoisan), based on a large matrix with as many rows (notably, 1153) as Starostin & Starostin have reliably reconstructed *Borean lexical items; the macrophyla constitute the columns of this matrix, and each cell entry states whether the lexical item in question is or is not attested for that particular macro-phylum. For the non-African macro-phyla and for Afroasiatic I could safely rely on the Starostins’ (1998-2008) authoritative etymological database, appropriately named Tower of Babel. The three African phyyla however are very unsystematically and patchily represented there. I have therefore only taken its data on Khoisan, ignoring its data for Nilo-Saharan (which are extremely sporadic) and Niger-Congo (which are more numerous yet very restrictive). I resigned myself to the fact that I could not get adequate quantifiable data for Nilo-Saharan. For Niger-Congo, I had to concentrate on the major sub-phyllum of Bantu. Here Guthrie’s lexical reconstructions of a proto-Bantu corpus (although subject to much controversy), with Meeussen’s additions do provide quantifiable data. Having found that Starostin & Starostin (1998-2008) fail to acknowledge a considerable number of plausible *Borean reflexes in Bantu, I reassessed the proto-Bantu corpus, by reference to an explicit methodology specifying proposed *Borean-Bantu transformation rules. Performing an hierarchical cluster analysis, using the Single Linkage (= Nearest Neighbour) linkage method, and employing Russell & Rao’s distance measure as is systematically indicated for dichotomous yes / no data like in this case, this resulted in the dendrogram of Fig. 4.3. The rationale of the cluster analysis may be explained by reference to the following simplified example. Suppose three macrophyla display a score as in Table 4.1. In Table 4.1 it is clear that Eurasian and Sino-Caucasian, in so far as the five fictitious *Borean roots listed are concerned, cluster together, and as cluster dissociate from Amerind, since they both have reflexes for *BVCV and *DVFV where Amerind has none, whereas Amerind has full reflexes for the four items *GVHV, *JVKV, *LVMV, and *NVPV, which hardly have reflexes in Eurasi-

157 For which the geneticist Cavalli-Sforza et al. – 1994 – has given (pace Vigilant et al. 1989) an adequate explanation: today’s Khoisan speakers are a hybrid African-Asian population which had still ancestors in West Asia 10,000 years ago – they are another example of the Back-to-Africa movement.

158 Cf. van Binsbergen 2011a.
atic and Sino-Caucasian. The cluster analysis mathematics allows us to discern such patterns in large data sets, and with a precision far exceeding visual inspection. Of course, the pattern is never consistent nor immediately transparent, but shows great stochastic variation, which is why we need multivariate statistics rather than formal logic to identify that pattern. Thus in Table 4.1, the dissociation between Amerind on the one hand, the Eurasian / Sino-Caucasian cluster on the other, is not total, as the rows for *JVKV and *LVMV reveal, yet the dendrogram is a fair representation of their relationship.

In Fig. 4.3, the percentages next to the names of the macro-phyla indicate which proportion of the *Borean lexicon is represented in the reconstructed proto-lexicon of the respective macro-phyla; for Khoisan I rely here on the Tower of Babel treatment, but I suspect that closer and more systematic scrutiny would yield a much higher percentage – like I found for Bantu. Note the closeness of Bantu and Khoisan, their joint clustering with Amerind on the one hand, the Eurasiatic / Sino-Caucasian and the European from the African/Amerind macro-phyla at 12.5 ka BP (under the Natufian hypothesis – cf. Militarev & Shnirelman 1988; Militarev 1996, 2002; Turner 2008; cf. van Binsbergen 2011a for extensive empirical, methodological and mathematical details). I have taken Niger-Congo to constitute a macrophylum in its own right. In the relative paucity of comparable data on the other branches of that linguistic group, I have relied on proto-Bantu data to assess Niger-Congo’s global affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures, in such fields as puberty rites, divination, mythology, astronomy, games, basketry / weaving, hunting and fishing technology, and confirm the hitherto overlooked Central Asian affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures), while these three macro-phyla together with Austrofasic constitute one main branch of *Borean, the other main branch being composed of the dominant languages of Eurasia (with Eurasian and Afroasiatic constituting one rather close cluster, and with Sino-Caucasian at a considerable distance). In the light of this analysis, recent suggestions by Manansala and Pedersen as to the closeness of Indo-European and Austrofasic cannot be systematically sus-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fictitious *Borean lexical item (V= unspecified vowel, other letters represent consonants)</th>
<th>Eurasian</th>
<th>Sino-Caucasian</th>
<th>Amerind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*BVCV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*DVVFV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*GVHV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*JVKV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*LVMV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NVPV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. How *Borean roots may be clustered (fictitious example)

160 Cf. Manansala 2006 and n.d.; Pedersen n.d. But this does not rule out the possibility of an Austrofasic substrate (cf. Table 28.4, below, and my remarks in this section, below, on affinities between Austrofasic and Niger-Congo).

161 Cf. van Binsbergen 2011a for extensive empirical, methodological and mathematical details. I have taken Niger-Congo to constitute a macrophylum in its own right. In the relative paucity of comparable data on the other branches of that linguistic group, I have relied on proto-Bantu data to assess Niger-Congo’s global affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures, in such fields as puberty rites, divination, mythology, astronomy, games, basketry / weaving, hunting and fishing technology, and confirm the hitherto overlooked Central Asian affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures), while these three macro-phyla together with Austrofasic constitute one main branch of *Borean, the other main branch being composed of the dominant languages of Eurasia (with Eurasian and Afroasiatic constituting one rather close cluster, and with Sino-Caucasian at a considerable distance). In the light of this analysis, recent suggestions by Manansala and Pedersen as to the closeness of Indo-European and Austrofasic cannot be systematically sus-

Fig. 4.3. Dendrogram setting out the relative positions of *Borean-associated linguistic macro-phyla in relation to Niger-Congo and Khoisan; percentages indicate the minimum proportion of the corpus of 1153 reconstructed *Borean roots to be traceable in each macrophylum.161
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161 Cf. van Binsbergen 2011a for extensive empirical, methodological and mathematical details. I have taken Niger-Congo to constitute a macrophylum in its own right. In the relative paucity of comparable data on the other branches of that linguistic group, I have relied on proto-Bantu data to assess Niger-Congo’s global affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures, in such fields as puberty rites, divination, mythology, astronomy, games, basketry / weaving, hunting and fishing technology, and confirm the hitherto overlooked Central Asian affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures), while these three macro-phyla together with Austrofasic constitute one main branch of *Borean, the other main branch being composed of the dominant languages of Eurasia (with Eurasian and Afroasiatic constituting one rather close cluster, and with Sino-Caucasian at a considerable distance). In the light of this analysis, recent suggestions by Manansala and Pedersen as to the closeness of Indo-European and Austrofasic cannot be systematically sus-
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160 Cf. Manansala 2006 and n.d.; Pedersen n.d. But this does not rule out the possibility of an Austrofasic substrate (cf. Table 28.4, below, and my remarks in this section, below, on affinities between Austrofasic and Niger-Congo).

161 Cf. van Binsbergen 2011a for extensive empirical, methodological and mathematical details. I have taken Niger-Congo to constitute a macrophylum in its own right. In the relative paucity of comparable data on the other branches of that linguistic group, I have relied on proto-Bantu data to assess Niger-Congo’s global affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures, in such fields as puberty rites, divination, mythology, astronomy, games, basketry / weaving, hunting and fishing technology, and confirm the hitherto overlooked Central Asian affinities of today’s sub-Saharan African cultures), while these three macro-phyla together with Austrofasic constitute one main branch of *Borean, the other main branch being composed of the dominant languages of Eurasia (with Eurasian and Afroasiatic constituting one rather close cluster, and with Sino-Caucasian at a considerable distance). In the light of this analysis, recent suggestions by Manansala and Pedersen as to the closeness of Indo-European and Austrofasic cannot be systematically sus-
My statistical outcomes suggest an initial bifurcation of the *Borean-speaking linguistic, cultural and demographic stock, with

1. one, ultimately peripheral branch vacating the Central Asian homeland and moving on (being chased? or differentially equipped with the necessary technology to explore new continents and their own initiative?) to South East Asia, Oceania, the Americas and sub-Saharan Africa, and
2. the other, ultimately central, branch remaining in the Eurasian homeland, gradually expanding westward to finally occupy most of Eurasia, and the Northern half of Africa.

Even supposed that this audacious analysis can withstand statistical and linguistic criticism, much further reflection is needed before we can try to explain such an early bifurcation — perhaps at the level of differential innovation in modes of production, perhaps to be sought at the level of lithic technologies, or hunting and finishing technologies); of world-view and ideology; and of sociopolitical technology. Thus shamanism appears as a secondarily and perhaps rather recently acquired institution among peoples speaking languages of the ‘peripheral branch’ (today’s exclusively African languages, as well as Amerind and Austro); by contrast, the ‘central’ branch (Eurasiatic, Afroasiatic and Sino-Caucasian) retained and developed, perhaps even initiated, shamanism as a dominant institution, from which gradually the more highly organised political and religious status, and statal, systems may be derived that seem to be characteristic of Eurasia. As indicated, one might take the horizontal axis of this dendrogram for a very rough time scale, under the following assumptions which however require much further substantiation:

- The Mal’ta archaeological culture, of Lake Baikal c. 22 ka BP (cf. Abramova 1997) can be plausibly identified as one of the possible contexts for the reconstructed *Borean parent language; however, probably the *Borean ‘homeland’, if any, was situated rather more to the West, in West Central Asia, near the probable homelands of some major proposed descendants of *Borean notably Afroasiatic, Khoisan, and part of Eurasiatic.164

162 Yet in terms of modes of production and technology in the Upper Palaeolithic, no obvious differences between the Central and the Peripheral branches spring to mind. The linguistic split in question took place not too long after the extinction of the Neanderthaloids in Western Eurasia. By a very long shot, one might propose, as a hypothesis open to further investigation, that it was differential rejection or acceptance of Neanderthaloid associations that helped bring about this first, crucial step in the disintegration of *Borean. The possibility of genetic exchanges between Anatomically Modern Humans and Neanderthaloids seemed excluded once Neanderthaloid DNA was extracted and analysed — but was recently reconsidered; moreover, the question of cultural exchanges in this connection has been re-considered repeatedly, e.g. in the work of d’Errico et al. 1998a, 1998b. Another, equally remote, possibility is that the postulated bifurcation of *Borean into a Central and a Peripheral group reflects a cross-Beringia backflow of New-World Peripheral *Borean speakers into the Old World, who then remained distinct from Central *Borean speakers; such a backflow would be associated (cf. Fig. 6.8 below) with haplogroup A2a (rather too recent to explain the initial disintegration of *Borean) and haplogroup C1a (still too recent, but more promising since (Forster 2004) also Austric speakers tend to be long to C — but not speakers of the African macrophyila).

163 There is a scientific growing consensus that shamanism emerged as worldview, a socio-ritual technology, a form of proto-science, and of proto-stratification, in Upper Palaeolithic Eurasia. From the extensive literature I mention: Bednarik 1990; Clottes & Lewis-Williams 1996 / 1998; Eliaide 1951; Garvin 1978; Hermanns 1966, 1970; Hoppé 1984, 1992; Kirchner 1952; Lewis-Williams 1997a, 1997b; Lewis-Williams & Dowson 1989; Lommel 1968 / 1969, 1970; Maringer 1977; Miyakawa & Kollantz 1966; Ozols 1971; Rappenglück 1999; Tromnaa 1993. As a significant remnant of the period, only a few decades ago, when specialists associated the ‘Human Revolution’ (symbolism, articulated speech, art, microlith and other technological innovations) primarily with the European Upper Palaeolithic, some of the most famous specimens of Upper Palaeolithic art (Trois Frères, Lascaux) have been almost canonised now as depictions of shamanism. Here Lewis-Williams’s entoptic hypothesis (also cf. Carr 1995) is dominating the field, but with astronomical interpretations (e.g. Rappenglück 1999 and extensive literature there) as perhaps more convincing and more open to other than speculative, exclusively hermeneutical scientific enquiry. However, there is a more recent tendency (most manifest in the work of Bednarik, e.g. 1995) to recognise the cultural achievements of Humans prior to the rise of of Anatomically Modern variety, and in that connection shamanism (depending on definition, of course) may be suspected to be rather older than the Upper Palaeolithic; in this connection the bear cult (if any, despite the well-known taphonomic critique; Binford 1981) has been cited already in much older work (Narr 1959). In the context of my leopard-skin symbolism project (van Binsbergen 2004-11) I have developed an argument, based on a distribution analysis of various features of shamanism, likewise suggesting that we may date the emergence of shamanism to the Upper Palaeolithic, and situate it in West to Central Asia. This agrees fairly well with the reconstructed dynamics of *Borean, with shamanic interpretations of cave art from Upper Palaeolithic Europe, and with my Aggregative Diachronic Model of World Mythology (van Binsbergen 2006a, 2006b).

164 Notably Indo-European and Dravidian; the Uralic homeland may also be situated here although a recent proposal situates it rather at Lake Baikal; cf. Fortescue 1998; Mallory 2001.
For modelling purposes, language change, like genetic change, can be tentatively assumed to take place at a constant pace.\footnote{A similar assumption underlies the dating estimates of recent molecular genetics, even though they inevitably have alarmingly wide error distributions. Assumption (b) has informed glottochronological research for over half a century now. However, the time scale in Fig. 4.1 is clearly compressed towards more recent ka, suggestive of exponential rather than linear pace. That language change may have increased in the more recent millennia especially under conditions of greater population density and statehood, is suggested by the case of Chinese, whose oldest forms as authoritative for Eurasian. The *Borean nature of Khoisan was accepted, on formal linguistic grounds (e.g. its affinities with North Caucasian are obvious), but also in the light of Cavalli-Sforza’s hypothesis of modern Khoisan speakers being the descendants of a hybrid Asian / African population whose Asian ancestors still lived in the Asian continent 10 ka BP (Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994: 176; pace Vigilant 1989, 1991).\footnote{In the more recent genetic studies involving the Khoisan genome, stress is laid on the exceptional genetic distance between Khoisan and other African and global populations, suggestive of an ancestral separation date of 50 ka BP or more (Gonder et al. 2007; Tishkoff et al. 2009; Schuster et al. 2010). We have an apparent contradiction here with Cavalli-Sforza’s claim of a West Asian admixture into African Khoisan populations, c. 10 ka BP (Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994 – a claim based on an earlier form of population genetics using not molecular analysis but classic genetic markers). The more recent genetic studies listed above explicitly confirm the claim of Cavalli-Sforza et al. (1994) concerning a very large geographical extent of Khoisan in Africa.}}

Perhaps there is, after all, a very simply explanation for the bifurcation between the peripheral branch (African languages, Amerind and Austro-Asiatic) and the central branch (Eurasiatic / Nostratic, Afroasiatic, and Sino-Caucasian) that strikingly emerges from Fig. 4.3. When we confront these statistical results with the reconstruction of the global history of mtDNA haplo groups as given by Forster (2004; Fig. 4.2b, above), an elegant solution presents itself: the peripheral branch appears to derive from mtDNA haplo type M, the central branch from type N – the bifurcation appears to mainly reflect an initial segmentation, already in the Arabian peninsula some 60 ka BP, between the Southern and the Northern Route ‘Out of Africa’.

Already two decades ago, leading linguists (Kaiser & Shevoroshkin 1988) included Nilo-Saharan and Niger-Congo as branches of ‘Super-Nostratic’, where Nostratic is more or less synonymous with Eurasiat. The *Borean nature of Khoisan was accepted, on formal linguistic grounds (e.g. its affinities with North Caucasian are obvious), but also in the light of Cavalli-Sforza’s hypothesis of modern Khoisan speakers being the descendants of a hybrid Asian / African population whose Asian ancestors still lived in the Asian continent 10 ka BP (Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994: 176; pace Vigilant 1989, 1991).\footnote{My provisional quantitative results suggest that also Niger-Congo – including Bantu – may be seen as the result of local African (to some extent including Palaeo-African) interaction\footnote{Cf. the comments by Oliver and Sinjuy Wandibba in Oliver et al. 2001, in response to Ehret 1998. cf. 2001. Considering the commonly recognised affinities between Austro and Bantu, and the insistence, by linguistic specialists, on the contribution, to Bantu, of non-Bantu elements from inside the African continent, the linguistic process of Bantu genesis was probably much more complex than I recently proposed (van Binsbergen 2010a, 2011e) with my appeal to an unoccupied and defenceless niche of cultural ecology) for the spiked wheel trap and similarly distributed cultural items such as mankala, geomantic divination and the belief in a unilateral being.} with incoming transcontinental elements, among which we would probably have to consider both trans-Saharan (westerly) and trans-Indian-Oceanic (easterly) contributions, in line with the recognised internal heterogeneity of Bantu and its apparent affinities, not only with *Borean, but also with Austric.}

Since most of my readers will not be Bantuists or Africanists, I should add here that my view of a substantial *Borean, Eurasian contribution to Bantu is not shared by mainstream specialists in African linguistics especially Niger-Congo > Bantu. The latter tend to reduce the origin of present-day African macrophyta to the African continent they are now exclusively occupying. Thus there is fairly general consensus among Bantuist specialists such as Blench, Williamson and Steward that Bantu emerged near-Lake Chad c. 8 ka BP (albeit without any attestation). The specialists also propose far longer periods of isolated development for these macrophyta within the African continent, for Niger-Congo specifically under the influence of other then local languages in West Africa in the 1\textsuperscript{st} mill. BCE, and they acknowledge the fundamental heterogeneity

\textsuperscript{165} For such an argument there is also extensive archaeological support notably in the distribution of ostrich-shell products in numerous African sites including Ancient Egyptian contexts. Considering the closeness to West Asia of some of this Khoisan distribution area, it would appear as if the apparent contradiction can be resolved: *both statements apply*, in the sense that the relatively recent West Asian intrusion does not radically alter the excentric ancestral position of Khoisan. In fact, the molecular analysis of Khoisan genetic material brought some more recent authors to confirm:

‘Phylogeographic analyses suggest that a large component of the present Khoisan gene pool is eastern African in origin and that Asia was the source of a back migration to sub-Saharan Africa’ (Cruciani et al. 2002).

Study of this Asian intrusion in the Khoisan case was in fact an important factor in bringing to light the ‘Back-into-Africa’ migration.

\textsuperscript{166} Cf. Ambrose 1982: 104 f.; Scozzari et al. 1999; Semino et al. 2002; Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994). For such an argument there is also extensive archaeological support notably in the distribution of ostrich-shell products in numerous African sites including Ancient Egyptian contexts. Considering the closeness to West Asia of some of this Khoisan distribution area, it would appear as if the apparent contradiction can be resolved: *both statements apply*, in the sense that the relatively recent West Asian intrusion does not radically alter the excentric ancestral position of Khoisan. In fact, the molecular analysis of Khoisan genetic material brought some more recent authors to confirm:

‘Phylogeographic analyses suggest that a large component of the present Khoisan gene pool is eastern African in origin and that Asia was the source of a back migration to sub-Saharan Africa’ (Cruciani et al. 2002).
of Bantu. However, lacking contemporary documentary attestation and going back several millennia, such reconstructions are entirely conjectural and risk to be off by thousands of years and by thousands of kilometres – as is demonstrated by the wide divergence of opinions concerning, for instance, the Indo-European homeland. Below we will find to our surprise that the oldest probable attestations of Bantu derive, not from West Africa, but from the Bronze Age Mediterranean. This makes it somewhat more plausible that at least some elements of proto-Bantu originated from Asia – fully in line with the ‘Back-into-Africa’ hypothesis – and had *Borean connotations – as already suggested by linguists a century ago. We have already seen that Niger-Congo (as well as Khoisan) clusters with Amerind and Austric as against the more centrally Old-World macrophylla of Eurasiatic, Sino-Caucasian and Afroasiatic. Some Austric languages have noun classes reminiscent of Bantu, and the Bantu eponymic root –ntu, ‘human’ is very similar to Austronesian –tav-, ‘human’ – quite compatible with the idea of at least some Asian strands towards Bantu. Nor should we underestimate affinities between Bantu and Indo-European; not without reason did accomplished comparative linguists such as Kaiser & Shevoroshkin (1988) consider Niger-Congo a branch of Nostratic / Eurasian. Admittedly, this entire field is beyond my competence, yet I cannot help remarking that when at the Harvard / Peking University Round Table at Beijing, 2006, one of the convenors Prof. Duan Qing 段晴 (a specialist in Chinese Buddhism) showed me transcriptions of Khotanese Saka (an Eastern branch on Indo-European), at first glance I mistook those texts for Bantu. Finally, the proposed *Borean element in Bantu is scarcely to be argued away as merely peripheral: if we take the time-honoured Swadesh 100-words list as our guide, many Bantu words for which *Borean affinities could be claimed, feature semantically in the Swadesh list and therefore can be argued to belong to the Bantu core vocabulary (cf. van Binsbergen 2011a).

4.4. Uninvited guests on the linguistic scene of the Bronze-Age Mediterranean

If there is truth in the common scholarly image of the Sea Peoples as populations on the move (but we will see that this image is not uncontested), then their case was not unique, and showed considerable affinities with that of the Hyksos, treading a similar trajectory three or four centuries earlier. Here we have as a likely model that of a linguistically and culturally heterogeneous cluster of people on the move, hierarchically organised under an aristocratic leadership that was probably Indo-European (Indo-Iranian) or Afroasiatic in language and culture, but bringing in its trail subject groups speaking any languages of the cluster here identified as ‘uninvited guests’. Some of the relevant indications are listed in the following Table 4.2, which highlights particularly the presence of Bantu (< Niger-Congo): Possible Bantu affinities in the Mediterranean are not limited to theonyms. Below (Chapter 29) we shall see how even the place name Rome may be given a Bantu origin. Karst (1931a) interprets the name Canaan as Bantoid. Here we can appeal to proto-Bantu -kāān-, ‘to refuse request’, Guthrie no. 999; Meeussen -kāān-, ‘refuse, deny’, cat. 4.1. Although there has been much debate concerning the meaning and etymology of Canaan, the possible Bantu connection has hardly been considered. The accepted wisdom still derives from Astour 1965c (with apt summary of the earlier discussion, which vainly sought to derive the word from kinākhu, ‘red purple dye’, but finally had to concede that the dyeing practice was named after the country and not the other way around. Astour (1965c: 348) then proposes:

‘The established semantics of the root KN provide us, however, with an acceptable explanation of the name ‘Canaan.’ In Biblical Hebrew, it is found only in niphal (‘to be subdued’ or ‘to lower oneself’) and in biphil (‘to subdue’). In Aramaic, it occurs also in qal (terea, ‘to bow down, bend’). In Arabic, the verb kanaka has several semantically unconnected usages, of which those related to the Hebrew and Aramaic cognates are: (a) ‘to fold wings and to descend to earth’ (said of a large bird), and (b) ‘to bow, to incline toward the horizon’ (said of a star, ...). As applied to the sun, it would be exactly equivalent to the Latin ‘occidere,’ the derived form Kina or Kóra signifying the ‘Occident,’ the

(continued p. 83)

168 E.g. Ehret 1998, 2001; Blench 2006 does not see Niger-Congo > Bantu as deriving from *Borean or some equivalent Eurasian constrict, but instead advocates a sheer dichotomy between Northern and Southern linguistic macrophylla, apparently reviving – unless I am merely reading this into a neutral and detached scholarly product, as I have been inclined to do – such implied stereotypes of Southern / Black / African primitiveness as one would have hoped to have been left behind with the end of the colonial period, c. 1960 CE); Vansina 1995; Oliver et al. 2001.

Table 4.2: Proposed connections between on the one hand Bantu, on the other hand Mediterranean divine names, religious concepts and ethnonyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Connections proposed by Karst 1931a</th>
<th>II. Proto-Bantu</th>
<th>III. remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phoenician / Punic / Meso</td>
<td>mukuku / mhuko, mngu, mukungu, God, Heaven'</td>
<td>*dök, 'rain, drip', 5.4, [ &gt; South Central &amp; Southern Bantu mukungu, 'God']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Canaanite / El / Bel, cf. Egean</td>
<td>Bantu yw-ulo, eyulo, itha, God, Heaven'</td>
<td>*goddu S L JH, sky, above', 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aegean / Abantes; Iliad II, 1966, see Chapter 5 below</td>
<td>Abantu, 'people'</td>
<td>*ñtù L 1, 'person', 1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lapion (Apollo), Melitinos (Zeus),</td>
<td>Bantu mi- logi, mo-lozi, mntoki, mi- logi, 'magician, sorcerer'</td>
<td>*dōgi L, 'be-witch', 5.4, / dōgi 1.1, 'witch', 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chaldean / Owen, Cappadocian</td>
<td>Bantu d- wangi, uwingo, uwingo, God, Heaven'</td>
<td>*ganfia L 1, 9, 'doctor, medicine man', 4.3, / ganfia L 1, 'wrapp', 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Minoan, Memnias [Urtarian] king</td>
<td>Bantu mi- ranga, mungu, mungu, God'</td>
<td>*ñinea, 'big', 1.3; *dök, 'rain, drip', 5.4, [ &gt; South Central &amp; Southern Bantu mukungu, 'God']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Basque / yinko / 'God'</td>
<td>Bantu &gt; Zuñi Nkuku, 'God' Masai ngai, en-gai</td>
<td>*ñink, 'give', 2.3, / *kiddu, 'big, senior, adult', 6.3, [ &gt; nkutu, in South Central &amp; Southern Bantu )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in this row appear to go a long way towards solving this mystery by revealing the Bantu affinities of the Basque thonyms *Yinko* it means 'the All-Giver', as the Earth, or Heaven, are so often called in arcaic cosmologies. The mystery simply lies in the counter-paradigmatic nature of finding Niger-Congo present in the Bronze Age Mediterranean. Not necessarily Bantu-related, cf. "Borean (approx.)" *KWRV* 'old' (from *Eurasian: *KWRV, Afrosasian: *KRV, 'old' (Cushitic, Chadic and Berber "Krv", "be bigger, older"); Sino-Caucasian: *qwa /jWRV* 'old'; African (misc.): Bantu *kiddu* 'old'; Zuñi *k'ur* 'year' (?); San. karde 'full grown person' (Illich-Svytcyn 1971-84; Dolgopolosky n.d., unpublished but incorporated in data bases Globet, Nostret and in Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, 2005: 664, 670).
‘Land of Sunset’ or ‘Westland’ – the West Semitic translation or counterpart of Amurru. This Akkadian term for Syria, partially adopted by the Syrians themselves, means ‘West.’

Its ideographic writing MAR.TU consists of MAR (dialectal Sumerian for GAAR) = Akkadian Sakanu, ‘to install, to place,’ and TU = Akkadian erētu, ‘to enter,’ and its derivations: nētu ‘entrance,’ erētu, ‘sunset.’ (…) The terms ‘Canaan’ and ‘Amurru’ were largely synonymous in the Amarna Age texts and in the Bible.(…)  

Against this background, we may perhaps interpret the proposed semantics of ‘bowing / going down’, not as totally inapplicable, but as a folk etymology for a more original Bantu semantics, referring to a proto-Bantu-speaking population segment that had been increasingly subdued and marginalised under the expansion of Semitic-speakers.

Apart from the fact that we do not usually associate Bantu speakers with this part of the world, the proposed Bantu etymology of Canaan makes excellent sense, especially in view of the fact that Bantu speaking regions of Africa (e.g. South Central Africa) abound with ethnonyms containing a semantic element ‘refusal’: the refusal, specifically, to accept the overlordship of a pre-colonial king or emperor, in other words the refusal to accept (pre-colonial) state rule. From c. 3000 BCE found itself in between two regions of major state formation: Egypt and Mesopotamia, with, from the mid-second millennium onwards, the Hittite empire in the none too distant northwest; and whereas there were extended periods when either region held political sway in Canaan, exacted tribute and had administrative representatives there, the Bedouin segmentary style of self-government often prevailed, and effectively it must have amounted to a refusal to accept such state rule. Alternatively, since (proto-)Afroasiatic and (proto-)Indo-European may be postulated to have been spoken in Syro-Palestine in the Early Bronze Age and earlier (Kammerzell 1994; Ray 1992), one might interpret a reconstructed meaning ‘refuse’ in terms of a fundamental ethnic cleavage between two groups that differed both linguistically and somatically (given our usual association of Bantu-speaking with an Africoid human phenotype).

A little serendipity adds further credibility to this line of analysis. The Canaanite hydronym Jordan172 might also be given a proto-Bantu etymology: it is perhaps to be compared with proto-Bantu -cōdō3 / 4, ‘stream.’173

This shaky example has however a much more convincing counterpart. One of the most moving and enigmatic passages of Genesis is when Jacob / Israel: ‘…rose up that night, and took his two wives, and his two womenservants, and his eleven sons, and passed over the ford Jabbok. And he took them, and sent them over the brook, and sent over that he had. And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day…’ (Genesis 32:22 f., King James translation; my italics).174

The hydronym Jabbok,175 modern Nahr al-Sheriyya (‘Brook of the Sacred Law’) or Nahr al-Zerqa (‘Blue Brook’), has no certain etymology in Hebrew, although the name is usually associated with בָּקָק bâqâq, ‘to pour out’;176 the stream in question is a tributary of the Jordan.

170 Incidentally, the last few lines have a typical Bernallian ring about them – Astour (especially 1967) having been one of the great influences on the Black Athena thesis.

171 Cf. Lancaster 1974: 324, where that claim is specifically made, on the authority of the Rhodesian colonial civil servant and researcher F.W.T. Posselt, for the Zambian Tonga. Another example, from Western Zambia, is the name of the Kwanga people, whose name is locally held to mean ‘To Be Tired’ (which in fact is the meaning of kwanga in Nkoya and in Luyana, the Barotse court language); the Kwanga ethnonym is locally explained as people who are tired of, i.e. opting out of, the overlordship of the Barotse indigenous state, which has dominated the Upper Zambezi flood plain and surrounding areas for a century or more prior to colonial rule (1900-1964).

172 In this connection the emphasis, in the Exodus mythology, on the crossing of the Jordan (e.g. Thompson 1981) may be significant as a sign of awareness of crossing into alien territory, of old associated with mythical, totally alien beings – the Rephaim who were often depicted as giants; cf. de Moor 1976; Caquot 1960; Kallai 1990.

173 Guthrie no. 406 (uncertain reconstruction; Guthrie 1967 and n.d.; d in proto-Bantu has the tendency to develop into r / l, but for our proposed etymology it is to develop into rd). Guthrie’s cōdō 3 / 4, ‘stream’ however does not come back with Meeussen (1980 and n.d.). The latter has the rather different - gedī L 3, ‘stream’, 3.2., which is a less likely etymon for jordan.

174 For systematic reasons given there, I will elsewhere (van Binsbergen 2010c: 199) interpret Jacob’s struggle at the ford as a manifestation of two related ‘Pelasgian’ mythemes: (a) the stream god (of either gender) as a transformation of the Upper Palaeolithic ‘Mother of the Waters’; and (b) the unilateral mythical being, who may bestow incomparable fortunes or misfortunes when encountered.


176 Cf. Strong 1989, Strong nos. 1238, 2999. More reliable and more recent sources, however, highlight mainly negative meanings: ‘to plunder, destroy; to rot; to grow abundantly’ (Broers 2007: 50, s.v. בָּקָק) – which may have to do with the Jabbok in summer, when this otherwise pleasant stream flows very low, or with the negative connotations of the postulated proto-Bantu speakers as despised and vanquished enemies. The reed symbolism widespread throughout the Old and the New Worlds in cosmogonic and Flood-myths and in symbolic geography (e.g. in Ancient Egypt, where the reed marshes are a symbolically charged place of luck and freedom in the encounter between humankind and nature), however, makes it thinkable that for the earlier, presumably Bantu-associated inhabitants the Jabbok was a sacred
Biblical scholars have sought to interpret this enigmatic passage by pointing out that the Jabbok was ‘always’ a natural boundary of Amorite territory, but certainly more is at stake here; for the *hāqeq* etymology leaves the *ja*-*b*-*j*-*b*-*h*-*k* element unexplained. The express mention of the Jabbok as a fordable place, however, points unmistakably to a Bantu etymology, cf. proto-Bantu *jabok*-, ‘to cross a river’! Semantically, the proposal is further strengthened in that the world-view of Bantu-speaking cultures (with parallels however throughout the Old World) tends to attach great importance to spirit provinces, that each have their centre in streams down in the valley, and their boundary up in the elevated lands above the streams, where the latter have their watersheds (van Binsbergen 1992a). Hydronyms absolutely dominate Bantu toponymy: the landscape is essentially a map of hydronyms. Streams are venerated, particularly by small offerings (sprinklings of meal, beads, coins) when crossing. Hence initiation to ritual office often includes such offerings to a nearby stream. An elopement marriage is considered to be successful, irreversible, and legal, once the eloping couple has crossed the watershed and thus has passed into a different spirit province.

The Bible contains no details concerning the supernatural being with whom Jacob fought at the bank of the River Jabbok, at the place subsequently called Peniel (‘Facing God’). However, in Rabbinic and other esoteric literature Jacob’s adversary (there variously identified as an archangel or as God himself) is known as ‘the Dark Angel’ (*Davidson 1967*), s.v. ‘Dark Angel’ – perhaps another reminder of the high pigmentation levels usually associated with Bantu-speakers such as appear to have lived near the Jabbok and to have given the river its name. Under the modern Arabic names of the Jabbok, one referring to the obscure town of Hutzal in Ancient Mesopotamia as the only place in the world as inhabited by Israelites where people carry loads on their heads (so that a particular rabbinical injunction concerning modes of carrying does not apply to them); in view of its emphatically exceptional nature, this could be another African reminiscence in the Canaanite environment, even though carrying on the head especially of water containers is also found in the Arab world, in South East Asia, and elsewhere.

Sorting out the available data, we end up with less but firmer evidence than Karst had at his disposal, concerning a distinct Bantu element in the Bronze Age Mediterranean. We see that, given the assumption of higher level linguistic parent groups such as *Borean*, comparison between lin-

stream associated with cosmogony – as if the reed banks here evoked the original reed clump of the emerging Land. Jacob’s Adversary, too, may be imputed to have had such cosmogenic connotations for the original narrators. Such connotations may also hide under the modern Arabic names of the Jabbok, one referring to the most sacred institutions, the other with its connotation of the colour ‘blue’:

‘The color blue is used quite extensively in the Old Testament to describe the various hangings in the holy places. It also is used as a symbol of wealth and the corruptions thereof, but it should be noted that purple is used far more frequently for such distinctions. In general blue should be viewed as a heavenly color. Below is only a representation of the color’s use in scripture, it occurs far more frequently than demonstrated here’ (Anonymous, ‘Color symbolism’).


178 Guthrie no. 916; Mecussen *-jabuk-*L, ‘cross (a river)’, 4.3. associated with iron-working (mines, large quantities of slag, the Biblical mention in 1 Kings 7: 46) – which may be why it seems to have been claimed by the Ammonite kings in the early first millennium BCE (Elliger 1970). The earliest mining in Syro-Palestine is often taken to be associated with speakers of Indo-European (Best, *personal communication, 12 September 2005*).

In passing one other mythological indication of African affinities in Syro-Palestine may be cited. The legendary Andromeda was claimed to be a daughter of king Cepheus and queen Cassiopelia of ‘Aethiopia’ (the general designation for Black Africa in Graeco-Roman antiquity), but rather than being situated somewhere along the Southern Atlantic or Indian Ocean African coast, she was allegedly chained to a rock at Joppe / Jaffa, on the Levantine Coast, and saved there by Perseus. In the context of our discussion of the Biblical Table of Nations in Chapter 6, it is interesting that according to some traditions, Jaffa was founded by and named after Japheth / *J[ɑ]f[h]e*th son of Noah (cf. Agnon 2000: 168) – puzzling nonetheless because Japheth is the ‘son’ who is associated with the peoples North of the Mediterranean (cf. Genesis 10, see Chapter 6 below), whilst those South are associated with Ham / *H[ɑ]m* (who throughout Judeo-Christian-Islamic traditions has connotations of high skin pigmentation). I suspect that more such apparent African indications, however puzzling, could be found if a thorough search for them were instituted. For instance, the *Talmud* singles out one obscure town of Hutzal in Ancient Mesopotamia as the only place in the world as inhabited by Israelites where people carry loads on their heads (so that a particular rabbinical injunction concerning modes of carrying does not apply to them); in view of its emphatically exceptional nature, this could be another African reminiscence in the Canaanite environment, even though carrying on the head especially of water containers is also found in the Arab world, in South East Asia, and elsewhere.

179 Best, *I., personal communication, 12 September 2005*.


guistic families often dissolves the initial impression of horizontal borrowing, into the admission of, vertically, a joint common source. Whatever Bantu-reminiscent elements remain after deducting the vertically generic, *Borean element, I would still prefer to attribute, not to some Bantu presence as a result of North-East-bound migration from sub-Saharan Africa, but to the presence of pre- or proto-Bantu in the region (below I will call it ‘the Pelasgian realm’) stretching from West Asia to the once fertile Sahara, – pre- or proto-Bantu elements that were on their way to sub-Saharan Africa in the wider context of the ‘Back-to-Africa’ movement (cf. van Binsbergen 2011a).

Recent genetic research has brought out the exceptional position of the Greeks as relatively recent immigrants from an Africa-associated context, into the Mediterranean region that otherwise, by the Late Bronze Age, had had largely stationary populations for several millennia (Arnaiz-Villena et al. 1999, 2001a, 2001b). There is some additional linguistic support for this model. The following Table further brings out some affinities between Greek and Bantu. Here it is remarkable that, whereas the first lexical item in that table can be conveniently relegated to *Borean, the consensual etymology of the second lexical item only goes back as far as proto-Indo-European, – confirming, in other words, the idea that Bantu sprang from a linguistic environment fairly close to Indo-European and possibly (as already admitted by Kaiser & Shevoroshkin 1988) as another branch of Eurasastic / Nostratic. This makes it conceivable that the Bantu phylum (or at least important elements towards it) originated in Eurasia rather than in sub-Saharan Africa, and was only brought to sub-Saharan Africa by the end of the Bronze Age – in line with linguistic proposals made in the beginning of the twentieth century but soon discarded and forgotten because (with the subjectively uncomfortable closeness they suggested between Africans and Europeans) they did not fit the geopolitical othering of Africans under colonial and postcolonial conditions. However, such impressions, based on merely two lexical items, are certainly not enough to go by and extensive specialist research would be required before the suggestions in this chapter can be substantialised.

At least two comparative ethnographic underpinnings can be given for the view that in the context of the Back-to-Africa movement groups passed through West Asia on their way to Africa, bringing with them items of culture that can still be recognised as constitutive of African cultures many millennia later. The first concerns the ground-plan of houses; throughout the early Neolithic (PPNA, Pre-Pottery Neolithic A) in the Near East the ground-plan was round, like in many parts of Africa, only to change to a square ground-plan rather abruptly at the onset of PPNB (c. 8800 BCE). The second point has to do with female genital anatomy. In Central, South Central and East Africa, it is a widespread ideal for women – an ideal transmitted by both formal and informal puberty training – to have very long labia minora, up to about 6 cm. This is a few times the natural length among the Bantu-speaking African population, and in order to produce this effect the girls spend

---

182 Fallows 1910: II, 894, with extensive contemporary references.
183 The existence of a rather stationary population over a considerable number of millennia in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages as an important condition, without which the Pelasgian Hypothesis which I will advance in Chapter 28 would lack a stable demographic basis.
184 Trombetti 1905 (presenting a comprehensive comparative view of the world’s languages, in which a great deal of attention is paid to Bantu within a Eurasian context), 1923; van Oordt 1907 (stressing Uralic and Altaic elements in Bantu); Johnston 1907 (supporting van Oordt as a leading Africanist); Crabtree 1919 (as van Oordt). Regrettably, this early affirmation of the transcontinental affinities in Bantu may not have been disinterested (or, if they were so initially, they may not have stayed so): throughout the 20th century CE the White minority in Southern Africa has sought reasons to discredit the Africans’ (mainly Bantu-speaking) birth-right on the land that had been appropriated through White conquest, hence the attempt to depict the Bantu-speakers as relative newcomers – and Eurasian affinities would fit that project. Meanwhile, African majority rule has been established throughout Southern Africa, and supposedly one can now look at transcultural exchange processes from the Late Bronze Age on with a disinterested academic gaze.
dozens of hours of their late childhood and early adolescence manipulating these body parts in order to stretch them. There is only one human group for whom such labia are claimed (perhaps spuriously) to be natural and hereditary: the Khoisan speakers (cf. Gqola 2006), who now live in Southern Africa, but whom genetic research (as we have seen) has demonstrated to be a hybrid population between Africans and Asians, some of whose ancestors still lived in West Asia c. 10 ka BP. Probably the (proto-)Bantu-speaking population adopted the custom of artificial elongation in order to imitate the group that already had this feature as an hereditary trait. That means that by that time, probably several millennia ago, (proto-)Khoisan speakers constituted a culturally dominant group, and a reference group, for the proto-Bantu speakers.

We scarcely know of any other population practising the elongation of labia outside Africa today. There is some slight indication\(^{186}\) to suggest that the practice once occurred in East Asia;\(^ {187}\) and as could be expected given the West Asian Early Neolithic attestation of the trait, coupled with the fact that the New World was partly populated from Central to East Asia, we also find it very sporadically attested in the New World. For instance in a Mohave Coyote story (Devereux 1948), which contains a giant’s contemptuous expression *hithpaan kwiiviya* ‘vulva winged (referring to the labia [Devereux’s explanation])’. The Mohave people live in the South West USA. With only one North American attestation so far, there is insufficient reason to consider, in this connection, the possibility of a trans-Bering, westbound backflow of this trait from some hypothetical North American origin. Incidentally, the Mohave, too, are ‘Water People’ which is the literal translation of their name *Aha Macave*. Despite the amazing genital parallel, I am not suggesting an intimate link with the Sea Peoples of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, but only wish to remind the reader how utterly general and unspecific the designation ‘Water / Sea People’ is. We will encounter several more such examples. Whatever the case, a woman with similarly elongated labia was depicted in PPNB at Göbekli Tepe, Pre-Pottery Neolithic B, Anatolia (8800-8000 BCE); (b) Khoisan apron (source: Anonymous 2007, ‘Khoisan apron’).

Beyond these two comparative ethnographic traits, there are other indications that we find ourselves here near one of the cradles of what we know today as the Niger-Congo speaking civilisations of sub-Saharan Africa. The Caucasus region, and the legendary Colchis region (associated in Graeco-Roman mythology with the Iphigenia and Orestes, Argonauts, Helius and his descendants Æëtes, Circe, Pasiphaë and, in the next generation, Medea) has stood out (e.g. in the context of the Afrocentrism and *Black Athena* discussions) as a place inhabited by a highly pigmented population which in various ways (e.g. in connection with the legendary exploits of the Egyptian Pharaoh Sesostiris, *i.e.* Senwosret I or III at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, 20th century BCE) is associated with sub-Saharan Africa.\(^ {188}\) Most dynasties and aristocratic groups in South Central Africa trace their origin to a legendary land *Kola*, whose location in the distant North East has remained one of the mysteries of South Central African studies. Thus for the Nkoya people of Zambia, Kola is to be found in modern Lunda country in the modern Democratic Republic of Congo, a few hundred kms North of the Congo / Zambezi watershed (van Binsbergen 1992a). For

---

187 Derrick 2001 reports the same condition as an occasional trait among Japanese women, named ‘winged butterfly’.
the Nkoya’s northern neighbours the Kaonde (Jaeger 1974: 8), Kola lies between the Congo river and the Atlantic Ocean, i.e. in the country known as the Lower Congo in recent centuries. By virtue of the toponymical mechanisms we have examined in Chapter 2, the same may in principle be associated with several places far removed from one another. One of these locations could be Kola, in modern North-western Turkey (cf. Edwards 1988), and apparently a cognate of the name Colchis. When, by a time-honoured approach which has yielded credible results for Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Nostratic / Eurasianist, etc. (de Vries 1958: Introduction; Dolgopolsky 1998; Witzel 2001a), we use reconstructed proto-Bantu vocabulary in order to reconstruct the physical environment, society and technology of proto-Bantu speakers, we find a well-watered environment, wetlands perhaps with islands, in the temperate zone, with hardly any conspicuous African natural features, and basic metallurgy (van Binsbergen 2011a). It is tempting to situate such a homeland in the wider Caspian region and adjacent North-eastern Anatolia, but another possible choice would be the Munda-speaking region around the Bay of Bengal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>proto-Bantu</th>
<th>Greek (van den Es 1896)</th>
<th>higher-level etymology (Starostin &amp; Starostin 1998-2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. ‘to cut’ | Gaedic *dÉm* ‘to cut down’, 1703, 1705; *dÉm* ‘to cut in two’, 1740; Meeussen: *dÉm* ‘cut down, fell’ 3.1 | témno , támno , témé got ‘to cut’ | *Borean (approx.):* TV‘N/K ‘to cut’
Amerind (misc.): *tán ‘cut’ (cf. Ruhlen n.d.: 158) [+ A].
African (misc.): Bantu *dēr- ‘to cut’. Bengtson & Ruhlen 1994: 113 list this as a Global Etymology under *tām. |

Table 4.3. Possible Greek-Bantu correspondences via higher-level etymologies

In a much discredited book from the end of his otherwise splendid career, Hrozný (the decipherer of Hittite) traces linguistic, cultural and ethnic connections all over West and Western South Asia, highlighting a possible connection between what (unspecified) Egyptian inscriptions represent as the region of Kode (i.e. Kizzuwatna, cf. Weiss 1982) and countries south of the Hittite empire and south of the river Indus (Hrozný 1951: 196). By transformations especially common in Bantu, Kode may be read as Kole or Kola. An apparently cognate name Kīr surfaces in the Biblical book of Amos, e.g.

‘Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the LORD. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? and the Philistines from Caphthor, and the Syrians from Kir?’ (Amos 9:7)

which according to Albright (1975 / 1987: 531) refers to the deportation of Aramaeans to Kir in a general Mesopotamian context where also Elam finds itself; the context may even refer to the deportation, in Pharaonic times, of a highly pigmented, Africa-associated population such as led to the origin of the Greeks, according to a reconstruction by the geneticists Arnaiz-Villena et al. (1999, 2001a). Karst (1931a: 241) mentions a chain of apparently cognate South-west Asian ethnonyms in the Dravidian context:

‘…Kuruk, Koroi, Kurru, Kora in the Dravidian region; Kurku in the Munda-Kolarian group, whose etymology also comes back in the Kolarian horo, horh, horra, koro, ‘human being’. Cf. the proto-Indian Kuru people of the Mahabharata…’. 189

189 Also cf. Kloss & McConnell 1989: 889, where Kola / Kolehar / Ho appears as branch of the Munda group < Austrasian < Austro-Asian macrophylum. Given the demonstrable Buddhist substrate in
and moreover draws our attention (Karst 1931a: 538) to the fact that in Sanskrit *kula means ‘gens, ethnos’. Even more to the point appears the fact that two similar *Borean re-
constructed lexical items may be considered to be at the root of the name Kola in ways that make it impossible to pinpoint the exact phylum of origin: *KVLV ‘walk, roam, ford’\(^{190}\) and *KVLV ‘valley’\(^{191},192\). Incidentally, the place name Kola also applies to a major peninsula on the White Sea in Northern Russia. Perhaps these occurrences of the same place name in Northern Europe, West Asia, South Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa (and probably also South Asia) are no mere coincidence (although the word is simple enough to invite coincidence): below, Chapter 28, we will encounter the Pelasgian cross-model as a mechanism system-
ically accounting for a West Asian epicentre with diff-
sion in four directions, including Northern Europe and sub-Saharan Africa, as well as East into East and South Asia.

On these various grounds, I believe to have substan-
 tiated the claim that West Asia in the Late Bronze Age quali-
 fies as one of the places of origin of Niger-Congo / Bantu, so that proto-Bantu may be counted as part of the linguistic situ-
tion prevailing in the general area that formed the scene for the Sea Peoples Episode.

\(^{190}\) With reflexes in most Eurasian phyla, in Afroasiatic, Sino-
Caucasian notably North Caucasian, Austric and Bantu; cf. Star-

\(^{191}\) With a doubtful reflex in Indo-European notably Baltic, but firmly attested reflexes in other Eurasian phyla such as Altaic, Uralic and Dravidian, and moreover in Afroasiatic (notably Cushitic and Berber), Sino-Caucasian (notably North Caucasian and Sino-Tibetan), cf. Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008; Dolgopol-
sky n.d. 620.

\(^{192}\) One might be tempted to connect the place name Kola with the cola nut, a tree fruit indigenous in de rain forests of West A-
frica – its breaking or splitting in a very common social ritual may be an implicit symbol of the cosmogenic separation of Heaven and Earth; but although the name of this fruit कोळा is claimed to come directly from the West African Temne language (cf. Manding कोळा), there the क- is merely a prefix to a root डीः (Schlenker 1864: 103), so no connection with *KVLV can be maintained.

\(^{193}\) Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008 list on this point: Dolgopol-

\(^{194}\) Note the semantic closeness to the notion of ‘scatter, speckle, which underlies leopard-skin symbolism throughout the *Borean realm – which we will discuss at various points in this book, most elaborately in Chapter 29 below. Nonetheless, Tefnut, ‘Moisture’, may be a reflex; Tefnut and her brother-husband Shu are the first creatures to be produced, by masturbation or from spitting, by the male Primal God Atum – we may again

4.5. Further evidence of uninvited guests in the Late Bronze Age
Mediterranean: Some Uralic and shamanic trances in Ancient Egypt

In addition to this possibly Niger-Congo element in the Levant and Anatolia, there is an Uralic, possibly shamanic element to be appreciated in Ancient Egypt. In the first place, no Old Egyptian etymology can be given for the theonym *Nt (Neith) who yet was the dominant Delta goddess in Early Dynastic times, later relegated to an ancil-
larly position as funerary goddess only to be restored to her original splendour in the Saïte period (6th-5th century BCE). The theonym *Nt does not have an obvious etymol-
yogy in Ancient Egyptian / Afroasiatic.

Yet a few interesting suggestions can be made on the basis of the Tower of Babel data (Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008).

Thus from *Borean (approx.) *TVPV, ‘spit’, we get\(^{193}\) Proto-Afroasiatic: *tu/ku ‘spit’ (with cognates in Euras-
atic: *tu/if ‘spit’ and Amerind (misc.): *tupa ‘saliva’ (Ruhlen n.d.: 589); in Pyramid texts this Afroasiatic reflex produces not only the regular ꝲ ‘spit’ but also (Old King-
dom) ꝲ ꝲ ‘to sprinkle’\(^{194}\) [of which the theonym Tefnut, ‘Moisture’, may be a reflex; Tefnut and her brother-husband Shu are the first creatures to be produced, by masturbation or from spitting, by the male Primal God Atum – we may again

South and South Central Africa (cf. van Binsbergen 2010e), and its South and East Asian antecedents, the Kola name, even if uni-
formly deriving from West Asia, is more likely to have travelled to South and South Central Africa via South Asia than, across the Sahara, via West Africa.
suspect a Bronze Age gender shift here, with a male god supplanting an original female creatix associated with the Primal Waters, cf. *ntś* (Medical Texts) ‘sprinkle’ (with a Prefix *nV*). Moreover, we find Old Egyptian: *nty.w* (Old Kingdom) ‘people, men’ (where *-y* may be a suffix or a reflex of a front vowel; this reflex is probably one of the inspirations for the mytheme according to which the male primal god Ra’ produced humankind from his spittle or tears); Old Egyptian: *nttḥ* (Medical Texts), proposedly from < *n̂yIw?* < from Proto-Afro-Asiatic: *ḥlat* (*‘skin’, with the explanation: ‘reduplication; Egyptian *n*- may be < *y*’ (Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Egyptian etymology’). On the basis of the name principle Old Egyptian *nw.t* ‘sky’ (Pyramid texts; an unmistakably feminine form) – which also features as a theonym, the goddess Nut – could derive from Proto-Afro-Asiatic *ḥw-, ‘cloud, sky’ (without higher-level, i.e. *Borean, forms). Neith (*nt*) and Nut (*nw.t*), whose names are very similar anyway, can both be understood as derivations from an earlier creator Goddess, who as Mother of the Primal Waters would hold sway over the sky (Water Above), the sea, and the Underworld (Waters Below).

Although I propose, in Table 4.4, a very different etymology for the name of Neith / *Nt*, Neith cannot be considered to have a totally different identity from *nw.t, Nut*, ‘sky’. For Neith is clearly not only a Mother of the Primal Waters, but by implication (since this means that she – at least her Upper Palaeolithic prototype – also ruled over the ‘Waters Above’, the sky, prior to the installation of the Cosmology of the Separation of Heaven and Earth) she is also the sky goddess. This explains why she, in her form as Isis, wields power over Ra’ (the male sky / sun god who has supplanted her) by knowing his secret name – and why this awareness of Neith’s initial superiority is retained in Ancient Egyptian magic and popular religion as a typical subversive reservoir of outdated and supplanted religious notions. 195 This also explains why, when the trial of Seth and Horus has reached a draw, Neith clinches the issue by threatening to drop the sky if her ruling is not accepted.196 Neith’s claims to supreme cosmogonic powers, still manifest in fragmented form in the Early Dynastic corpus (Kaplon 1963), was suppressed in subsequent millennia when Neith was reduced to one of the funerary goddessess; it is as such that she appears, for instance, in the tomb of Tutankhamun. However, Neith’s cult, and claims to suprema-


196 Interestingly, and a confirmation of the closeness between Celtic and Egyptian branches of the Pelasgian cultural substrate, Celts have been documented on two occasions, nearly a millennium apart, to have sworn by the falling of the sky (Rolleston 1994: 23).

The goddess’ aspect as Mother of the Primal Waters, might suggest a connection with Indo-European,197 notably acy, were revived in the Late, Saïtic period (when her temple at Saïs became once more a major religious centre, and when the interpretatio graeca came to identify her once more with Greek Athena with whom she had always shared cosmological and etymological, Pelasgian roots). This exalted Neith / Athena is still manifest in the Isis-related testimonies by Apuleius, Plutarch and Proclus in Late Antiquity.

**Table 4.4. Proposed Uralic etymology of the Ancient Egyptian theonym Neith © Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008**

197 Cf. the Hittite and other Indo-European connotations of the Delta (e.g. Kammerzell 1994; Ray 1992) also indicated from an archaeological perspective in Hoffman (1980). Also the key word *bīt*, ‘bee, honey, [king / priest of] Lower Egypt’ is isolated within the Afroasiatic linguistic realm to which Ancient Egyptian belongs. Its only proposed cognate within Afroasiatic is *ēbē* ‘kind of gadfly’ in the Chadic Dangla language; the recognition of an otherwise isolated root *bīV* in proto-Afroasiatic seems merely to avoid the embarrassment of having to recognize an Indo-European etymology for an Ancient Egyptian word; – Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, s.v. ‘Afroasiatic etymology’. Our conclusion could be that *bīt*, ‘bee, honey, [king / priest of] Lower Egypt’ has primarily an Indo-European etymology; which is also the opinion of Dolgopolsky (n.d.: 278) – he explicitly compares Indo-European *bīV* with Egyptian *bīl* ‘bee’. We are reminded of the fact that, outside the direct and conspicuous influence of Egypt, several Aegean priesthoods in the Late Bronze and the Iron Age were named after bees.
German *nass*, Dutch *nat*, ‘wet’, whose etymology however also remains obscure;\(^{198}\) yet outside Indo-European a convincing Eurasian, specifically Uralic, etymology may be formulated.\(^{199}\) There are indications of Neith’s identity as Mother of the Primal Waters in the Egyptian documentary corpus of the Early Dynastic period, *e.g.* (see Kaplony 1963: I, 412) *Fy-Nt*, ‘Neith takes her ablutions’ in other words: ‘Neith at home in her watery environment’. In another theophoric name she appears as *Nfr-p[y]t*, ‘the beautiful female from Buto’;\(^{200}\) and the implication of reference to a female hippopotamus again refers to the Primal Waters (Kaploný 1963: I, 543). Incidentally, it was an hippopotamus that was credited in Antiquity (Manetho’s king list; Waddell 1940) with killing Menes / Min, the first Egyptian king that was credited in Antiquity (Manetho’s king list; Kaplony 1963: I, 543). Incidentally, here opens up a metaphorical, mythical aspect of the Old Egyptian conception of *People of the Waters*, which again reminds us not to fall too readily into a ‘fallacy of misplaced concreteness’ when analysing Egyptian records referring to the ‘People of the Sea’ – as we will inevitably do in the context of Sea Peoples studies. In the Egyptian cosmology, the Waters, like the deserts, were undomesticated parts of reality, lacking the order of kingship and agriculture brought by *Wsīr*, ‘Osiris’, and instead ruled by Seth, ‘the god of confusion’ (te Velde 1967), increasingly, in the course of Egyptian dynastic history, with connotations of alienness, especially West Asian alienness. In Ancient Mesopotamia, the same notion was associated with the word *kūr*, ‘mountain, desert, fringe of civilisation’. Bringing order (in the sense of agriculture, winemaking, weaving, kingship and the abolition of human sacrifice) Osiris as a culture hero is highly comparable with the Biblical Noah. Although Osiris is not clearly identified as a Flood hero at the emic level of Ancient Egyptian culture, yet implicitly he unmistakably is one.\(^{202}\) Moreover, the cult of boat and boat burials throughout Egyptian dynastic history, the indications of his junior status vis-à-vis  a double theophoric name combining Neith and Khnum (Kaploný 1963: I, 572). Is it reading too much in the evidence, to see here a confirmation of my hypothesis of the succession of two cosmogonies, the former based on the Separation of Water and Land (it is at this, archaic, level that the name Neith may have Uralic antecedents\(^{201}\) which semantically are still detectable in the Early Dynastic period), the latter in terms of the Separation of Heaven and Earth, which increasingly becomes the dominant cosmology both in Egypt and throughout the Old World, causing Neith to end up as a sky goddess?

Incidentally, the image of the Mother of the Primal Waters is also very conspicuous in the principal Uralic mythical text, the Kalevala cycle; cf. Kalevala 1910; Tamminen 1928.

Implicitly, at a level of structural analysis, Osiris has many elements of a Flood hero, though: initially enclosed in a prismatic three-dimensional wooden structure (a chest or coffin in Osiris’ case, an Ark in the case of Noah and many other Flood heroes), cast into the waters and drowned, the sixteen parts of his body scattered over the waters, his wooden encasement to land up in the roots of a tree in Phoenicia (cf. the post-Flood landing of the Ark on Ararat, *Genesis* 8:4), whither Isis’ desperate wandering in search of her lost loved one (cf. Demeter looking for Persephone) took her; Osiris’ subsequent successful reproductive action (even in death?) when he sired Horus the King of Heaven (cf. the celestial / terrestrial symbolism I shall attribute, in Chapter 6, to Noah’s sons Japheth and Ham), crowned by Osiris’ apotheosis as king of the Underworld – cf. Noah’s post-Flood covenant with the Supreme God / Causer of the Flood (*Genesis* 9).

---

\(^{198}\) Cf. de Vries & de Tollenaere 1983; de Vries 1958; van Veen & van der Sijs 1997, all s.v. ‘nat’.

\(^{199}\) Cf. Karst 1931b: 75, where he lists Finnish (< Uralic) *neiti* ‘humidity’; Armenian *nay* ‘wet, fluid’ and even Nuba (< Nilo-Saharan) *nie*, ‘to drink’, without making the specific connection with Neith. Incidentally, ‘humidity’ is the common translation of the name of the Egyptian goddess *Tfnt* (Tefnut), who with her husband *Św* (Shu) constituted the first creatures, twins, produced by an act of self-procreation through masturbation, performed by the primal god Atum. In my opinion, the masturbation is a later rationalisation (hinted at by Atum’s name ‘the hidden one’?), when the process of masculinisation of state, society and myth has progressed so far that the idea of a female creatrix had been rendered unspeakable. Along the path indicated by Karst, a state-of-the-art etymology for the name Neith can be proposed as in Table 4.4 (Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Nostratic etymology’). Note that despite the Indo-European affinities of the Egyptian Delta including the name of Neith’s divine attribute the bee (see two footnotes up), the Eurasian / Nostratic affinities of her own name do not extend to Indo-European as a branch of that macrophyllum.

\(^{200}\) Buto is the Greek version of the name of the sacred ancestral site Pe in the Delta.

\(^{201}\) The image of the Mother of the Primal Waters is also very conspicuous in the principal Uralic mythical text, the Kalevala cycle; cf. Kalevala 1910; Tamminen 1928.

\(^{202}\) Moreover, the cult of boat and boat burials throughout Egyptian dynastic history, the indications of his junior status vis-à-vis
his ‘wife’  $\text{ḥats}$ / $\text{ḥêt}$, ‘Isis’, by reference to which his very name is written as shown here, and the parallels with other junior-generation, demiurge-like Eastern Mediterranean gods such as Dionysus and Dumuzi, suggest that also in Osiris case we may surmise that his prototype has been informed, in part, by that of the male Flood hero dependent on an alliance with the supreme Divinity of the Waters, initially perhaps his virgin mother as creatrix. Our two case studies to be examined in the next chapters, the Homeric Catalogue of (Achaean) Ships, and the Biblical Table of Nations, come closely together and begin to appear as scions from the same trunk, once we take into account that underneath the epicising, historicising conception of the Trojan war (the one that was taken literally by most historical actors in Gracco-Roman Antiquity, and that was brilliantly revived by Heinrich Schliemann albeit on the basis of, again, a fallacy of misplaced concreteness), there has always been an undercurrent of a totally different view, which connects directly with the Biblical Flood story around Noah, and transparently goes back to the now extremely well-studied Ancient Mesopotamian prototypes (around such Flood heroes as Utnapishtim, Ziusudra and Atrakhasis), and which also has close parallels in the Egyptian myth of the overzealous lion goddess Sekhmet / Hathor destroying humankind at the instigation of the annoyed sungod, finally to be tricked by red alcoholic drink that looked like more blood (Bonnet 1952 / 1971, s.v. Sachmet; Smith 1984). Below, in the beginning of Chapter 5, we will see how John Reeves (1966) called scholarly attention to the Ancient Greek interpretation according to which the Trojan war was merely a cunning devise, by the gods or by Zeus alone, to decimate or even annihilate the human population for annoying the gods and showing disrespect of the Earth. The importance of this comparative-mythological discovery goes further than merely bringing out another link between our two empirical examples in the present argument. It also suggests that – to the extent to which the Trojan war has been regarded as parallel to, even an aspect of, the Sea Peoples Episode – we must be prepared to consider that both the Trojan war, and the Sea Peoples’ Episode in general, have strongly mythical overtones, however much the Sea Peoples scientific industry has tried to persuade us otherwise. Troy shared with other such place names in Europe (Trojaburg, etc.)

203 Muller 1934; Farwerck 1978; Rappenglück 1999: 346 n. 1200 with very extensive literature. Important discussions of the shamanistic connotations of Swan, Egg, Dioscuri, Leda and Zeus are to be found in Michael Rappenglück’s 1999 doctoral dissertation. I am indebted to Dr Rappenglück for making his thesis on prehis-

tonic astronomies available to me, and for further helpful responses to my query.

204 Cf. Heller 1946. While archaeoastronomy continues to be locked in a heated debate over the Upper Palaeolithic versus the Iron Age / Hellenistic date of discovery of the precession of the equinoxes, there is mounting consensus (cf. Rappenglück 1999 and extensive references there; O’Neill 1893-97) concerning the Upper Palaeolithic dating of the notion of the celestial axis (around which the circumpolar stars visibly rotate every night – in other words, this is a direct observational phenomenon of naked-eye astronomy). Probably the symbolism of the celestial axis merged with that of the spindle whorl, many specimens of which were unearthed by Schliemann (1984 / 1884) at Troy, and by his successors such as Blegen; also cf. Keith 1998.

205 Biblical scholars have treated *-el, *-il- as a Semitic root meaning ‘god, sky’, (Hastings 1908-21 / 1926, index vol., s.v. ‘El’; Hebrew el, Akkadian ila. However, state-of-the-art historico-comparative linguistics do not seem to confirm this as an acceptable proto-Semitic root; Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Afroasiatic etymology’. The ‘Celestial City’ became a central trope in Christianity, best exemplified in St Augustine’s De civitate Dei (early 5th century CE).
in the first place the authority of the prominent Egyptologist Helck (1984). He interprets, on the famous Narmer tablet (c. 3100 BCE, from Hierakonpolis, Upper Egypt; Quibell 1900, I: Plate XXIX), not the king, but the Tꜣ official in front of the king, as a shaman in leopard skin; this is, in Egyptian iconography, the earliest depiction of the Šm priest – the standard leopard-skin wearer – who is ideally the king’s son and heir.

Moreover there is the evidence from ceremonial head-gear as set out in Fig. 4.7.

Interestingly, the term used for the owner of the pharaonic diadem, sidel-n-ḥn means ‘binding of the rower’ (Hannig 2000 s.v. ‘Diadem’); while in the context of the Egyptian kingship this unmistakably refers to the solar ship (to which the king is promoted through his kingship, death, and identification with Osiris), it could have ancestral connotations of nautic crafts of the type we will examine for the South and Central Europe, and much further afield, in the context of the Sea Peoples’ vessels. Ultimately, there may be even Sunda connotations here, in line with Stephen Oppenheimer’s (1998) Sunda thesis which I shall briefly discuss below. This indication does not stand on its own. Formally plausible Austric / Sunda etymologies can be proffered for key names in Bronze Age Mediterranean religions and myth (such as Neith, Osiris, Minos, Ra’, Cocalus, Talus, Daedalus). Moreover, an Austric element could be seen in the etymology and cosmology surrounding the legendary land of Dilmun – usually identified as Bahrain in the Persian Gulf – and other ‘moon’ islands such as Ceylon and Madagascar. Below I will come back to the Sunda question in passing, and try to take a relative view of these complexities – interpreting them in the light, not of wholesale Indonesian influence on Western Eurasia, but of my Pelasgian Hypothesis, which stipulates, among many other influences in all four directions, Mediterranean and West Asian influence on South and South East Asia – thus reversing the equation. However, it is fair to admit that this far from exhausts the possible applicability of Oppenheimer’s intriguing thesis. For a fuller treatment see: van Binsbergen c.s. 2008, and 2011c. An important component of the maritime peoples who have spread Indonesian products, culture and genes in South East Asia and beyond, is called Orang Laut, ‘Sea Peoples’ – another example of the unspecific nature of that name.
4.6. Karst’s layered and hierarchical model for the Mediterranean Bronze Age linguistic situation

One of the ways to unravel the linguistic and cultural complexities attending Bronze Age Mediterranean (as exemplified in our two case studies below, and a fortiori in our analysis of the Sea Peoples) is by reviving, as a heuristic hypothesis, Karst’s (1931a) intuitive and hypothetical yet perceptive model of the five-tiered linguistico-ethnic structure of the protohistorical Mediterranean. This model stipulates throughout the Late Bronze Age essentially the same few layers (Caucasian / Basquoid, Afroasiatic and Indo-European), upon a complex of more or less identifiable older substrates.

Karst’s insistence (1931a, 1954) on the Basquoid element as a substrate throughout the Mediterranean layered ethnico-linguistic system in the Late Bronze Age, would at first glance be counter-intuitive, yet it is also supported by Hubschmid 1953, 1960, and by a considerable consensus to the effect that the Ausci are in fact an Aquitanian / Ligurian variant of the Basques. Hubschmid (1953) sought to retrieve the ancient Mediterranean substrate in the language of Sardinia, and predictably came up with Berber and Basque traces. Also recent authors like McCall & Fleming (1999) see the Northern Mediterranean coast in the Bronze Age as largely Sino-Caucasian speaking. Michael Witzel’s (1999, 2002, 2003) painstaking lexical reconstructions offer a fascinating view of the substrate languages underlying Indo-European and Afroasiatic as the currently dominant (macro-)phyla in West (to be precise, Western Central) Asia, as what I shall identify below (Part III) as the Eastern part of the Primary Pelasgian realm.

It is tempting to interpret the distribution of Sino-Caucasian as evidence of both a westbound and an eastbound spread from a West Asian epicentre associated with the early phases of the disintegration of *Borean; and there is genetic support for such an hypothesis (Forster 2004). However, the puzzling fact remains that the Basque population (Calafell & Bertranpetit 1994) appears to have been stationary since the Upper Palaeolithic, so that either

(a) the pre- or proto-Basques acquired Sino-Caucasian considerably later and through a process of non-demic cultural transfer; or
(b) pre- or proto-Basques were among the original speakers of proto-Sino-Caucasian, and came with that language macrophylum from West Asia as long ago as 18 ka BP; or
(c) pre- or proto-Basques were among the original speakers of Sino-Caucasian, having developed that macrophylum out of *Borean in South-Western Europe instead of, or in addition to, West to Central Asia (where I have so far assumed that *Borean was situated). A similar movement has been identified as the Neolithic westbound spread of farming from the Middle East along the shores of the Mediterranean.

It stands to reason to conflate both movements and associate the spread of farming along the Northern Mediterranean shore with the spread of Sino-Caucasian; however, others have considered Indo-European in this connection (although Gimbutas’ kurgan hypothesis provides an attractive alternative), while also Afroasiatic appears to be involved. As Bodmer states:

“Some years ago, Luca Cavalli-Sforza noted that the frequency of Rhesus negativity might reflect a gradient of change across Europe, and found other genetic differences with a similar pattern. Putting together the data available already some 25 years ago led Cavalli-Sforza to suggest that the gradient of genetic differences across Europe reflected the expansion of agriculturists from the Fertile Crescent in the Middle East outwards, starting some 10000 years ago. More recent studies, using a greater variety of genetic markers, have strongly supported this intriguing idea which brings together the work of human geneticists, physical anthropologists and archaeologists.” (Bodmer 1996: 1046)

Interestingly, the spread of Indo-European as a lan-

206 Meyer-Lübke 1908; Tovar 1949: 82 f., 1961: 130, and n.d.; Sarkissian 1999. Further contributions to the analysis of the linguistic situation in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean were made by Best & Woudhuizen (1988, 1989), but they have no affinity with the view stressing Sino-Caucasian presences.

207 Even so, the Sardinian population and linguistic makeup stands out as exceptionally peculiar and isolated; cf. Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994; Scozzari et al. 2001.

208 Fleming & McCall’s idea, however compelling, is not new. Not only does it already surface with Karst, seventy years earlier, but even the pioneering physical anthropologist Broca (1875: 8 f. – his views on race and hybridity are of course totally obsolete, and dangerous) perceived a ‘langue touranienne’ in Southern Europe, according to him preceding the expansion of the ‘languages aryennes’ i.e. Indo-European; in the same vein Cruel 1883. In the light of such early insights now forgotten, one can only agree with Bernal’s insistence on the occasional lasting value of some of 19th-century CE archaeology and Ancient history, against the sweeping waste-making that has been habitual in Academia in more recent decades.

language no longer seems to have any detectable genetic component (Arnaiz-Villena et al. 2002, cf. 2000b), in other words, that language phyllum did not spread through demic diffusion, but through simple cultural diffusion among an essentially stationary local population; this also applies to the Mesolithic / Neolithic tradition on the Iberian peninsula (Arnaiz-Villena et al. 2000a). A similar conclusion was also reached by Flores et al. 2001. Against this background, Karst’s model of a five-tiered linguistico-ethnic model as hypothesised to apply throughout the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean finds, belatedly, a mainstream linguistic confirmation, including the point that the Indo-European and Afroasiatic layer(s), politically sufficiently dominant to impose their language, were for a long time demographically too insignificant to leave much of a specific genetic trace.

The Sino-Caucasian including Basqoid element is relegated to substrate status, highlighting the politico-ethnically dominant, surface manifestations of the, substantially more recent, Indo-European and / or Afroasiatic (macro-) phyla. All that is needed in addition, then, to arrive at Karst’s five-tiered model, however hypothetical, is an identification of the layers that underlie even the Sino-Caucasian substrate – and having already identified the presence of the Niger-Congo macrophyllum (including the Bantu phylum) in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, one is all the more motivated to search for further traces of the likely other (macro-) phyla involved, such as:

(a) the African Nilo-Saharan (whose Mediterranean manifestations are already stressed by Karst 1931a) and Khoisan;
(b) besides Indo-European, the representatives of the other Eurasatic / Nostratic phyla such as Uralic, by shamanic streaks in the Egyptian kingship, and by the mechanism of the cross-model, Dravidian, perhaps even Altaic (suggested by Karst on the basis of the Noahic; and
(c) Austric.

Meanwhile, retaining Karst’s illuminating hypothesis of the five-tiered linguistico-ethnic system prevailing throughout the Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age, does not mean that we have to accept Karst’s complex reconstructions wholesale (cf. van Binsbergen 2011d). Considerable corrections of Karst’s approach are in order. Thus he sees, next to the essentially North Caucasian elements of the Sino-Caucasian macrophyllum, also traces of Sino-Tibetan in the Bronze Age Aegean, and interprets the Sinim of the Table of Nations (Genesis 10; see Chapter 6) accordingly; much of this, however, is based on Karst’s Sinologically anachronistic reading of onomastic elements. Moreover, perhaps the idea of a sweeping westbound migration from the Caucasus in the Neolithic and Early Bronze Ages, followed by a similarly massive eastbound sweep in the Middle Bronze, seems counterintuitive and an unnecessary infringement of Occam’s Razor – is it not more likely that the first, westbound movement was in itself sufficient to leave many traces of a North Caucasian, pre-Basqoid linguistic orientation throughout West Asia and the Mediterranean shores? Or should we once more take recent genetic findings into account, and resign ourselves to the consideration that, if (with the exception of the Greeks) the Mediterranean population has tended to be stationary since the Early Bronze Age or earlier, and if the Basques can be argued to have lived in their present habitat for 18 ka, that then sufficient conditions are met for the eastbound Basque movement towards the Levant as postulated by Karst?

At this point, when we have already made several references to ‘Pelasgian’ in passing, it is useful to formally introduce the term ‘Pelasgian’ into our argument; it will play an increasingly important role. I use Pelasgian in a specific sense which is different from that adopted by Woudhuizen, this volume. For him, like for van Windekens (1952, 1960) and his followers, Pelasgian is a very specific historic ethnic group in the Aegean / Balkan / Italian regions during the Late Bronze and the Iron Ages, with one

---

210 In demic diffusion, an immigrant population replaces an earlier one, and in the process brings its culture and language to the new habitat. Cavalli-Sforza has been, with his associates, a major exponent of the thesis that Indo-European spread through demic diffusion hence must have left a clearly identifiable genetic footprint, which he has tried to identify through multivariate analysis on classic genetic markers; cf. Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994.

211 Altaic, or with the now obsolete term ‘Turanic’, elements were seen by 19th-century CE scholarship in the Hittites, and also in the Noah figure, as we shall see; Karst simply follows this trend.

E.g. Karst interprets Ancient Mediterranean Aetios and Eteoretes by reference to modern Chinese hǎi [pre-classical Chinese shāo7] ‘sea’ (Karlgren 0947 x-y), and féng [pre-classical Chinese fēng7] Tē (Karlgren 0833 f.) or dǎo [pre-classical Chinese tāo7] ‘island’ (Karlgren 1116 c) – which however, as the bracketed forms indicated, sounded very differently in Bronze Age Chinese (Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, s.v. ‘Chinese characters’; Karlgren 1957).

The methodological principle entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate, in other words: always try to keep the number of adduced explanatory factors to an absolute minimum.

213 Even in the light of the findings of Calafell & Bertranpetit 1994 as discussed above?
distinct, identifiable and reconstructable Indo-European language. For me\textsuperscript{215} Pelasgian is not a specific ethnic group nor a specific language, but a regional cultural complex, which (from more modest beginnings in the Neolithic / Early Bronze Age), by the Late Bronze Age had come to extend (largely as a result of chariot locomotion) from the previously fertile Sahara to China, and soon was to spread into sub-Saharan Africa. Its main characteristic was an elaborate package of 80 cultural traits, which nowhere occurred all in combination, and whose presence or absence could serve to distinguish between specific ethnic groups within the regional ethnic space, but which yet were effectively recognised as a sign of identity, a shared history, and socio-political identification, over a very large area. For an extensive list of Pelasgian traits, see Table 28.5.

In the complex setup proposed by Karst, any of the ethnico-linguistic groups listed would qualify to be situationally called ‘Pelasgian’, depending on the time and place of the ancient historical actor speaking. Yet it appears to be only the most recent (Late Bronze and Early to Middle Iron Age) Eastern Mediterranean groups under 1b, with strong Luwian affinities, that would be targeted in the modern objectifying reconstruction, mainly by van Windekens, of Pelasgian as a unique, well-defined (although not directly attested) Indo-European language. Here we would encounter ‘Pelasgian’ speaking ethnic Pelasgians in an Eastern Mediterranean, especially Aegean, context, as more or less independent, culturally and politically more or less Hellenised groups in socio-political control of their own situation and territory and fairly well integrated in the Hellenic world.\textsuperscript{216} These are, in Karst’s terminology, ‘secondary Pelasgians’, to distinguish them from more original, proto- or non-Indo-European speaking Pelasgians who are found dispersed over all the other boxes of the legend to Fig. 4.8.

For our present purpose it is not of great importance whether the Indo-European language spoken by these ‘Secondary Pelasgians’ must be identified as Luwian / Hitite / Anatolian, as a language cognate to Thracian,\textsuperscript{217} as Albanian,\textsuperscript{218} or as a Pelasgian branch of Indo-European in its own right.\textsuperscript{219} The important thing to realise is, as brought out by the legend to Fig. 4.8, that such a clearly identified, Indo-European ‘Pelasgian’ language is a relatively late development, underneath of which lurk numerous more ancient and more diverse language forms, which only a fallacy of misplaced concreteness (cf. Whitehead 1997: 52, 58) could manage to misrepresent as one ‘Pelasgian’ language.

Utilising Starostin’s *Borean hypothesis, we may identify the substrates identified by Karst as some of the other accepted descendants from *Borean, such as: Sino-Tibetan and possibly Austric; other branches of Afroasiatic than are found in the Mediterranean in historical times (e.g. Cushitic); other branches of Eurasian than are found in the Mediterranean in historical times (e.g. Uralic, Dravidian, Altaic, etc.); and finally languages now only found in sub-Saharan Africa and not yet convincingly classified within the orbit of *Borean: proto Nilo-Saharan, proto Niger-Congo and proto-Khoisan. The fact that here I deliberately and emphatically extend the applicability of the *Borean hypothesis to languages now exclusively found in Africa should not be allowed to pass without comment. The intercontinental long-range antecedents of African languages is a moot point. African linguistics is no exception to the general tendency according to which for the past fifty years Africanists have sought to explain African phenomena by virtually exclusive reference to intra-continental African conditions. No doubt, in this tendency Africanists were largely inspired by laudable considerations of anti-hegemonic reticence, not wishing to deny Africans their local / regional cultural roots in the continent they are presently inhabiting; yet the one-sidedness of this approach is brought out when we read ‘Europe’ for ‘Africa’: the fact that the languages, scripts, religious forms and contents, artistic conventions, even genes, all largely originated from outside Europe, never seems to have deterred Europeans from claiming a central place for themselves in global cultural history!

\textsuperscript{215} Cf. van Binsbergen 2011b.

\textsuperscript{216} But also Central and Northern Italy including Etruria had strong Pelasgian connotations in the Late Bronze to Middle Iron Age. This state of affairs was already recognised in the nineteenth-century CE scholarly literature: Lepsius 1842; Meyer 1892: 1; Bine 1853: 35f; Baldwin 1874: 371 f.; Montelius 1897. For more recent treatments, cf.: Hester 1965; Karst 1931a; Briquel 1984; Klotz 1942; Vonk n.d.; van Windekens 1952; and Woudhuizen, this volume, Part II.

\textsuperscript{217} Cf. Georgiev 1950-51; Hoenigswald 1943; the association between Pelasgian and Thracian is frequently found in the Ancient sources.

\textsuperscript{218} Schwandner-Siever & Fischer 2002.

\textsuperscript{219} Van Windekens 1952, 1960; and, building on the latter, Georgiev 1966a, 1972. This is also, more or less, the position Woudhuizen has taken (this volume). Below, Chapter 28, I will use the concept of Pelasgian in a very different way, also cf. van Binsbergen 2011b.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Constituent ethno-linguistic groups</th>
<th>remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>linguistic (macro-)phylum</strong> <strong>Constituent ethnico-linguistic groups</strong> <strong>Western Mediterranean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eastern Mediterranean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Pelasgians are typically found in these rows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Pelasgians are typically found in this row</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Indo-European</strong> <em>(a) satem group; (b) kentum</em></td>
<td>1a. Secondary Ibero-Ligurians, Caphthor / Caslukhim (with an Indo-European speaking ruling class) in Spain, Sicanians, Tyr-rheno-Tuscans, proto-Illyrians</td>
<td>1b. Secondary (Illyro-) Pelasgians <em>(including pre-Israelite Pherisites, Secondary Philistines, Numidian Persae)</em> Secondary Leleges, Caphthor / Caslukhim (with a partly Indo-Aryan ruling class) ≈ Carians, Alarodians (= Caucasian speakers) aristocratic top layer this layer manifests itself particularly as that of a semi-Indo-European language form associated with a local dominant class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Afroasiatic</strong> <em>(‘Hamito-Semitic’ / ‘Hamitic’)</em></td>
<td>2a. Jaccetani, Rhaetians, Rasenna, Rutenu <em>i.e.</em> Afroasiaticised Sicanians</td>
<td>2b. Secondary Leleges. NB. Insofar as Cushitic, this Afroasiatic element is often 3rd millennium <em>i.e.</em> older than ‘5’ (3 = (proto-) Basquoid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. (proto-) Basquoid</strong></td>
<td>3a Western Mediterranean: Basquoids, Ibero-Sicanians</td>
<td>3b. Eastern Mediterranean: Liguroid or Eastern Basquoid Leleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Caucasian</strong></td>
<td>4a. In the Western Mediterranean this layer is inconspicuous, its place seems to remain largely occupied by ‘5’ Liguroid pre-Euscarian groups: Opici, Opisci, Sicani, Ausci, proto-Basques</td>
<td>4b. (Eastern Mediterranean). Abkhazoids (pre-Leleges, Telleges, Telchines, Tubal peoples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Complex substrate of Ligurian</strong></td>
<td>if interpreted in the light of the state-of-the-art <em>Borean hypothesis</em> <em>(which was not yet available to Karst), this layer comprises fragmented presences of Sino-Caucasian, and of branches of Eurasiatic / Nostratic notably Urals, Altaic and Dravidian; and also of Khosan, Nilo-Saharan and Niger-Congo / Bantu</em></td>
<td>archaic popular bottom layer / substrate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.8. Layered linguistic complexity of the Bronze Age Mediterranean according to Karst 1931a

---

220 The distinction between *satem* and *kentum*, once popular, is less so in modern Indo-European studies; *cf.* Woudhuizen, this volume.
For a considerable number of boxes of the legend of Fig. 4.8 we encounter, among numerous other ethnicities, primary Pelasgians, i.e. ethnic (proto-)Pelasgians speaking a variety of languages potentially belonging to various macrophylla (Eurasian including Indo-European but especially Uralic and Altaic, possibly also Dravidian; Afroasiatic especially Semitic and Berber, possibly also Cushitic; Sino-Caucasian especially North Caucasian and proto-Basian; and finally, perhaps, now exclusively African languages belonging to the Khoisan, Niger-Congo and Nilo-Saharan phyla); and for all these boxes, these mainly non-Indo-European speaking ethnic Pelasgians would have stood in a strained, conflictive relationship²²¹, often downright subordination, vis-à-vis other, more dominant groups speaking Indo-European (especially Hittite / Luwian, Mycenaean and Hellenic Greek, and also – as far as Hyksos and Mitanni are concerned – Indo-Iranian) or Afroasiatic (especially Ancient Egyptian, West Semitic – Phoenician, Hebrew, Punic).

Since linguistic relationships closely reflect sociopolitical relationships, the ‘Pelasgian’ substrate can in fact be hypothesised to reflect the marginalisation and subjugation of ethnic ‘Pelasgians’ by ascendant Indo-European / Afroasiatic speaking, state-controlling elite groups in the course of the Middle and Late Bronze Age. Here already becomes apparent what, in Chapter 28, I will stress as an illuminating perspective on the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples: there I will suggest that the Sea Peoples’ episode is the final and partly successful attempt to consider the political, cultural, religious and linguistic domination imposed by non-Pelasgian military elites founding or controlling a powerful state; and this resistance movement consists of ethnic ‘Pelasgians’ united by the recognition of diffusely distributed elements of a common culture, socio-political organisation and religion (perhaps accompanied by fragmented elements of some common Pelasgian lingua franca,²²² but probably not as the core binding factor).²²³

But we should not rush to these conclusions of my argument. Let us first consider the theory and methodology of protohistorical research into ethnicity (Chapters 2 and 3) and try our hand at an application of these insights on two case studies (the Homeric Achaean Catalogue of Ships, and the Biblical Table of Nations) before seeking to contribute specifically to Sea Peoples studies.

²²¹ This is also what the Middle and Late Helladic (Bronze Age mainland Greece) archaeological record suggests: sites that have stronger Pelasgian affinities are typically peripheral, in ‘glens and crags’, dissociating themselves from the Mycenaean Greeks who dominated the plains; cf. French 1989-90: 35.

²²² By a very long shot, I suspect that we may know more of a Pelasgian lingua franca than we have so far realised. When trying to relate proto-Bantu to *Borean, two systematic transformations turn out to govern many of the proposed *Borean reflexes in Bantu: (a) metathesis of the two key consonants of the *Borean words; and (b) retention (and often duplication) of either the first or the second syllable of the *Borean word to become the sole basis of the reflex in Bantu, while the other syllable is discarded (van Binsbergen 2011a). These two transformations appear to define proto-Bantu as the kind of creolised lingua franca one may expect to emerge in conditions of proto-globalisation such as prevailed in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean. An analysis of ecological and zoogeographical indications in the proto-Bantu lexicon suggests (ibidem) that the marshlands north of the Caucasus could have been a possible habitat for the emergence of these *Borean elements towards proto-Niger-Congo / Bantu to emerge. Although the terms ‘lingua franca’ and ‘proto-globalisation’ carry the same suggestion of unbounded access and circulation that is part of the concept and the ideology of globalisation as applied to today’s world of 2000 CE, the systematic transformations suggest to me rather a more secluded context, for instance a secret cultic society emulating the *Borean-based language of another group than the speakers – a group that was initially dominant over them and that served them as a reference group.

²²³ Not surprisingly, coming from an Armenologist, Karst’s model has the advantage that it also accommodates, as one of the elements of heterogeneity, the claims for an Iberian-Caucasian dimension of Pelasgian culture and language, as also advanced by such Georgian scholars as M.G. Tseretheli, R.V. Gordeziani, M. Abdushelishvili, and Zviad Gamsakhurdia. Admittedly, the French linguist Faye 1931 does not have a good word for Karst because of the ‘general uncritical attitude that characterizes this study’. This criticism is very well taken, yet it does not do justice to Karst’s many brilliant intuitive insights into Mediterranean Bronze and Iron Age ethnicity in general, and the Pelasgians in particular. Karst is not totally forgotten. Only recently, homage was paid to his controversial but perceptive theories of the nature of Basque (Sarkisian 1999), whereas in a feminist context of literary studies Karst’s views of a Pelasgian realm stretching from the Caucasus to the Western Mediterranean (the goddess Circe’s double garden) were cited in agreement (Percovich n.d. [2004]). Incidentally, in essence a similar, only marginally more restricted, view was held by van Windekens (1952: 154), who saw his reconstructed Indo-European Pelasgian language, cognate to such Western European language families as Germanic and Baltic, extend from Western Anatolia to Northern Italy.
CHAPTER 5. CASE STUDY I: THE HOMERIC ACHAEAN CATALOGUE OF SHIPS

5.1. Introducing the Homeric Catalogues of Ships

Attributed by tradition to an otherwise unattested personage called Homer,224 the Iliad and the Odyssey constitute the best known and by far the most complete monuments of Archaic Greek epic literature. These poems purport to depict, in the language of the Early Iron Age, Late Bronze Age conditions in the form of an allegedly factual account of the exploits of heroes, with frequent intercession on the part of the gods. The context for both poems is the (legendary or historic) siege of Troy, the city of the Trojans (Dardanoi, Dardanians), in North-western Asia Minor. The siege is laid by an alliance of forces (the Akhaioi, Achaeans) from the Greek mainland and part of the Aegean islands, at a date which Greek tradition – notably Eratosthenes – has fixed at 1194/93 to 1184/83 BCE.225 The occasion for the siege and final destruction of Troy was allegedly the abduction of Helen (said to be the wife of Menelaus king of Sparta) by the Trojan prince Alexander or Paris.226 In retaliation the various principalities and communities of Greece strike an alliance, and sail onto Troy with a massive fleet. The Odyssey describes the vicissitudes of one of the principal Greek heroes before Troy, Odysseus, during the ten years of his return journey. The Iliad describes a short period during the ten years of the siege, when the Greek commander-in-chief, Agamemnon (said to be king of Mycenae and Menelaus’ brother), quarreled with the Myrmidon prince Achilles over the captured woman Briseis, from Lesbos, Mysia or the Troad (von Geisau 1979d), whom Achilles has received as a honorary gift from the Greek army. Before crossing the Aegean, Agamemnon musters the troops, and it is at this point that the text of the Iliad (Chapter B or II, from line 474 onwards) offers two lists of the naval contingents with sundry detail, the longer list for the Greek or

224 The literature on Homer and the Homeric problem is too vast to cite here; for an introduction cf. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1916 (Iliad); Murray 1961; Morris & Powell 1997. Despite the insistent but contradictory ancient reports to the effect that Homer hailed from Ionia on the West coast of Asia Minor, there is some credibility to the suggestion that the Homeric poems were originally in written form and from a Levantine origin, only later to be Graecised in the hands of Mycenaean bards, and transmitted orally.

225 Cf. Piggott 1973: 159: ‘The siege of Troy can hardly have been (did it ever take place?) at the Greek traditional date of 1183 B.C., but rather, as others have argued, in the general context of the Sea Raids, around 1240-30’. Also see Page 1959a, 1959b / 1972; Blegen 1961. Indeed, a recent review of the Mycenaean pottery of the site has caused one scholar to suggest that it was Troy VI and not VIIa, that was Priam’s city: barbarians using pottery of central or east European types squatted there in VIIb. (Nylander 1963).’

Ever since Schliemann, the debate on Homer and archaeology has continued unabated (cf. Sherratt 1993; Purves 2006). The Hittite documentary sources discussed by Woudhuizen, this volume, similarly suggest a mid-13th century date for disturbances at Alexander’s city of Wilusa, which modern scholarship (Güterbock 1986) has identified with Troy / Ilios.

226 I take distance from this statement, for a number of reasons. The historicity of the Homeric poems appears as a point of discus-
Achaean forces, the shorter list for the Trojan ones. It is on the longer, best studied, ‘Achaean Catalogue of Ships’ that we shall concentrate here; for convenience’s sake we will just refer to it as ‘the Catalogue of Ships’.

It is no exaggeration to state, with Hendrik Müller (2000), that ‘The Catalogue of ships (...) in the Iliad can count as one of the main fields of interest of Homeric scholarship since antiquity.’

The bibliography on the subject is considerable. Much scholarship has been devoted to tracing the genesis of the Homeric poems from a rather heterogeneous bunch of traditions in Archaic and Classical times (many classical authors quote fragments that, though allegedly Homeric, are not to be found in our Homer). via the unifying effects resulting from the exalted, virtually sacred, status that was accorded to the Homeric poems at the four-yearly Panathenaean Festival at Athens from Peisistratus’ times onwards, to, finally, the polished, consensus edition of Alexandrian Hellenism and after. In this Athens-centred process, ‘Athenian interpolations’ may have been added as was already noted in Antiquity. This, at least, is a convincing explanation (cf. Strabo, Geographica, 394) for the dominance attributed, in the Catalogue, to Athens, at the expense of, for instance, Salamis (listed with only 12 ships i.e. a mere 30% of the average number of ships each ally brought, cf. Table 5.1), while also the famous harbour of Corinth is slighted by being subsumed under Agamemnon’s Mycenae – in fact, a much more convincing explanation than Stubbings’ (1987: 347 f.) naïve suggestion that the political unity of Attica was already sealed before the Trojan war.

The Catalogue of Ships is part of an Early Iron Age composition that only found its definite form in the Middle Iron Age, c. 500 BCE. If we want to use this text as a source on Late Bronze Age ethnicity, what are our reasons to consider it historical and reliable? Does the Catalogue of Ships contain detectable major elements of Mycenaean historical information, or is it largely or exclusively a Archaic i.e. Early Iron Age document?

5.2. The Catalogue of Ships as a historical document

To what extent, then, can we consider the Catalogue of Ships a reliable historical source on Late Bronze Age conditions in the Aegean? Heinrich Schliemann’s vindictive spirit, stressing the historicity of Homer, has continued to dominate the field. Few scholars have dared speak out against the Catalogue’s historicity, among them, Jachmann (1958) and Giovanni (1969). Writing a century after Schliemann made his spectacular discoveries at Troy, Kirk (1987: 831) declared that scholarship displays ‘a growing optimism’ vis-à-vis the use of the Homeric poems as a historical source on the Late Bronze Age. He praises (1987: 831)

‘the degree of detailed Bronze Age knowledge preserved in the poems – and seen most notably in the political geography of the Achaean Catalogue in the second book of the Iliad...’

Yet Kirk fails to point out the specific other sources for Bronze Age political geography, independent from the Homeric poems, that could amount to such a confirmation; such sources do not exist in documentary form, as far as we know; and whatever can be read from archaeological data is generally too unspecific to amount to confirmation or refutation of the details of the Catalogue of Ships. The case of Gortyns having fine walls, demonstrably an Early Iron Age achievement yet mentioned in the Catalogue, is recognised as a hint at the archaising mechanisms at work. Yet Kirk remains convinced. Admittedly,

‘Neither the general outlines nor most of the details of the Homeric picture of the Trojan war need have descended by a continuous poetical tradition. The Catalogue presents us with a possible exception, just as it is quite exceptional in its relation to the other Homeric poetry. In spite of the reservations mentioned above, its size and thoroughness are impressive; it cannot be just an archaizing construction. (...)’ (Kirk 1987: 837, my italics).

We shall see that the claim of the Catalogue’s exceptional style as compared to the rest of the Iliad is not supported any more in the most recent and impressive contribution to Homeric scholarship, that by Edzard Visser (1998).

It is generally considered an important argument for

227 Of the general bibliography of the Catalogue of Ships I mention: Allen 1910, 1921; Leaf 1923; Schmid 1925; Jacoby 1932 (reviewed by Bowra 1953); Burr 1944; Bornemann 1941; Heubeck 1949; Jachmann 1958; Croxett 1968-69; Hope Simpson & Lazenby 1970 (reviewed by Lang 1972); García Ramón 1974; Lopstson 1974; Combellack 1951, 1971, 1972; Giovanni 1969 (who states the case for an Early Iron Age projection; reviewed by Hainsworth 1971); Edwards 1980; Dickinson 1999; also cf. Whitaker 2000.


229 With specific reference to the Boeotian section, this question is discussed by Fossey 1989.

230 Iliad II, 646: teikhíóessan, accusative.

231 The same point comes up in Stubbings 1987: 348.
the historicity of the Catalogue that about 50% of its place names have been identified (Kirk 1987: 836; thus Stubbings 1987: 343), but the very statement reminds us of the methodological pitfalls at hand: suppose that not 50% but 100% of the place names had been recognised in the sense of being identified as existing in Archaic or Classical times – that would certainly be an argument, not for but against historicity. For it would create the impression that the Iron Age bards had simply taken for granted the places they knew from their own time, without making allowance for any historical change in the distribution, emergence or dissolution, and naming, of communities since the Late Bronze Age.

A recent study, by Edzard Visser (1998), proposes on formal philological grounds (much more elaborately, and much more critically presented in Visser 1997) that the Catalogue format goes back to Mycenaean booty-raids, and concludes that:


Writing for the 1975 edition of the authoritative (but rapidly obsolescent) *Cambridge Ancient History*, Hammond (1987: 678) cites with obvious approval three studies that claim that the Catalogue has been ‘confirmed’. Writing in the same collection, Kirk (1987) presents an extensive argument in favour of the claim of at least partial historicity of the Catalogue. To the circle of scholars accepting the (partial) historicity of the Catalogue, also the author Page must be added. Early in the twentieth century CE, already Allen (1921) called the Catalogue a reliable source. For Huxley,

‘The Homeric catalogues [ both Achaeans and Trojan] are a remarkable tribute to the accuracy of oral epic’ (Huxley 1956: 27).

Also Stubbings (1987) attaches great historical significance to the Catalogue of Ships. In his view (1987: 343) it

‘may almost be described as a Mycenaean historical document’.

Stubbings implies that one of his chief arguments for the historicity of the Catalogue is that it

‘represents a political geography quite unlike that of histori-
cal Greece’.

Yet Stubbings’ argument that, as a sign of Mycenaean authenticity, post-Mycenaean Dorian occupation is ignored, applies only superficially: the tripartite ethnic structure of the Rhodians as described in the Catalogue, has definite Dorian connotations (as both Kirk and Hammond agree) hence would date from after the ‘Return of the Heraclids’ c. 1000 BCE.234 As far as political geography is concerned, Stubbings (1987: 343 f.) does recognise discrepancies between the Catalogue and the rest of the *Iliad*, which would be in line with the hypothesis of the Catalogue being an extant Mycenaean document inserted in its entirety into the *Iliad*. Thus Agamemnon, elsewhere in the *Iliad* presented as the ruler of many islands and of whole of Argos, in the Catalogue has a more limited territory, while the rest of the Argive plain is under Diomedes.235 Similarly, Sparta is held by Agamemnon’s twin26 brother Menelaus,

‘which suggests a particularly close degree of political cooperation’

but need not be based on historical fact in the Late Bronze Age – especially not since Agamemnon (the

234 τρικθήδα δὲ ὀψίθην καταπυθαλὸν ‘in three divisions, by tribes’, *Iliad* II, 668; also cf. Kirk 1987: 844, who recognises here the Heraclid Dorian tripartite division. Albright (1975 / 1987: 511) interprets three types of decoration on the three different types of Philistine helmet decoration on the anthropoid sarcophagi at Beth-shan as tribal insignia, allegedly bringing out a tri-partite socio-political organisation. Meanwhile we have to realise that triads are so much a standard feature of Indo-European and in general Middle and Late Bronze Age centralised socio-political and religious organisation (Dumézil 1958, and see below, Sections 6.5.4 and 6.5.5) that the feature is little convincing as a discriminating characteristic of Heraclid Dorians and no other groups.

235 Stubbings remark (1987: 346) that

‘there is no suggestion that Diomedes is anything but the willing and loyal vassal of Agamemnon’

is not confirmed by the text of the Catalogue. Diomedes brings in as much as 80% of the number of vessels that Agamemnon can boast, thus confirming himself as a near-equal of Agamemnon, and the latter as a mere primus inter pares.

236 As royal twins married with the divine twin sisters Helen and Clytaemnestra who were moreover the sisters of the divine brothers Castor and Pollux – the Dioscuri and protectors of seamen (over a millennium later the Christian Apostle Paul was to travel in a ship named after these demigods, and survived! *Acts*, 28:11), Agamemnon and Menelaus at one level of analysis must be seen as a mythical pair notably an emphatic expression of the dyadic worldview that, below (Sections 6.5.4 and 6.5.5), we will analyse as the archaic standard apart from the post-Neolithic literate states of the Old World, and – in the specific context of the Bronze Age Mediterranean – as Pelasgian rather than Hellenic.
name also appears as an epithet of the sky and thunder god Zeus himself) was a semi-divine heros venerated in various regions of mainland Greece before pressed into service as an epic character, notably as commander-in-chief of the Greek army against Troy (von Geisau 1979a; cf. Taplin 1990). Other prominent Homeric characters underwent the same fate: Achilles was widely venerated as a sea god (especially among the Pontic Greeks), and Helen was worshipped as a goddess in her own right at Sparta. It is disconcerting that in the very few cases where external independent corroboration is available, the negative outcome is recognised to be ‘disappointing and puzzling’ but does not lead to revision of Stubbings’ view of the Catalogue as largely a reliable Mycenaean historical document. Yet even Stubbings spots strange omissions. For instance, the Cyclades and northern Sporades do not feature in the list although archaeology tells us they shared in Mycenaean culture; did they remain neutral in the Achaea / Dardanian conflict? And Agamemnon’s position in his capacity of king of Mycenae is, rightly or wrongly, minimalised in the Catalogue

‘we are left on the whole with a picture of a temporary union, for the purposes of war, of a number of diverse and independent kingdoms, rather than of a close-knit Mycenaean Empire’ (Stubbings 1987: 348 f.).

This takes us to the next question: even assuming that the Catalogue is somehow a reliable source on Mycenaean Greece, how could authentic historical information from the Late Bronze Age have found its way, across nearly half a millennium, into the Homeric text? A widespread assumption is that the Catalogue of Ships was an extant Mycenaean catalogue, in other words an available older document, which was simply, with formal adaptations, incorporated in Homer’s Iliad (thus: Allen 1921; Murray 1961: 694). Hammond (1987: 680) suggests that such information is likely to have been kept in the oracular shrine of the hero Tlepolemus (Heracles’ son) on the island of Rhodes. The point is interesting, in the first place because a similar suggestion has been made for our other Case Study, the Biblical Table of Nations (Genesis 10), and secondly because of the stress I will lay in Chapter 28 on shrine cults as integrative forces in the interregional socio-political landscape, comparable in function with ethnicity.

In view of converging scholarly consensus as to the considerable degree of historicity of the Homeric poems, it might be attractive to assume that these poems functioned as a funnel in which, probably quite heterogeneous, historical information of, sometimes, great antiquity was caught and transmitted. Thus T. Palaima, against the 19th-century CE contention (challenged by Schliemann) that Homer is largely literary and mythical, writes

‘recent scholarship (e.g. Ruijgh) seeks to demonstrate that elements of the Iliad, as we possess it, must have originated as early as the 16th-15th centuries B.C.’ (Palaima n.d.; cf. Ruijgh 1996).

Against this optimism as to the reliability of the Catalogue as a historical source, it is time to lend our ear to more pessimistic and sceptical voices. For Murray (1961) there is, pace Hammond, no doubt as to Homer’s archaising – which introduces a deliberately performative and recreative element not normally associated with a reliable historical source. Homer clearly admits that he is speaking of a time that is not his own, peopled by heroes very different from

‘men as they are now’ (also cf. van Wees 1992).

There is a careful management of the couleur locale: cavalry and horseback, though known in Homer’s time, were carefully excluded from the poems. So was iron. At marriage no dowry is given but bridewealth is paid, and the dead are burned. Murray sees occasional anachronistic lapses in this ‘wonderfully maintained’ illusion. He sums up (Murray 1961: 695) the anachronisms in dress and ritual. He also points out, as anachronisms, the mention of Sicily and, once again, of Dorian chieftains. Murray plausibly argues that the overall consistency in upholding the archaising illusion was probably not the work of one

237 The construction of the past in Homer was considered in Page 1959b / 1972; Andersen 1990; Schrott 2008, among others.

240 However, the Greek text has sidérō, Iliad VII, 473, so there is a mention of iron, after all. On the handling of metals in the Homeric poems, cf. Jevons 1892-93; Lang 1906; Gray 1954; Morris 1997.

241 Murray assumes that ‘Homerica Greece’ – an artificial literary construct purporting to coincide with Mycenaean Greece in the Late Bronze Age – had made no nautic contact with Sicily yet, which is simply wrong, as is e.g. demonstrated by Piggott’s map of the European distribution of Mycenaean finds outside the Aegean, reproduced here as Fig. 5.1. The mythical material around Minos, Daedalus and Cocalus (Ovid, Metamorphoses VIII, 261; Herodotus, Historiae VII, 169) also links Crete to Sicily; although we cannot take it at face value as evidence of Cretan-Sicilian contacts in the Bronze Age, it at least indicates the thinkability of such contacts for historical actors in the Iron Age.
poet in the Early Iron Age, but of a process of ‘collective’
editing in the course of centuries, culminating in the Alex-
andrian recension of Hellenistic times.

Also Blegen, in his turn (1987), admits anachronisms:

“If ‘Homer’ had been totally successful and consistent in
his emulation of Bronze Age conditions, he could not have
made reference to the invasion of the Doriann” (Blegen 1987:
169).

But he adds that the destruction of Thebes, however,
took place in Mycenaean times, and it is consistent that
Thebes is not mentioned in the Catalogue of Ships, al-
though – according to Strabo – the unwalled lower town is,
under the name of Hypothebai – again indications of a de-
liberate attempt at archaising.

Contrary, and yet a sense of relevance and authenticity that
is difficult to ignore. There is no going back to the nine-
teenth-century conception of the Homeric poems as myth
and nothing more, despite the fact that one can come a con-
siderable way with, for instance, an astronomical / astro-
logical, or a poetic-mythological, reading of the Iliad.243

Edzard Visser has presented what is probably the most
extensive and profound recent discussion of the historical
questions surrounding the Catalogue of Ships, and has
come up with a new approach that circumvents the problem
that, even if we suppose that the Catalogue contains au-
thentic Bronze Age knowledge, we would not know how to
identify the latter amidst an abundance of performatively
archaising material. Visser discovered that the nearly thirty
titles in the Catalogue of Ships, all show a conventional
structure, for which I propose the following schematic lit-
ary form:

\[
\text{Entry} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{I well-known mythical} \\
\text{association} \\
\text{II toponymical or eth-


nonymical designa-


tion of a particular


place or commu-


nity, with some
genuine topog-


raphical details} \\
\text{III stereotypified}


'couleur locale'


through a fixed


repertoire of


epithets}
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 5.2. A schematic rendering of Visser’s approach to
myth and literary form in the structure of entries in the
Catalogue of Ships

Visser’s approach has been adequately rendered in
English by H. Muller’s very positive discussion in the Bryn
Mawr Classical Review:

‘Visser has already established over ten years ago a new con-
cept of verse improvisation according to which hexameters
are not constructed by formulae but by determinants, vari-
ables and free elements (...) In Chapter C (pp. 78-150) Visser
lists the geographic epithets that can be found within the
Catalogue and comes to the conclusion that the poet must
have had concrete knowledge of the geographic facts of the
places he describes. Visser’s analysis proves also that it is
not imperative to postulate a traditionally fixed Mycenaean
source for the Catalogue of ships; it could also be a product
of poetic improvisation with a similar time of origin to the Il-
iad. The fact that only a few epithets have a concrete indi-
vidualising function shows that it was sufficient for the poet
to have only general geographic knowledge of a place.
Therefore Visser includes in his interpretation a source that
has often been neglected when interpreting the Catalogue of

5.3. Belles lettres between history
and myth: Edzard Visser’s recent
breakthrough in the study of the
Catalogue of Ships

Thus we are left with a wonderful contradiction: the flower
of modern Homeric studies claiming historicity for the
Catalogue in the face of very extensive suggestions to the

242 Piggott’s map shows that, up to the early 1970s CE, no
Mycenaean finds had been attested from Sardinia or Etruria.
Meanwhile the Kommos excavations on Southern Crete (Watrous
1985, 1989, while Watrous et al. 1998) have brought to light that,
contrary to Piggott’s map, there was considerable Mycenaean
trade with Sardinia and the mainland shores of the Tyrrenian Sea,
in other words Tuscany.

243 The Iliad has been read as an astronomical allegory e.g. by
Krichenbauer 1874, 1881 (1877 sees Odysseus as a predecessor of
Hanno circumnavigating Africa!); Plunket 1906; Cardona 1989;
Wood & Wood 1999. Astronomical aspects of the Zeus cult and
mythology were extensively discussed in Cook 1914-40.
ships: heroic myth. (...) Chapters E and F (pp. 239-750) then form an extensive commentary on the whole Catalogue of ships, which, in contrast to former commentaries, not only focuses on archaeological and historical facts but also deals with the mythological background of the place names.' (Muller 2000; my italics – WvB).

Visser’s approach amounts to unravelling the structure of the Catalogue in terms of the poetical, including mythical, mechanisms surrounding the enunciation of toponyms. It in fact manages to explain a puzzling feature of the Cata-
logue in the context of the Homeric poems as a whole: throughout,

‘geographical vagueness and literary myth are the rule, which is why it is remarkable that much of Iliad II is so easily interpretable, geographically (...) there are undoubtedly historical cores here but these are difficult to identify; the core may in fact be mythical while fragments arond that core are historical’ (Murray 1961: 696).

Visser’s is a typical application of postmodern deconstruction, and convinces as a sophisticated and up-to-date product of the science of literature. He brings us to appreciate

1. the trappings of apparent factuality that myth per-
formatively assumes, and
2. the specificity of a literary form whose minute mechanisms we have to appreciate fully before we can read and understand an ancient source.

Evocations of reality are used to create a literary ef-
fect; that effect in itself is not enough to call a source his-
torical and reliable; yet there are limits to which one can create such an effect without in fact allowing historic reality in. It is the local myth and the place to which it applies, which, in combination, convey a sense of identity, of ‘home’, and which creates reality at the same time as re-
cording it.

But while Visser shows us how to read the Catalogue of Ships, and even though he assures us that much of its contents could be historical, he leaves us rather pessimistic as to the methodological procedures through which to ex-
tract that historicity from underneath the layers of myth and literary form in which the Catalogue of Ships is so clearly clothed.

5.4. The religious context: Specifically Greek gods?

In the present context I cannot enter into a detailed critique of the concept of specifically ‘Hellenic / Greek gods’, which informs much of Ancient (proto-)history, and much of which is predicated on the work of Nilsson (e.g. 1932 / 1972). My co-author Woudhuizen is also partial to this mainstream conception, e.g. where he discusses (also cf. Schachermeyr 1950) the divine character of Poseidon as a specific Bronze Age development. I beg to differ. Many of the divine and heroic concepts of the Aegean may be argued to go back to the much more widespread, Pelasgian substrate.244 Flood myths (ultimately evoking an obsolete cosmogony in terms of the Separation of Water and Land); the central concept of the Separation of Heaven and Earth (which throughout the Old World, and even in part of the New World, has been the dominant cosmogonic conception since the later Upper Palaeolithic, incompletely supplanting the cosmogony of the Separation of Water and Land); hero figures like Heracles and Prometheus and other Gi-
gantes (still recognisable as demoted gods); demoted Mother goddesses i.e. transformed Mothers of the Waters relegated to feminine subalternal status and displays of femi-
nine crafts (e.g. Athena, Neith, Anahita); stream divinities whose original association with cosmogony is reduced to their shape-shifting capabilities (e.g. Proteus); bow god-
desses whose original association with the rainbow and the Waters Above have been transformed into an association with weapons hardly compatible with feminine roles in the Bronze and Iron Age Aegean (Artemis, Athena, cf. Egyp-
tian Neith, Iranian / Syrian Anahita, etc. – the underlying basic form of many of these theonyms

*-{a[N/V]}r-, where V = unspecified vowel,

brings out their essential unity and links them up to peripher-
al Pelasgian divinities further afield, such as West Africa Nzambi), the accommodation already of the watery cos-
mosogonic nation with alternatives stressing Fire (Hephaes-
tus, Helius), Earth (Gē), Air (Io), by the Middle Bronze Age incorporated in a subsequently widespread Pelasgian transformatitional cycle of elements245 – all these have a time depth exceeding, by one or two millennia at least, the specific articulation of Greek culture in Mycenaean times (pace Nilsson 1932 / 1972, 1950 / 1971).

Incidentally, I submit that this geographically widely distributed, apparently Pelasgian, chain of female god-
desses with specific emphasis on feminine arts – foremost weaving, hence the spider associations in addition to the uniquituous bee associations – and virginity was also associ-

244 Van Binsbergen 2011b, and below, Section 28.9.
245 Van Binsbergen 2010b.
ated with female puberty rites, for which there are some indications in the Ancient Greek world in regard of Artemis (cf. her connection with the moon, Iphigeneia, and the puberty initiation rites in her honour at Brauron, near Athens), as well as – following (see Chapter 28 below) the ‘cross-model’ of transcontinental dissemination of Pelasgian traits in the Bronze Age – scattered indications in East Asia, and massive attestations in sub-Saharan Africa.

In the specific case of Poseidon I would go much further back in time, seeing him as a Bronze Age, masculinising transformation of the Mother of the Primal Waters, and reading his name as derived from *Borean *PVCV-*TVNV: ‘genital’-‘flow / tree’.246, 247

Greek religion developed by specific transformations and innovations on the basis of this Pelasgian substrate, in the Middle to Late Bronze Age, when the notion of a supreme, male sky god took precedence over all Pelasgian elements and forced them selectively and subordinatingly into the straight-jacket of the Greek Olympian pantheon.248

246 Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008. I even suspect that the name of Nü Wa’s (女娲) companion, the Chinese culture hero and legendary emperor, with shamanic connotations, Fu Xi (伏羲) is a transformation of the phonologically close *PVCV. His usual Chinese etymologies in terms of ‘ambush’ or ‘victim’ make no sense semantically, and he fits perfectly in the Extended Pelasgian realm.

247 Admittedly, such an interpretation runs into the difficulty that in a Linear-B attestation (Pernasi 2001-2: 223), Poseidon is already qualified (like in the Homeric poems) as the ‘earth shaker’ E-NE-SI-DA-O-NE, the god of earthquakes and volcanic activity rather than of the sea, as he appears in classical times. However, in the context of the Aegean, where land is typically near, or surrounded by, the sea, and where volcanic activity tends to be concentrated near or at sea and to manifest itself in the form of tsunamis (such as have been argued to have greatly contributed to the end of Minoan civilisation), the difference does not seem insurmountable. If the putative Upper Palaeolithic creator goddess would, as I hypothesise, have been mistress of the Waters Above (the sky), the Waters Below (the underworld, the earth), and the Surface Waters (the sea), she combined the referents of land and sea rather than being merely a sea goddess, and Poseidon, in his Late Bronze Age as well as in his classical shape, could well be a (relatively late?) transformation of such a goddess.

248 If we could find the Poseidon / *PVCV-TVNV form back in Native American cultures, this would considerably support my hypothesis that Poseidon is in fact a very old Ruler of the Primal Waters, going back to a postulated Water-Land cosmology to be situated in Eurasia in the Upper Palaeolithic. And indeed, among the Pueblo Zuñi (Cotterell 1989: 232), we find the first man Poshayanyakoy: born from one of the four slime-encased wombs created by god of heaven and god of earth; womb encased in slime; it is Poshayanyakoy who requested the creator god to release the creation, which makes him the Creator god’s alter-ego, and (like Poseidon), a First God himself. Nearer to our region of study is the name Don as the primal mother in Irish mythology. Roll-

5.5. The ethnic dimension in the existing literature on the Catalogue of Ships

In the face of such far-flung insistence on long-range continuities in space and time, the approach to the Catalogue of Ships in the Cambridge Ancient History can only strike us as (perhaps refreshingly) literalist. And although these authors claim access to an authentic Late Bronze Age source on political geography, they have little to say on the Catalogue as an insight in ethnicity during that period. Stubbing (1987: 346 f.) merely makes the point that whenever a locality is designated, in the Catalogue, by a tribal name instead of by reference to its cities, this means that the local group in question has remained at a lower, tribal level of political organisation. This conclusion is not borne out by the detailed discussion of all such groups in my Table 5.1.

Bringing to bear upon her argument a host of recent, postmodern studies on cultural geography, and charmingly little Homeric scholarship or archaeology, Carla Bocchetti,

‘...propose[s] to read the landscape of the Catalogue of Warriors [under which the author refers to what has traditionally been called the ‘Catalogue of Ships’] as a narrative structure of identity; as a form of social and textual affiliation. I do not wish to deny the particular aesthetic meaning of its topography, by shifting from the aesthetics to the political implications of its landscape; but to argue that ‘narrating space in Homer’ means that a landscape-text structures the language of belonging. I will argue that the importance which cultural geography gives to landscape offers a wide theoretical framework for re-considering the study of space and landscape representation in ancient Greek literary work.’ (Bocchetti 2003).

This is an interesting approach from the perspective of our present study of Late Bronze Age ethnicity, because it stresses, more than most studies so far in the bibliography of the Catalogue of Ships, the extent to which that text is primarily a long list of expressions of local identity. However, the link with archaeology is severed, since the time referent of such expressions is not in the Late Bronze Age, but in the Early or Middle Iron Age, when the accomplished Catalogue of Ships circulated as part of, then, contemporary local identity production. Whatever historically

249 Of course, I use this qualification ironically. It is meant to bring out the post-modern atmosphere of the decontextualisation and anachronistic appropriation of texts in which Bocchetti’s method situates itself.
relevant, contemporary information the Catalogue may be argued to contain, there is no reason to assume that Late Bronze Age identity expressions have in more or less original form been retained in the Catalogue of Ships, *pace* Bocchetti.

From the point of view of ethnicity it is very important that, in Murray’s view (Murray 1961: 692), the Homeric heroes are not the heads of states, or heads of tribes, but adventurers / condottiere

‘with no national territories and no strong ties of kindred’.

Rather than showing us the glory of the Mycenaean age, the *Iliad* seems to depict for us (or so I interpret Murray’s views) something well comparable, if not identical, to what Murray takes to be the chaos of the time of the Sea Peoples; perhaps the Greeks before Troy were largely indistinguishable from the Sea Peoples who in roughly the same period sailed and marched against Egypt and *Ḫatti.* While strongly contested by Lehmann (1979, 1983, 1985, 1996) and, in his wake, by Woudhuizen (this volume) as far as the Sea Peoples are concerned, such a roughish view of the Homeric heroes was rather *en vogue* in the middle of the twentieth century CE – we also find it with Piggott (1973) and in the sources he cites (Page 1959a, 1959b / 1972; Blegen 1961; Hawkes 1940):

‘... the world of second millennium barbarian Europe was essentially the world of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* – I would add, and of the *Argonauts* (...) the heroes of the stories, for all the poet’s skill, remain obstinately of an alien world, primitive and barbaric.’ (Piggott, 1973: 140)

This reflects, not only a shift from tight socio-political organisation to loose warrior bands and brigandage, but also, after the orientalising emphasis of V.G. Childe and of the *Ex Oriente Lux* movement in general, an increasing Eurocentric and localising orientation in European archaeology – an orientation that – as we have seen – has been marked throughout the British school and the work of its finest living representative, Colin Renfrew (1973 / 1976). Piggott quotes, in agreement, Rhys Carpenter, stressing the non-Minoan and non-Asian nature of the Greek bards: ‘behind Mycenaean Greece... lies Europe’ (Piggott 1973: 126), a world whose red deer rhyton, animal-headed and antler shaped pins, and double spiral gold wire ornaments connects it more to the north and the north-east (Southwest Russia) than to the East *i.e.* West Asia. To some Europeans and others identifying with European culture this may be somewhat more comforting and more like ‘home’ than the ‘Ex Oriente Lux’ paradigm, even though

‘The real Akhaiausha’ who took Troy were probably a horde of savages’ (Murray 1961: 698).

The truth is likely to be more phased (the regular statal warfare involving Troy in the early 13th century is to be contrasted with the irregular, probably Sea People related, hostilities attending the end of that century) as well as more balanced: by comparison with the highly cultured elites of Egypt and West Asia in their time, the Homeric warriors before Troy may have been rustics, but they were sufficiently sophisticated to wield a new, longer type of sword – a technological innovation that greatly contributed to their military success (Piggott 1973: 145, 157).

‘Homer’s narrative of the siege of Troy is doubtless related to the real siege much as the Norse or German or French poems are related to the actual brutalities of the age they describe. The facts have been idealised and transfigured by memory, and confused with abundant myth, folklore and fiction; but some of the truth can be descried, as in a palimpsest, beneath the poetry. We can see in the first book of the *Iliad* a plague-stricken army, or mob of mixed peoples under diverse leaders, pinned to the barren sea shore, the narrow space choked with dead dogs and mules, the piles of burning corpses, the best fighting force in mutiny because of a quarrel about a captured woman; and the various bands “fighting to fill their belly daily” by raids on the exhausted neighbourhood. At the end of Book VII, on the arrival of a wine-ship, we see the soldiers selling all they have, bronze, iron [sic! – WvB], shields, cattle and captives, for liquor and lying all night long on the beach under a thunderous sky.’ (Murray 1961: 693)

These amusingly chaotic, barbarian elements – elements of war and violence, whose delicate balance against the elements of order and peace make up the central vignette of the *Iliad*, Achilles’ Shield – have not always been appreciated sufficiently, not in the Greek classical reception of Homer, nor in the context of European classical studies, which – idealising the Greek world as a humanistic

250 Recently, this point was taken up again by Moreu 2003. He comes to the original conclusion that the coalition of five Sea People groups invading Palestine and heading for Egypt, were in fact chased by a third party of real aggressors, whom Moreu identifies as the Mycenaean – with the attack on Troy as one of their historical feats.


252 This form of the ethnonym is, of course, nowhere to be found in Homer. Murray employs here an obsolete vocalisation of the Egyptian ethnic terminology from the monumental inscriptions effected under king Memneptah at Karnak, Luxor, Egypt.

ideal – have always recognised that
‘the thrust in the Homeric poems is towards images of order’
(Murray 1961: 696; cf. Kramer 1946),
and therefore have tended to consider the images of barbarism as mere artistic props leading on to this order.

Murray feels that the adventurer perspective, which he himself introduced, happens to be in opposition to, of all places, 
*Iliad* II which
‘gives geographical kingdoms to all the heroes’ (Murray 1961: 692).

However, an unprejudiced close reading of the Catalogue (such as I attempt, perhaps unsuccessfully, in my Table 5.1) shows that this statement by Murray is not tenable.

Anyway, he admits (1961: 693) that Agamemnon’s leadership style as described in the Homeric poems was in fact that of the Sea Peoples, and he considers it out of type that Agamemnon and Menelaus are depicted, in *Iliad* II, as kings of Sparta and Mycenae.\(^{254}\)

Also important from an ethnicity perspective is that the Pan-Greek term Argives does not occur in *Iliad* II (Murray 1961: 693), as if (much in line with my own analysis of the Catalogue, below) ethnicity was not, or not yet, a major factor of socio-political organisation in the Late Bronze Age Aegean.

---

\(^{254}\) Herodotus, *Historiae* VII, 150, quotes a speech by Syagras the Spartan making Agamemnon, and not Menelaus, king of Sparta, but this – like many other fragments – has not made it to inclusion in our Homer; cf. Murray 1961: 694. However, the variant brings out the uncertainty and mythical nature of the association of both heroes (we have already noted their mythical nature as twins closely linked to the Dioscuri) with the kingship of a specific town that survived into the Archaic and Classical period. On Agamemnon’s position, also cf. Taplin 1990. Meanwhile the question is rather more complex, on at least two counts. In the first place, recognising the images of disorder in the Homeric account does not mean that, from an objectifying historiographic point of view, such an account is the true and only possible interpretation of events in North-western Anatolia in the 13th century BCE. Perhaps a situation of centrally-directed, confederate warfare before Troy in the early 13th century was followed, in the late 13th century, by a more chaotic Sea-Peoples-related episode – in such a way that, with poetic license, the Homeric account, and the protracted process of editing for historical *couleur locale* in the course of centuries, may have confounded the two accounts. Second, modern scholarship has given us the picture of Mycenae as an increasingly formidable international player in the Late Bronze Age (Wood 1987; Gurney 1990; Woudhuizen, this volume, Chapter 15). When in the main text I argue for Agamemnon as a relatively weak leader, a *primum inter pares*, this is in the first place an attempt to make sense of the literary textual context in which also the Catalogue of Ships is being presented – and only secondarily, if at all, a contribution to objectifying historiography based on state-of-the-art scholarship.

We have now sufficiently dwelled on the existing scholarly literature as a first step in any methodology. Let us now turn to the text of the Catalogue of Ships and see if, from an ethnic perspective, and bearing in mind the accumulated insights of our specialised Graecist predecessors, we might still be able to extract something new and ethnically relevant from that Early to Middle Iron Age document. Now that we have learned how to read it, and how others have read it, let us try, as our next methodological step, an ethnicity-orientated close reading, tabulating all information the Catalogue has to offer.

### 5.6. Tabulating the Catalogue of Ships

In Table 5.1 below I have entered, mainly on the basis of Samuel Butler’s well-known classic translation (1898) of the *Iliad* for convenience’s sake (but checked against the original Greek), all descriptive detail the Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad* has to offer. For the purpose of demonstration, I will, in this case study, concentrate on these data, and not allow any other information, from other passages in the *Iliad*, or from the vast general corpus of data on the Early Iron Age in the Aegean, to bear on my ethnic analysis. My purpose is not to add to Homeric studies, but merely to offer a detailed example of the close reading of protohistorical texts from a point of view of ethnic studies.

### 5.7. Towards an ethnic analysis of the Catalogue of Ships

Our detailed breakdown of the Catalogue of Ships reveals a number of traits relevant to the study of ethnicity and power in the early Iron Age.

In the first place it turns out that nearly half of the warrior contingents in the Greek army were designated, not by an ethnonym, but merely by reference to toponyms. In a minority of cases these toponyms complement real ethnonyms, but in most cases there simply does not seem to exist an ethnonym for the social group in question, merely a regional designation. This means that while *regional identity* may have been important, *ethnic identity* does not seem to internally structure all of Greek society in the early Iron Age in a consistent, contiguous nomenclatural space. *There are severe limitations to ethnicity as a structural principle in this society.* Or perhaps we should say that such ethnic classification as existed, for most purposes encompassed the entire set of the confederates before Troy, as the ethnic group of the Achaeans, so that it was scarcely
necessary to subdivide this unity into smaller ethnic sub-units. Those ethnonyms that are acknowledged are often used indiscriminately at various levels, inconsistently and in a perspectival manner. In other words, the author of the *Iliad* simply operates at too low a level of geographical and ethnic scope to be able to perceive any further internal eth-

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I no.</th>
<th>II leader or leaders</th>
<th>III designation of social cluster</th>
<th>IV topographical details</th>
<th>V associated details (animals, weapons, somatic traits)</th>
<th>VI divine association (between parentheses: god in question not specified)</th>
<th>VII number of ships (and number of men)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>chiefs and princes</td>
<td>Danaans [the collectivity of warriors before Troy]</td>
<td>the Greek world as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poseidon; (Nisa) 50; in each there were a hundred and twenty young men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Penelos, Leitus, Arcesilas, Prothoe- nor, and Clonius, captains</td>
<td>Boeotians</td>
<td>in Hyria and rocky Aulis, and who held Schoenus, Scopus, and the high- lands of Ebronos, with Thespia, Graia, and the fair city of Mycaleuss. They also held Harma, Eikesium, and Erythras; and they had Eleon, Hyle, and Peton; Ocalea and the strong fortress of Medeon, Copae, Euertes, and Thisce, Corona, and the pastures of Haliartus; Platea and Glaos; the fortress of Thebes the less; holy Onchestus with its famous grove of Neptune; Arne rich in vineyards, Midea, sacred Nisa, and Anthedon upon the sea. From these there came</td>
<td>doves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ascalaphus and Ial- menus, sons of Ares [so brothers]</td>
<td>the people that dwelt in Aspledon and Orchomenus the realm of Minyas</td>
<td>sons of Ares</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Schedius and Epistro- phus, brothers, chief- tains</td>
<td>Phoceans</td>
<td>These were they that held Cyparissus, rocky Pytho, holy Crisa, Duulis, and Panopeus; they also that dwelt in Anemorea and Hyampolis, and about the waters of the river Cephiussus, and Lisaea by the springs of the Cephi- sus;</td>
<td>(Crisa) 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ajax, son of Oileus</td>
<td>Locrians</td>
<td>These dwelt in Cynus, Opous, Callia- rus, Bessa, Scarphe, fair Augeae, Tarpe, and Thronium about the river Bougius; the Locrians who dwell beyond Elaeora.</td>
<td>breastplate made of linen, spear</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elephenor chief over all the Abantes</td>
<td>Abantes</td>
<td>Euboea with its cities, Chalcis, Ere- tria, Histiaeia rich in vines, Cerinthus upon the sea, and the rock-perched town of Diun; with them were also the men of Carystus and Styra</td>
<td>fleet of foot and wearing their hair long, long ashen spears</td>
<td>of the race of Ares 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Menestheus, son of Peteos</td>
<td>they that held the strong city of Athens, the peo- ple of great Erechtheus</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>bulls and rams; chariots and foot soldiers</td>
<td>Ge [listed is: ‘the spelt-producing soil’]; Athena 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Diomedes, Sthenelus son of famed Cal- panes, and Euryalus, son of king Mecistus; but Diomedes was chief over them all</td>
<td>men of Argos; those who held the walls of Tiryns; the Achaean youths</td>
<td>The men of Argos, again, and those who held the walls of Tiryns, with Hermione, and Asine upon the gulf; Troezenae, Eionae, and the vineyard lands of Epidaurus; the Achaean youths, moreover, who came from</td>
<td>vineyard; of the loud battle-cry</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

255 As usual, square brackets in this table reflect my personal observations and additions as an author. I have retained the translator’s latinisation / anglicisation of the Greek proper names, even though this forced me to adopt this barbarian approach throughout my argument. However genuinely important to the philological specialist, the details of their rendering are immaterial to the present argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>King Agamemnon, son of Atreus.</th>
<th>Those who held the strong city of Mycenae,</th>
<th>Mycenae, rich Corinth and Cleonae; Oraea, Araethyrea, and Licyon, Adrastus reigned of old; Hyperesia, high Gonoeessa, and Pellan; Aegium and all the coast-land round about Helice</th>
<th>His force was far both finest and most numerous, and in their midst was the king himself, all glorious in his armour of gleaming bronze – foremost among the heroes, for he was the greatest king, and had most men under him</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Menelaus brother to Agamemnon</td>
<td>those that dwelt in Lacedaemon</td>
<td>Lacedaemon, lying low among the hills, Phars, Sparta, with Messe the haunt of doves; Brysae, Angrae, Amycile, and Helos upon the sea; Laas, moreover, and Oetylus</td>
<td>doves; of the loud battle-cry</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nestor, knight of Gerene</td>
<td>The men of Pylus and Arene, and Thryum where is the ford of the river Alpheus; strong Aspy, Cyparisseis, and Amphigenea; Pteleum, Helos, and Dorium.</td>
<td>Pylus and Arene, and Thryum where is the ford of the river Alpheus; strong Aspy, Cyparisseis, and Amphigenea; Pteleum, Helos, and Dorium.</td>
<td>minstrelsy, lyre</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>King Agapenor son of Acaeus was commander.</td>
<td>Arcadiens; those that held Arcadia, the men of Pheneus also, and Orchomenus rich in flocks; of Rhipe, Stratie, and sleek Eunoie; of Tegea and fair Mantinea; of Symphyllias and Parthasia.</td>
<td>Arcadia under the high mountain of Cyllene, Pheneus also, and Orchomenus rich in flocks; of Rhipe, Stratie, and sleek Eunoie; of Tegea and fair Mantinea; of Symphyllias and Parthasia.</td>
<td>the people fight hand to hand; rich in flocks; good soldiers; not a people that occupied their business upon the waters</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>four leaders, and each of them had ten ships; captains were Amphilochus and Thalipus – the one, son of Cieatus, and the other, of Eurynus – both of the race of Actor [distant consanguines]. The two others were Diores, son of Amarynnes, and Polyxenus, son of King Agasthenes, son of Augeas.</td>
<td>The men, moreover, of Buprasium and of Elis; Epeans.</td>
<td>Buprasium and of Elis, so much of it as is enclosed between Hyrmine, Myrsinus upon the sea-shore, the rock Olen and Alecsum.</td>
<td>4x10 = 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ied by Meges, peer of Ares, and the son of valiant Phyleus, dear to Zeus, who quarrelled with his father, and went to settle in Dulichium [so an immigrant chieftain]</td>
<td>those of Dulichium.</td>
<td>Dulichium with the sacred Echian islands, who dwell beyond the sea off Elis.</td>
<td>(the sacred Echian islands); peer of Ares, father dear to Zeus</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Odysseus</td>
<td>Cephalenians.</td>
<td>who held Ithaca, Neritum with its forests, Crocylea, rugged Aegilips, Samos and Zacyntus, with the mainland also that was over against the islands.</td>
<td>peer of Zeus in counsel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Thoas, son of Andraemon; for the great king Oeneus had now no sons living, and was himself dead, as was also golden-haired Meleager, who had been set over the Aetolian.</td>
<td>Aetolians who dwelt in Pleuron, Olenus, Pylene, Chalcis by the sea, and rocky Caelydon.</td>
<td>those of Dulichium.</td>
<td>(the sacred Echian islands); peer of Ares, father dear to Zeus</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

256 It is remarkable that this group is only designated as a collection of toponyms, as if it was very heterogeneous and was not even bound together by an ideology of common descent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Portrayed</th>
<th>Relation to the King</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Idomeneus and Meriones, peer of murderous Ares</td>
<td>Cretans</td>
<td>stranger king</td>
<td>Crete, Lindus, Ielysus, Cameirus</td>
<td>stranger</td>
<td>brave</td>
<td>Meriones, peer of murderous Ares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idomeneus and Meriones, peer of murderous Ares</td>
<td>Idomeneus and Meriones, peer of murderous Ares</td>
<td>stranger</td>
<td>Crete, Lindus, Ielysus, Cameirus</td>
<td>stranger</td>
<td>brave and large</td>
<td>Heracles [hero]; Zeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nireus</td>
<td>Nireus</td>
<td>Immigrant chief</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td></td>
<td>handsome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Phidippus and Antiphus, two sons of King Thessalus the son of Heracles</td>
<td>those that held Nisyrus, Crapathus, and Casus, with Cos, the city of Eurytus, and the Calydonian islands</td>
<td>Immigrant chief</td>
<td>Crete, Lindus, Ielysus, Cameirus</td>
<td>stranger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Achilles</td>
<td>Myrmidons, Helles, and Achaean/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Protesilaus captain, after he fell as the first Greek before Troy, succeeded by his younger brother Podarces, of the race of Ares, he was son of Iphiclus</td>
<td>those that held Phylace and the flowery meadows of Pyrasus, sanctuary of Ceres; Iton, the mother of sheep; Antrim upon the sea, and Pteleum that lies upon the grass lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Eumelus, son of Admetus and of Alcestis daughter of Pelias</td>
<td>those that held Phereae by the Boebean lake, with Boebe, Glaphyrae, and the populous city of Iolcus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Philoctetes, and since he was left behind suffering from snake-bite, acting in his place was Medon, the bastard son of Oileus by Rhene</td>
<td>those that held Methone and Thaumacia, with Meliboea and rugged Olizon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>archers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>the two sons of Asklepios, skilled in the art of healing, Podalirius and Machaon</td>
<td>Those, again, of Trikka and the stony region of Ithome, and they that held Oechalia, the city of Oechalian Eurytus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asklepios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eurytus, the son of Euamemon</td>
<td>the men of Ormenius, and by Ormenius, and the fountain of Hyperia, with those that held Asterius,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

257 It is interesting that here the two comprehensive ethnonyms, ‘Hellenes’ and ‘Achaean/s’, should be explicitly distinguished in the Homeric text.
Although ethnicity has great limitations as an organising principle internally structuring the military forces evoked in Iliad II, the table also hints at interesting dimensions of ethnicity. The political structure holding the Greek forces together appears to be ephemeral and accidental. The Homeric poems themselves do not consciously perceive any enduring and formalised structure at all; they have to rationalise the Greeks’ collaboration by reference, not to some public law arrangement however rudimentary, but as a result of private obligations into which Menelaus and the other sometime suitors of Helen had entered, and which only takes effect under the explicit personal pressure from the part of the allegedly cuckolded Menelaus.258 Again, an argument against an interpretation of the Iliad in terms of statehood, and in favour of Murray’s, and Piggott’s, interpretations in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Polytope was leader, but sharing command with Leontius, of the race of Ares, who was son of Coronus, the son of Caeneus</th>
<th>Those that held Argesa and Gym- tone, Orthie, Elone, and the white city of Oloosom’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guneus</td>
<td>Enienes and Per- aebi</td>
<td>Prothous son of Ten- thredon was com- mander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona, and held the lands round the lovely river Titaresius, which sends its waters into the Peneus</td>
<td>(Styxs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fleet of foot</td>
<td>1205 (the average number of ships per group is 1205 / 20 = 62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1205 (the average number of ships per group is 1205 / 20 = 62) |

Note that the ‘shaggy mountain savages’ (who may be pre-Hellenic i.e. Pelasgian, tribesmen, and / or Centaurs) are characterised not only by locality but also by physical characteristics.

Admittedly, cluster 25 is problematic: taken in isolation and on face value it would appear to belong in the South Western Peloponnesus, but considering the immediate context in which this cluster is mentioned in Iliad II it would belong to Northern Greece, and this is where it has usually been situated by later scholarship – which we have followed here.

Table 5.1. A systematic breakdown of the Achaeans' Catalogue of Ships in Iliad II

... Polytope was leader. He was son of Pirithous, who was son of Jove himself, for Hippodameia bore him to Pirithous on that day when he took his revenge on the shaggy mountain savages and drove them from Mt. Pelion to the Aithices.'

258 Parallel to the dominant account of Helen’s causing the Trojan war by eloping with Paris / Alexander (already in the Homeric poems), there are accounts (Euripides, Helenae; Herodotus, Historiae II) according to which Helen was totally innocent: foreseeing her fate, the shape-shifting (!) sea-god (!) Proteus (we have already identified these characteristics as transgressed reminiscences of the creatrix Mother of the Primal Waters) had hidden her near his residence (the Isle of Pharus at the later Alexandria) and had fabricated an effigy of Helen to go to Troy. Hence at the end of the Trojan war Menelaus could collect Helen unscathed from Proteus, and without misgivings.

Apparently it was on the same visit to Egypt that Helen, like Abraham’s wife Sara / Sarah, ended up in the Egyptian king’s harem, later to be reclaimed by her rightful original husband. The same happened to Sarah again vis-à-vis the Palestinian king Abimelech, and with Isaac’s wife Rebeka and Abimelech, and on all occasions the husband dissimulated his role as spouse and merely presented himself as the wife’s brother (he was a close agnatic kinsman anyway). These episodes are somewhat reminiscent of Achilles’ being hidden in a harem for fear he would join the Trojan war, only to be found out when showing unwomanly enthusiasm for weaponry shown to him by Odysseus (Schol. to Homer’s Iliad XIX, 326; Ovid, Metamorphoses XIII, 162 ff.) – cf. the weaponry associated with the aquatic goddesses Neith, Anahita and Athena. Remarkably, Achilles (who especially in the Black Sea area was primarily venerated, not as a hero before Troy but as a sea god) is reputed to have been joined in matrimony with Helen after his death. I suspect here a common Pelasgian theme, also found in sub-Saharan Africa e.g. among the Zambian Nkoya, according to which a man’s wife is not only his wife but also (emotionally, by manner of speaking, and symbolically, and despite the emphasis on the avoidance of classificatory and clan sister incest between siblings and parallel cousins) his sister, and therefore by implication available for affinity circulation. Cf. Yee 2001.
terms of only loosely organised adventurism. Only by ex-
pressly ignoring Homer’s rationalisation in terms of the leaders’ private personal ties is it possible to claim (cf. Woudhuizen, this volume) that, apparently regional groups under various forms of leadership (see below) had the treaty obligation to offer support in case of war. Such confederacies or amphictyonies are known from other parts and periods of the Mediterranean, and they do not suggest that the leader of the most powerful group (here Agamemnon of Mycenae) was some sort of paramount chief, king or emperor over the entire confederacy. In fact, much of the Iliad can be read as an illustration of the limitations of Agamemnon’s powers of supreme command. He does not even have the power to appropriate the concubine (Briseïs) of a prince of average means (Achilles, with fifty ships) without risking his whole military command to shipwreck on that prince’s wrath. Although there is considerable variance in the number of ships provided, the regional groups tend to the mean value of just over 40. The most powerful group, Agamemnon’s Mycenaean one, has scarcely 2.5 times that number, and is thus nearly at a par with Nestor’s from the South West Peloponnesus, Diomedes’ Argives and the Cretans. While no strict historical truth may be attached to these precise figures, at least they may be taken to depict relative strength in the subjective perception of the Early Iron Age bard. They confirm Agamemnon as someone who socially and economically was largely a primus inter pares:260

‘His force was far both finest and most numerous, and in their midst was the king himself, all glorious in his armour of gleaming bronze – foremost among the heroes, for he was the greatest king, and had most men under him’ (Iliad II, 576 f.).

However, where Agamemnon does stand out is that he alone is the incumbent of the unique office of military and ritual leader of the Greek confederacy. In that capacity he has the power and the obligation to summon the confederates to war. This has also ritual implications. Outside the context of the Catalogue of Ships (e.g. the human sacrifice of Iphigeneia in order to get good sailing winds) it is suggested that Agamemnon combines military and political leadership with ritual responsibility: mediation between humans and the meteorological powers. Throughout the Old World, from Western and Southern Africa to Scandina


259 They follow the amphictyonic model, which has been attested in Ancient Etruria, Ancient Israel, North Africa, Central Asia, and passim throughout the Pelasgian realm. As a form of socio-political organisation, the amphictyony is a federation of ideally twelve equal constituent groupings. The Etrurian case (cf. von Vacano 1955; Chambers 1983) is particularly well-known, but such organisations also existed in the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age: Mannsman 1979, where the Ionia and the Pylaean-Delphian amphictyony are discussed. Herodotus Historiae 1, 145 claims the amphictyony to exist among the Ionians who, by many classical authors, are specifically identified as Pelasgian. Moreover, the two Homeric catalogues of ships (Chapter 5 above) could be read as further indications although the number of members there is much larger. Various instances could be cited all across Asia (Vacano 1955: 65 ff.), while traces of the same institution could be detected in the North African institutions of the confederation, e.g. the Confederation of the 7Atata tribe which I studied in North-western Tunisia in 1968-1970 – in a context (the easternmost outskirts of the Atlas mountains) that in many ways qualified as a Pelasgian survival. Also the Nkoya clan system of South Central Africa, which I describe elsewhere, may well be a remnant of such a confederate structure (van Binsbergen 1992a, 2009a, 2010b; the extensive systematic reasons to take seriously such long-range, transcontinental connections, I discuss especially in van Binsbergen 2008b, 2010c). Inspired by the study of Ancient Greek socio-political systems, amphictyonies have also formed a prolific topic in the study of Ancient Israel, cf. Schmitt 1964; Rahtjen 1965 (Philistines and Israelites); Campbell 1969; James 1976; Bach 1972, 1977; Lemche 1977 (Greeks compared with Israelites); Chambers 1983; Engel 1983 (who rejects the concept); Mölle 1980; Otto 1979; Ringgren 1994; Smend 1963, 1971.

jurisdiction within the classical Hellenic context,\textsuperscript{261} where Artemis, as the virgin daughter of Zeus and Leto, features as the patroness of hunting, of death, of the forces of nature, and probably of puberty rites. Admittedly, use of the bow presupposes air, one of the handful of widely recognised elements, but that element was hardly ever explicitly assigned to Artemis. One of her manifestations is that of the quail, \textit{ortus}, some of whose species as merely terrestrial although others are capable of long-distance flight; moreover, Artemis is intimately associated with the stormy Wild Hunt (rather the domain of her cognate Hecate). This however nearly exhausts Artemis’ flimsy associations with the airy element. Like all major Greek goddesses, also Artemis betrays her (putative) origin in the prehistoric Mother of the Waters by a close association with the sea, navigation, and marine trade – notably under her Cretan forms of Britomartis and Diktynna. However, the Mother of the Waters by implication also controls the Waters Above (the sky) and Below (the underworld), and this could give Artemis some implicit control over meteorological phenomena. All this goes some way to explain Agamemnon’s sacrifice, but does not really convince. In this connection I would submit that Agamemnon was understood to have incurred Artemis’ wrath since he withdrew his daughter from the ritual control of the goddess;\textsuperscript{262} Iphigenia may have been a novice in seclusion, about to be initiated in female puberty rites sacred to her. These rites (to which only girls from noble families had access, and where, dressed in black, they impersonated arktos, ‘bears’) were associated with the locality of Brauron, outside Athens.\textsuperscript{263} However, a red thread through my argument is that the so-called Greek gods cannot be understood on the basis of a local, Aegean and contemporary, Early Iron or Late Bronze Age reading along, but bring out mythological and ritual themes that have a very wide distribution encompassing much of the Old World and often part of the New World, over many millennia – possibly harking back, in some cases, all the way to the Upper Palaeolithic. Although the name of Artemis does not readily fit\textsuperscript{264} into the list of goddesses whose name appears to be a reflex of *-[a]N[V]/r-*, such as Neith, Athena, Anat, Nzambi and Anahita, as a virgin wielder of the bow she is semantically very much part of that company. The Egyptian foundation and wisdom goddess Seshat comes close to this: her headdress may consist of an arch, a pair of horns inverted, or a seven-petalled motive usually interpreted as papyrus – these emblems closely resemble those of Neith (a bow and arrows, notably two crossed arrows in front of a shieldlemnisate-shaped shield; two facing bows inside a tassel – the latter symbol also interpreted as a weaver’s shuttle) (Bonnet 1952 / 1971: 264 f., 512 f., 699 f.). A bow as headdress can also be discerned in the famous Aouanheret engraving of the White Lady of Tassili (Central Sahara Neolithic), which its discoverer Lhote did not hesitate to connect with Ancient Egypt (Lhote 1959: Fig. 54 opposite p. 105); however, Lhote was found to have jumped to conclusions on other points. The Aouanheret image bears a superficial likeness to the apparently rather younger image of the bow-wielding ‘White Lady’ (who may well be male or bisexual, while the white colour may be ritual paint) of the Brandberg in Namibia.\textsuperscript{265} In Southern Africa, the mythological interpretation is that of Inkosazana / Nomkhubulwana, the heavenly princess, daughter of the King of Heaven – she is the demiurge mediating between Heaven and Earth (particularly for rain and fertility and general well-being), has the rainbow as her weapon, and may be associated with female puberty rites (Berglund 1976, Scorgie 2002). In the light of the Pelasgian Hypothesis, these parallels to Artemis would not constitute mere transcontinental coincidence but rather the manifestation of a central Old World theme in a periphery, where (as has long been recognised for formal cultural systems such as languages, myths and rituals) such themes tend to have greater chances of survival. This suggests that the bow in the hands of the Mediterranean goddesses including Artemis was primarily an attribute of an avatar of the Mother of the Primal Waters in her celestial aspect (mimicked in male form by, for instance, Artemis’ brother and counterpart Apollo), and only secondarily (when in the process of masculinisation these goddesses, claims to divine prominence became problematic) was interpreted as a weapon – spawning, apparently, a whole, rather surprising, mythology of virgins’ military prowess – which perhaps in its turn spawned not only the myth but also\textsuperscript{266} the actual historical practice\textsuperscript{267} of female warriors, Amazons, both in the Mediterranean region and in sub-Saharan Africa.

If many regional groups were not clearly demarcated by an ethnic name, the Catalogue does suggest that the overall ethnic space of Greekness was subdivided into smaller ethnic units, but not exhaustively, and not systematically so. One could have expected that the spatial pattern in which the fleet was laid out at the moment of the review, reflected the \textit{geopolitical mental map} of the contemporary bard. However, specific information on mutual position is only given for clusters 3, 7 and 10, and is not enough to go by. Of the Phceans it is said that they were ‘stationed next to the Boeotians, on their left’; of Ajax’s ships that they found themselves ‘alongside those of the Athenians’; and of Menelaus’ ships that they were ‘drawn up apart from the others’. No other information is given con-

\textsuperscript{261} Cf. Fauth 1979c; Rutgers 1924: 55 f.

\textsuperscript{262} By an ancient Mediterranean cultural logic which still survives in the cult of saints in the highlands of the Eastern Atlas (van Binsbergen 1971d), the transgression of interfering with a person (novice, pilgrim, priest) who is sacred to a deity / saint, is structurally equivalent to killing an animal in a deity’s / saint’s sacred precinct.

\textsuperscript{263} Burkert 1985: 263; Willis 1994: 139; Perlman 1999.

\textsuperscript{264} The earliest attested form of her name, \textit{a-te-mi-to-} in Linear B from Pylos, lacks the -\textit{r-} (Chadwick & Baumbach 1963: 176 f.), and may be more easily accommodated in that company of goddesses.

\textsuperscript{265} Lewis-Williams & Dowson, 1989: 5 f.; Holm 1969: Plates 12-13; Maquet 1972: 45; Brenli et al. 1955.

\textsuperscript{266} Contra Blok 1991, 1995.

\textsuperscript{267} Clarke 1984; Fraser 1988; Law 1993; van Binsbergen 1992a; for a striking West Asian protohistorical parallel, combining a female priesthood with prowess and leopard symbolism, cf. Davis-Kimball c.s. 2002.

---

\textsuperscript{261} Cf. Fauth 1979c; Rutgers 1924: 55 f.

\textsuperscript{262} By an ancient Mediterranean cultural logic which still survives in the cult of saints in the highlands of the Eastern Atlas (van Binsbergen 1971d), the transgression of interfering with a person (novice, pilgrim, priest) who is sacred to a deity / saint, is structurally equivalent to killing an animal in a deity’s / saint’s sacred precinct.

\textsuperscript{263} Burkert 1985: 263; Willis 1994: 139; Perlman 1999.

\textsuperscript{264} The earliest attested form of her name, \textit{a-te-mi-to-} in Linear B from Pylos, lacks the -\textit{r-} (Chadwick & Baumbach 1963: 176 f.), and may be more easily accommodated in that company of goddesses.
cerning the spatial layout of the ships during this fleet show.

When we yet try to reconstruct that postulated mental map by projecting the 29 different clusters onto the map (Fig. 5.3), we see that the mapping is not so much in terms of geographical contiguity, but of linear, serial association, more or less in the way a traveller would encounter one group after the other when voyaging through Late Bronze Age Greece (that is, through its Early Iron Age reconstruction in the hands of the bard). An herald travelling around to summon allies to war would follow such a trajectory. Interestingly, the *Rundschau* is not completed in one round, but clearly contains three separate movements, identified in Fig. 5.4:

1. Central and Southern mainland Greece;
2. Maritime Southern and Eastern Greece *i.e.* Crete, Rhodes, Syme and Cos (the more central islands of the Aegean archipelago are ignored; and so is Ionia, probably because it sided with the Trojans); and – only after the Maritime circle has been dealt with, yet adjacent to the Central and South cluster:
3. Northern mainland Greece.

This is an *implicit ethnic structure* in three parts. It falls outside my present scope to ascertain to what extent such a clustering may be made sense of in the light of traditional accounts of Early Iron Age Greece in the Ancient Greek literature, as well as the archaeological and linguistic reconstructions by modern scholarship. Since the *Iliad* author seems to be unaware of the underlying cluster structure, it can hardly be explained as another application of the triadic model of literature statehood, which Dumézil (somewhat myopically, as we shall see) has elevated to the hallmark of Indo-Europeanness. Incidentally, whereas the order of presentation in clusters (1) and (2) suggests a sea journey along the coast or from island to island, the order of cluster (3) would appear to reflect a perambulation on foot or on chariot (and most likely even, although that would destroy the carefully maintained Late Bronze Age illusion, on horseback).

What emerges is an unmistakable suggestion of three supra-regional ethnic clusters recognised by contemporary actors:

A. mainland Central and South;
B. maritime South and East;
C. mainland North.

The numbers correspond with Table 5.1.

The fact that many regional groups failed to be demarcated by an ethnonym may also suggest that their formation was uncertain and shifting, and rather dictated by the need and pressures of the moment. The same is suggested by the considerable variation in regional scope of the groups, from a single city to whole islands and regions. On the other hand, there is the suggestion of an older, more consistent system glimmering through: although the entries in Table 5.1. (columns V and VI) are incomplete on these particular points (after all, they were part of a poem, not of a tax list), *there is the suggestion that each regional group was to be characterised by a specific regional symbol*

---

268 Identification of the regions, in so far as problematic, on the basis of detailed information under the heading of each locality in Ziegler & Sontheimer 1979; for Dodona the earlier, easterly location has been adopted, cf. the discussion of Dodona above, Chapter 2.
suggests it does) and rightly criticised, Graves' reading of Greek myths was in fact in place (although temic) structure, linking each region with a particular spirit province and hydronym in Bantu speaking Africa, which is clearly an aspect of the same phenomenon, and once more brings out the continuities between the Bantu-speaking world on the one hand, and that of West Asia and the Mediterranean, on the other. Of course, the tabulated entries in the Catalogue of Ships are not carried through systematically, and the apparent effect to which I call attention here could well be an artefact of my own scholarly imagination. On the other hand, the parcelling up of the local landscape into smaller units which are named and which in the first place are ritual units (i.e. spirit provinces with a shrine and a tutelary god) can be found throughout the Old World, and goes back to at least the Neolithic. If such a symbolic-heraldic (perhaps ultimately totemic) structure, linking each region with a particular conventionalised symbol was in fact in place (and although highly and rightly criticised, Graves' reading of Greek myths suggests it does) then we would not expect the bard to reproduce the full pattern in Iliad II, because its outlines would be commonplace to his audience anyway. Instead, in the specific context of the epic the incidental references to this symbolic structure (as listed in Table 5.1 column V) were employed, not in order to convey essential information but merely as epitheta ornantia, and as stopgaps. There is even the occasional suggestion that there is a parallelism of two kinds of such symbolic series, one for peace, the other for war – which is reminiscent of the famous description of the Shield of Achilles.

In addition, some clusters, but by no means all, seem to be characterised (Table 5.1 column VI) by the specific details of their military specialisation in terms of weaponry and armour (or its absence).

Also, some regions appear to be associated, in addition to a totem-like symbol, with a particular god from the pantheon (without necessarily excluding others); or, since the pantheon was more likely still in the process of formation, with a specific local deity or heros. This again is a system we know from the Egyptian nome structure, and from both shores of the Mediterranean in the second millennium CE, where it has taken the form of saint worship, as a further development of the attested worship, by highly fragmented local congregations, of highly localised gods and heroes in Antiquity, under conditions of Christian and Islamic monotheism. These suggestions, even if only partially elaborated in Iliad II, go a considerable way to show that the wider socio-political space of Early Iron Age Greece was elaborately structured in terms of symbolic and cultic oppositions and linkages between groups. However, this structure was not primarily an expression of ethnicity as a central feature of the structuring of wider space. What we see is one overall Achaean ethnic identity, that was regionally broken down into smaller units which, while effective as war contingents within a Pan-Greek confederacy, were only partially designated in specifically ethnic terms.

To the extent to which ethnicity tends to be framed by the actors in terms of descent, and hence the sharing of a more or less distinctive gene pool, it is interesting that only rarely do the clusters in Table 5.1 give rise to comments on distinctive somatic traits (fair hair, tallness) or optional, artificial physical characteristics such as long hair. Apparently, it was not possible to clearly distinguish between the many intra-Greek clusters in terms of congenital somatic characteristics. The Greeks before Troy are already forming more or less one ethnic identity, albeit that it is segmented into three main constitutive regional parts, within which smaller ethnic clusters could be distinguished in a fragmentary, non-systematic and not exhaustive way. This emerging Pan-Achaean identity is all the clearer when it is contrasted with the only two alien ethnic groups that are mentioned in this context: in the first place the Dardanoi / Trojans, and further the phēres (…) lakkhēentes, ‘shaggy savages’, by which a Pelasgian mountain tribe (and / or the Centaurs) may be meant.

On the point of leadership, it is very striking that the Catalogue attests to a wide range of possible principles on which leaders are recruited, and a similarly wide range of leadership styles. This again confirms that the pattern of social organisation is not predominantly ethnic, and that it is, in many ways, hybrid. Various titles are used for the leaders: hégemones (chiefs), princes (koiranoi), or simply the verb archein,

269 Roeder 1952.
270 Cf. Renfrew's (1973 / 1976) discussion of the parcelling up of space in Neolithic farming communities, which tallies with GImbutas' (1963a) discussion of Baltic culture, and the fragmentation of ritual space by the plurality of minor shrines in North African villages (van Binsbergen 1971d). Also cf. the discussion, in Chapter 4, of spirit provinces and hydronyms in Bantu speaking Africa, which is clearly an aspect of the same phenomenon, and once more brings out the continuities between the Bantu-speaking world on the one hand, and that of West Asia and the Mediterranean, on the other.
272 Iliad XVIII, 478-608.
to lead’, is being employed. Often the leadership over one cluster is shared by several persons, who may be brothers (e.g. Ascalaphus and Ialmenus, of cluster 2), or who may appear to be unrelated. It is not clear what factors determine whether the leadership is to be shared, and to be shared by brothers, by other close kin, or by non-kin. Many leaders are identified by patronymic and other particulars of descent, as if such descent is the main claim to leadership. For many leaders a specific divine descent is given, while for others their being sons or otherwise descendants, or even peers, of Ares is probably primarily a mode of expressing their military prowess and may not be intended to be taken literally as a genealogical statement. However, as I shall argue in detail in Chapter 6 (in connection with the Biblical Table of Nations) we must realise that in ethnic contexts all genealogical idiom is primarily an imagery of classification and must not be taken at face value as a statement on objective biological close consanguineal ties. Sometimes leadership comes in tiers, like in Diomedes’ case: his cluster has several leaders, but he outranks them all. There seem to be aristocratic families that – in a way confirming their condottiere nature, and foreshadowing a pattern that was to become dominant in Hellenistic times – have a claim to leadership even outside their region of origin. Several leaders are in fact depicted as fugitives escaping conflict with their close kin, or blood revenge connected with the murder of such kin. Another example of such a supraregionally active aristocratic family is offered by Menelaus, Agamemnon’s brother. Menelaus is leader over Lacedaemon, at a considerable distance from Agamemnon’s Mycenae. Especially, descent from a heros would qualify for leadership, as in the case of Heracles’ son Tlepolemus and his grandsons Pheidippus and Antiphus, as well as Aesculapius’ two sons. Sometimes two distinct groups that are differentiated in the sense that each has its own ethnonym, operate under one and the same leader, e.g. Guneus. By and large, military leadership seems to accrue to a person not so much as member of an ethnic group, but as an aristocrat – as if, indeed, they are Hellenistic or Renaissance condottieri, adventurers offering their sword, aristocratic name, and followers, to whatever community or cause that may need them.

As one short passage in the Iliad, the Catalogue of Ships is admittedly insufficient evidence to go by, yet I would venture to suggest the following generalisation: In the Aegean Early Iron Age, such fragmentary ethnic and local groups as may be discerned are often the results of the organising and entrepreneurial efforts of aristocrats, whereas in other cases aristocrats emerge as the logical leaders of pre-existing ethnic groups. The emphasis on aristocrats in the Catalogue of Ships is clearly a case in point. For our study on ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age throughout the eastern Mediterranean this would suggest, as an implication, that ethnicity may not (or: not yet) be taken as an independent variable subsequently structuring events and relationships in its own right, but instead must be considered as the outcome of other initiatives and power struggles of an, initially, non-ethnic nature. Among these factors, we should mention in the first place the career aspirations of aristocrats. A second important factor that can be identified concerns the differential wealth of various local communities which yet, within the wider geographical space of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean (structured as it was, however diffusely and fragmentarily, through statehood, regional cults, trade, and language communalities) were aware of each other and were drawn within each other’s orbit.

This brief analysis is not meant, in the first place, to throw new light on one of the best studied passages in the Iliad, but to illustrate the method of close reading of (more or less) contemporary texts in a bid to extract the ethnicity-related information from them. Our conclusions are somewhat novel and illuminating as far as ethnic structures in the Early Iron Age (as an approximation of the Late Bronze Age) are concerned, but since the Catalogue of Ships is largely mono-ethnic (Achaeans / Hellenes / Greeks) while the main ethnic conflict of the Iliad is between that ethnic category and the Trojans / Dardanians, we should not be surprised that our text does not reveal a great deal of information on inter-ethnic structures. Our examination, in the next chapter, of our next empirical example, the Biblical Table of Nations, will raise rather more interesting perspectives, but will also reveal far greater difficulties.

274 For the ethnicity component in this, see Chapter 28.
5.8. Appendix: The Homeric Catalogue of Ships (Iliad Book II 484-760), Greek text and English translation

Greek text: *Iliad* – The Chicago Homer, Northwestern University, Chicago, USA, based on the Perseus texts, which are the digital transcriptions of the Oxford Classical Texts and are used by arrangement with Oxford University Press. English: Samuel Butler’s translation. In my main argument I have not always adopted Butler’s specific English renderings of the proper names.

**Greek text**

II 484 έπεκε τον μοι Μούσαι Ολυμπια σέ αμέτρετ' ἔρχουσιν: ομαίζε γάρ θαν ἐπεῖ διόρθωσε τοι ἑκάστε τοι πάντα, ἤδη δὲ κλίσεις οἱν ἀποδέουσιν οὐδέ τι δήμεν. οἱ τενες ἄκλεος Δανιάδα καὶ κοιναῖν ήσσον: πλεῖν δ' οὐκ ἦν ἐπεὶ μοθηρόφωσι οὐσ' οὐκόμηκα, οὐδ' ε' μοι δέκα μὲν γλάσσα, δέκα δέ στόματ' πέμεν.

II 490 φιλή δ' ἄρρητος, χάλκεον δ' μοι ἦτο ἐνείη, ε' μ' Ὄλυμπιάδες. Μούσαι Δόκα ιδίικιον ἀγάπαμε φθαρτέρας μισοπαθός δοίο ὴ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἤλιον: ἄρχεις παί γνήν ἐρώτων γῆς τε προσήματι. Βουιάν̣ μὲν Πηγέλεως καὶ Λήθιος ἔχοιν Αρκεσίτλας τε προσθερῴον τε Κλωνίκας τε, οἱ θ' ἂργαν ἐνέμοντο καὶ Λιάρδα περίπλησιν Σκελδόν τε τελωνικὸν τ' Εἰσινον, θέσσαν τε θεὰν τε καὶ κύριοβορον Μυκελοράσι, οἱ τ' ἄμφ' ἄρρωμ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Ἑλέον καὶ Ἑρυθράς.

II 500 οἱ τ' Ἑλέον' ἔχοι θ' Ὡρὴν και Πετσύκα, Ἐκέλεον Μεικανά τ' ἐπιτέμανεν ποιεῖσθαι, Κάπας Ἰθέαν τε πολυπρόσωπη τε Θήβην, οἱ τε Μικράνες καὶ Ποιονομ' ἀλκατον, οἱ τ' Πέλαγον' ἔχοι θ' οἱ Γλυσιόντο ἐνέμοντο, οἱ θ' Ποθήβιας ἔχοιν ἐπιστίμιον ποιεῖσθαι, Ὄχρηστον θ' ἢ Πολίενθοι στελθιάν ἄλοιπος, οἱ τε πολυπρόσωπον Πλήθον' ἔχοι, οἱ τε Μίσιανος Νικαν τέ καθήκοννα τ' ἐπαγαγόν: τῶν μὲν πεντάκομα νέας κών', ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη.

II 510 κοίσιος Βουιάν σεβάν καὶ ἱκονομ' βαθῶν. οἱ δ' Ἀσπελάθηνα ναοῖς θ' Ὀρχυμενομ' θυάτηρος τε Πηγής ἔχοιν, τῶν ἄρρως Ἀκλάομασ εἰς τάκεν τε αὐξήση λίμα Ρητόρος Καλλίο, παρθένους ἀλκοῦς ὑπάρξεων ἱππομάλλης ἄρρως κρατεῖν: δὲ δ' οἱ παρελεῖστο λάβησι, τείν' δὲ τρέφοντας γλαυκοράς νέας ἐστικόματο. αὐτής θησυκῶν Σκέλας καὶ Ἐπτερίσσωρος ἔχοιν νέας θρίσιο μεγαθρόμον Ναυβαλάκης, οἱ Κυνάρσον τε Ποθόναν τε πεπράκαλεν

**English translation Samuel Butler**

And now, O Muses, dwellers in the mansions of Olympus, tell me – for you are goddesses and are in all places so that you see all things, while we know nothing but by report – who were the chiefs and princes of the Danaans? As for the common soldiers, they were so that I could not name every single one of them though I had ten tongues, and though my voice failed not and my heart were of bronze within me, unless you, O Olympian Muses, daughters of aegis-bearing Jove, were to recount them to me. Nevertheless, I will tell the captains of the ships and all the fleet together. Penelope, Leitus, Arcesilus, Prothoenor, and Clionus were captains of the Boeotians. These were they that dwelt in Hyria and rocky Aulis, and who held Schoenus, Scolus, and the highlands of Eteonus, with Thespeia, Graia, and the fair city of Mycalessus. They also held Harma, Eileusium, and Erythrae; and they had Eleon, Hyle, and Petoan; Ocalea and the strong fortress of Medeon; Copae, Eutresis, and Thische the haunt of doves; Coronae, and the pastures of Haliartus; Plataeae and Glisas; the fortress of Theseus the less; holy Orchestus with its famous grove of Neptune; Arne rich in vineyards; Midea, sacred Nisa, and Anthedon upon the sea. From these there came fifty ships,
Daulis, and Panopeus; they also that dwelt in Anemorea and Hyampolis, and about the waters of the river Cephissus, and Liliae by the springs of the Cephissus; with their chieftains came forty ships, and they marshalled the forces of the Phoeceans, which were stationed next to the Boeotians, on their left. Ajax, the fleet son of Oileus, commanded the Locrians. He was not so great, nor nearly so great, as Ajax the son of Telamon. He was a little man, and his breastplate was made of linen, but in use of the spear he excelled all the Hellenes and the Achaeans. These dwelt in Cynus, Opous, Calliarius, Bessa, Scarphe, fair Augeae, Tarpte, and Thronium about the river Boagrius. With him there came forty ships of the Locrians which dwell beyond Euboan. The fierce Abantes275 held Euboan with its cities, Chalcis, Etereia, Histiaeae rich in vines, Cerinthus upon the sea, and the rock-perched town of Diunum; with them were also the men of Carystus and Styra; Elephonor of the race of Mars was in command of these; he was son of Chalcondon, and chief over all the Abantes. With him they came, fleet of foot and wearing their hair long behind, brave warriors, who would ever strive to tear open the corslets of their foes with their long ashen spears. Of these there came fifty ships. And they that held the strong city of Athens, the people of great Erechtheus, who was born of the soil itself, but Jove’s daughter, Minerva, fostered him, and established him at Athens in her own rich sanctuary.

There, year by year, the Athenian youths worship him with sacrificces of bulls and rams. These were commanded by Menestheus, son of Peteos. No man living could equal him in the marshallings of chariots and foot soldiers. Nestor could alone rival him, for he was older. With him there came fifty ships. Ajax brought twelve ships from Salamis, and stationed them alongside those of the Athenians. The men of Argos, again, and those who held the walls of Tyrins, with Hermione, and Asine upon the gulf; Troezene, Eionae, and the vineyard lands of Epidaurus; the Achaean youths, moreover, who came from Aegina and Mases; these were led by Diomed of the loud battle-cry, and Sthenelus son of famed Capanus. With them in command was Euryalus, son of king Mecistes, son of Talaius; but Diomed was chief over them all. With these there came eighty ships. Those who held the strong city of Mycenae,

275 Apart from the Greek plural form -es, this name follows Bantu ethnonym formation and could well be taken as another indication of Bantu presence in the Bronze Age Mediterranean, cf. Chapter 4.
rich Corinth and Cleonae; Ornea, Aeraethyrea, and Licyon, where Adrastus reigned of old; Hesperia, high Gonoessa, and Pellene; Aegium and all the coast-land round about Helice; these sent a hundred ships under the command of King Agamemnon, son of Atreus. His force was far both finest and most numerous, and in their midst was the king himself, all glorious in his armour of gleaming bronze – foremost among the heroes, for he was the greatest king, and had most men under him. And those that dwelt in Lacedaemon, lying low among the hills, Pharis, Sparta, with Messe the haunt of doves; Bryseae, Augeae, Amyclae, and Helos upon the sea; Laas, moreover, and Oetylus; these were led by Menelaus of the loud battle-cry, brother to Agamemnon, and of them there were sixty ships, drawn up apart from the others. Among them went Menelaus himself, strong in zeal, urging his men to fight; for he longed to avenge the toll and sorrow that he had suffered for the sake of Helen. The men of Pylos and Arene, and Thryon where is the ford of the river Alpheus; strong Aipy, Cyprarisites, and Amphigenea; Pteleum, Helos, and Dorium, where the Muses met Thamyris, and stiffled his minstrelsy for ever. He was returning from Oechalia, where Eurytus lived and reigned, and boasted that he would surpass even the Muses, daughters of his divine power of song, and thenceforth he could strike the lyre no more. These were commanded by Nestor, knight of Arcadia, under the high mountain of Cyllene, near the tomb of Aeppylus, where the people fight hand to hand; the men of Pheneus also, and Orchomenus rich in flocks; of Rhipe, Statrae, and bleak Eniseis; of Tegea and fair Mantinea; of Symphelus and Parrhassia; of these King Agapenor son of Ancaeus was commander, and they had sixty ships. Many Arcadians, good soldiers, came in each one of them, but Agamemnon found them the ships in which to cross the sea, for they were not a people that occupied their business upon the waters. The men, moreover, of Buprasium and of Elis, so much of it as is enclosed between Hyrmine, Myrson, upon the sea-shore, the rock Olen and Alesium. These had four leaders, and each of them had ten ships, drawn up apart from the others. Among them was Pheneus also, and Orchomenus rich in flocks; of Rhipe, Statrae, and bleak Eniseis; of Tegea and fair Mantinea; of Symphelus and Parrhassia; of these King Agapenor son of Ancaeus was commander,
All these were led by Ithocens, son of Hercules, who dwelt in the hundred cities of Crete.

Chalcis by the sea, and rocky Calydon, for the great king Oeneus had now no sons living, and was himself dead, as was also golden-haired Meleager, who had been set over the Aetolians to be their king. And with Thoas there came forty ships. The famous spearman Idomeneus led the Cretans, who held Crossus, and the well-walled city of Gortyns; Lyctus also, Miletus and Lycastus that lies upon the chalk; the populous towns of Phaestus and Rhytium, with the other peoples that dwelt in the hundred cities of Crete.

Their captains were Amphimachus and Thalpius – the one, son of Cteatus, and the other, of Eurytus – both of the race of Accor. The two others were Diore, son of Amaranus, and Polyeunes, son of King Agasthenes, son of Augeas. And those of Dulichium with the sacred Echinean islands, who dwelt beyond the sea off Ellis; these were led by Meges, peer of Mars, and the son of valiant Phyleus, dear to Jove, who quarrelled with his father, and went to settle in Dulichium. With him there came forty ships. Ulises led the brave Cephalenians, who held Ithaca, Neritum with its forests, Crocylea, rugged Aegeilips, Samos and Zacynthes, with the mainland also that was over against the islands. These were led by Ulises, peer of Jove in counsel, and with him there came twelve ships. Thoas, son of Draemon, commanded the Aetolians, who dwelt in Pleuron, Olenus, Pylene,
whom they had taken from Lynnessus at his own great peril, when he had sacked Lynnessus and Thebe, and had overthrown Mynes and Epistrophus, sons of king Evenor, son of Seleus. For her sake Achilles was still grieving, but ere long he was again to join them. And those that held Phylace and the flowery meadows of Pyrasus, sanctuary of Ceres; Iton, the mother of sheep; Antrum upon the sea, and Peleus that lies upon the grass lands. Of these brave Protei- laus had been captain while he was yet alive, but he was now lying under the earth.

He had left a wife behind him in Phylace to tear her cheeks in sorrow, and his house was only half finished, for he was slain by a Dardanian warrior while leaping foremost of the

wherefore of Saturn showered down great riches upon them. And Nireus brought three ships from Syme – Nireus, who was the handsomest man that came up under Ilus of all the Danaans after the son of Peleus – but he was a man of no substance, and had but a small following. And those that held Nysirus, Crapathus, and Casus, with Cos, the city of Euryppylus, and the Calydian islands, these were commanded by Phieprippus and Antillus, two sons of King Theseus the son of Hercules.

And with them there came thirty ships. Those again who held Pelasgic Argos, Alos, Alope, and Trachis; and those of Phthia and Hellas the land of fair women, who were called Myrmidons, Hellenes, and Achaecans; these had fifty ships, over which Achilles was in command. But they now took no part in the war, inasmuch as there was no one to marshal them; for Achilles stayed by his ships, furious about the loss of the girl Briseis,

They had fourty ships, and those that held Phereas by the Boebean lake, with Boebe, Gaphyrae, and the populous city of Iolcus, these with their eleven ships were led by Eumelus, son of Admetus, whom Alcestis bore to him, love- liest of the daughters of Pelias. And those that held Methone and Thaumacia, with Meliboea and rugged Oizon, these were led by the skilful archer Philoctetes, and they had seven ships, each with fifty
Such were the chiefs and princes of the Danaans. Philips and Prothous were their leaders, and with them there came forty ships. Guneus brought two and twenty ships from Cyphus, and he was followed by the Enienes and the valiant Peraihi, who dwelt about wintry Dodona, and held the lands round the lovely river Titaresius, which sends its waters into the Peneus. They do not mingle with the silver eddies of the Peneus, but flow on the top of them like oil; for the Titaresius is a branch of dread Orcus and of the river Styx. Of the Magnetes, Prothous son of Tenthredon was commander. They were they that dwelt about the river Peneus and Mt. Pelion. Prothous, fleet of foot, was their leader, and with them there came forty ships.

Such were the chiefs and princes of the Danaans.

and they that held Oechalia, the city of Oechalian Eurytus, these were commanded by the two sons of Aesclusilus, skilled in the art of healing, Podalirius and Machaon. And with them there came thirty ships. The men, moreover, of Ormenius, and by the fountain of Hypereia, with those that held Asterias, and the white crests of Titanus, these were led by Euryyulus, the son of Euaemon, and with them there came forty ships. Those that held Argissa and Gyrtone, Orthe, Elone, and the white city of Oloosson, of these brave Polypoetes was leader. He was son of Pirithous, who was son of Jove himself, for Hippodameia bore him to Pirithous on the day when he took his revenge on the shaggy mountain savages and drove them from Mt. Pelion to the Aithices. But Polypoetes was not sole in command, for with him was Leonteus, of the race of Mars, who was son of Coronus, the son of Caeneus. And with these there came forty ships. Guneus brought two and twenty ships from Cyphus, and he was followed by the Enienes and the valiant Peraihi,
CHAPTER 6. CASE STUDY II: THE BIBLICAL TABLE OF NATIONS (GENESIS 10)

6.1. The Table of Nations in the Biblical account

Let us now turn to our other Early to Middle Iron Age document, the Biblical Table of Nations (Genesis 10), and assess to what extent we can interpret it, in its turn, from the perspective of Late Bronze Age ethnicity.

*Genesis* is the Greek name (‘Coming into being’) of the Hebrew book בְּרֵאשִׁית Be-rešīt (‘In the beginning...’), the first of the five books (the Torah or Pentateuch) that are traditionally attributed to Moses, and that constitute the very core of the sacred book of the Jews and the Christians, generally known as the Tanakh or Bible – and a considerable inspiration for the Qur'an. *Genesis* relates the history of the world, and specifically of the Israelites, from the moment of creation, via the Fall of Man, the eviction from Paradise, the history of mankind up to Noah, the Flood, God’s covenant with Noah to the effect that He would never again seek to destroy mankind by water, the re-peopling of the earth after the Flood by the descendants of Noah (which is described in Genesis 10, commonly called ‘the Table of Nations’ – subject of the present chapter), God’s covenant with Abram, the history of Abram’s descendants in Palestine and Egypt, the Exodus from Egypt, the tribulations in the desert, and the establishment of the politico-religious order of Israel on the eve of the conquest of the Promised Land.

I have hesitated to include this summary here. Stating the obvious is not the hallmark of scholarship. However, obvious to whom? If, as I argue repeatedly in the present study, our own self-evidences are the main hindrance in intercultural knowledge formation across space and time, then one such unwarranted self-evidence would certainly consist in the assumption that all present and future readers of my text will be familiar with the first section of the Judaic-Christian sacred book. Globally, scholarship is still dominated by White male inhabitants of the North Atlantic and people identifying – in terms of culture, language, religion, and somatic characteristics – with that part of the modern world even if they do not themselves live there now or can trace descent from there. However, there is – much to the benefit of scholarship – an increasing number of scholars who do not share these distinctive features; as there is an increasing number of people for whom the Bible is no longer, or has never been, an open book. Assuming otherwise amounts to a subordinating, hegemonic view predicated on past and current North Atlantic, violence-underpinned dominance in knowledge and power. Cultivating such assumptions will never lead us to greater insight in protohistory, even if the attempt to avoid them may look perfunctory in its attempt at political correctness. Hence this summary.

Over the centuries, an enormous literature has built up about *Genesis*. Of the more recent and prominent Biblical scholarship Soggin gives a comprehensive and generally incisive discussion. The Table of Nations, specifically,

---

276 From the voluminous literature on *Genesis* I mention: Hecht 1858; Sayce 1925; Custance 1975 / n.d.; Kreitzer 2004; Ross 1980-81, 1981b; Nelis 1966-69a; Soggin 1997; Brügmann 1982; Cassuto 1961-64a; Coats 1987; Delitzsch 1852, 1872, 1888; de Vaux 1962; Bacon 1891, 1892; Hinckley 1901; Dillmann 1892 / 1897; Driver 1904; de Prain 1963; Gunkel 1910, 1922; Holzinger 1898, 1922; Jacob 1934; König 1924; Nei 1986; Procksch 1924; von Rad 1972; Sarna 1996; Sebass 1996; Simons 1954; Skinner 1930; Speiser 1932-33, 1964; Testa 1969-74; van Selms 1967; Wenham 1892, 1992; Westermann 1979-82; Zimmerli 1967, 1976; Boice 1998. Also cf. the bibliographic resource presented by Pyle & Doerfel n.d. [2004]. Obviously, any analysis of *Genesis* must be placed against the background of the evolving specialist theology of *Genesis* (e.g. Edelkoort 1954; Gnuse 1994; Smith 1977; van Wolde 1989, 1991, 1994), and I am afraid it is a weakness of the present argument that I am scarcely capable of doing just that. Another weakness must be that I have largely relied on Christian sources and have had only very limited access to Jewish and Islamic exegeses of *Genesis* and of corresponding sections of the Qur’an. Interestingly, the Table of Nations took on a life on its own in the sense that it exercised a considerable influence on the constructions of ethnicity and identity in Europe in Medieval and Early Modern times, e.g. Bochart 1646; Michaelis 1769, cf. Smith 1833; Braude 1997. This leads to unexpected and little known effects. Thus Bastomsky (1976) tells us: ‘In his *Origine della Lingua Fiorentina*, originally published in 1549, Pierfrancesco Giambullari makes an astonishing claim—that the language of Dante takes its origin from Hebrew, brought to Italy by Noah, the inventor of wine, who known as Janus, settled and died there. (…) This belief is repeated by Fabricius in his Codex Pseudepigraphus of the Old Testament of 1713 (…) and the same story is again told by Fuchs writing in 1849.’

Thus in early medieval Syriac texts the Children of Japheth appear as Central Asian barbarians to the Christians of the Levant, deriving their despicable customs from the fact that their apiac ancestor was alleged to have been sucked by a bitch after the death of
has been the subject of quite a few monographs, in addition to numerous studies on individual topics, mostly attempts to identify in terms of modern scholarship one or more of the nearly eighty names which *Genesis* 10 contains. Like the rest of the Bible, *Genesis* 10 has been subjected to specialised scrutiny on the part of Biblical scholars for millennia, and it cannot be my intention to bring me to commit blunders which specialised Hebrew and Biblical scholars may hopefully forgive me.

The Table of Nations is one of the best known documents of the Ancient world. Yet for further detailed reference it is inevitable that we cite it here in full (see the Section 6.9, and in a processed, tabulated form, Table 6.1).

### 6.2. The Table of Nations: Dating and historicity

For millennia, the Table of Nations has been the point of departure for idiosyncratic, essentialising attempts to reconstruct early human history, usually in a form so as to suit the author’s cultural, ethnic and racial stereotypes. The Table’s apical ancestor, Noah, and his Biblical ancestors such as Enoc, also feature in the world of Islam, especially in the occult and secret sciences of that world religion, whose major components tend to be accompanied by a mythical list of authorities along which that component (e.g. Arab. *‘ilm al-raml*, ‘Sand Science’, a major divination technique) was handed down through the ages; in these

his mother (Llewelyn Price 2003: 6). As we shall see, Japheth will continue to be associated with the Christian-European and the Islamic construction of Asians far into the second millennium CE (cf. Davidson & Aldersmith 1940 – like Temple 1976 a not uncommon example of serious scholarship wasted on a nonsensical topic); also cf. Crawford 1891. The impact of the images of Shem and Ham on ethnic and racial stereotypes is even more obvious – the equation of the sons of Ham with Black Africans / Ethiopians (cursed by Noah according to *Genesis* 9:25 f.) appeared as an early racial stereotype in Judaism and Christianity, while in the 19th century CE both Shem and Ham were to lend their name to a scientific classification as Semitic and Hamitic languages – now usually subsumed under the more neutral term of Afroasiatic.


lists Noah and Enoch, along with Idris and the angel Jibril, tend to play prominent roles. Christian literature through the centuries has excelled in pious interpretations of the Table of Nations, and in identifying the various ancestral branches with latterday nations, ethnic groups, and so-called races. The rise of Internet in the last decade has made such pseudo-historical mythical bricolage on the basis of Biblical sources a very common pastime. In the light of such unsystematic and unscholarly manipulation of fragments of mythical and possibly historical information gleaned from the Bible, the modern scholar’s safest option seems to be to refrain from any attempt to make history out of *Genesis* 10, even though this might mean sacrificing one of the most tantalising, and potentially rich, protohistorical sources for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean.

As long as the Table of Nations was attributed to Moses, a literalist interpretation of the Bible suggested a mid- or even early second millennium date for the text. In the twentieth-century CE reassessment of this date, and of the Table of Nations in general, an important role was played by Albright, one of the most prominent (and certainly the most acclaimed) Biblical archaeologists of the mid-twentieth century. Referring to the works of Noth (e.g. 1961, 1962), Mowinckel (cf. Barstad 1988), and the Baltimore theologians (Albright himself taught at the Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore), he dates the nucleus of the Table of Nations to the tenth century BCE. He identifies J as chief source, with some of E and partly of P – referring to the conventional code names (‘Jahwist’, ‘Elohist’ and ‘Priestly source’ respectively) for the different source material out of which Biblical scholars, since Graf and Wellhausen in the late 19th century CE, have considered *Genesis* to have been compiled, with the further addition of some redactional material. The Dutch theologian Nelis, a mainstream Biblical scholar, identifies cues to date the Table of Nations:

‘Seba and Dedan are anarchonisms, for they emerged much later. Yet does not feature among the sons of Japheth which suggests that the author has no recollections anymore of the Hittite empire which collapsed c. 1200. Thus also the mention of Yavan, Tiras and the Philistines, Medes, Kimmertians and Scythians only appeared in the 8th-7th centuries; this suggests a date in the 7th century, and so, or even later, does the classification of the Lydians under Shem. Also the worldwide perspective in which the ancestors of Israel are at a par with those of other peoples is reminiscent of the Exilic period, a time when the Judeans, torn from their ancestral lands, began to project their religico-national traditions against a universal and universalist background.’ (Nelis

278 Also see Section 6.9 for details of this attribution.
1966-69a; my translation and my italics – WvB).

On the authority279 of Friedman 1988 and Soggin 1997: 174; see Section 5.8) we attribute parts of the text to three different source documents:

- source document R (mid-5th century BCE)
- source document P (late 7th century BCE)
- source document J (early 8th century BCE).

The attributions of both scholars largely agree; however, Friedman attributes the first part of verse 10:1 to a later editor, which makes the bulk of Genesis 10 (in fact all except for the first half of the first verse) date from around 600 BCE. Soggin (1997: 170) sees in the mention of ‘Aram’ except for the first half of the first verse) date from around 600 BCE. For Soggin (ibidem), other indications for a dating only shortly before the 6th century would lie in the possible identification of the non-Semitic name of Arpakhshad (one of Shem’s ‘sons’) with the ancestor (cf. Jubilees 9:4 ff.) of the ‘ūr kašdim and so of the Chaldaeans; as well as the possible association of Rehoboth-ir with Nineveh (Soggin 1997: 172; Sasson 1983). Soggin’s general verdict on the nature of the Table of Nations as a document:

‘Die Volkertafel ist etwas Einzigartiges in der Antike und stammt vielleicht, was die Herkunft der Materialien betrifft, aus einer sakralen Kosmologie oder Geographie, wie sie in einem Heiligtum überliefert wurde, von wo sie dann zu ‘P’ gelangte. Doch, wie schon gesehen, scheint die Urkunde nicht älter als das 7. Jh. zu sein, was freilich nicht ausschliesst, dass älteres Material darin enthalten ist: manches deutet nämlich auf Zustände aus der zweiten Hälfte des 2. Jt v. Chr.’

Nelis’ (1966-69a) line of argument on this specific point is difficult to follow. It is a moot point, and certainly not one of general scholarly consensus, whether Lud, ‘son’ of Shem, can be read as ‘Lydians’. And contrary to what Nelis suggests, there is not a reliable independent source outside the Table of Nations to fix a seventh-century BCE date for any putative linkage between Lydians and the peoples listed under Shem in the Table of Nations. Nonetheless, Nelis’ point on the post-Exilic nature of the universalist orientation of the Table of Nation appears to be well-taken.

Reviewing the extant scholarship, the authoritative recent study by Soggin 1997 also dates the redaction of the Table of Nations down to the 6th century, for what appear to be excellent reasons.

Parallel to the discussion of the historical nature of the Homeric epics, Biblical scholarship has extensively discussed the historicity of the Bible, especially of the historical books following the Pentateuch (Eissfeldt 1987b). Like for the Catalogue of Ships, also for the Table of Nations the question of historicity has been central in the scholarly discussions. With regard to the Table of Nations we see, *grosso modo*, the same pendulum swing movement that we have seen in connection with the Homeric Catalogue of Ships: after many centuries of attributing a literal truth to the ancient text, the nineteenth century CE saw almost total denial of any historicity and great emphasis on literary and mythical dimensions of the text; after which the pendulum swung back: the mid-twentieth century CE saw again great optimism in the historical rehabilitation of the message of Genesis,280 but now with rational, scientific methods – although rich and illuminating scholarship on the mythical dimensions of Genesis has continued to this day.281 The discovery of a name Paliga, similar to Peleg, along with a few other personal names and names of cities similar to those mentioned in Genesis 10-11, in the Mari tablets of Northern Mesopotamia in 1935, has been eagerly appropriated by Bible vindicationalists.282

Meanwhile, the prudence of professional Biblical scholars is building up greater immunity to such literalist temptations. Yet the belief in the Table of Nation’s historicity is not limited to amateurs and non-specialist clergy. Eissfeldt holds the view that in the Table of Nations283 we are dealing with

‘literary inventions and poetical symbolizations’ (Eissfeldt 1987a: 317),

but having said this, Eissfeldt is prepared to consider the possibility that these ‘literary inventions and poetical symbolizations’ may yet be valuable historical sources on peoples, although not on individuals. The leading Biblical

279 Cf. Speiser 1958, 1964; Mazar 1969 as their specific identification of Ninrood as Tukulti-Ninurta I.

280 Cf. Gaster 1969; Carroll 1983; Ginzberg 1928, 1988; as Slayman 1996 put it:

‘The real challenge for Biblical archaeologists today is not to search for long-lost cities, but to understand why the ancient Israelites formulated these powerful myths.’

281 E.g. Keller 1956; and more recently, many more such claims of a literal confirmation of Genesis 10 are to be found on the Internet.

282 On Genesis as literature, cf. Golka 1976 (aetologies); Dundes 1999 (as oral literature).
archaeologist of his generation, Albright (1955) calls the Table of Nations

‘an astonishingly accurate document.’

A modern observer would, in turn, be equally astonished to find accuracy being attributed to a document that contains nearly eighty proper names, the identification of nearly all of which has been, as we shall see (Table 6.15), the subject of heated scholarly controversy for centuries, even (if we take into account the Talmudic disagreements on such identifications, cf. Neubauer 1965 / 1868) millennia. The enormous and rapidly increasing literature on such identifications shows that such disputes go on unabatedly; they will form a central theme in this chapter – an illustration of my above claim that contradictions in our data are the chief growth points of our insight.

For the identification of the many names in the Table of Nations it is of course important to decide whether Genesis 10 should be considered

1. an integral part of the Bible as a long and coherent sacred text written or edited by identifiable historical actors whose conscious minds produced that consistency, or whether
2. Genesis 10 (much like what has been claimed for the Homeric Catalogue of Ships) may be considered an older text from unknown provenance, that happened to be incorporated in the Biblical canon without undergoing major editorial revisions.

If (1) were the case, one would expect intra-Biblical inter-textuality to throw much light on the specific names in the Table of Nations. In that case the geographical, political and ethnic contents of the Table of Nations would be largely contemporary to these historical actors, and would not be likely to contain any significant information on remotest history. This has been the standard view among Biblical scholars until well into the 20th century CE. But if (2) were the case, such intertextuality would have to be considered an unwarranted hypothesis imposed by scholarship, both ancient and modern, in the light of identifiable historical actors’ conscious deliberations. Under this second view, the Table of Nations would be an alien insertion into the Biblical text, largely independent from the conscious minds that composed and edited the rest of the Pentateuch, and may well contain fragments of very ancient reminiscences. The distinction made here is simplified. Identification of specific verses, in the Table of Nations, as J, P or R implies that the Table of Nations is a mix of older fragments and much later material.

In the present case study, we adopt position (2), as if this text existed in isolation and was not part of a much larger Biblical corpus of signification and interpretation. Although Biblical studies have often admitted the possibility that the Table of Nations was a ready document inserted into the overall Biblical texts, most interpretations of the specific onomastic material contained in Genesis 10 have been inspired by the appearance of the same or similar names elsewhere in the Bible, not so much in 1 Chronicles 1 (which is merely a duplication of Genesis 10), but in Ezekiel, Kings, etc. However, if the Table of Nations would indeed be an originally independent, pre-existing text, the appearance of the same names elsewhere in the Bible need not be a sign that these names, or all of these names, had a real-life tangible meaning for the ancient historical actors, corresponding with real places and peoples these actors were in contact with; such names appearing in other Bible books may, alternatively have been used in a purely literary fashion, deliberately chosen in emulation of the onomastic material contained in a received sacred text (the Table of Nations) with the sole purpose of linking up with that earlier text and its established authority. For instance, such a strategy is suggested by the repeated use, in the Bible, of the conventional formula ‘Gog and Magog’, along with the names of other (from the perspective of Palestine) northern peoples, to designate the collectivity of demonised enemies of Israel; such a usage is clearly nothing but a literary stratagem expressing ‘enmity’ and ‘moral depravity’, and does not in the least evoke specific historical moments of conflict between the Israelites and these Northern peoples.

Since our purpose in this chapter is to indicate theoretical and methodological themes, and not to find the empirical historical truth behind the Table of Nations, it is sufficient to point out the dilemma indicated in the heading of this sub-section, without trying to solve it.284

In our methodological analysis of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships and the Biblical Table of Nations we have decided to limit our discussion to the material that is explicitly presented in these two documents. However, with regard to the Table of Nations it is important that we realise what it does not contain: absent is any mention of some of the ethnic groups that must have been of prime importance to the ancient writers, including Israel, Ammon, Moab and Edom – ethnic groups to be discussed in other parts of Genesis. We owe this reminder to the eminent Dutch theo-

284 For an approach to the Table of Nations with considerable reliance on intra-Biblical inter-textuality, also cf. Pett n.d.
logian Beek, who rightly chides the imperfect literary form of Genesis 10, and also stresses – like many Biblical commentators have done – that the format of the Table of Nations is geographical, even political-geographic rather than ethnic, in the sense that broad geographic regions rather than detailed ethnic subdivisions are subsumed under the dendrogram (treelike) structure of the classification scheme merely posing as a family tree. Here we see once more the relevance of my earlier point as to the typical oscillation, in many ethnic discourses, between a more objective geographical idiom and a more ideologically-inspired kinship idiom.

Nelis denies that there is any report on prehistoric peoples in the Table of Nations:

‘Without doubt, the Table of Nations is not based on a tradition concerning an early phase in the spread of peoples over the earth; on the contrary, it is essentially a reflection of the contemporary situation, from which the writer departed in order to sketch an ethnographic picture that suited the context where he wished to insert his Table of Nations into his account of primal history, making use of recollections of a few older nations. Hence he could not mention, not only Israel, but also Moab, Ammon and Edom, whose origins would be related in later chapters of Genesis’ (Nelis 1966-69a: 1512; my translation).

### 6.3. An overview of the Table of Nations

Table 6.1 presents the textual contents of Genesis 10 according to generational level, while conjunctions (‘and’) and other details have been omitted. For convenience’s sake (I need to establish a text reference accessible to all my readers, many of whom will be at least as incompetent in Biblical Hebrew as I am), I largely follow the King James English translation, but checked against the Hebrew original, and where necessary altered so as to be brought closer to the latter. For easy reference I have numbered, in Table 6.1, all names of persons and collectivities by numbers between brackets, e.g. [3], [18], etc. I have distinguished the various generational levels in the genealogy by alternating Arabic and Roman numerals and by letters.

### 6.4. Understanding the Table of Nations as a text

#### 6.4.1. A unique text?

Beyond the obsession with identification of the many individual names in the Table of Nations, Biblical criticism of Genesis 10 has been interested in establishing the authorship, redaction process, and date of the Table of Nations, the literary genre to which it belongs, in understanding the details of its format, and in identifying the purpose for which it was written.

In the first place, we should appreciate the format of this text as displaying a very widespread Ancient Near Eastern rudimentary classification method through listing. Much of the Assyriological literature, regardless of whether we deal with economics, politics, religion or myth, consists of lists, and the Table of Nations must be seen within this familiar format.

For over two millennia, the traditional view was that Moses was the author of the five books of the Pentateuch, and hence also of the Table of Nations. In the mid-20th century CE, this was still the prevailing view among believers and even non-scholarly clergy in the Jewish and Christian faiths. As late as 1976, an authoritative standard work still suggested Moses as the likely author of the Table of Nations (Mitchell 1976a). Even today this view has not died out. Pett (n.d. [2004]) still shows the traditional tendency to see one historical actor, even Moses himself, as author of the Table of Nations:

‘It was just such knowledge as would be available to a man in Moses’ position in Egypt, although there are indications that at least part of it was composed earlier than Moses. See, for example, the mention of Sodom and Gomorrah as though they were still active cities.’ (Pett n.d. [2004])

Meanwhile this naïve view has given way to more sophisticated and less literalist approaches, seeing the final redaction as the result of a long editorial process in which many contemporary scholars participated during the Early and Middle Iron Age; this process was intensified and largely led to the form we know today, by the middle of

---

285 Beek 1975.
286 E.g. Soggin 1997: 167 f.
287 In the sense that named groups are clustered together because they fall under the same state power – hence Egypt, Libya, Canaan are all counted as sons of Cush: by the seventh century BCE, when the Table of the Nations received its final redaction, Egypt was ruled by a Nubian i.e. Ethiopian dynasty (a point made by Soggin 1997: 170).

(continued p. 129)
1. Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah [1], (…)
      i.  Gomer [3],
          1. Ashkenaz [4],
          2. Riphath [5],
          3. Togarma [6].
      ii.  Magog [7],
      iii.  Madai [8],
      iv.  Javan [9].
   b. Ham (Ḫašmon), [17]
      i.  Cush [18],
          1. Seba [19],
          2. Havila [20],
          3. Sabta [21],
          4. Rama [22],
          a. Sheba [23],
          b. Dedan [24].
      ii.  Sabtechah [25]
   c.  Nimrod [26] ‘he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the LORD: wherefore it is said, ‘Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the LORD.’ And the core area\textsuperscript{289} of his kingdom was
      a. Babel [27], and
      b. Erech [28], and
      c. Accad [29], and
      d. Calneh [30], in the land of
      e. Shinar [30a]. Out of that land went forth
      f. Asshur [31], and builded
      g. Nineveh [31a], and
      h. Rehoboth-ir [31b], and
      i. Calah [31c] and
      j. Resen [31d] between Nineveh and Calah: the same is a great city.’
      ii.  Mizraites [32],
          1. Ludites [33],
          2. Anamites [34],
          3. Lehabites [35],
          4. Naphthuhites [36],
          5. Pathrusites [37],
          6. Casluhites [38], out of which came
          a. Philistines [39],
          b. Caphtorites [40].
   d.  Put [41],
   e.  Canaan [42],
      1. Sidon [43] his first born,
      2. Heth [44],
      3. the Jebusite [45],
      4. the Amorite [46],
      5. the Girgasite [47],
      6. the Hivite [48],
      7. the Arkite [49],
      8. the Sinite [50],
      9. the Arvadite [51],
      10. the Semarite [52],
      11. the Hamathite [53]: and afterward were the families of the Canaanite [42] spread abroad. And the border of the Canaanite [42] was from Sidon [43], as thou comest to Gerar [53a], unto Gaza [53b]; as thou goest, unto Sodom [53c], and Gomorrah [53d], and Admah, [53e] and Seboim,[53f] even unto Lasha [53g]. These are the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations. Unto Shem (Š[e]m) also, the father of all the chil-

\textsuperscript{289} ‘Core area’: thus: Sogg in 1997: 166 after Skinner 1930.
c. Shem [54],
   i. Elam [55],
   ii. Asshur [31], and
   iii. Arpakhshad [56],
      1. Selah [57];
         a. Eber [58],
            i. Peleg ‘Division’ [59]; for in his days was the earth divided; and his brother’s name was
            ii. Joktan [60],
               1. Almodad [61],
               2. Sheleph [62],
               3. Hazarmaveth [63],
               4. Jerah [64],
               5. Hadoram [65],
               6. Uzal [66],
               7. Dikla [67],
               8. Obal [68],
               9. Abimael [69],
               10. Sheba [70],
               11. Ophir [71],
               12. Havila [72],
               13. Jobab [73]: all these were the sons of Joktan. And their dwelling was from Meša [73a], as thou goest unto Sephar [73b] a mount of the east. These are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their lands, after their nations.
   iv. Lud [74],
   v. Aram [75],
      1. Uz [76],
      2. Hul [77],
      3. Gether [78],
      4. Mash [79].

These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations fragmented in the earth after the Flood.

• For reasons explained in the text, I take Japheth to be the oldest son, and put Shem third.
• I deviate from the King James translation here to bring out the element of ‘distributing, dividing’, of which scattering is the logical implication, cf. the scattered islands = Sporades, of the Aegean.
• On the expression ‘the islands of the nations’, cf. Horowitz 1990. I deviate from the King James version here: of the two occurrences hagoyim and begoyihim in this sentence it translates the first as ‘Gentiles’, which I — and what is more — many specialist Biblical scholars today, consider anachronistic. In the theoretical sections above I have stressed the importance of such an emic ethnic term as goyim in the context of an analysis of ethnicity.
• The King James version suggests Ca płt[h]orites to belong to the ‘generation’ of the Caslukhites rather than of the Philistines.
• In the discussion of the sons of Ham, and elsewhere, in Noah’s genealogy, names of persons and of localities (countries, cities) have been mixed so as to bring out the fact that this is not strictly speaking a genealogy in the narrower sense, but a classification defining greater or lesser degrees of association or distance in the manner of a genealogy. However, at this point names of human collectivities (marked by –im in Hebrew, -ites in English) begin to be added to those of persons and localities.
• Concerning the descendants of Arpakhshad, Lud and Aram, the same irregularity occurs in the text as concerning the descendants of Shem, their alleged father: although the order in which Shem’s sons are first mentioned suggests Arpakhshad to be senior to Aram, still Aram’s descendants are enumerated before those of Arpakhshad. As we shall see, this may be taken as a sign of genealogical manipulation, and corroborates my idea that the descent line of Shem–Arpakhshad–Selah–Eber was originally that of non-kin grafted onto the general genealogy.

Table 6.1. The text of Genesis 10 tabulated in genealogical form, according to the generations

the first millennium BCE, and again in the Masoretic period of the 7th-10th century CE. Much Biblical scholarship has been invested in studying the redaction of Genesis.290

A general view is that the Table of Nations is quite unique in ancient literatures, and constitutes a genre on its own.291 Thus Pett (n.d.):


291 There were however parallels in Roman and Germanic history, e.g. Friedrich 1910; Holz 1894 – but as we have seen in the opening footnote to this Chapter, these may not have been totally independent from the Table of Nations. The Biblical format has been so widely available as a source of inspiration, so authoritative and
‘In many ways it is unique in the ancient world. Although lists of people and nations are known elsewhere, this was not a list of conquests. It was a deliberate attempt to reveal ‘a world view’. It demonstrated God’s concern for the whole world, and showed that Yahweh was God over all.’

Also for Albright (1955; cf. Custance 1975 / n.d.)

‘The tenth chapter of Genesis (…) stands absolutely alone in ancient literature, without a remote parallel, even among the Greeks, where we find the closest approach to a distribution of peoples in genealogical framework…’

The prominent though controversial Orientalist Cyrus Gordon (1959), in his rather superficial discussion of Genesis 10, echoes a common view of Biblical scholars when he pinpoints the genius of Hebrew Biblical historiography by contrasting the cosmogonies of other peoples of the Ancient Near East, with the ethnogony contained in this Biblical chapter. He has a point in that this extensive and detailed account of the world as known has no parallels in the literatures of the Ancient Near East. However, we shall see that representations of the world as a whole were not totally unknown in the Ancient Near East, and that the opposition between cosmology and ethnogony is rendered less acute when, in the course of this Chapter we shall recognise the cosmological elements which Genesis 10 does contain. For theologians the purpose of the Table of Nations is clear: to show how mankind constitutes a unity, and how this unity is led through sacred history by the guiding hand of the Judaeo-Christian God. The unicity of the Table of Nations would then directly derive from the Israelites’ unique conception of history as sacred history, which makes them, on the one hand, part of the world history of all peoples (as strongly brought out in Genesis 10), but, on the other hand, would set them apart from the other people as God’s unique chosen people (in other parts of Genesis and throughout the Bible).

Pett (n.d.) believes that the main purpose of the Table of Nations narrative was to account for ‘the differentiation of nations’ after the Flood,

‘and the assertion that they were all descended from Noah in one way or another. Further we cannot go. (…) However, one main message of this record is that the “world”, as known to the writer, descended from Noah, was originally of one language, but that as a result of their behaviour towards God and each other, they split up into many nations and languages.’

Later however Pett comes back to this point:

‘This remarkable chapter has demonstrated the growth of the nations from the families of Noah and his sons, simplifying a most complicated situation. Its concern is to demonstrate that all known nations are descended from Noah. At this stage there are no “chosen people”. All nations are the same before God. But the connecting narrative will demonstrate why they are now no longer satisfactory in God’s eyes leading on to his calling of one man, Abraham, to finally bring about a remedy for the needs and sins of the nations.’

Since the purpose of the Table of Nations lies in a remarkable ancient attempt at the explicit formulation of a system of world-wide classification of humankind, the Table of Nations has inevitably generated a considerable literature that emphasises the ethnic perspective. Pett’s point about the Table of Nations as, more or less, an etiological narrative ‘explaining’ the diversity of human nations, reminds us of the existence of an extensive literature invoking Genesis 10 for purposes of the justification, or denouncement as the case may be, of ethnic, racial, or national segregation. Little wonder this Bible chapter was heatedly debated in South Africa during the installation of apartheid in the late 1940s, and again during its abolition from the 1980s onward.

Of course, discussing the Table of Nations as a Biblical injunction in favour or against certain forms of latter-day ethnicity, is something very different from understanding the Table of Nations as a contemporary statement on the ethnic structure of the Ancient Near East in the Iron Age or Late Bronze Age. This aspect, crucial within the context of the present book, I will discuss in Section 6.8.

294 Genesis 11:1 In a way, there is a connection here with our discussion of *Borean in Chapter 4 – but we must be very careful less we ourself yield to the temptation of ‘the original, one language’ as a scientific myth which was inspired by Genesis in the first place! See below.


6.4.2. Noah and *Borean – The one language of the Table of Nations against the background of long-range linguistics

However, the wider scholarly and societal appropriation of the Table of Nations has not been limited to ethnic issues. The Table of Nations purports to be a sacred text dealing with the common ancestry of all of mankind after the Flood, and hence with remotest history; inevitably, therefore, the Table of Nations has for several millennia been the point of departure for idiosyncratic, essentialising attempts to reconstruct early human history, usually in a form so as to suit the author’s cultural, religious, ethnic and racial stereotyes.

For those who wish to take Genesis 10 literally as an account of humankind’s oldest history, an interesting difficulty arises. One of the implications of the confusion of the tongues and the dispersion of nations297 after the Flood, is that before the Flood humankind was supposed to have spoken one common tongue (Genesis 11:1, where that situation endures even till the post-Flood construction of Nimrod’s Tower of Babel). In the absence of written records, we have no direct evidence of such a long-extinct language, and there is no prima facie reason to assume a monogenetic origin of all human languages. In the course of the last two centuries the antiquity attributed by specialists to articulate language has increased from the few thousand years implied in the Biblical record to tens even hundreds of thousands of years. With the idea of Anatomically Modern Humans emerging in Africa c. 200 ka BP and spreading outside Africa from 80 ka BP on, a general consensus has been established that articulate speech, with full capacities of symbolisation and logical operation, is the hallmark of this variety of humanoids, to which we ourselves belong. Even if language beginnings may have been heterogeneous in other words polygenetic, there is increasing consensus among comparative linguists that a Mother Tongue of human languages may be reconstructed by application of the same laws of historical linguistics that allowed us, for instance, to trace the ramification of Indo-European languages. These reconstructions situate the emergence of articulated language in the Middle, even Lower Palaeolithic. Since we have to reckon with the past existence of innumerable languages that have left no recognisable traces in historical times, the reconstruction of such a Mother Tongue is almost impossible. Rather unex-

pectedly, however, a much more recent language reconstruction seems to fit the Noahic bill remarkably well: after more partial reconstructions of such linguistic macro-families as Eurasian / Nostratic, Austro, etc. in the early to middle 20th century CE, the next step was to reconstruct a parent language (now designated *Borean), from which these macro-families could be argued to descend. So regardless of whatever previous, now irretrievably extinct languages may have existed, c. 25 ka BP a highly successful language explosion took place, eclipsing or absorbing most or all pre-existing languages, and becoming the basis for most language proliferation worldwide in subsequent periods. *Borean is the putative one language from which (nearly) all languages descend that have been attested in protohistorical and historical times. This also allows us a tentative situation in time and space: probably, *Borean was spoken c. 25 ka BP in Central Asia.

Against this background the claim of one language being spoken in the mythical time to which Genesis 10 refers, should perhaps be taken seriously as a scrap of genuine historical recollection across the millennia, harking back to the Upper Palaeolithic in Central Asia. Such an identification does not come as a surprise; the apparently Nordic / Hyperborean, lowly pigmented, even albino nature of Noah has been a persistent tradition in Christianity and Islam, while especially Islamic traditions have regarded Japheth not only as a prophet but particularly as the apical ancestor of all Asian peoples, from the Near East to China.298 This means that, whatever the perspective that is unfolded in the Table of Nations upon ethnic relations and conditions in the Eastern Mediterranean and extensive surroundings in a period ranging from the Early to Middle Iron Age (when the Table of Nations received its final redaction) to the Middle to Late Bronze Age (to which the text of the Table is implied to refer), in fact this regional ethnic expression was moulded using linguistic and cosmological material from thousands of kilometres away (Cen-


298 Cf. Leslie 1984; Fu Xi, who around the beginning of the Common Era was paired with the Flood heroine Nü Wa (cf. the assonance with the name Noah!) appears in the Chinese classic Shu-ching (Legge 1861-65: vol. III, as Shoo king) as a post-Flood culture hero who orders the waters, saves the animals, etc. – in many respects an East Asian version of Noah. Bouvet, one of the first French Jesuits to live in China, equated Fu Xi with Hermes Trismegistus, Zoroaster, or Enoch – an insightful claim which was however rejected by Leibniz (cf. Cook & Rosemont 1984: 98; Walker 1972). Another 17th-century Jesuit, Kircher, proposed that the Chinese civilisation derived from Egypt, which perhaps, in view of the Pelasgian cross-model to be presented in Chapter 28, has a point, even though it is admittedly a grossly one-sided over-statement.
tral Asia), more than twenty millennia old, and from a world in which Hebrew, or Afroasiatic for that matter, had not yet dissociated itself from the parent *Borean. In other words, if the Table of Nations is to be considered a statement on ethnicity, it is certainly also a statement on myth and on the very remote past, in ways that ideally should be disentangled from the contemporary ethnicity contents before the latter can be scrutinised in the context of a study of ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean.

A linguistic perspective also offers us an example of the possible fragments of objective historical information, remote memories of processes and events in the very distant past that the Table of Nations may contain without its authors being aware of the fact. This is the division between Japheth and Ham, which remarkably coincides with that between the Indo-European and the Afroasiatic linguistic macrophyla, as branches of Nostratic. Shem’s irregular and apparently manipulated position as a third category of its own, underneath of which Ham is suggested to be his original ancestor, could even be said to articulate the Semitic branch’s membership of the Afroasiatic macrophylum. Modern historical linguists tend to situate the Afroasiatic (including the Semitic) homeland in northeastern Africa, although there is also much to be said for the Natufian Hypothesis, advocating the Afroasiatic homeland in the Natufian Mesolithic culture of the Levant. But whatever the ultimate solution on this point, we cannot deny the existence of a measure of convergence between modern long-range linguists and the Table of Nations, although this is no case of independent parallel knowledge formation for, of course, comparative linguists are very much aware of Biblical Hebrew – the Table of Nations is in a way the ideological charter constituting the linguistic family of Semitic.

This also suggests a possible *Borean etymological background, rather than a Hebrew background, especially for the more comprehensive onomastic elements in the Table of Nations, those not referring to concrete localities and populations known from everyday experience in the Early to Middle Iron Age, but to what is presented as the primal subdivisions of humankind: Noah, Japheth, Ham and Shem – the tripartition on which the Table of Nations hinges as a genealogy.

6.4.3. Do the proper names in the Table of Nations have a meaning based on their alleged Semitic / Hebrew etymology?

Christian literature through the centuries has excelled in pious interpretations of the Table of Nations, and in identifying the various ancestral branches with latterday nations, ethnic groups, and so-called races. In the light of such un-systematic and unscholarly manipulation of fragments of mythical and possibly historical information gleaned from the Bible, the modern scholar’s safest option seems to be to refrain from any attempt to make history out of Genesis 10, even though this would mean sacrificing one of the most tantalising, and potentially rich, protohistorical sources for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean.

Our challenge is to try and avoid throwing away the baby with the bathing-water, and create a theoretical and methodological framework that allows us to argue for the extraction of such elements of remote history as the Table of Nations may contain.

The purpose of describing the nations of the world in great detail and in their mutual connections, is not to offer a Baedeker-like guidebook for travellers or conquerors, but to render the world meaningful by the local, emic, standards of the times. Finding itself between two centres of ancient civilisation and statal power, Egypt and Mesopotamia (with the Ḫatti / Hittite empire just over the horizon), it is to be expected that from these centres considerable influence has been exerted on the format and contents of Genesis, including the Table of Nations. Most of the specific scholarly identifications of the onomastic material there (see Table 6.15) explore possible links with Mesopotamia. The Egyptological dimensions is less prominent in the literature but exists nevertheless.

As Biblical scholars have recognised already in the nineteenth century, it would be a grave mistake to consider such a genealogical charter as the Table of Nations as an objective historical statement, and to investigate its literal credibility in detail. Such a genealogical charter is not a declaration of fact, but a socio-political statement about the social space within which the authors of the Table of Nations found themselves. And it is precisely in this latter sense that the study of the Table of Nations is worth our while and lends insight into ethnicity – even though it does not lend insight into the actual life span and reproductive achievements of the legendary figures peopling the first

299 However, such safety may well amount to throwing away the baby with the bathing-water; Karst (1931a, 1931b) has offered an inspiring, although obsolete and in details tantalizingly intuitive, approach to the many trouble cases in Genesis 10, see my discussion in van Binsbergen 2011d.

300 For an Egyptological perspective on Genesis, especially its cosmology, cf. Currid 1991; Notter 1974. Over the years, especially the work of Manfred Görg has attempted to highlight the Egyptian dimension of the Bible world.
books of the Bible.

One common line of argument that seeks to endow the Table of Nations with more interpretable information than it appears to contain at first sight, is to dwell on the meaning of the many names it contains.

Most proper names in present-day North Atlantic practice are meaningless empty labels whose only function is the semantically empty, ‘nominal’ designation of one particular human individual, group, or geographical feature. Through the centuries, scholars and lay people have been tempted to read meanings in names – on the basis of the plausible idea that even if proper names have no meaning in the context where they have ended up and are attested, they once may have had a well-defined meaning in the linguistic context in which they originally came into being.

Here the question arises: what, then, was the linguistic context to which such putative meaning can be argued to have belonged? Since the Table of Nations is part of the Hebrew Bible, our first hypothesis would be to identify that context as Hebrew. Indeed, proposing Hebrew etymologies for the names in the Table of Nations has been a scholarly industry ever since Genesis 10 received its redaction, and even in that text itself an example of such etymologising is present (Genesis 10:25):

‘the name of the one was Peleg; for in his days was the earth divided’.

The name Peleg is explained by reference to the primary root pālag, ‘to split, to divide’, which applies both to the seismic movements of the earth (hence peleg also means ‘earthquake’), as to the domestication of the earth through irrigation channels. Against the background of the progression of early humankind through various modes of production, it is tempting to associate this punning on Peleg with irrigated agriculture in a neatly parcelled up domesticated landscape such as was initiated in the Neolithic (cf. Renfrew 1973 / 1976; Sherratt 1990) and existed in Bronze Age Mesopotamia and Egypt. However, the seismic interpretation cannot be dismissed so readily, either, considering that the wider context of Genesis 10 is that of a Flood story, and that seismic and volcanic phenomena – including the theme of victims turning to stone – are often treated in Flood stories worldwide (think of the account of Sodom and Gomorrah, which is a Flood story recast in volcanic form, including the post-Flood resort to father-daughter incest in order to restore the world population – all other possible partners towards repopulation having been killed in the cataclysm).

Peleg is an example of a name where the phonological and semantic fit with Hebrew is excellent, but whereas there are numerous listings of proposed Hebrew etymologies of all names in the Table of Nations, in most cases either the phonology is defective and / or the semantics is irrelevant or nonsensical. That there is such a convincing etymological fit in Peleg’s case can be explained on the basis of my hypothesis, argued below on the basis of the formal characteristics of Near Eastern genealogies, that the Shem people constitute a junior and perhaps foreign element which only through genealogical manipulation has managed to insert their apical ancestor Shem into the presumably pre-existing Table of Nations; until then he may have had a Eurasianic, more specifically perhaps Uralic signature. Through this putative act of genealogical manipulation, Shem became the fictive ‘brother’ of the two more original ‘brothers’, Japheth and Ham. Presumably the Table of Nations was a much older text (possibly written, more probably only oral). Considering that the uppermost generations in the genealogy it presents are supposed to have lived at the mythical times when all of humankind still spoke one tongue, there is no reason to assume that that language was Hebrew. In fact, the reference to one common tongue may be one of the few truly historical elements contained in the Table of Nations, but we need an extensive detour through state-of-the-art comparative and historical linguistics before this point can be appreciated.

Approaches based on the meaning of the names in the Table of Nations usually take a different perspective: they assume, without good reason, that the names are Hebrew and may be illuminated by exploring their Hebrew etymologies. Such fanciful etymologies, specimens of which have been brought together in Table 6.2, are a recurrent feature of the listings in standard Bible encyclopaedias of

302 The Urheimat of Uralic has been proposed to be due West of Lake Baikal (Fortescue 1998), which however after the rise of spoked-chariot technology in Central Asia c. 2000 BCE was only a few weeks’ travelling away from the Mediterranean – or from the Pacific Ocean, for that matter. On possibly Uralic connotations of Egyptian religion and kingship, see Section 4.5. See Chapter 28 on the relevance of chariot technology as a likely part explanation of the stupendous cultural distribution referred to by the cross-model, bringing out demonstrable continuities in Western and Northern Europe, the Eurasian Steppe with extensions to South, South East and East Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa – presumably from an epicentre in Neolithic West Asia with early extensions into the Mediterranean.

301 A likely model on which Eurasian mythological traditions, discursive writers in Graeco-Roman Antiquity, and modern archaeology, show some measure of agreement.
an earlier vintage.\textsuperscript{303} In the Talmudic traditions, the proper names of \textit{Genesis} 10 have received identifications that often differ from those in the Christian Biblical scholarship; cf. Neubauer 1965 / 1868. It is interesting to compare the proper names with those listed in contemporary Egyptian documents (cf. Ahituv 1984), which throws in relief both the extensive Egyptian knowledge of Canaanite etymology at the time, and the lack of overlap with \textit{Genesis} 10 – as in further corroboration of the latter’s mainly mythical nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number in Table 6.1</th>
<th>Proposed Meaning on the (contentious) Assumption that the Name is Purely Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>[01]</td>
<td>uncertain, but often read as: ‘rest, resting place’; ‘comfort’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japheth</td>
<td>[02]</td>
<td>cf. \textit{Genesis} 9:27, which contains a pun on \textit{saphah}, ‘to open, to be or make roomy, to be or make simple, to delude in a sinister way, to allure, to deceive, to enlarge, to entice, to flutter, to persuade; to be silly’ (Strong no. 6601); also: ‘extended’; there is a similar word \textit{suphah}, ‘beautiful’ (Strong no. 3302), but that lacks the final -t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomer</td>
<td>[03]</td>
<td>‘completion’ (Douglas 1976); cf. \textit{gorna}, ‘charcoal; consumption or digestion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashkenaz</td>
<td>[04]</td>
<td>painted with fire, fire-red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riphat</td>
<td>[05]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togarma</td>
<td>[06]</td>
<td>made of bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magog</td>
<td>[07]</td>
<td>of the roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madai</td>
<td>[08]</td>
<td>Medes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javan</td>
<td>[09]</td>
<td>eHervescing; dirt (in relation to Japheth’s son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elishah</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>God’s blessing; \textit{Ezekiel} 27:7 speaks of the Elishah Islands, which according to Heubner (1866) must probably be situated in the Aegean – which offers a link with our first case study (Chapter 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarshish</td>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>searcher for marble; the meanings ‘Cilician capital’ and ‘Tartessos in Spain’ have been reserved for other Biblical contexts than \textit{Genesis} 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittim, Kinite</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodanites</td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>friend of sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubal</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>worldly, [owner] of the entire world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshech</td>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>one who bends a bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiras</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>destroyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>hot, warm; Douglas 1976: 500; etymology uncertain; hot, burnt, black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>black, e.g. \textit{yyn kuši}, ‘black wine’ (\textit{Babylonian Talmud, Baba bathra} 97b; Neubauer 1965: 410, n. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seba</td>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>one who rages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saba</td>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>one who crosses, transites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raḵima</td>
<td>[22]</td>
<td>[in regard to other Biblical contexts, Rama is declared to mean ‘bright, heights’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sab</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>oath-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedan</td>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>dear child; one is tempted to make a connection with Egyptian \textit{Dhwn} and \textit{Aegean Dodona}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabtechah</td>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td>[26]</td>
<td>‘let us rebel!’; ‘subduer of the leopard (\textit{numur})’; adversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babel</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>confusion; (narrowly using the Biblical narrative of \textit{Genesis} 1) and popular etymological punning on \textit{bab} ‘to mix’, in order to explain the place name, and ignoring the obvious Babylonian etymology \textit{bab} \textit{idini}, ‘Gate of Gods’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezch</td>
<td>[28]</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accad</td>
<td>[29]</td>
<td>to strengthen?; fortress?; bucket, pitcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calneh</td>
<td>[30]</td>
<td>perfect hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinar</td>
<td>[31]</td>
<td>a hated enemy (in general the element \textit{sīn}; cf. \textit{Sinarc, Sinite, Sinai}) appears to mean ‘thorn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur</td>
<td>[32]</td>
<td>successful, white or burning fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>[33]</td>
<td>‘Ninus’ home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboth-ir</td>
<td>[34]</td>
<td>width, wide space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calah</td>
<td>[35]</td>
<td>‘old city’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizraim</td>
<td>[36]</td>
<td>the two Egyptians (Upper and Lower); recalcitrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludim, LIDADES</td>
<td>[37]</td>
<td>born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anamites</td>
<td>[38]</td>
<td>sources, singing of the waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehahim, Lehabites</td>
<td>[39]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphthim, Naphtahites</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathrusim, Pathrustes</td>
<td>[41]</td>
<td>sprinkled (or forced open) pubis or shame\textsuperscript{304}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casluhnites</td>
<td>[42]</td>
<td>one who hides the adversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistim, Philistines</td>
<td>[43]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{303} E.g. Cheyne & Black 1899-1903; Orr 1915; Fallsow 1910; Riehm n.d. [ca. 1900 ]; Hastings c.x. 1898, 1909.

\textsuperscript{304} Apparently another \textit{pria}, \textit{prg} word, of the ‘sprinkle, scatter’ semantic cluster; see Section 29.4.2, below.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>[43]</td>
<td>of resin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heth</td>
<td>[44]</td>
<td>intimidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jebusites</td>
<td>[45]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorites</td>
<td>[46]</td>
<td>one who speaks against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girgaseite</td>
<td>[47]</td>
<td>evictors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hivite</td>
<td>[48]</td>
<td>lively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkites</td>
<td>[49]</td>
<td>my arteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinite</td>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>(in general the element sin- (cf. Sinear, Sinite, Sinai) appears to mean 'thorn')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvadites</td>
<td>[53b]</td>
<td>strong lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaria, Semarite</td>
<td>[52]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamathites</td>
<td>[53]</td>
<td>wrath, heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerar</td>
<td>[53a]</td>
<td>pilgrimage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gara</td>
<td>[53b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodom</td>
<td>[53c]</td>
<td>secret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosorra</td>
<td>[53d]</td>
<td>with many sheaves of grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admah</td>
<td>[53e]</td>
<td>['Adam = red, blood-coloured; Admah is not specifically entered but could be a metathesis of Adam']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seboim / Sebostes?</td>
<td>[53f]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasha</td>
<td>[53g]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem</td>
<td>[54]</td>
<td>name; Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam</td>
<td>[55]</td>
<td>hidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpahshad</td>
<td>[56]</td>
<td>beautiful divineer, Chaldean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selah</td>
<td>[57]</td>
<td>Van der Born 1966-69: 1305: meaning unknown [in other Biblical contexts said to mean either 'peaceful' or 'rock']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eber</td>
<td>[58]</td>
<td>'yonder', 'he who passes over' (often interpreted as living 'across the Euphrates', i.e. in Mesopotamia); arrangement, drove, muster; Transition, one who travels through. On the grounds of an Akkadian parallel, Albright 1955 claims Heber to mean 'beer house', which is interesting for a descendant from the alcoholic Noah; however, Heber and Eber are not identical; cf. Gensser 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleg</td>
<td>[59]</td>
<td>rill (small water channel); 'division'; earthquake ('= separation', namely of the soil); One who distributes; Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joktan</td>
<td>[60]</td>
<td>he will be made little; –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almodad</td>
<td>[61]</td>
<td>he will not measure out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelph</td>
<td>[62]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazarnaveth</td>
<td>[63]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerah</td>
<td>[64]</td>
<td>moon, month (Douglas 1976: 605); –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadoron</td>
<td>[65]</td>
<td>their jewel or praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzal</td>
<td>[66]</td>
<td>migrant, peregrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikla</td>
<td>[67]</td>
<td>palm tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obal</td>
<td>[68]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimael</td>
<td>[69]</td>
<td>father of Maél, perhaps an Arab tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimael</td>
<td>[69]</td>
<td>a father from God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Even though most Biblical scholars appear to be unwilling to resign themselves to an astrological, etymological or mythical reading of Genesis 10, it is important to realise that, much in line with my remarks in the introductory Chapters, any attempt to present an overall ethnic classification system is basically the formulation of a

\textsuperscript{305} Sources: as in two footnotes up; moreover: Heubner 1866 Strong 1989; Douglas 1976; Fichtner 1956. Not all the information from these encyclopaedic sources could be accommodated in the table, but the general idea is clear.

\textsuperscript{306} Further on Eber: Biblical scholars have often tended to the view that Eber is an entirely artificial patronym, merely invented to create an eponymic apical ancestor for the Hebrews (cf. Apiru, Hapiru, which ethnonym would then originally derive not from a patronym but from some unknown other source). The Hebrew etymology of the name Eber ('yonder, across; arrangement, drove, muster') is not very helpful here, although the suggestion has been made that Eber came from 'across the river', notably the Euphrates. There is a superficial sound correspondence with the Hebrew and Ancient Egyptian word ibr, 'stallion' which also has a cognate in Ugaritic (cf. Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Afroasiatic etymologies’) but that word – whose symbolism could be full of meaning – has a different initial vowel. Also cf. Gordon 1959 n. 3 on the difference between the Hebrew ibrim, ‘descendants of Eber’, and the Mesopotamian Apiru / Hapiru / Špiru. It would be possible to explore the parallels, if any, between the name Eber and the Ancient Egyptian Aby, ‘leopard’, of which the name Eber could very well be a metathesis considering that the enclitic particle ꝏ, in Ancient Egyptian represents the sounds ‘a’, ‘al’ or ‘ar’. However, most probably we are dealing, in Apiru / Hapiru / Šspiru, with another prd / prg word, in that case meaning ‘those who live scattered, in dispersal, in diaspora’; cf. previous footnote but one, and Section 29.4.2, below.)
worldview and implies a fundamental cosmology. Like the Catalogue of Ships in Edzard Visser’s conception, also the Table of Nations is primarily a literary form joining geography to myth, with myth taking precedence. Any literalist reading of the Table of Nations as a contemporary historical source will be thwarted by this insight. If we want to make history (including ethnic history) out of the Table of Nations, it is to be done the hard way, not by a literalist reading (as can still be found up to this day in pious, fundamentalist Christian tracts, for which the Internet is now a welcome home) but by a methodical, yet essentially conjunctural, decoding of myth.

For that purpose perhaps another line of approach may prove useful: that of the Table of Nations as a genealogy, offering an apparently ethnic classification. But before we can turn to that topic in Section 6.6, it is important that we take an extensive, long-range look at Noah and his sons as mythical characters.

6.5. A long-range look at Noah and his sons as mythical characters

The text of Genesis 10 on the surface deals with the putative descendants of Noah; therefore an argued understanding of the nature and function of Noah is of the greatest importance as a basis for historical criticism of the Genesis 10 text, and as a stepping-stone towards any interpretation in terms of ethnicity. In several ways the mythological character of Noah, from the scriptural tradition of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, plays a pivotal role in the present argument; this will be discussed under the following headings:

1. Noah as a White God;
2. Noah as a Flood Hero;
3. Noah and his sons: Recursion against dialectics, binary opposition against triads;
4. Noah as exemplifying long-range connections.

In this section I will deal with these four topics one by one, showing that there are overwhelming reasons to consider Noah and his alleged three sons as entirely mythical and reflecting long-range connections that essentially go back to the Upper Palaeolithic – and that therefore any interpretation in terms of the concrete socio-political arrangements prevailing in Palestine during the Iron Age or Late Bronze Age, would be naïve and unscholarly.

6.5.1. Noah as a White God

In the first place, Noah exemplifies the widespread mythological figure of the White God of Creation or Second Creation. We will have to dwell on this point at some length because one of the very few scraps of information we have on the historical Sea Peoples of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean is that their vessels had the shape of aquatic fowls, hence seem to follow an iconographic convention that, throughout the Old World, is associated with such White Gods of Creation or Second Creation.

Using multivariate statistical contents analysis, and following in the long and rich scholarly tradition of the analysis of Flood myths (cf. Frazer 1918; Dundes 1988), I have recently undertaken (cf. van Binsbergen, with Isaak, 2008) an analysis of the hundreds of Flood myths that have been recorded worldwide (cf. Isaak 2006). Here the Noah figure is thrown in illuminating comparative relief

- as a primal White God, whose name probably has an *Borean etymology,
- as a Flood hero among others, and
- as the protagonist in an elaborate type of Flood story, ‘the male Flood hero in his Ark, as an Ally of the Supreme God’, which, while found all over West and South Asia, East Asia, South East Asia, parts of Africa, and even the Americas, yet (as painstaking statistical analysis indicates) probably originates in proto-Neolithic West Asia, with perhaps some admixture of motifs from the New World.307

I was struck by a number of unexpected recurrences, which suggested an underlying pattern of very wide transcontinental distribution, and therefore considerable antiquity. If the Flood essentially amounts to the annihilation of cosmic order in an Upper Palaeolithic worldview hinging on the Separation of Land and Water, then the Flood hero is associated with Second Cosmogony, and may well function as a Creator tout court. What I found in an amazingly large number of traditions from all over Eurasia, North and Central America (but not Australia, despite one New Guinea case) is evidence (often oblique, covered under layers of later and more dominant cosmogonies; sometimes only by implication), of the figure of a god who is claimed

307 Nor does this listing quite exhaust the transcultural resonances of the name Noah / Nu[ŋ]. For the point of view of Ancient Egypt (neighbour, reference culture, and often political overlord of the Ancient Israelites), the name might be understood as Nu[n] / Nu[ŋ] Ap – ‘the horizon of the Primal Waters / of Heaven [i.e. the primal waters above]. Surely, a mythical character that survives the Flood (as Primal Waters) and thus features as the latter’s boundary condition, could aptly be named thus. We shall come back to this possibility below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. no.</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>ethnic group / location</th>
<th>source</th>
<th>remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bumba</td>
<td>Bushong, Congo</td>
<td>van der Sluijs n.d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mme Aikuwa*</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Duchesne 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Digitara</td>
<td>Dogon, Mali</td>
<td>Gézaalé &amp; Dieterlen 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ancestral pair</td>
<td>Herero, South West Africa</td>
<td>van der Sluijs n.d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chihamba</td>
<td>Ndembu, Zambia</td>
<td>Turner 1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gun / Kun</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Allen 1984-95: ch. 2; Jons 1980: 184; Barel 1993: 79 f.</td>
<td>tamed the primal waters as a white horse (<em>&lt; <em>g</em>jVn-, cf. Janas, Ganesha?</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Viracocha</td>
<td>Inca, South America</td>
<td>Willis 1994: 254 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Old White man</td>
<td>Mongols, Central Asia</td>
<td>Willis 1994: 108</td>
<td>once a shamanistic god ruling heaven and earth; he was converted by Buddha, and on that occasion his magic wand became his walking stick = celestial pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>Judiasm, Christianity</td>
<td>Book of Enoch (Charles 1977?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Janus / Bassoja</td>
<td>Italic peninsula, Liguria, Northern Italian peninsula</td>
<td>Karst 1931a</td>
<td>associations with sun and white aquatic bird (cf. Gun? see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Poseidon</td>
<td>Aegert</td>
<td>Willis 1994: 230</td>
<td>the fateful horse he sent Minos was white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hayagriva</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Dallapiccola 2002</td>
<td>white giant horse god in Hinduism; avatar of Vishnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Geb, the Great Cackler</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Bonnet 1952 / 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ino / Leukothea</td>
<td>Aegert / Phoenicia</td>
<td>Europides, Medea 1284 ff.; Apollonius, Bibliotheica 1, 9, 11, 3, 4, 3; Ovid, Metamorphoses IV, 506-542; Farrell 1916; Meyer 1928b: 120 f.; Graves 1988</td>
<td>Ino (Leukothea / White Goddess, the mother’s sister of Dionysus) was stricken with madness by Hera and put her infant Melikartes into a seething cauldron – a story for which Cochrane (n.d.: 130) claims worldwide cognates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tumaderere</td>
<td>Wagawayo, Papua</td>
<td>Cotterell 1989: 206</td>
<td>white-skinned smooth-haired death god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Shiva</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Nivedita 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Reyers 1971</td>
<td>there is also a green version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cær</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>MacCulloch 1916</td>
<td>daughter of the Daghhia; took the shape of a beautiful white swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yël = ‘Raven’</td>
<td>Haida, Kwakunitl and Tsimshian</td>
<td>Boas 1918; Clark 1953</td>
<td>trickster god, changed himself into a snow-white bird, and as a snow-white bird he pleased Grey Eagle’s daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>White Body, god of this world</td>
<td>Navaho, North America</td>
<td>Matthews 1897</td>
<td>but this is only one among four gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>White Elder Brother</td>
<td>Hopi, North America</td>
<td>Stockbauer n.d.</td>
<td>Native Americans have been waiting his return for a long time; related to Ghost Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Asoyistan</td>
<td>Blackfoot, North America</td>
<td>Wassler &amp; Devall 1908</td>
<td>God of Snow and Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>White Painted Woman</td>
<td>Apache, North America</td>
<td>Fairer 1987</td>
<td>she is the creator spirit which every female novice impersonates at puberty rites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bielebog</td>
<td>Slavic speaking peoples</td>
<td>Machal 1916</td>
<td>Slavic god of happiness; order, and luck; often claimed to be an invention of mythologists, but the correspondence with other white gods is too close to support such a claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gwydion</td>
<td>Welsh realm</td>
<td>Arnot MacCulloch 1916</td>
<td>Welsh druid of the mainland gods; wizard and bard of North Wales, Prince of the Powers of Air; a shape-shifter. His symbol was a white horse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Qetralquati</td>
<td>Aztecs, Central America</td>
<td>Prescott 1843</td>
<td>white man, wearing a long beard, who came from the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Baldur</td>
<td>Germans, North-western Europe</td>
<td>Grimm 1997</td>
<td>associated with a foal, likened to Christ, radiant white colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cardea</td>
<td>Italic peninsula</td>
<td>Eisenbut 1979b</td>
<td>called ‘the white one’; associated with the horned, mistress of Janus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cerridwen</td>
<td>Celtic realm</td>
<td>Arnot MacCulloch 1916</td>
<td>Her name refers to the colour white and is connected to a Celtic legend related to ‘the White One’, a mythical sow. Some also believe her name means ‘White Grain’. This leads many to think she was a moon goddess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Heimdal</td>
<td>Germanic peoples, North-western Europe</td>
<td>Guerber n.d</td>
<td>called the White God, perhaps because (Dumézil) he is likened with a ram or with white waves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Michabo</td>
<td>Algonkians, North America</td>
<td>Fiske 1902</td>
<td>sun god, whose name means ‘Great Hare’ or ‘the Great White One’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Phoibos Lykegenes / Apollo / Lykaon</td>
<td>Aegert</td>
<td>Fiske 1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nankuwa</td>
<td>Nkoya, Zambia</td>
<td>van Binsbergen 1992a</td>
<td>‘Mother of Whiteness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>Ezell 1993</td>
<td>identified with Apocalyptic rider on white horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>White Crown hed-jer</td>
<td>Upper Egypt</td>
<td>Helck et al. 1975-86</td>
<td>dubutiful: venerated like a god but not supreme nor creator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3. Global attestations of the White God of Cosmogony or Second Cosmogony
to be White, or at least with the low skin pigmentation which today is typical of the inhabitants of, or originating from, Northern Eurasia. Often this god is claimed to be gigantic – so much so that many mythical giants (such as Chinese 盘古, P’an Ku, and Nordic European Ymir) may often be suspected to be dethroned i.e. supplanted White Gods in disguise. Sometimes solar or lunar connotations may accrue to the figure of the White God, but these are not decisive. Equally often, there are associations with horses (typically white), aquatic birds (typically white), and the sea. The latter of course is eminently appropriate for Flood heroes, but the data suggest that it is the association with the cosmogonic Primal Waters (those above, i.e. the sky as a source of rain; those aside, on the horizontal plane, i.e. the sea; and those below, i.e. the underworld, thought of as an immense underground water mass, with which in the Ancient Near East and Egypt the names of Apsu and Aopis were associated), as much as with the post-creational Flood, which characterises this widespread and immensely important category of ancient gods: they are, essentially, dethroned Supreme Creators. They are also, in Dumézil’s terms, ‘First Gods’ – although his reference was only to the Indo-European realm.

I will now specify and reference the data set, and map out the transcontinental distribution of such White Gods, in order to elucidate the wide category to which Noah belongs.

### 6.5.2. Noah as a Flood hero

In the second place, although Noah may originally have been a disguised White God of Creation or Second Creation, in Genesis we encounter him primarily as a Flood hero, under the tutelage of / in alliance with the Su-
 supreme God\textsuperscript{311} of heavens, whose faithful servant he is. It has been long recognised that this aspect of Noah owes much to the Flood stories that have circulated in Ancient Mesopotamia since the Neolithic. The discussion of Mesopotamian / Biblical parallels has been a major scholarly industry ever since the beginnings of Assyriology, and especially the Flood myths have received much attention in this connection.

Utnapishtim, Ziusudra, Atarkhâsîs, as Flood heroes, are Mesopotamian counterparts of Noah, attested in writing over a millennium before \textit{Genesis} received its redaction in the 6th century BCE.\textsuperscript{312} Because of their virtual ubiquity and their Biblical interest, Flood myths (cf. Frazer 1918), whilst already a focus of attention for the early Medieval Fathers of the [Christian] Church, have been a central point of attention of comparative mythology at least since Early Modern times. In order to create a hermeneutical strategy allowing us to penetrate, if at all possible, into the meaning of the few scraps of evidence concerning the Sea Peoples, I will make frequent appeal in the present argument, to the patterns of connectivity and transformation which state-of-the-art comparative mythology research has revealed, and here the figure of Noah looms large.

In the context of Noah we concentrate on the specific, elaborate form of Flood myths in which a male Flood hero is warned, and is saved in his Ark, by the Supreme God – usually with other attending motifs such as initial human transgression (murder, incest, the discovery of sexuality), the post-Flood repopulation of the earth often through asexual or otherwise irregular (incestuous, transspecies, etc.) means, the tower\textsuperscript{313} or other vertical structures to connect or reconnect Heaven and Earth, and the confusion of tongues / dispersal of the nations. As my quantitative contents analysis of Flood myths world-wide has indicated\textsuperscript{314} (van Binsbergen \textit{c.s.} 2008; van Binsbergen 2010d), the \textit{elaborate} Flood mytheme seems to have had an epicentre in the Primary Pelasgian realm (which includes Mesopotamia), and from there it may have diffused to many parts of the world (through the West Asian influence on South Asia, where the Flood myth of Manu saved by Vishnu’s avatar Matsya resembles the Noah mytheme; to East and South East Asia, and Oceania, via the Scythian trans-Steppe influence on Korea, Japan and Taiwan, and to sub-Saharan Africa – according to the Pelasgian cross-model, a mechanism which I shall identify below (Chapter 28) where I will also list Flood myths along with 79 other items as Pelasgian traits. These traits are percolating in a large area (‘The Extended Pelasgian Realm’) extending from the fertile Sahara to Central Asia, even China, in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages. They are not the traits of any specific ethnic group, but rather combinations of these traits circulate widely and may serve as specific boundary markers between ethnic groups in the local and regional scene.

What does it mean that Noah on the one hand has the trappings of a primal White God of Creation, on the other hand appears a Flood hero under the tutelage of a celestial Supreme god? When as a result of conquest, other forms of political incorporation such as empire formation, immigration, cultural diffusion, etc. religious systems are superimposed upon one another in the course of history, the attributes of the gods are adjusted so as to reflect the power relations between the respective social groups with which
each religious system is associated.\textsuperscript{315} Noah as a Flood hero is a sign that a social group associated with that White God of Creation came to be dominated by another social group associated with a celestial Supreme God. I propose to relate this to what I hypothesise to be the succession between two overall world views since the Upper Palaeolithic in large parts of Eurasia:

- a cosmogony based on the Separation of Water and Land, which came to be supplanted by
- a cosmogony based on the Separation of Heaven and Earth – with as attending phenomena the emergence of an upward gaze of cosmological attention, hence the invention of naked-eye astronomy, shamanism, and especially the invention of heaven as a separate realm of existence.\textsuperscript{316}

Flood myths seem to be based, not on some historic flooding in prehistoric times (as is commonly assumed) but on a thought experiment of Upper Palaeolithic historical actors, according to which the cosmic order imposed by the separation of Water and Land is annihilated – hence Water takes all. The idea of a Flood hero under tutelage of a Supreme Celestial God, however, is a compromise between the two cosmogonies, manifestation of a situation where the Cosmogony of the Separation of Heaven and Earth, and the socio-political groups adhering to that cosmogony, have gained ascendance over the older cosmogony and its adherents – Noah as Flood hero – as a subjugated and encapsulated White God of Creation – is in a way an accommodation between the older Water People or Sea People (\textsuperscript{7}) and the later, dominant Sky people. In Chapter 28 I will take up this idea of socio-political subjugation as one of the keys towards an understanding of Sea People exploits and Sea People ethnicity.

In this perspective we can also begin to appreciate the birds that tend to accompany the Noah figure as Flood hero\textsuperscript{317} – not only in the Biblical Flood account but worldwide. Like the mytheme of the Flood hero, also birds provide an excellent compromise between the two cosmogonies, since birds on the one hand may be aquatic and then (especially if they are white) are epiphanies of the White Gods of Creations; yet most birds are not aquatic but celestial, and as such they may be looked upon as a connection between Heaven and Earth, restoring somewhat the negative effects of the latter’s Separation.

In the process we may also recognise a gender dynamics. The Cosmogony of the Separation of Water and Land is inherently feminine – the Mother-of-the-Waters’ amniotic fluid, milk, menstrual blood, even urine.\textsuperscript{318} are the

\textsuperscript{315} In the Mediterranean context, e.g. Farnell 1895-1909; van Binsbergen 1970, 1971d, 1980a, 1980b, 1985a, 1985b.

\textsuperscript{316} In the Middle Palaeolithic, hunters’ geographic range of action increased considerably in response to dwindling game stocks (Holman 1998: 58), resulting in new technologies. Perhaps the invention of naked-eye astronomy was one of these responses: in the Upper Palaeolithic, with increasing emphasis on community belonging and its distinctive cultural expression (Mellars 1985; Lewis-Williams 1997; Gamble 1998), the desire to return to a camp they began to consider home required the ability to navigate on the stars across great distances – as Nkoya big-game hunters still did in recent decades. By 18 ka BCE the concepts of the celestial pole and of the pole star may already have been developed, in conjunction with the rise of shamanism (conceptualised as the shaman’s movement up and down along the celestial axis on behalf of the community). On the prehistory of the concept of the celestial pole, cf. Rappenglück 1999 and extensive references cited there; O’Neill 1893-97. In the context of my leopard-skin symbolism project (van Binsbergen 2004-11) I have developed an argument, based on a distributional analysis of various formal features of shamanism, suggesting that we may date the emergence of shamanism to the Upper Palaeolithic, and situate it in West to Central Asia. This agrees fairly well with the reconstructed dynamics of *Borean, with shamanic interpretations of cave art from Upper Palaeolithic Europe, and with my Aggregative Diachronic Model of World Mythology (van Binsbergen 2006a, 2006b).

\textsuperscript{317} Cf. the dove and the raven that accompany the Noah narrative in the Biblical context, could be interpreted by the smooth versus variegated colour symbolism referred to elsewhere in the present argument. The Talmud and other non-Biblical traditional Jewish texts has much to say on the Raven as a violator on the taboo on sexuality aboard the Ark, as a trickster who tries to avoid being sent out on a reconnaissance mission and who even accuses Noah of coveting Mrs Raven, etc. This is a good illustration of how Genesis has utilised much older Flood myths and fitted them to the pattern of Israelite religion and cosmology. Thus in North American Flood myths, Raven himself, as a divine trickster, appears of Flood hero or Flood causer, and another type of bird is prominent: an aquatic bird (typically a coot) which is the earth-diver, in other words brings up the beginning of earth in the form of a clood of mud after the mud; here clearly there is a merging of first cosmogony (from the Separation of Water and Land) and second cosmogony (after the Flood has destroyed the first creation). Structurally, the Ark could be identified with the Earth emerging from the Primal Waters. Jewish tradition (Cotterell 1989: 143; cf. Leslie 1984; Landa 1919) has retained a further implicitly bird motif in connection with the Flood: the giant Og (apparently another, potentially White, Primal God, eminently comparable with the Chinese giant Creation God 耆 千 P’an Ku who produced the world from an egg) is reputed to have survived the Flood sitting astride the Ark – and his name may mean ‘egg’.

\textsuperscript{318} Cf. in Celtic mythology, the figure of Queen Medb ‘She with the Great Bladder’, as a Mother of the Primal Waters, whose procreative powers are further emphasised by the gigantic flow of her menstrual blood (Edel 1986). The theme of celestial urination, in the form of rain, is developed in Allegro 1970. In Graeco-Roman mythology, the celestial hunter Orion (cf. Nimrod) has an etymology and attending aetiological myth related to urination: he is al-
typical substances through which she plays her cosmogonic role. The invention of heaven goes hand in hand with a discarding of the feminine corporality of reproduction, to be replaced by the almost hysterical disembodiment of creation through the male creative word (cf. Fromm 1976: 231 f.). Hence we see, all over Eurasia in the Bronze Age, a dramatic shift from female to male dominance in the various pantheons (see Table 6.4) – and as a result the Celestial Supreme God can only be male, exerting tutelage over former White Gods of Creation / Mothers of the Waters relegated either to feminine domesticity (as happened to Hera, Athena, Anahita, Anat, etc.), or to male subservience e.g. as Flood heroes.

We will now embark on a discussion of Noah and his sons as a model of thought. This will take us into a consideration of range semantics, binary opposition, triads, recursions as a model of thought. This will take us into a consideration of range semantics, binary opposition, triads, recursions as a model of thought. This will take us into a consideration of range semantics, binary opposition, triads, recursions as a model of thought. This will take us into a consideration of range semantics, binary opposition, triads, recursions as a model of thought. This will take us into a consideration of range semantics, binary opposition, triads, recursions as a model of thought.

6.5.3. Comparative mythology and long-range linguistics as tools for the retrieval of the oldest history of modes of thought

If we are to read to Table of Nations as a classification scheme, we must in the first place explore the time frame within which what kind of classification is likely to have occurred – and consider such limited empirical evidence as we have to support our pronouncements. Here the Table of Nations enters into the field of comparative mythology.

Analytically interesting and artistically / emotionally moving as many mythological narratives may be, they also present, at a more abstract and formal level, specific modes of thought that have archaic characteristics, and that seem to invite us to reconstruct the remote past even though these modes are usually enshrined in texts that are only a few thousand years old maximum. Such reconstruction is now in the forefront of the work of comparative mythologists, as in Michael Witzel’s work (2001b, 2010). In recent work (van Binsbergen 2006a, 2006b, 2010c) I have also myself attempted to reconstruct the oldest narratives contained in the cultural package that was evolved by Anatomically Modern Humans in Africa, 200,000-60,000 BP. This package (whose empirical basis is accessible to us – though not, of course, without great difficulty – in the form of frequently recurrent, often even near-universal, traits in the mythologies and other cultural features of the cultures of Anatomically Modern Humans in historical times up to today) was subsequently transmitted, transformed, innovated, the results transmitted further and further outside Africa, from 80 ka BP on, and finally fed back into Africa, from 15 ka BP on. Each of these narratives and their innovations can be conceived, not only as a narrative, but also as a particular type of logical relation which the narrative makes thinkable, however tentative at first.

Mythological and (archaeological) iconographic material can help us some way in this over-ambitious endeavor, and so can long-range linguistics, with its reconstruction of *Borean. Whereas reconstructed *Borean has an extensive repertoire of expressions for ‘wet and dry environments’, so far only one word, *HWKMV, has been reconstructed for ‘sky, cloud’, and the usual words for ‘heaven’ in historic languages cannot be considered reflexes of any *Borean parent forms. This suggests some confirmation for the reconstruction I had already reached by distributional and hermeneutical analysis: in Eurasia between the Upper Palaeolithic and the Early Bronze Age, two dominant cosmogonies succeeded:

- the older one based on the separation of Land and Water, and
- the more recent one based on the separation of Heaven and Earth: typical for this cosmogony is emphasis – now absolutely dominating most cosmologies, rituals and mythologies throughout the Old World (and part of the New World) – on the natural connections between heaven and earth (through mountains, trees, rain, the rainbow, meteorites, food crops), and on the human attempts to reconnect heaven and earth, in and through ritual – altars, temples, poles, sacrifice –, religious representations – demiurge, angels – and through human roles – shaman, king, priest, twin, prophet.
*Borean also offers us clues as to the specific format of thought. Etymologists are aware that many recent languages display (I suggest: have retained) what could be called ‘range semantics’: terms that are semantically each other’s opposite, yet may be represented by the same or a very similar lexical item. A rather shaky example of this phenomenon could be English black and bleak (Dutch bleek, German bleich), all arguably deriving from Proto-Germanic: *blika(i)-n- 'to shine bright’ – yet the opposite from blackness). Such range semantics now are particularly manifest in the reconstructed *Borean lexicon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (Bronze Age)</th>
<th>Mother goddess of early times</th>
<th>Subduced by male god of subsequent times</th>
<th>Reduced to a secondary role as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Spider goddess Utu</td>
<td>Raped by Enki ‘Lord Water’ (has usurped the sea, as one of the domains of the Mother of the Primordial Waters)</td>
<td>Utta, goddess of weaving and clothing Ninhursag, Earth and Underworld goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Neith in the 1st dynasty (3100 BCE), goddess of warfare and hunting</td>
<td>Horus, Ra’ Goddess of weaving and funerary goddess in the New Kingdom c. 1300 BCE (but continues to rule the waters and to have a final say in the assembly of gods)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Armenia</td>
<td>Anahita, Anahit Azamaid, Vahagn</td>
<td>Anahita largely reduced to domestic and subservient function, but still a weaving virgin and control over waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Anahita</td>
<td>Anahita largely reduced to domestic and subservient function, but still a weaving virgin and control over waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Syria-Palestine</td>
<td>Asartate-Name-of-Ba’al, Anat Ba’al</td>
<td>consort; the goddess slays Ba’al’s enemy and revives Ba’al, yet is relegated to the subaltern level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Athena, Hera</td>
<td>Zeus, Poseidon, Hades Demeter, Persephone, Athena as goddess of handicrafts and weaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Magna Mater</td>
<td>Jupiter Juno Names of Jahweh; Leviathan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>El, Elohim, Yam</td>
<td>Jahweh Names of Jahweh; Leviathan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td>The pre-Islamic female goddesses at Mecca Allah Names of Allah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Japanese society</td>
<td>Izanami, giving birth to the entire world and to the elements is her epiphany</td>
<td>Izanagi, Susanowo Izanami as death goddess, but the celestial realm remains under female rule, notably that of the Sun goddess Amaterasu, who is mainly a weaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Chalchihuitlicue Taloc</td>
<td>consort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Devi Shiva</td>
<td>consort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. Masculinisation as an Old-World mythological and religious development in the course of the Bronze Age: Towards male celestial gods


*Borean reconstructed roots are mainly of the form *CVCV, where C is a specifically reconstructed consonant, V an unspecified vowel. Now looking at the *Borean repertoire for ‘wet’ and ‘dry’, we see to our amazement that many reconstructed words which have the same specific consonant structure (although, admittedly, the underlying vowel structure remains undefined), in their semantics relate to both ‘wet’, ‘intermediate, swampy’, and ‘dry’. It is as if the *Borean words (or, to be more precise, the vowel-unspecified word cluster with the same consonantal structure) had a meaning that is not calibrated at one specific point in the semantic range between ‘wet’ and ‘dry’, but that indicates the entire range, leaving it to context to determine which position on this range is meant. Such ‘range semantics’, as a general characteristic of *Borean, reveal a mode of thought that is very different from the triadic mode often found in the literate Eurasian civilisations from the Bronze Age on, and even (because of the fluid range semantics which implies an absence of firm juxtaposition) from the dyadic, binary oppositions which Lévi-Strauss (1962a, 1962b, 1969-78) thought to be a human universal and even the very basis of human culture. On the contrary, *Borean range semantics are far more reminiscent of Derrida’s différence (the postponement of dyadic opposition); when Derrida (1967b: 149 f.; 1997 / 1967a) attacked Lévi-Strauss precisely on the latter’s postulate (following de Saussure 1916 / 1968) of the universally constitutive nature of binary opposition, Derrida was in fact reviving the time-honoured ancient mode of thought characteristic of the Upper Palaeolithic and reconstructed for *Borean, and thus thinking away from the logocentricity of modern academic language use based on the Aristotelian logical principle of the excluded middle (‘it is impossible for A to be, and to be not, at the same time’), and modern life in general.

Table 6.5 lists all relevant cases from the reconstructed *Borean lexicon of wetness and dryness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>LAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(CVK)V</td>
<td>bird</td>
<td>*(CVK)V, *(CVK)(L) dry; stone; tip, spout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(CVL)V</td>
<td>water, pour</td>
<td>*(CVL)V steppe, valley, meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(CVM)V, *(CV)M(V)</td>
<td>a kind of bird; fish</td>
<td>*(CVM) marsh, uncultivated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(CVP)V</td>
<td>to sink</td>
<td>*(CVP)V dry; to dry; to stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(CVR)V</td>
<td>to flow, drip</td>
<td>*(CVR)V, *(CVR)(L) dirt; to dry; to stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(CVT)V</td>
<td>drink, liquid</td>
<td>*(CVT)V dirt; to dry; to stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(CWW)V, *(CWW)(L)</td>
<td>liquid; sea, water</td>
<td>*(CWW)V to stand, move upwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(HV)K</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>*(HV)K to stand up, move upwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(HV)L</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>*(HV)M(V) stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(HVM)V</td>
<td>drink, swallow</td>
<td>*(HVM)V dirt, earth ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(HVW)V</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>*(HVW)V stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(HVR)V</td>
<td>liquid</td>
<td>*(HVR)V stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(HHV)W</td>
<td>bird; stream, flow of water</td>
<td>*(HHV)W stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(JVM)V</td>
<td>sea, water</td>
<td>*(JVM)V to live, stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KHC)V</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>*(KHC)V dry; sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KV)W, *(KV)W(L)</td>
<td>a kind of bird; big fish; pond</td>
<td>*(KV)W, *(KV)W(L) dry, burn; stone, rock; valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KVM)C(V)</td>
<td>a kind of fish</td>
<td>*(KVM)C(V) dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KVM)V</td>
<td>a kind of bird</td>
<td>*(KVM)V, *(KVM)(L) dry; hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KV)N(V)</td>
<td>a kind of bird</td>
<td>*(KV)N(V), *(KV)N(V) burn, roast, dry; hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KVP)V</td>
<td>a kind of bird</td>
<td>*(KVP)V enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KRV)T, *(KRV)T(L)</td>
<td>a kind of fish; a kind of gullim-crean bird; crane</td>
<td>*(KRV)T, *(KRV)(L) dry; dung, mud; enclosure; mountain, hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KTV)T, *(KTV)T(L)</td>
<td>water, to submerge; a kind of bird</td>
<td>*(KTV)T dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(KV)W(V)</td>
<td>stone, mountain</td>
<td>*(KV)W(V) stone, mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(LW)V</td>
<td>liquid, flow</td>
<td>*(LW)V liquid, flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(LVK)V, *(LVK)(L)</td>
<td>a kind of bird; goose</td>
<td>*(LVK)V pool, low ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(LVW)V</td>
<td>boat</td>
<td>*(LVW)V dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(LVH)V</td>
<td>to wash, pour</td>
<td>*(LVH)V stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(LVP)V</td>
<td>soft, wet</td>
<td>*(LVP)V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(LV)T(V)</td>
<td>liquid</td>
<td>*(LV)T(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(LVW)V</td>
<td>to pour</td>
<td>*(LVW)V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(MVK)V</td>
<td>wash</td>
<td>*(MVK)V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>*(MVL)V mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(MV)R(V)</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>*(MV)R(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(MV)T(V)</td>
<td>moisture</td>
<td>*(MV)T(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(MVW)W</td>
<td>water, wet</td>
<td>*(MVW)W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(NV)H(V)</td>
<td>to stay, be, stand</td>
<td>*(NV)H(V) to stay, be, stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NVRV</td>
<td>a kind of fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NVRV</td>
<td>flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PVCV</td>
<td>sprinkle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PVHV/2</td>
<td>bird, fly, to pour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PVKV</td>
<td>to pour, wash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PVNV</td>
<td>water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SVKV</td>
<td>a kind of bird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TVHV</td>
<td>spit, spittle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TVKV/2,3</td>
<td>a kind of duck or hen; fish; to pour, drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TVNV/1,2</td>
<td>pot, vessel; to melt, flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TVRV/1,2</td>
<td>a kind of bird; to drink, flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*WVTV</td>
<td>water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cells with a grey background present the isolated words, i.e. those that are not paired with an opposite or intermediate form displaying the same consonantal structure. The subscripts indicate a plurality of otherwise indistinguishable reconstructed *Borean words with the specified consonantal structure.

| *KVLV | dry, burn, stone, rock, valley |
| *KVLV/1 | walk, roam, ford |
| *KVLV/2 | a kind of bird; big fish; pond |

where \(-9 \leq n \leq 1\): the number of different vowels involved in these 10 reconstructed *Borean words of the general form *KVLV is minimum 1 and maximum 10. For each of the dry, intermediate and wet clusters, n is to be determined in the same way. Note in many ancient cosmologies, birds are regarded as ‘fishes of the waters above’

Fig. 6.3. The semantic field of the cluster of *Borean words *KVLV/1 \(-n\) = 10

A case in point is the semantic field of the cluster of *Borean words *KVLV/1 \(-n\) = 10, which I present in Fig. 6.3. Table 6.5 indicates that this phenomenon occurs throughout the *Borean reconstructed roots for ‘wet and dry’. The example does not stand on its own – I ascertained the same phenomenon for other semantic complexes, notably for ‘light and dark’ words (Table 6.6).

Let us agree that *Borean seems to have had considerable difficulty in thinking absolute difference, in other words in thinking the kind of binary oppositions that Aristotle has planted as the hallmark of rationality and proper thinking in the Western philosophical tradition.

In fact the binary opposition appears to be merely a relatively recent (Middle Palaeolithic?) achievement (closely associated with, and enhanced by, the emergence of articulated speech) of Anatomically Modern Humans worldwide; which in turn was greatly enhanced again in the Late, or Post-, Neolithic (the civilisation package) within the Extended Fertile Crescent – a belt stretching across the Old World from the then fertile Sahara to China.

As the principal logical tool of modern humankind, binary oppositions not only allow us to think and to symbolise in a ‘modern’ fashion, and to formulate an objective, (proto-)scientific world-view. The binary opposition is also largely responsible for one of the greatest revolutions in the history of religion: the installation of the notion of transcendence. The possibility of thinking beyond the here and now is already given in any language, which by the universalising tendencies of the semantics of lexical items allows us to speak of situations, entire worlds even, that are far away, long past or in the distant future, and even non-
existential. But such rudimentary, universalising and virtualised dimensions as are inherent in any language use, are greatly enhanced if (especially with the invention of writing, and its vital contribution to the creation and maintenance of states, organised religion and proto-science) language is utilised to think and express differences that are no longer conceived as merely gradual as specific calibrations upon a scale between two opposites or contrasted paired concepts (as, presumably, under the *Borean range semantics), but differences that are absolute. Transcendence amounts to the application, in the cosmological, ritual and experiential fields, of the ability to think absolute difference. Today, transcendence as a feature of human thinking permeates all aspects of the modern societal experience, from world religions to state-of-the-art science, from legal systems to new technologies of information and communication, and to the virtualisation of the body, the person, and identity in the face of the encroachment of external models, so eminently persuasive through the very virtuality through which they are being mediated. If in an empty street in the middle of the night and without evidence of camera supervision (therefore no risk of external sanctions) we find it normal to stop for a red traffic light, this is because the authority of the state’s regulations has taken on a sense of transcendence that allows it to operate irrespective of the practicalities of the here and the now. But although totally taken for granted, and almost impossible to think away (although Derrida has come a long way in this respect), transcendence must be recognised as a relatively recent achievement, whose antecedents in writing, the state, organised religion and proto-science suggest it to date, in recognisable form, from the Neolithic or Bronze Ages – even more recent than binary opposition in general.

This insight, however tentative, has considerable implications for my hypothesis of a succession of cosmogonies (the Cosmogony of the Separation of Land and Water, supplanted after five or more millennia by the Cosmogony of the Separation of Heaven and Earth) which partly informs my approach to Flood myths, Noah, and the Ancient’s conceptualisation of the sea, especially of the Primal Waters. In our scholarly reconstruction, with all the thinking tools of modern academic language at our disposal, we can etically render the idea of such cosmogonies, but we must realise that they would be impossible to have been thought, in that form, at the emic level, by the historical actors of the Upper Palaeolithic – for the latter appear to have lacked the conceptual tools of absolute difference and transcendence which we, moderns, would automatically imply with these cosmogonies. Our two cosmicgonic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light’ words</th>
<th>Dark’ words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘CVCV’ ‘fire’</td>
<td>‘CVCV’ ‘to blink, shine, shade’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘to burn, shine, shade’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘white’; ‘CVLV’ ‘morning, evening’; ‘CVLV’ ‘fire, to strike fire’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘black, dark’; ‘CVLV’ ‘coals, soot, burn’; ‘CVLV’ ‘slime, dirt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVMV’ ‘burn, shine’</td>
<td>‘CVMV’ ‘night, sleep’; ‘CVMV’ ‘cold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVMV’ ‘black’</td>
<td>‘CVMV’ ‘star, shine’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVNV’ ‘to burn, to’; ‘CVNV’ ‘sun’</td>
<td>‘CVKV’ ‘to burn’; ‘CVKV’ ‘bright’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘light, shine’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘light, shine’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘to burn, boil’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘dry, burn’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, weigh (?)’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, heat’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, hot coals’; ‘CVLV’ ‘to burn, bake’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, fire’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, hot coals’; ‘CVLV’ ‘to burn, bake’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, fire’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, hot coals’; ‘CVLV’ ‘to burn, bake’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, heat’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘burn, hot coals’; ‘CVLV’ ‘to burn, bake’</td>
<td>‘CVLV’ ‘night, sleep’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cells with a grey background present the isolated words, i.e. those that are not paired with an opposite or intermediate form displaying the same consonantal structure

© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Long-range etymologies’

Table 6.6. *Borean words of lightness and darkness
models have a sound, rich, transcontinental empirical basis in mythical texts and iconographies from the Bronze Age and later; there the transcendent dimension is already unmistakable although usually still in statu nascendi – hence the immanentalist, ‘down-to-earth’ orientation specialists have detected in the life worlds of Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt.\textsuperscript{319} We may even be tempted to extrapolate this Bronze Age empirical basis, by applying the same models to our reading of Neolithic, Mesolithic and Upper Palaeolithic iconography, but then we are projecting (as is often unavoidable in the retrieval of the distant past, anyway), not only specific semantic contents, but also our own overall, transcendent, modes of thought. This does not mean that my reconstruction of the two Upper Palaeolithic cosmogonies is a mere figment of the imagination – but that, in order to render it in a modern academic context, it has acquired transcendent overtones which in reality it cannot have had. As a result, we are hard put to imagine what these very ancient cosmogonies, if any, were really like. But we are not entirely without clues on this point. We are reminded of how in many of the cosmogonies collected all over the world in historical times, heaven and earth are still merged, God or the gods dwell on earth (only to retire to heaven after a crisis, often identical with the Flood), and while still on earth they encounter humans even before the latter have been ‘created’, – even the very notion of creation (predicated on the neat, absolute distinction between Being and non-Being) seems an anachronistic projection in the contexts of such myths.\textsuperscript{320} If my hypothesis of the two cosmogonies is to make any sense, allowance must be made for these kinds of ‘inconsistent’ signs of immanentalism.

All this raises the question (fundamental for any pre-and protohistory of human thought and philosophy) as to how the transition was made from the range-like logic implied in *Borean reconstructions, to the binary oppositions that today govern our lives, technologies, and knowledge production.

In my opinion the binary opposition came to be installed as the norm, in the first place as a result of articulated speech (which – de Saussure was right – is predicated on binary opposition between phonemes), and subsequently and even more formidably, as a result of the package of post-Neolithic civilisation, containing writing, the state, organised religion and proto-science, that has raised domesticated, binary thought to the norm and has banished undomesticated thought to the (fortunately still very extensive) non-specialised, non-academic, non-formal domains of everyday life. The capability of transcendent thought is also predicated on binary oppositions. In a logic based on range semantics, however, no firm binary opposition and no genuine transcendence can be thought. It is my contention that not transcendentalism, but immanentalism is the default option of the world-view of Anatomically Modern Humans. Only occasionally, under very specific historical and statal conditions which happened to be met in sections of the Extended Fertile Crescent since the Early Bronze Age, does immanentalism fully give way to transcendentalism.\textsuperscript{321} The typical implication of immanentalism is repetition, when it is fundamentally impossible to escape from the here and now, and all appearances to the contrary are ultimately a disguise of the idea of an ‘Æwigen Wiederkehr des Gleichen’ (Nietzsche 1973a, 1973b; Eliade 1954). In ancient cosmologies, two complementary forms of repetition are conspicuous:

- In the first place the cyclical repetition implied in a transformative cycle of elements, such as we know from Chinese Taoism but as is also implied in the elemental systems of the Greek Pre-Socratic philosophers, with further manifestations throughout Central Asia (Mongolia, Tibet), South Asia, and South Central Africa.\textsuperscript{322}

- And in the second place the process which the ethnomathematician Ron Eglash (1997, 1999, 2005) in his studies of African formal systems in divination and ornamentation, following common mathematical us-
For a comparative treatment of the Janus theme, see Syme 1979 in Mesoamerica, likewise based on unbroken lines and *Borean, – perhaps even the Maya numerical system. Janus theme also abounds in African art, nesha), and who has also been argued to have left traces in the Near East, has discussed under the heading of recursion: the endless repetition through bifurcation of the same phenomenon at successive levels, like a binary dendrogram unfolding endlessly. Here the binary opposition is not a real one, because it is not conclusive nor stable in itself but – for fear of the absolute difference implied in the real binary opposition – it keeps repeating itself, it is merely an invitation to further and further bifurcation.

Typically, man-made (cultural) formal systems based on recursion tend to rely on series of $2^n$: 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, etc. In this sense, the classic Chinese *yi jīng cosmological and divinatory system is based on eight trigrams combined two by two (yielding 64 configurations), and the same is true for the great divination systems of the Islamic world (‘ilm al-raml or ‘Sand Science’, and of Africa (Ifa, Sikidy, Hakata, etc.). But the applicability of $2^n$ recursion goes much further, and I suspect that here we have one of the principal intermediate and transitory modes on thought between *Borean ‘range semantics’ and the binary opposition.

6.5.4. Recursion in counting as an indication of the antiquity of binary opposition and of the revolutionary nature of triads

There are many indications (Chinese counting rods, Indo-Iranian *barsamen i.e. sacred twig bundles, Latinic *fasces, Teutonic and Latinic divination tablets as reported by Tacitus and Cicero, – perhaps even the Maya numerical system in Meso America, likewise based on unbroken lines and dots) that in the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age in Central or West Asia wooden sticks were considered epiphanies of the supernatural, and were used for divination. Considering the geographic extent of the distribution of this phenomenon, I suggest that we may project it much further back into the past, to the Neolithic, even the Upper Palaeolithic.

This recursion-associated numerical basis of $2^n$ is very old indeed and fundamental to counting and divining throughout the Old World. *Borean is supposed to have been spoken in extended Central Asia in the Upper Palaeolithic. The only numerals that could be reconstructed for *Borean, are 2, 4 and 8. For these, *Borean has several distinct lexical items, one of which, *H/V/NL.V, even stands for all three of these powers of 2:

Hence (Dolgopolsky n.d.) proto-Uralic *nejä (*nejäh ‘4’ to be found in Finnish, Hungarian, etc., (cf. also Ugric *niIV ‘eight’); Proto-Dravidian: *ṭāḷ ‘4’; Proto-Sino-Caucasian: *Vnt emoji ‘2, 4, 8’ (found in proto-North Caucasian *bú nd_e (‘-n’, proto-Sino-Tibetan *ŋi (p-), proto-Burushaski *ålto and proto-Basque *ñato; and in proto-Austro: *a7 ‘two, half’; Proto-Austronesian *wału ‘eight’; cf. Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, where for individual language families further references are given.

In view of the Africanist tendency – noted above, Chapter 4 – to distrust or even reject non-African explanations of African phenomena, it is only with reticence that the numerals in the language families of South Central and Southern Africa, i.e. Khoisan and Niger-Congo (including Bantu), might be linked to *Borean. For the Khoisan languages I have not been able to complete the necessary research in time. For Bantu the results (Table 6.7),

323 A useful general definition of recursion is: the situation in which a class of objects or methods defined by a simple basic case and where specific rules derive from, and reduce to, this basic case all other cases. In iconography, repetitive patterns of ornamentation and where specific rules derive from, and reduce to, this basic case.


325 One conspicuous form of recursion is manifested in the mirror symmetry of the god Basojuam / Janus, whose Old World presence we have seen ramifying into East Asia (Gun) and South Asia (Ganesha), and who has also been argued to have left traces in the Biblical books of Genesis and Job (Rendsburg 1980; Noegel 1996). As was to be expected under the Pelasgian hypothesis, the Janus theme also abounds in African art, e.g. von Sydow 1932. For a comparative treatment of the Janus theme, see Syme 1979 and Cardona 1995.

326 When proto-Khoisan, proto-Niger-Congo, proto-Dené-Sino-Caucasian, and proto-Nostratic / Eurasatic speakers, and their languages and cultures, presumably displayed considerable communalities as offshoots of *Borean, see next paragraph.

327 It stands to reason to look there for the prototypes of the tablets used in the Southern African four-tablet oracle and of many other types of artefacts used in African cleromantic divination. Some of these are likely to have come to the African continent in the context of the Back-to-Africa migration, more specifically of the Southern expansion of the Pelasgian realm during the Late Bronze Age; others would have a longer history on African soil. In my recent publications on the subject I have noted the close similarities between these divination tablets, and the tokens used for gaming and divination by Native Americans (cf. Culin 1907 / 1975) – suggestive of a common cultural substrate going back to Upper Palaeolithic Central Asia, and also surfacing in material culture (basketry, fishing techniques), female puberty rites, ‘Wounded Knee’ as name for a trickster/demiurge, etc.

328 The only remarkable result so far is that, in all Khoisan languages, *haka is the word for ‘4’, which suggests an interesting
etymology for hakata, i.e. the name of the four- tablet oracle in that part of the world (van Binsbergen 1995a, 1996b), thus strengthening the suggestion (Bleek 1928: 28 f., describing leather divining pieces similar to the hakata ones used by the Southern African Bantu-speakers; and Hammond-Tooke 1998) that Bantu forms but also (understandably, in the light of the Back-to-Africa migration from extended Central Asia – yet as a largely submerged undercurrent) in Egyptian (e.g. the 2x4 gods of the Hermetopolitan cosmogony,329 and the 16 parts into which Osiris’ body was cut by Seth),330 Greek Antiquity (Empe-docles’ four elements) and Chinese Antiquity (易經 yì jīng / I Ching, with its 64 = 2⁶ configurations).

### Table 6.7. Possible reflexes of *Borean numerals in proto-Bantu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Borean</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>*proto-Bantu as compared to *Borean: Guthrie (1967-71)</th>
<th>*proto-Bantu as compared to *Borean: Meesuen (1980)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV/PV</td>
<td>finger, claw</td>
<td>-pōkā ‘one’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV/RV</td>
<td>finger, fingernail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/PV</td>
<td>hoof, fingernail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV/CV</td>
<td>one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV/RV</td>
<td>one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV/TV</td>
<td>one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SVMV</em></td>
<td>one</td>
<td>-mõ '1314'</td>
<td>-mā/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/KV</td>
<td>one, finger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV/NV</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>-tẽn 1740</td>
<td>-tābā ‘four’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DP 1335</td>
<td>-tādī ‘four’ (1335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-tābā ‘eight’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV/RV</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>-bōki 12</td>
<td>-bōki L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/WV</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>-bōki 12</td>
<td>-bōki L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV/NE/LV</td>
<td>two / four / eight</td>
<td>has perhaps reflexes in the following Bantu forms but very unlikely: -tā ‘four’ DP 1335</td>
<td>has perhaps reflexes in the following Bantu form but very unlikely: -tā ‘four’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV/LV</td>
<td>two, get in pairs, pair &gt; two</td>
<td>-kõdĩ, 5, ‘ten’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVRV</td>
<td>two, pair</td>
<td>-kõdĩ, 5, ‘ten’</td>
<td>-kõdĩ, 5, ‘ten’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVKTV</td>
<td>two, pair, one</td>
<td>-kõdĩ, 5, ‘ten’</td>
<td>-kõdĩ, 5, ‘ten’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIKV</td>
<td>big, large</td>
<td>-kõdĩ, 5, ‘ten’</td>
<td>-kõdĩ, 5, ‘ten’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) = *Borean reconstruction uncertain

Within the present scope I cannot go into detail as to the transformation rules that connect the proposed proto-Bantu reflexes with *Borean. These are discussed in van Binsbergen 2011a. By and large, these rules are the following: 1. *Borean C₁VC₂V > proto-Bantu C₁VC₁V (metathesis); 2. *Borean C₁VC₂V > proto-Bantu C₁V or C₁VC₁V or C₂V or C₂VC₁V (fission, possibly with duplication); 3. the usual transformation of consonants according to the general sound laws that also have been demonstrated to operate in the case of Indo-European.

329 Sethe 1929; Kilian 1966.
330 Reecuil 3: 56 and 4: 23 apud Budge 1911 / 1973: I 386 n. 3, etc.; cf. the last sentence of footnote 8 above.
All this creates a context in which recursion appears as a standard mode of thought and mode of representation in the Mediterranean and West Asia during the Early and Middle Bronze Age (cf. Fig. 6.4, below).

6.5.5. Triads

The emphasis on recursive dyads, and on four and foursomes, in Upper Palaeolithic *Borean, as well as in North America and sub-Saharan Africa in historical times, is still conspicuous in the dualistic cosmogonies that were to dominate the worldview since Upper Palaeolithic times: the Separation of Land and Water, and the Separation of Heaven and Earth – and can still be detected in the Early Dynastic Egyptian dualist socio-political organisation of the Early Bronze Age: the royal title ‘The One of the Reed / Sedge and the Bee’, and in the elaborate iconography of the distinction and unification of the Two Lands (Thwy), Upper Egypt and Lower Egypt. Such elements of recursion contrast strikingly with the very conspicuous, ‘Dumézilian’ emphasis on cosmological and mythological threesomes / triads throughout the Ancient Near East (including Egypt), South Asia, and Europe, in the protohistorical and historical times – of which the Table of Nations dividing the world according to Noah’s three sons also appears to form an example. The triadic format therefore stands out as a regional Neolithic or Bronze Age innovation, underneath of which apparently much older twosomes and foursomes persist. One can hardly overestimate the revolution that a triadic system constitutes as compared to a classification system based on powers of 2 and therefore on recursion: whereas recursion reproduces, fractal-wise, the same set of relationships over and over again at an ever increasing or decreasing scale, triads introduce the Heraclitan / Hegelian dynamics of dialectics, where the relationship between each two components is essentially shifting and unstable, and informed by the third component; on a formal logical level one can very well understand why a cultural setting dominated by triads has become, from the Neolithic onward, the main growth region for the revolutionary package of writing, state, organised religion, and (proto-)science. The ‘Triadic Revolution’ consists in the acknowledgement of a third element in addition to the two that had hitherto constituted the two poles between which the worldview was organised. Typically, therefore, that third element takes the form of a mediator or connection between Heaven and Earth, such as the aether, air, a demiurge, a Child from Heaven descending on Earth (e.g. in the form of food crops: Osiris, Dionysus, Jesus), the celestial pole, lightning, rain, etc. One might also look for intermediate forms between Land and Water (the mythically-charged ‘Flood land’ Boeotia seems to be a case in point.), but the worldview informed by the cosmogony of their separation was in fact already obsolete when, during the Bronze Age and mainly in its literate polities, the ‘Triadic Revolution’ established itself as standard.

Whereas the binary opposition is static in that it, in endless recursion, can only copy its underlying juxtaposition, the triad is immensely dynamic in that, perhaps for the first time in global cultural history, it offers the mode of thought capable of handing movement, escape from the original juxtaposition, and transformation into something totally new and unexpected – the dynamics of dialectics, such as fathomed, in the history of Western philosophy, first by Heraclitus (Diels 1934-37), formalised more than two millennia later by the end of the 18th century CE for the first time (Kant), subsequently given a central position in Hegel’s ternary logic, and popularised in Chalybaeus’ well-known three-stage operation Thesis – Antithesis – Synthesis (Chalybaeus 1860; Hegel 1807 / 1977, 1822-31 /

332 In his pioneering but masterful study Das doppelte Geschlecht: Ethnologische Studien zur Bisexualität in Ritus und Mythos (1955), the prominent German Africanist Baumann covered much of the same Old World historico-comparative ground as I do in the present argument and in my Pelasgian Hypothesis. And although the distribution of the ‘bisexual’ (rather: *ambisexual or *ambi-gendered) mytheme he focuses on, largely coincides with the literate states of the Old World Bronze Age, yet I cannot bring myself to decide whether this intermediate state attributed to gods and humans in ritual situations (very conspicuous, for instance, in the case of Ancient Egypt) is (a) an atavistic remnant of pre-Bronze Age recursion, or (b) a dialectical, ‘synthetic’ position, in other words a third option transcending the opposition between male and female, hence a more progressive, triadic arrangement. The historically most satisfactory answer appears to be that, in the course of the general cultural dynamics towards triads throughout the Neolithic and Bronze Age, what was initially an example of recursion (only one or two steps away from *Borean ‘range semantics’ with its apparent incapability of firm, clear-cut binary oppositions), was in the end revolutionised into a secondary, conscious and explicit denial of binary opposition, so ended up as triadic.

333 Tripartite cosmologies have been given considerable attention in the context of European protohistory, e.g. Magrath 1975; Kaul 2005; Dowden 1993; and specifically in the Sea Peoples context: Woudhuizen, this volume. Perhaps the Sicilian twin gods the Palici (Meurant 1998), and throughout the Ancient Mediterranean the Dioscuri, can be cited as an expression of a pre-triadic dyadic mode of thought, which I argue is the older and simpler format. The bronze statuette from Sardinia (Early Iron Age), with its accumulation of duplications (Fig. 6.4.d), may also serve as an interesting iconographic example of the dyadic mode of thought.

a. Early dynastic reed decoration, Egypt (Emery 1961)

c. Decoration of coloured cones on the facade at Uruk (Maspero et al. 1903: III)

b. ‘Frying pan’, Early Bronze Age, Syros, Cyclades, Aegean (source: Demakopoulou et al. 1999: 18)

d. Bronze hero statuette from Early Iron Age Sardinia; with its four eyes, four arms, two swords and two shields, it is a convincing expression of a dyadic, recursive world view; Albini near Teti (Nuoro), 7th-8th centuries BCE, Museo Nazionale, Cagliari (source: Lilliu & Schubart 1967: 87)

Fig. 6.4. b-d. Selected recursion patterns from the Mediterranean and West Asian Bronze Age

/ 1992; Kant 1781 / 1964). Against the background of my Aggregative Diachronic model of global mythology (van Binsbergen 2006a, 2006b, 2010c), the restriction of triads to the post-Neolithic Extended Fertile Crescent can hardly be considered an accident. On the contrary, it is indicative of such a systematic, increasing and accumulative complexification – only a handful of kiloyears ago – of the thinking tools with which Anatomically Modern Humans left Africa.

Triads dominate Dumézil’s (e.g. 1958) analysis of the culture of early Indo-Europeans, and thus are invoked in Woudhuizen’s (this volume) analysis of Sea Peoples’ ethnicity. A distributional analysis however shows that, although the attestation of triads in comparative religion and mythology is amazingly restricted both in space (a central West-East belt of the Old World) and in time (post-Neolithic), yet the distribution is far from limited to Indo-European speaking peoples, and in fact encompasses all the literate, statale societies of the Old World.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>region and / or period</th>
<th>members of the triad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1 Khaldis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>(1)? Dharma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic, espec. Irish</td>
<td>1 Esus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic, espec. Irish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1? Sau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1 earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1 Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1 Osiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (jmy-wt shrine)</td>
<td>1 bowl with sacrificial blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruscan</td>
<td>1 Thalna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etruscan</td>
<td>1 Uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1 Demeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1 Hades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1 Gaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1 Hera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>2 Vayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

334 The imiat (jmy-wt) shrine is another Egyptian triad: it consists of a leopard skin (representing heaven – the spots are explicitly interpreted as stars; however, also speckled skins from other animal species may be used for this purpose) hanging from a pole (connection, demiurge, celestial pole, lightning, etc.) that stands in a bowl (typically filled with sacrificial blood) and that represents earth; cf. Stricker 1963-89; Kohler 1975; Logan 1990. In the Ancient Near East and elsewhere in Eurasia the circumpolar constellations – which never set; and which Frank & Arregi 1996 consider as more ancient, and more original, prehistorical astronomical conceptions than the zodiacal constellations grouped around the ecliptic – are (even more than the other stars) associated with the leopard with its star-spangled coat. The same complex, and its implicit shamanic overtones, help explain the preponderance of reputed leopard-skin wearers among the Aegean heroes associated with Troy: Alexander / Paris, Menelaus, and Antenor – as well as the Argonauts Jason and Orpheus.

335 This triad is somewhat exceptional in that each member has its own temple, rather than being represented as part of a threesome in a joint temple. The table does not exhaust the available triads in Ancient Egypt – another demonstration that the triad is far from particular to Indo-European speakers (although it may be considered as a specific, late Pelasgian development; in Chapter 28 we shall see that the great majority of proposed Pelasgian traits apply to Ancient Egypt). Possible additions, which however would not affect the overall mapping results from this Table as shown in Fig. 6.5, include: ʿɪmunn-Satet-Anuket (Elephantine); Amun-Mut-Khons (Thebes); Ptah-Sekhemet-Nefertem (Memphis); Anubis (jackal funerary god)-Hesat (white cow)-Mnevis (black bull) (22nd nome Upper Egypt); Amun-Ptah-Raʾ (Thebes); Raʾ, Lord of Sachebu, sires triplets with Ruddgedjet, a priest’s wife; but Chufu / Cheops objects to their birth – yet he will be succeeded by these three, which marks the beginning of the 5th dynasty (there is an echo here of the three ruling brothers in Aegean mythology: Minos, Sarpedon and Rhadamantys (Willis 1994: 52; Papyrus Westcar, cf. Simpson 1975-86; Erman 1890)).
I have refrained from detailed references per triad listed, since nearly all information can be gleaned from Hastings 1908-21 / 1926; additional triads derive from standard collections of comparative mythology such as Cotterell 1989; Willis 1994.

Table 6.8. Major triads in comparative religion and mythology (greatly simplified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Deity 1</th>
<th>Deity 2</th>
<th>Deity 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>Vishnu</td>
<td>Brahma</td>
<td>Shiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurrian</td>
<td>Hepat</td>
<td>Teshup</td>
<td>Illuyankas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Zoroastrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Zoroastrian</td>
<td>Atar fire god</td>
<td>Ahriman (adversary)</td>
<td>7 Ahura Mazda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Zoroastrian</td>
<td>7 Ahura Mazda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Sassanian</td>
<td>Mithra</td>
<td>Anahita</td>
<td>Azuramazda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel (Ancient)</td>
<td>Japheth</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>Shem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Enlil (Bel)</td>
<td>Anu</td>
<td>5 Ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td>Thor</td>
<td>Odin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>Loder</td>
<td>Odin</td>
<td>Hoenir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Juno</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Egyptian</td>
<td>Ceres (Deme-ter)</td>
<td>Libera (Persephone)</td>
<td>4 Isis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samer</td>
<td>2 / 7 Enlil; 2 / 7 Ninil</td>
<td>7 Ahura Mazda; 7 Asha (Amesha Spenta); 7 Vohu Manah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 / 7 Ninil (= Ninurta)</td>
<td>see under 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugurit</td>
<td>Anat (Earth)</td>
<td>Ba’al (rain)</td>
<td>3 Mot (death)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have presented the triads in the dataset as members of obvious cosmological categories: Earth; Air and tempestuous meteorological manifestations such as Lightning, Thunder and Rain; the Rainbow, the Sun, the Adversary; Heaven; the Primal Waters; the

---

336 From the point of view of Neolithic or post-Neolithic people with a mode of production dependent upon rain-fed agriculture, the Sun and the Rainbow constitute the Adversary in that they represented the end, the chasing, of Rain – while the latter (in a cosmology already based on the Separation of Heaven and Earth) tends to be seen as Heaven’s great gift to humankind, as the Demiurge par excellence, mediating between Heaven and Earth. When agriculture is not rain-fed, like in Ancient Egypt, this scheme no longer applies. Nor is it obvious for food production based on animal husbandry instead of agriculture. Neither can it be insisted on for pre-Neolithic situations with modes of production hinging on hunting, fishing and collecting, which are rather indifferent to rain and shine. This suggests that the elevation of the rainbow to the status of the symbol of the connection of Heaven and Earth (as in the Noahic account of Genesis 9; and as I suggested to be the case for the bow-associated goddesses with demiurgical characteristics, from Artemis and Neith to Inkosazana / Nomkhubulwana) is pre-Neolithic, and was already a survival, disconnected from then contemporary modes of production, by the time of the first attestations of bow-wielding goddesses in the fertile Sahara, in the literate cultures of the Ancient Mediterranean.
Moon; and other categories. However, for our present purpose of interpreting the nature of the relationship between Noah and his ‘sons’, these cosmological details are less important than the more general fact, demonstrated by Table 6.8, that triads usually have a cosmological dimension. As the column ‘other’ indicates, it is not always easy to interpret the trinites’ members in terms of the six categories offered here.337

6.5.6. Noah’s three sons as a triad

After this long excursion into White Gods, Flood heroes, prehistoric modes of thought, recursion and triads, we are finally equipped to tackle the apparently triadic basic structure of the Table of Nations. In Genesis 10, the number of Noah’s sons is three: Shem, Ham and Japheth, and it is the lineal descendants of these three that are supposed to make up the entire post-Flood population of the world. Other sources may mention or imply additional sons, but that is immaterial. The Biblical series ‘Shem, Ham and Japheth’ is a classical example of a triad, such as abound in the mythology and religion of the Ancient Near East and many post-Neolithic civilisations of the Extended Fertile Crescent.338

On closer scrutiny, however, we have to retract on this identification in space and time. For the triad formed by Noah’s alleged three sons does not seem to be a real and credible triad: as we shall see below, two of its components, Ham and Japheth, may be given etymologies that, through reflexes in one or more macrophylla, can be traced all the way back to *Borean, and that can be demonstrated to have mutually complementary semantics.

The third element, Shem, however, is in the first analysis meaningless (its meaning, in Biblical Hebrew, proto-Semitic, proto-Afroasiatic and even in *Borean *CVMV, being ‘name’ (cf. Tables 6.13, 6.14, below), which can hardly be the genuine proper name of an historical or mythological character).339,340 It would therefore appear as if the third element was merely added to the equation in order to provide an honourable position to the putative apical ancestor of the Israelite authors / redactors of Genesis 10 sometime in the Middle Iron Age, bringing what was originally known as an ancient dyadic model hinging on the opposition between Ham and Japheth, in line with the model of triads which, by the Middle Iron Age, had been in fashion for one or two millennia throughout the literate states of the Ancient Near East including Egypt. That the name Shem is probably a dummy, not at a par with the names Ham and Japheth, also becomes clear when we try to map the geographical regions associated, in Genesis 10, with each of these three apical ancestors (Fig. 6.6): whereas Japheth and Ham rule almost half the known world (from the perspective of Syro-Palestine in the Middle Iron Age), Shem is squeezed between them in a little corner.

But if we can thus reduce the number of Noah’s sons to two, applying the time-honoured recession which has governed human thought since *Borean times, and tracing

337 Sometimes it looks as if we can pinpoint the diffusion of triads from the literate state centres to outlying areas. Thus Shaw’s (1998: 6) discussion of the Egyptianising trade goods at Kommos, Southern Crete, suggests that images of divine triads were diffused and informed tripartite elements in local religious architecture.

338 Meanwhile we must not overlook Bronze and Iron Age regional parallels to Noah’s three sons: the triad of the three brothers Sarpedon, Minos and Rhadamantus; sons of Zeus, which in itself seems to be indebted to the 12th-dynasty Egyptian story (Papyrus Westcar, see three notes up) of three brothers sired by Ra with the wife of that god’s high priest, – a story pressed into service to legitimate the 5th dynasty. Somewhat further afield but linked to these two examples by the Pelasgian cross-model, is the concept of a Flood and culture hero with three sons among the West African Dogon (van Beek 2005).

339 There are convincing Ancient Near Eastern parallels to this argument, in the fact that Astarte, in Ugaritic texts is referred to as ‘the Name of Ba’al’ (Albright 1936-37, 1941b). Perhaps equally instructive is the well-known Ancient Egyptian myth, in which the goddess Isis, however much eclipsed by the ascent of the cult of the male god Ra (the fifth dynasty onward), managed to gain magical power over Ra by forcing him to disclose his secret name (Bonnet 1952 / 1971: 328; Roeder 1923: 138).

340 It is important to realise that, given the overall influence of Egypt upon Bronze and Iron Age Palestine, the name Shem in the Table of Nations might well have an Egyptian background. Here there are several possible associations with Old Egyptian words, none of which is semantically closely connected with ‘name’: sm, ‘herb, plant; succour, occupation, pastime’; smyt, ‘necropole, desert’; sm, ‘lung’; smin, ‘unite, be united’; smi, ‘companion’; sms, ‘locks, hair-covered part of head’; sm3, ‘slay’; sm3, ‘clothing priest’; sm, ‘go, depart’; sm(w), ‘wanderers, strangers’; Smw, ‘Upper Egypt’; Smr, ‘make music’; Smn, ‘hot’. For whatever it is worth, we note that ‘companion’ comes close to the West Semitic use, noted in the previous footnote, of sm as *[Astarte] Name of Ba’al]; ‘hot’ is traditionally associated in Bible studies with Noah’s ‘son’ Ham; the concept of ‘wanderer’ may also be attributed to the moon; while ‘unite’ may be semantically reminiscent of Noah as the overarching, higher-level principle that unites his three ‘sons’ and (as the matric of the cosmos, or as an evocation of the original chaos) offers them a ‘resting place’.
etymologies for both Noah and his two remaining sons to similar times, this means that there is no reason to assume that the overall format of Genesis 10, dividing the human world (with the exception of the Semitic-speaking part that was central in the mind of the Ancient Israelites) into two major parts, had its origin in Palestine in Biblical times, and derived directly from ethnic divisions as perceived by historical actors at the time, in the Middle Bronze Age.

From the point of view of today’s linguistic scholarship, the overall division of Genesis 10 coincides with one between Afroasiatic (Ham and Shem – Afroasiatic used to be known as Hamitic until well into the 20th century CE) on the one hand, Eurasian (especially Indo-European) on the other hand. This suggests that the division may be rooted in some contemporary ethnico-linguistic reality perceived by the historical actors. Yet its designation in terms of an opposition between Ham and Japheth amounts to a cosmological division which, at the time of the redaction of Genesis 10, may have been at least 10 ka old! Given this extremely remote provenance, and its *Borean association, the Noah character could have come from anywhere in the Old World.

In Fig. 6.6, clearly, the essential bifurcation is between Ham and Japheth, while Shem is forced in between as a category not belonging to the same level as the other two – as an afterthought.

Note the intrusion of Ham in the form of Lud - Lydians into the Japhethic domain in Western Asia Minor. This may be an indication of an Egypt-related migration from the Southern shore of the Mediterranean – perhaps of the same kind as, or identical with, what geneticists have recently reconstructed as the African origin of the Greeks (Arnaiz-Villena et al. 1999, 2001a). When, in the time of the Sea Peoples, we see the Egyptians sending shipments of grain to Lydia in order to alleviate a famine there (Barnett 1987), this may be related to this kind of long-standing affinities.

6.5.7. Noah as exemplifying long-range connections

Noah as a mythological and religious character offers examples of long-range connections, in that the same name, associated with comparable semantics, seems to occur in a number of disparate contexts in different continents. This is hoped to add further credibility to the insistence, throughout my argument, on long-range continuities, between languages, language groups, phyla, macro-phyla, and their attending cultures and genetically constituted demic groups; and to bring out the plausibility – even for the comparative focused study of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean – of a global model of long-range cultural history, in which the boundaries between ethnic and demic groups, cultures, major geographical regions, even continents, are demonstrated to be porous and flexible, so that explanation has to be comparative and long-range, both in space and in time.

Fig. 6.6. The geographical regions associated, in Genesis 10, with the three apical ancestors, Shem (1), Ham (2) and Japheth (3)

Note the intrusion of Ham in Lydia, in the overall Japhethic domain.

6.5.8. The distribution and origin of the theonym Noah

As comparative mythology indicates, most probably the Biblical Flood story contains elements that have no direct contemporary roots in the Middle-Iron-Age (part-)society of Hebrew- or Aramaic speaking Syro-Palestine Jews by which that story was enshrined in its religious canon and committed to writing. This means that Semitic / Hebrew etymologies of the names in the Biblical story, can only apply to the extent to which these stories were recounted with fresh personages with fresh, local names. However, the occurrence of central mythological characters, including First Gods, with a name resembling that of Noah, over an incredibly large region stretching from sub-Saharan Africa to Oceania, suggests that the name Noah is both much older that the Middle Iron Age, and probably has an origin outside Syro-Palestine – which also suggests a different language background than Hebrew / Semitic. These attestations include those in Table 6.9.

341 I use the expression part-society because we cannot assume that the society producing the Tanakh in its earliest redaction was ethnically homogeneous and fully integrated – both in Palestine and during the period of Babylonian exile, it was part of a wider social formation that was ethnically, linguistically and culturally diverse.
The distribution of gods with the names enumerated in Table 6.9 is shown in Fig. 6.7. In that Figure, the African attestations can be interpreted with the ‘Back into Africa’ model (Chapter 4, above), which might then also account for the Egyptian and Syro-Palestinian (Biblical) attestation. Alternatively, we might see the African attestations as due for the Egyptian and Syro-Palestinian (Biblical) attestation. 

North American Flood stories were committed to writing by missionaries and anthropologists. These narratives appear found (Isaak 2006) in the New World, which makes it unlikely that there was already a sizeable Christian impact before 2008. They could have been taken to the Old World by demic diffusion (i.e. as part of the cultural baggage of a population on the move); cf. Tamm et al. 2007, whence I derive Fig. 6.8. On the other hand, the Judaeo-Christian-Islamic factor cannot be ruled out: already as early as the 1820s the extent of missionary influence was a bone of contention among the Cherokee (McLaughlin 1974), which means that there was already a sizeable Christian impact before most North American Flood stories were committed to writing by missionaries and anthropologists.

343 More than half of the recorded Flood myths in the world were found (Isaak 2006) in the New World, which makes it unlikely that this genre of narrative only ended up there as a result of Judaeo-Christian-Islamic proselytisation. These narratives appear to have been at home in the New World for millennia. My quantitative contents analysis of the global distribution of Flood myth (van Binsbergen c.s. 2008) even yielded suggestions that certain themes in Flood myths may even originate from the New World. They could have been taken to the Old World by demic diffusion (i.e. as part of the cultural baggage of a population on the move); cf. Tamm et al. 2007, whence I derive Fig. 6.8. On the other hand, the Judaeo-Christian-Islamic factor cannot be ruled out: already as early as the 1820s the extent of missionary influence was a bone of contention among the Cherokee (McLaughlin 1974), which means that there was already a sizeable Christian impact before most North American Flood stories were committed to writing by missionaries and anthropologists.


345 Indonesia, with its history of occupation going back into the Middle Palaeolithic, its diversity, and its post-Holocene insular fragmentation, is a complex puzzle way beyond my grasp. One would have expected that any original Flood myth here would be preserved and enhanced under the impact of Hinduisation and Islamisation – both world religions having a flood hero under the name of Manu and Nicht, respectively. However, although flood stories abound in South East Asia as well as in Oceania, some of the elaborate Nauhic type (Isaak 2006; van Binsbergen c.s. 2008), they seem to be independent from, and go back to an origin older than, the regional influence of these world religions. Apart from Hawaii, however, no apparent cognates of the name Noah are in evidence in this part of the world.

Table 6.9. The theonym Noah and proposed cognates in various continents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>name and details</th>
<th>sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noah, Nüh</td>
<td>Genesis 5:11; Qur’an, Surah LXXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nū Wa, Nū Gwa (South East China), Flood heroine</td>
<td>Willis 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Chu</td>
<td>Hok-Lam Chan, n.d. [1990]; Fontenrose 1980: 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nu (Hawaii), Flood hero</td>
<td>Cotterell 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nankowa (South Central Africa): ‘Mother of Whiteness’</td>
<td>van Binsbergen 1992a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Madame Akowa (Aguine people, West Africa): central possession spirit</td>
<td>Duchesne 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nun / Nunet (Ancient Egypt), paired Egyptian deities of the Primordial Waters, of complementary genders, members of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad</td>
<td>Bonnet 1952 / 1971: 506, 535 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(possibly also: Namaq (Eskimo / Inuit, North America, White Bear god) – combination of sound assonance and ‘white’ semantics; moreover, Eskimo is generally considered an Eurasian / Nostratic language</td>
<td>Boas 1899; Boas 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(possibly also: Munun (Bella Coola, British Columbia, North America), Creator Goddess, mother of the Sun God) – combination of sound assonance and ‘First God’ semantics; she comes in the shape of a mosquito, but cf. the bees of Old World cosmogonic mythology</td>
<td>Boas 1898: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(possibly also: Nahualpilli (Aztecs, Central America, better known as Tlaloc), god of flood and droughts – combination of sound assonance and ‘Primordial Waters’ semantics</td>
<td>López Austin 1997; Miller &amp; Taube 1993; Townsend 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nui, Flood hero of Lifou, one of the Loyalty Islands; combination of sound assonance with the fact that several details of the Noahic Flood account are found also here</td>
<td>Gaster 1969: 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Nenebuc / Nenebojo / Wene bojo, among the Timagama Ojibway, of Canada, and the Chippewa Ojibway of Ontario (Minnesota and Wisconsin); my reasons for this identification are a combination of sound assonance with the fact that several details of the Noahic Flood account are found also here)</td>
<td>Frazer 1918: 297; 305-8 and Barnouw 1977: 33-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

342 See my discussion of the etymology of mw.t in Section 4.5.
Meanwhile, reaching for a *Borean etymology means that we reject not only the Hebrew etymology in terms of נְחַ蜗 ‘rest’, but also another possibility – already indicated in a footnote above – that is close to Middle Iron Age Syro-Palestine in terms of space and time: to derive נוּח from Egyptian ‘Horizon of the Primal Waters / of the Primal Waters Above’. Even if this is not the actual historical meaning of the name as intended by the original namers, and even if the original namers must be sought in the Upper Palaeolithic, such an Egyptian etymology of Noah could be made true as a form of punning, for which the Ancient Egyptians were notorious. This means that in the near vicinity of Syro-Palestine where the name Noah is attested in the Middle Iron Age writings of the Tanakh / Hebrew Bible, we find a context where this name can be explained as ‘the boundary condition of the Primal Waters’ – which admittedly is rather in line with the conventional biblical explanation in terms of ‘rest’.

6.5.9. A proposed *Borean etymology of the name Noah

For *Borean the most likely candidate as etymon for Noah, is *Borean *W/V/NXV, ‘breast, udder’, which leads to a perfect fit both phonologically and semantically:

The Afroasiatic listings in Table 6.10 make it clear that the Biblical proper name Noah (like so many in Genesis) is better not interpreted within the West-Semitic, and by extension Afroasiatic domain, even although it is the inveterate habit of Biblical scholars to do so. If the proposed *Borean etymology is acceptable, then Noah was originally considered the female, not the male, ancestor of human-kind, which makes a lot of sense, and tallies with widespread Old World mythologies of a primal mother.

Table 6.10. Proposed long-range etymology of the name Noah: ‘breast’

© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Long-range etymology’

346 The relevance of such Great Mother mythologies for the Mediterranean Late Bronze Age and specifically the Sea Peoples problematic will be argued in Chapters 28 and 29.

347 And which, incidentally, reminds us of the possibility, explored in Table 28.4 below, of assigning Austro-etymologies to many key names in the Bronze Age Mediterranean.

348 E.g. in Kurdistan (Empson 1928: 147). Noah features in Arabic / Islamic accounts as one of the inventors of geomantic divination (Warrington Eastlake 1980; al-Zanati 1995 /1923). Also the common identification, in the older literature, of Noah (whose name sounds similar to the South Chinese / Miao Flood and culture heroine Nü Wa 女媧, ‘Lady Frog’ or ‘Lady Gourd’ by perhaps a popular etymology) with Fu Xi 伏羲 – Nü Wa’s
So it looks as if in the White God and Flood Hero Noah we encounter once more a transformation of the Upper Palaeolithic Mother of the Primal Waters, of whom here the nurturative aspect as mother of all humankind was initially emphasised.

However, although this etymology fits the obvious cosmological idea of a primal mother, there is a plausible alternative within *Borean, which ties in with well-known circum-Mediterranean cosmogonic notions in terms of a 'primal abyss, chaos' (cf. the traditional Hebrew etymology of Noah as 'rest' – the foundation on which the whole of the world, or humankind, rests?) – but also with the ‘vulva’ etymology which, as I proposed above, also seems to underlie the name of the Greek water god Poseidon:

Table 6.11. Alternative long-range etymology of the name Noah: ‘hole’ © Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Long-range etymology’

6.5.10. Towards *Borean-derived etymologies of the names of Noah’s three sons

Since Noah has the trappings of a White God of first or secondary creation, apparently continuous with Central and East Asian as well as North American and African manifestations of this type, we may take it that the constitutive components of the Genesis Flood story and its protagonists are many millennia old, and that the diffusion of these st" companions at least from the late 1st millennium BCE (Faber 1816: II, 343 f.; Davidson & Aldersmith 1924 / 1940; Cook & Rosemont 1994: 15, 98 f.; Walker 1972). A similar claim for Japheth (Leslie 1984), from whom an entire race of Huns is claimed to have descended in Late Medieval and Early Modern literature (1984: 15, 98 f.; Walker 1972). A similar claim for Japheth (Leslie II, 343 f.; Davidson & Aldersmith 1924 / 1940; Cook & Rosemont 1984). Ssu-ma Ch’ien described (Allen 1894-95) the legendary country of the Tungusic ancestors of the Manchus, north of the Ever White Mountain where birds, trees, beasts were all white, and whose economy and funerary customs (involving wine libations, cf. Noah as the first wine-maker) centred on white pigs – perhaps a place where some White Noah still alien to Semitic abhorrence of pork would be at home. No doubt as a result of Islamic influence, Noah and his flood also appear in the foundation myth of a devotional site in West Java (Djunatan 2011).

ries is to be situated within the overall ‘Back-to-Africa’ movement from Central Asia to Africa, from c. 15 ka BP onwards (more recently specifically mediated in through the Pelasgian cross-model of expansion). The names of the protagonists may have been given Semitic etymologies, within a narrow spatial and temporal framework, but these are probably just popular etymologies concealing a non-Semitic provenance of great antiquity. This is particularly clear for the specific case of Noah, whose homologues and near-namesakes extend from East Asia to South Central Africa, and with a possible etymology that might go back to *Borean but that is most convincing in Sino-Tibetan and perhaps Austro-Aleut reflexes of *Boran. Of course, a mythological claim of relations of filiation, whilst reflecting socio-political relations prevailing at the time when such a claim is made, may bring together mythical characters of very different background in space and time. In other words, if Shem, Ham and Japheth are claimed to be Noah’s sons, it may simply be that these are three older local gods that happened to be subjugated and incorporated with the advent and rise to dominance, in West Asia, of the specific ethnic group championing Noah as their ancestor / Flood hero / White God / Supreme God. On the other hand, the package of Noah and his specifically named sons may have come down from Central Asia as one unified ensemble, and in that case the names of these sons may have etymologies belonging to the same linguistic, and spatio-temporal background as the name Noah himself.

Table 6.12 offers a plausible etymology of Japheth.349

Semantically, this would suggest the following possible interpretation for the name of Japheth:

1. ‘the first, he who opens the series of descendents of Noah’; this is primarily narrowly Semitic; but it tallies with a passage in Genesis 10 where Japheth indeed appears to be designated as the eldest son, and not Shem – and where an explicit etymology of Japheth’s name is given:

   ‘God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.’ (Genesis 9:27)

2. A comparatively much more obvious semantic: ‘marsh, (fallow / uncultivated) field, land, earth’; in other words, not the wide sky, but the wide earth – of such an etymology we also have a Telugu (Dravidian) example.

3. ‘openness’ in the sense of ‘brightness’, as opposed to darkness; with the characteristic layerness of myth and symbol, this could suggest both ‘coolness’ (heat dissipating in the open) and ‘heat’ (brightness being associated with the diurnal luminary, the sun), and by extension of the sun, the open, bright sky.

To this we might add a fourth semantics, deriving not from the *Borean *pTV, ‘wide, open but from time-honoured attempts351 to link the Biblical name of Japheth to the Greek theonym Iapetus. Iapetus is a Titan banned to Tartaros by the triumphant Olympian gods. He typically has the characteristics of an older god of creation relegated to a secondary position under a new cosmological (and ethnic) dispensation; he is only two generations removed from the flood – Deukalion his grandson by Prometheus and Pyrrha his granddaughter by Epimetheus are the Greek flood heroes. Assuming the name Iapetus to have a Greek etymology (which, in view of the above, is however unlikely both in time and in space), the name has been ex-

---

350 This suggests that the name Japheth is cognate to that of Ancient Egyptian Ptah, who then (like Janus and his cognates Baso- jaun and Ganesha) would be a god of beginnings, openings, and espousal cosmogony, and only secondarily (by a flattening of the cosmogonic element) of artisanal arts. Quite possibly Japheth was a cosmogonic god in his right before he was pressed into service as son of the Flood hero and culture hero Noah. The prominent comparative linguist Blažek (2010) sees the name Pah as the etymon of Ancient Greek Hephaestus / Ηφαιστος, but although the later manifestations of these two gods meet as patrons of artisanal arts, Hephaestus is more properly an elemental god of fire, and his name is best explained as deriving from proto-Berber hi- faw, ‘fire’, as I argue at length in my forthcoming book Black Vulcan (van Binsbergen, forthcoming (b)).
plained (Frisk 1973) in terms of the Greek verb ἱαπτω, ‘to move fast, to send’, also in connection of a spear therefore ‘to pierce’. Iapetus could then have the connotations of the celestial axis. Alternatively, since the Moon (which traverses in a month the same path that takes to Sun a year to complete) is the fast mover par excellence, Iapetus has been equated with the Moon; but to the everyday experience of the astronomical lay-person trying to get his day’s work done, the Sun itself would qualify as a fast mover. Next to Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon constitute an obvious cosmic pair, so Ham could then be other great luminary.

Next to Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon constitute a nation of the astronomical lay-person trying to get his day’s experience in a month the same path that takes to Sun a year to complete) is the fast mover par excellence, Iapetus has been equated with the Moon; but to the everyday experience of the astronomical lay-person trying to get his day’s work done, the Sun itself would qualify as a fast mover. Next to Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon constitute an obvious cosmic pair, so Ham could then be other great luminary.

Here we are reminded of Shu and Tefnut, the earliest Egyptian divine creatures, who were also equated with these luminaries, typically in the Late period. Incidentally, even for the name of the sun-god Ra⁺, which is hard to furnish with an Egyptian etymology, a Hebrew etymology has been proposed in terms of reʼa ndata ‘companion’, notably the Sun as the Moon’s companion (Morenz 1977: 23 f.). However, I believe that this is a late popular etymology upon a name that is much older than the emergence of Hebrew. Below (ch. 28) I reluctantly propose an Austric etymology for Ra⁺, as well as for several other core names in Ancient Egyptian religion.

This seems to agree with the proposed Hebrew etymology in terms of ‘heat, sun, day, burnt, black’ in Table 6.2; but again, although such notions may well have existed at the level of the Greek and Israelite historical actors in the Early and Middle Iron Age, these names are probably much older.

Let us now continue with Ham. To move beyond the conventional, but unconvincing Hebrew etymologies we may begin (since we also could list a plausible Egyptian etymology of Noah) by considering ʻAm equivalent to Ancient Egyptian kmt (t) ‘black, especially Black Land = the land of Egypt’.

Here the Earth-Heaven juxtaposition reappears, but (as is only to be expected on grounds of the capricious and reversible nature of symbols) this time Ham would be ‘earth’ and Japheth ‘heaven’ – just as their identification as either sun or moon seems reversible.

We noted above for *Borean only one word for ‘heaven’ has been reconstructed: *HV/KM/V, ‘sky, cloud’. It is not totally impossible to arrive at Ham / ʻAm from this *Borean point of departure. Especially in the Middle Iron Age Hebrew context of the redaction of Genesis, an evolved reflex deriving from the first part of *HV/KM/V, notably *HAV, might have been erroneously understood as the definite particle ha ʼil, which would leave only the part *

<KV as name, from where a development to the attested ʻHVm, ʻAm appears to be quite plausible – among other reasons, because in Hebrew the letter ʻ is pronounced k or kh / ק dependent upon its position within the word.

In view of some of the above considerations (recursion as revolving on binary opposition, the connotations of darkness that are often attributed to Ham, the name’s closeness to Old Egyptian kmt, ‘black [land]’, the juxtaposition between day and night as a the archetypical binary opposition, and the connotations of lightness, openness on Japhet’s side) one might be tempted to discern a secondary dimension in the names of Ham and Japheth: night and day, whose institution was taken to mark (Genesis 1 – but also the cyclical transformative worldview underlying Old World geomantic divination systems departs from the opposition between dark and light) a fundamental step in the process of creation – perhaps fittingly re-enacted in the names of the sons of the flood hero, proclaimedly in the context of Second Cosmogony after the Flood, but in fact also with elements pointing to the Original Cosmogony (Noah as matrix of the heavens / original parent of the universe).

In view of some of the above considerations (recursion as revolving on binary opposition, the connotations of darkness that are often attributed to Ham, the name’s closeness to Old Egyptian kmt, ‘black [land]’, the juxtaposition between day and night as a the archetypical binary opposition, and the connotations of lightness, openness on Japhet’s side) one might be tempted to discern a secondary constrastive dimension in the names of Ham and Japheth: night and day, whose institution was taken to mark a major early step in the process of creation (Genesis 1); also the cyclical transformative worldview underlying Old World geomantic divination systems departs from the opposition between dark and light, Yin / Yang (陰陽).

Perhaps this major cosmogonic step was fittingly re-enacted in the names of the sons of the Flood hero, proclaimedly in the context of Second Cosmogony after the Flood, but in fact also with elements pointing to the Original Cosmogony (Noah as matrix of the heavens, as the original chaos, almost the original parent of the universe).

It looks as if, in addition to the superimposed dimensions Sun-Moon, Heaven-Earth and hot-cold, the black-white contrast is particularly important, because it is here that we can offer a rather convincing *Borean etymology of the name Ham to match that of Japheth as presented above (Table 6.13).
Afroasiatic: *ḥVm- (?) (or *yam- *ḥam- (approx.), ‘dark’

Proto-Semitic: *ḥVm(H) ‘father-in-law’, and with Proto-Semitic:

Proto-Yupik: *amuГ- ?

Proto-Eskimo: ḥamm- (no. 816) ‘be hot’ 1, ‘warm’ 2

Proto-Austroasiatic: *Vm (only Khmuic) ‘red’

Proto-Khmu: *ım

Proto-Austronesian: *qım ‘shade, darkness, gloom’

Notes: Cf. *Vm(H).

Amerind (misc.): *xürna ‘night, dark, black’ (Bengtson & Ruhlen 1994: 76)

Reference: Starostin 1989: 53 *xVmHV.

Basque: ‘gau’ Proto-Basque: ‘gau’ ‘night’

Birzaians: gau; Gipuzkoan: gau; High Navarrese: gau; Low Navarrese: gau;

Lapurid: gau; Zueronan: ga; Roncalian: gau, gai;

Comments: Chiribas 1985 Basque + Proto-

Lezgian *k ‘evening’, etc.

Comments and references: Starostin 1989: 53 *xVmHV.

Austric: Proto-Austro-Aryan: ‘? Em ‘dark’

Proto-Austroasiatic: *Vm (only Khmuic) ‘red’

Proto-Khmu: *ım

Proto-Austronesian: *qım ‘shade, darkness, gloom’

Notes: Cf. *Vm.

Amerind (misc.): *xürna ‘night, dark, black’ (Bengtson & Ruhlen 1994: 76)


Table 6.13. Global reflexes of *Borean (approx.): *KVMV ‘black, dark’

© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Long-range etymology’

However, before we jump to conclusions (in terms of a post-Boreal fundamental cosmological dualism: heaven-earth, dark-light, sun-moon, male-female, also to be found in Eurasian divination) let us identify the long-range etymology of an interpretation of the name Ham starting from Hebrew יַהַן ‘hot, heat’;

Proto-Semitic: *ḥarn- (no. 816) ‘be hot’ 1, ‘warm’ 2

Akkadian: ṣarna 1, ‘warm’ 2

Hebrew: harn 2

Syrian Aramaic: ḫarn 1

Arabic: harrn [-u-] 1

Table 6.14. Reflexes of Proto-Semitic: *ḥamm- ‘warm’

© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Semitic etymology’

No higher-level reflexes can be found here for proto-Afroasiatic let alone for Borean, although there appears to be interference with Proto-Semitic: *ḥarn(m)- (Proto-Afro-Asiatic: *ḥarn- ) ‘father-in-law’, and with Proto-Semitic: *Vm(aw)- ‘venom, poison’ (which is especially interesting since, of all Noah’s sons, Ham is the only one to be associated, in the Bible and other traditions, with evil and sorcery), cf. the data in the following Table 6.15:

Table 6.15. Reflexes of Proto-Semitic: *ḥVm(aw)t- ‘venom, poison’
© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Semitic etymology’

Table 6.16. Global reflexes of Borean (approx.): *KVMV ‘black, dark’
© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Semitic etymology’

The absence of reflexes of *HV/MV ‘dark’ in Semitic makes it conceivable that the standard interpretation of the name Ham as ‘hot’ is a popular etymology inspired by the Hebrew word ‘hot, heat’, whereas in fact the personal name Ham comes from *HV/MV, ‘dark, night, black’, and is to be paired semantically with ‘light, day, white’. Since *HV/MV ‘black’ left a reflex in proto-Semitic but only surfaces in the Arabic twig of the Semitic branch, perhaps we are justified in suggesting that the proper name Ham antedates the dissociation – probably around 1000 BCE – of Hebrew and Arabic. However, considering the distribution of the reflexes of Borean *HV/MV (approx.), ‘dark’, it is not exclusively from Afroasiatic (and in that case, specifically from Proto-Semitic: *ḥam- ‘become black’) that we can propose the origin of a name Ham with the basic meaning ‘dark’, and part of a binary opposition ‘dark / light’ (i.e. still conceived in the long tradition of recurrence-based binary oppositions, and before the emphasis on triads that is characteristic of the great Old World civilisations of the Bronze Age). Alternative possible provenances, all to be considered reflexes of Borean *HV/MV (approx.), ‘dark’, are:

- Proto-Eurasian: *HV/MV ‘morning / evening’, and then especially Proto-Kartvelian: *畎 am- ‘night, evening’
- Proto-Sino-Caucasian: *畎 V[mn]HV ‘dark’ (which however has /n/ instead of /m/), and then especially Proto-Sino-Tibetan: *畎 V[mn] ‘dark, shade’.

References: Dolgopolosky n.d.: 1066b
The West to Central Asian connotations of the Noah figure (his association with the Caucasus as the site of his landfall after the flood, his alleged albino nature, etc.) return here for the case of his alleged son Ham, and despite the traditional biblical association *(Genesis 10)* of the name Ham with the regions south and east of Israel (Egypt, Cush, Mesopotamia), I believe the linguistic evidence suggests a West to Central Asian origin for the name and mythical figure of Ham. Indications are that the names of Noah and Ham already belonged to the pre-Pelasgian Central Asian region, were subsequently incorporated with the Pelasgian package and, with other Pelasgian traits, moved West to the Pelasgian realm proper in the Neolithic or Early Bronze Age. Our analysis of the complementary name, Japheth in terms of ‘open, day’ (Borean (approx.) *PVTV*, ‘open, wide’) is in accordance with such an interpretation. Japheth would then not in the first place refer to the lowly-pigmented Caucasian somatic type, nor to the sky or the earth, but to a division of the entire world in night and day, cf. *Genesis* (1:4-5):

4 And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness.

5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day. *(P)*

Since in this Section we are centrally engaged with the identification / reconstruction of ancient modes of thought on the basis of which we may perform historical criticism upon the text of *Genesis* 10, let us make one further step. We should realise that the likely Borean root which we have identified for Japheth, *PVTV*, ‘open, wide’ does not in the first place mean ‘light, white’, although that meaning is so close to ‘open, wide’ that it can be accepted without further argument. Something more is the matter here. Leopard-skin symbolism (cf. van Binsbergen 2004a, 2004b, 2004c; and Chapter 29, below) is very wide-spread in the world, especially when we consider that in the New World, the jaguar (*Panthera onca*) with its usually spotted skin is equivalent to the leopard / panther (*Panthera pardus*) in the sense that it shares in much the same symbolism – either because that symbolism is so old that it predates the migration from West to Central Asia to the New World, or because the oppositions on which such leopard-skin symbolism is based, are easily reproduced from scratch by the mind of Anatomically Modern Humans, regardless of the latter’s geographical location of their antecedents of cultural history. The leopard-skin with its spots (usually black and red ones against a pale yellow background) constitutes a natural example of *granulation*, and as such it is the obvious opposition to the unbroken extension of plain unicoloured surfaces, such as that of the lion’s skin. Where the daylight and the sun tend to be associated with the lion, the night sky with its myriad stars tends to be associated with the leopard – for instance the distinction is very clearly made in Ancient Egyptian astronomy (Stricker 1963-89). Numerous examples of this binary opposition can be cited, from all over the world, and from the Middle Palaeolithic onward. For Descartes (1904) the fundamental opposition in the world was that between the mind (whose ‘cogito ergo sum’ is the point of departure for all reality claims) and matter, whose only characteristic is supposed to be its *extension*. French philosophical and scientific thought has remained essentially Cartesian and dualist throughout the Modern Age, and it is the 20th philosophers Deleuze & Guattari (1980) who reproduce, in modern philosophical text, the idea that seems to underlie, not only globally distributed forms of leopard-skin symbolism, but also the opposition between Japheth and Ham. This idea is the following. In the unbroken extension of the featureless chaos of non-creation / non-perception, it is the one black spot that invites the roaming mind to apply and attach itself, and be quickened by it. It is the smoothness of the daylight, the continuous, the untouched and the unthought – the pre-cosmogonic chaos – against the definition, articulation, the spot and the word, of the cosmogonic engagement of the Mind. So essentially the juxtaposition of Ham and Japheth evokes the tension and opposition (between featureless not-yet-being, and articulated being under the effect of a creative Actor or Mind – initially merely implied, later probably expressed as ‘the Name’) that is resolved by the emergence of reality at the beginning of time, with all its inevitable evil (which is so clearly marked in the case of Ham!).

There is in fact a biblical passage in which some of the elements of this hermeneutical account come to the fore:

23 Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil. *(Jeremiah 13:23)*

Let us finally consider Shem. As far as this name is concerned, there exists, in *Borean, a widely ramifying etymology of ‘CVMV as ‘name, form’, which has actually
persisted all the way into Semitic. Now ‘Name’ of course is hardly a convincing name for a mythological character – even though, in the tradition of Judaism, it is the standard euphemism for ‘God’. ‘Name’ as the name of a person is exceedingly unlikely; there is the suggestion of an ancient conundrum, such as that which informed the name under which Odysseus revealed himself to the Cyclops Polyp heconundrum, such as that which was the name of a person under which Odysseus revealed himself to the Cyclops Polyphemus: ‘Nobody’ (Odyssey IX, 366). For Noah, Japheth and Ham we had some apparent success in finding, beyond Semitic, a long-range, even *Borean etymology. Could a Ham we had some apparent success in finding, beyond *Borean etymology. Could a

Table 6.17. Semantic possibilities of *Borean *CVMV hide under Shem / Šm ‘Name’? *Borean offers a number of possibilities here, as listed in Table 6.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstructed *Borean root</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₁</td>
<td>to swallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₂</td>
<td>grass, reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₃</td>
<td>to taste, eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₄</td>
<td>sour, bitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₅</td>
<td>smear, fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₆</td>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₇</td>
<td>eyebrow &gt; eyelid; hair of head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₈</td>
<td>bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₉</td>
<td>blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₁₀</td>
<td>dark, black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₁₁</td>
<td>edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₁₂</td>
<td>fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₁₃</td>
<td>marsh, uncultivated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₁₄</td>
<td>a kind of bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CVMV₁₅</td>
<td>name, shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.17. Semantic possibilities of *Borean *CVMV₁... after Starostin & Starostin 1998–2008, ‘Long-range etymologies’

Note that some of the meanings in Table reiterate the semantic themes identified above for Noah, Japheth and Ham (notably: darkness, land, edge / horizon), which may be taken as another indication that the name Shem is mainly a dummy to complete the triad and to position Shem’s putative descendants (the Israeliite redactors of Genesis 10) in an attractive, senior position. However, before we jump to conclusions we would do well to consider (cf. Table 6.18, **bold** entries) the considerable overlap in *Borean, between the semantic fields of the *Borean word clusters *CVMV₁... and *PVTV₁..., suggesting once more that Shem cannot stand on his own but is a dummy cate-
gory especially indebted to the category ‘Japheth’.

Here again we see that it is not possible to discuss ethnic categories while completely ignoring the cosmological, political, identity and emotional significance they have for groups of historical actors. The Sea Peoples problematic has become a major industry in the state of Israel, partly for neutral scientific reasons of access to rich archaeological grounds, partly however because of the symbolic equation between Plst, one of the constituent Sea Peoples, usually identified with the Philistines, and today’s Palestinians – and thus with legitimating implications for the Zionist state and to the Jewish people cannot be ignored as a factor in the background. An attempt like the present one, to doubt the historical reality of an ancestor Shem and to conflate those who today identify as his descendants (Jews and Arabs alike) with the putative descendants of Japheth, will create controversy and resentment, even if I try to demonstrate that Japheth is a mythical term representing cosmological themes and not (as commonly assumed in circles of Biblical studies) an emblem for White Caucasians or Eurasians as against Asians and Blacks and Afroasiatic speakers.

Biblical studies have for many centuries resorted to popular etymologies for the names of the three ‘sons’ of Noah; our present proposal, having obvious weaknesses in itself, does not immediately render these popular etymologies meaningless. However, my analysis brings out that such popular etymologies can only apply within the specific Biblical world, and cannot reveal anything about the possibly distant – which as we have seen is not totally beyond empirical investigation – origin of these names in a time that may be several even many millennia earlier, in an environment that may be thousands of km east of Palestine. 352

352 Water, its lexicon and its mythology inevitable pays a major role in this book on the Sea Peoples, and in this connection we could not help to notice other possibilities to make sense of the name of Ham. As we will see in Table 29.2, below, *Borean JVMVø, ‘sea, water’, yields the reflex *jamV in Eurasiatic / Nostratic, and *ham- in Afroasiatic; this is another of Bengtson and Ruhlen’s (1994: no. 78) ‘global etymologies’, also ramifying into Austric. This makes us wonder whether, after all, the name of Ham (although with a different phonology: ḫanām) could originally have meant ‘water’ – so that perhaps the fraternal triad Shem, Ham and Japheth stood for ‘sky, sea and earth / underworld’. This suggestion presses all the more, since also from *Borean MVVVo,
Table 6.18. The overlapping semantic fields of the *Borean
word clusters *CVMV₁…n and *PVTV₁…n

The genealogical format of the Table of Nations

6.6.1. Introducing genealogies

The overall format of the Table of Nations is that of a
(pseudo-)genealogy, which raises numerous problems some
of which I shall now discuss.

Our main aim in analysing the Table of Nations is to
to establish the extent to which this document can be con-
sidered as an ethnic-geographical construction of the Early
to Middle Iron Age.

Here an important question arises:

To what extent does the Table of Nations refer to
contemporary (Middle Iron Age II) and local
conditions in Palestine, and to what extent can it
be supposed to contain much older historical
knowledge also from much further afield?

The great majority of societies have always belonged
to the type in which kinship is the principal idiom in which
social organisation is shaped at the emic level of the social
actors’ consciousness. In such societies, it is kinship that
governs patterns of co-residence, division of labour, mobil-
isation of people in times of misfortune, conflict, war, ill-
ness and death, access to and management of collective
resources, and the incumbency of collectively managed posi-
tions of political and ritual leadership. Here, genealogies
usually function as ‘charters’, in the sense that, from the
lowest level of face-to-face relationships to the highest
level encompassing the entire local or regional society, ge-
nealogies add a formal legitimation in terms of descent
(and of kinship relations in general), to political relation-
ships that have already taken a particular shape as a result
of other factors. These factors are typically not ascriptive,
but on the contrary revolve on personal agency, manipula-
tion, power struggles and sleight-of-hand, and therefore
belong to the realm, not of ascription but of personal
achievement. Such a charter tends to offer a manipulated
rendition, in line with the official societal ideology but at
variance with objective history, of what would be the leg-
itimation of the actual status-quo at a particular moment
in time and as seen from a particular, interested perspec-
tive.

It is clear why, in the rendering of ethnic and geo-
graphical designations, people have so often and fr om
times immemorial reached for the genealogy as a model
of thought and of representation. The genealogy rep resents
social relations, in terms of what appears as the uncondi-
tional truth of the blood: one either is, or is not, some-
body’s child, or somebody’s parent. The genealogical

353 Malinowski 1954; Bohannan 1952.
354 But, of course, far from universally – there are many societies
in which the concept of the genealogy has little or no currency.
355 Although, of course, the relationship of descent between a
mother and a child is far less contestable than that between a fa-
ther and a child – this is in fact the reason why in Israelite / Jewish
contexts Jewish identity is determined by the identity of the
format imposes an inescapable regime of (the suggestion of) truth upon the fluid, contradictory and manipulable relations of an ethnic and geographical nature. It transforms these relations by a formal representation in terms of the historical actors’ dominant societal ideology, notably descent as the central ordering principle of kin grouping and of society in general.356

In many societies, by virtue of the normative formal structure as consciously and explicitly invoked by the social actors in official declarations (e.g. court cases, collective oaths, etc.), essential rights (notably the status of belonging to the local community, the exercise of full rights over that community’s resources in terms of land, springs, forest products, shrines, political and ritual offices, etc.) depend on descent from a former member of that community – and very often upon a specific form of descent, for instance an unbroken and explicitly cited genealogical chain from father to son extending over a number of generations (patrilineal descent). Yet many people would be temporary, or even permanent, members of such a community on the basis of other factors than descent, for instance their local status would be that of an in-marrying affine,357 a labour migrant, survivor of a shipwreck, foundling, slave, adoptive child, adoptive sibling, itinerant trader, an outsider who bought land locally, an outsider stationed in the local community as an official representative of a distant government, of a world religion, or of a scientific discipline such as anthropology. In principle such a community member who lacks the legitimation of descent in the prescribed line has far fewer rights in the local community, and far less prestige, than the born members. Therefore genealogies tend to play a decisive role in the attribution of collectively managed rights, and in social placement in general. However, such knowledge about the past as genealogies have to offer is defective, selective, and manipulable, particularly in the many societies where genealogical knowledge is handed down orally and not in written form. Often one can notice that genealogies are being adapted, through a plurality of strategies which anthropology has extensively identified and named. By subtle genealogical manipulation it becomes possible that appreciated outsiders are henceforth considered rightful insiders, however much such a new situation is at variance with the ‘objective historical reality’: in the genealogies that are henceforth handed down from generation to generation in an altered form, certain ancestors are given a few extra children or extra siblings, in order to give the appreciated newcomers a proper place (a place that they have earned anyway as de facto appreciated members of the local community), and after one or two generations hardly any member of the local community knows the objective truth anymore. Social communicative conventions (such as the very widespread practice of calling friends and neighbours by – classificatory – kinship terms regardless of actual biological relationships) work as lubricants towards such manipulation, and allow it to go virtually unnoticed; however, also cases have been recorded of groups deliberately and explicitly revising their formal genealogies in order to accommodate new local political facts.358 The process works both ways: while genealogical manipulation offers the possibilities of accommodating appreciated outsiders as kinsmen, biological kinsmen can also be unintentionally deleted from the genealogies if they are no longer effective interaction partners within the local community: if they have out-migrated, or if in other respects (e.g. as social outcasts, criminals or traitors) they have forfeited their right to be counted as members of the local community. After a few generations no one in the local community will recognise their descendants as kinsmen (i.e. ‘relative through marriage’), nor honour their claim to local resources.359

The genealogy constitutes a model of social ordering which is of the greatest importance for understanding ethnicity. The genealogy imposes, upon the social field, a consistent and detailed net of interpretation, because the genealogy can present the ad hoc result of socio-political manipulation and accommodation as something that is historically inescapable, that is determined by descent and blood, and perennial. In this way the genealogy amounts to the translation of

(a) patterns of actual interaction in geographic space, into
(b) ideal historical patterns of consanguineality in time.

Thus the genealogy also represents a moral order, for in most societies blood relationship implies a code of solidarity, etiquette, and both material and moral obligations, which one can scarcely infringe on unless at the cost of strong social and religious sanctions. If one can cite a genealogy that contains both one’s interaction partner and

mother, despite the fact that the Jews are emphatically patrilineal, and show themselves to be so already in the genealogy of Genesis 10.

357 In anthropology, an affine is ‘a relative through marriage’.
358 Bohannan 1952.
oneself, then this means that one accepts that other person as living within one’s own social horizon, as sharing the same world, as a fellow human being in the strictest sense. The broad subdivisions of the genealogy are then the conscious (albeit often implicit) subdivisions that historical actors make within their own wider world.

The anchorage of the genealogy in the universal, quasi-biological sphere of descent and kinship, makes it possible (as has been clearly recognised by anthropology) to see the genealogical format also, perhaps even primarily, as a formal, abstract model of classificatory thought that can be applied in numerous situations. Speaking in genealogical terms is then not in the first place a metaphor, but it is simply the form in which the logical tools are available that social actors need for the formal description of central aspects of their consciously recognised social order. In a comparable way medieval, Arabic tables (such as used, for instance, in various forms of divination) use the image of the ‘net’ and modern algebra uses the concepts of chains and roots, without even recognising this any more as metaphoric. The genealogy is, first and foremost, the most obvious traditional format for any kind of taxonomy. It is the pre-scientific form in which the dendrogram presents itself – and the dendrogram has remained a major analytical tool for statistical analysis, probability calculus, the analysis of government and industrial bureaucracies by means of organigrams. These features make it possible for the genealogy to appear, not only in the literate settings that were once the habitual haunts of anthropologists, or in the Bible as is the subject of the present section, but throughout mythological literature as a form of mythical narrative.\textsuperscript{361}

The example of the organigram reminds us of the fact that many different types of order may be expressed in the form of a genealogy. In this way the genealogy denotes, not so much a normative ideology of specific degrees of connectedness and obligation, but especially of social distance: the more steps one has to make, within the genealogy, to travel from A to B, the greater, in practice, the social distance between A and B.

As a classificatory statement, the genealogy also establishes sequences that have hierarchical implications. The elder brother, with all the superior claims and prerogatives that his position entails, is usually mentioned first in the series where the siblings of his generation are enumerated, and his descendants are enumerated before the descendants of his younger siblings. In the same vein, offspring of principal wives tend to take precedence over offspring of subsequent wives; and all legal offspring born in wedlock take precedence over the offspring of slaves, let alone of concubines.

\subsection{6.6.2. Biblical genealogies}

Biblical scholars count among their numbers those who are unfailing believers in the Jewish or Christian faith and who therefore have a stake in a particular interpretation of the Bible and of specific Biblical passages. Yet Biblical scholars are in the first place scholars, and it did not take them long, after the establishment of Biblical criticism (with the humanists around 1500 CE such as Erasmus and Melanchton, and seventeenth-century CE authors like Spinoza, Grotius and Le Clerc) and of scientific historicism (Vico, Hegel, Marx), to realise that Biblical genealogies constitute a class of their own, which does not excel in historical reliability. This important insight was already firmly established by 1900 CE. It is not only in \textit{Genesis} 10 that we find genealogies which are not statements about the biological relations between individuals, but statements about group relations. \textit{Genesis} is full of such pseudo-genealogies, so is in fact the entire Hebrew Bible, and this trend is continued right up to the beginning of the Gospel of Matthew in the Christian New Testament. The Biblical scholars of a century ago recognised (one can hardly miss it) the typical Semitic peculiarity of identifying the ancestor, as a person, with the entire set of his descendants, so that Jacob / Israel comes to stand for the vicissitudes of the entire people of Israel, etc.\textsuperscript{362} Through the genealogical expression (not necessarily based on historical fact) of various types of marriages (marriage with free-born women, slaves or concubines), claims were expressed concerning the degrees of legitimacy, and thus a hierarchy was created for the groups

\begin{center}
\footnotesize \textsuperscript{361} Cf. Philippson 1936 (on Hesiod).
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\footnotesize \textsuperscript{362} Incidentally, the same convention is in evidence in royal traditions of South Central Africa, where the king describes in the first person singular, as ‘I’, events that supposedly happened to the previous incumbents of his dynastic royal title, and that in fact usually did not take place at the level of an individual, but of the people as a whole; thus a Nkoya king in Zambia in 1973, referring to legendary events supposed to have taken place about six generations earlier (c. 1800 CE), would speak in the following manner (cf. van Binsbergen 1992a; Cf. Vansina 1966):
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\footnotesize ‘I crossed the Lualaba river and dwelled in the plain of Tumba, prior to moving on to the valley of the Donga river.’
\end{center}

Another indication of Bantoid traits in the world of the Hebrew Bible?
supposed to be the issue of such marriage. Quite early on
Bible scholars also realised that, at various points, there
was evidence of genealogical manipulation, which reflected
historical changes in the socio-political relations between
the groups in question.

Today, the professional analysis of people’s manage-
ment of their genealogies is primarily the domain of an-
thropologists and oral historians. There are indications
that many of the genealogical insights which anthropolo-
gists consider as pertaining to their own particular disci-
pline, were in fact derived from Biblical scholarship long
before the rise of a professional anthropology special-
ising in kinship research.

The Hebrew Bible’s genealogical obsession can be
dated, historically, to the post-Exilic, late period, when the
gradual assimilation between Israeliite and pre-Israelite Ca-
nanite population elements as a process had virtually
reached its completion, but when it was important to stress
correct genealogical position in order to keep the people
i.e. the religious community together, and also in order to
claim the privilege of priestly office. Therefore these late
genealogies are largely constructs that have little or nothing
to do with factual family history.

Fig. 6.9 brings out in a more usual form the textual
contents of the Table of Nations as primarily that of a
genealogy. Regional, geographical and ethnic distinctions are
discussed in terms of a classification system that happens to
derive from the conceptualisation and management of kin-
ship in everyday life: the genealogy.

The literature on Biblical genealogies is quite exten-
sive. This aspect of Biblical studies must be considered

363 Genealogies do not form the only point where anthropology
and Bible studies meet. Taking the lead of James Frazet’s Folk-
lore in the Old Testament (1918), anthropological approaches to
the Bible have grown into an interesting field, e.g. Carroll 1977;
Gottwald 1983; Leach 1969, 1983; Rogerson 1970; Boudillon
1975, 1979; Carroll 1977; Douglas 1999. To this we may add the
analysis of the Bible as oral literature, by the prominent folklorist
Alan Dundes (1999).

364 E.g. Robertson Smith, Kinship & marriage in early Arabia
(1969 / 1885) – not by accident republished by Emys Peters who
was one of the great anthropological specialists on Arab genea-
logical manipulation. Robertson Smith’s (1894 / 1927 / 1969)
Lectures on the religion of the Semites had a tremendous impact
on anthropology as the major influence on Durkheim’s Les formes
elementaires de la vie religieuse (1912).

365 For aspects of the anthropological approach to genealogies, cf.
Rivers 1910; Barnes 1967; Cunnison 1957, Hackenberg 1974;
Kramer 1978; McArthur 1967; Mayer 1965; van Binsbergen

366 For the literature on Biblical genealogies, cf. Aufrecht 1988,
1989; Barnouin 1970; Bryan 1987; Cook 1961a, 1961b; Hasel
against the background of scholarship’s wider appreciation
of genealogies in Antiquity and the Ancient Near East.

Pett believes to discern two distinct genealogical for-
mats in the Table of Nations: the dominant one which is
merely a conventional method for the ethnic and politico-
geographical classification of peoples, and a more genui-

367 The genealogy of Arpakhshad at this point is clearly a genu-
ine genealogy as we understand it (compare [Genesis] 11.10-
14) as befits the ancestor of Eber and Abraham.’

Generalising Pett’s insight, we can say that the entries
in the Table of Nations appear to belong to at least two dif-
ferent categories:

1. on the one hand there is the genealogical format
as a politico-geographical designation of state’s
territories and districts (such as indicated, grosso
modo, by the ‘sons’ of Migraim and Japheth), on
the other hand
2. real ethnic expressions for named groups that are
not states or districts, e.g. the Beny Eber, which
should be rendered, not so much, literally, as ‘the
sons of Eber’, but as ‘the Eberites’, i.e. the He-
brews.

By an inveterate convention that can still be observed
in the Middle East and North Africa in historical times and
even up to the present day, and that is very central to the
language of the Bible most if not all of the individual
proper names of the Table of Nations in fact designate just
that: ethnic groups or nations. Close associations between
such ethnic groups are indicated in the Table of Nations in
the idiom of filiation, which takes two variants: either from
the perspective of the father (‘he begat NN’), or from the
perspective of the son (‘son of NN’).

One of the principles outlined in my introdutory
Chapter 3. In the formula by which, in pseudo-genealogical fashion, the link is made between one personal name and the next, either: 369

a. ‘N.N. begat’, יָלַד, or
b. ‘these are the sons of N.N.’, ובן

2. In the formula that appears a few times in the chapter, and that implicitly sums up the ancient actors’ understanding of what constitutes an ethnic group: ‘with their families, in their lands, with their languages’.

Perhaps further study would reveal a fundamental difference between these two formulae and their application to particular ethnic situations, but I have not found any, so far.

If these insights have been available in Biblical studies for about a century, what could still be the specific contribution of modern anthropology? That may consist, in the first place, in the possibility (which, however, with increasing secularisation is now also available within Biblical studies itself) of adopting a secular perspective absolutely without any concession to the conventions of believers; and in the second place, in the possibility of precisely distinguishing very specific types of genealogical manipulation, and of identifying their possible socio-political consequences.

Biblical scholars have often been aware of the anthropological approach to genealogies – and Biblical scholars’ earlier, nineteenth-century work, has certainly helped to produce that anthropological approach, in the first place. This theological appreciation has tended to stress the elements of genealogical manipulation, charter-like legitimation, revision of genealogies in the light of the power dilemmas of a particular time and age, and hence genealogies’ very limited value as objective historical documents. 370 What theologians have less commonly appreciated is that genealogies come in a particular cultural format that carries meanings and implications specific to a particular society and period. Biblical genealogies belong to the wider category of Western Semitic, more general Semitic statements of kinship ideology, whose oldest attestations (Mesopotamian kinglists) are one or two millennia older than any text in the Bible; on the other hand, these early attestations are in considerable continuity with current genealogical practice in the Middle East and North Africa.

Informed by the strong sense of patriline, the variety of marriage forms (a man may marry more than one wife, one of whom tends to be the senior wife, and may in addition have children with servants, slaves and concubines), imposes an hierarchical difference in seniority among siblings. 371 Semitic genealogies are statements not only on the connectedness of people, but also of the internal hierarchical differences among them. Failing to appreciate this strong element of distinction and hierarchy, theologians have often 372 contrasted the apparent equality of all constituent parts of mankind through genealogical inclusion in the Table of Nations of Genesis 10, with the utter difference and fragmentation caused by the confusion of languages which is the central mytheme in Genesis 11. But the price for the declaration of the fundamental demographic / genealogical unity of mankind in Genesis 10, is the ranking of that same mankind into three groups of differential seniority: the eldest son is singled out, and the other sons and his descendants are inferior to him and his descendants.

This principle of hierarchy makes it all the more important, and politically contested, who could count as the eldest son. The logic of hierarchy invested in the genealogy makes the claim of Shem as, allegedly, Noah’s eldest son highly puzzling, and suggests that genealogical manipulation is at play here.

I have already discussed the triad formed by the distinction between the three explicitly mentioned sons of Noah: Shem, Ham and Japheth. Traditionally this tripartition has been conceived to be based on true siblings, the three sons of Noah – and has been conceived also as a somatic ordering, from the lightly pigmented Japheth to the more strongly pigmented Ham, with Shem possibly as an intermediate position. In broad general terms this also corresponds with a division in cardinal directions (cf. Fig. 6.6): as seen from Palestine, the Japhethites live predominantly to the north (and northwest), and the ‘Hamites’ to

---

369 This distinction is stressed by Mitchell 1976. Also cf. Block 1984.
371 Where the senior sibling is singled out by a special kinship term, in Arabic بُنُيَّا, ‘elder brother’, and أُثُلُّا, ‘elder sister’.
the southwest (with the exception of Nimrod and the Mesopotamian complex associated with him), while the ‘Semitic’ occupy the centre as is becoming for the group with which the original authors clearly identified. (Of course, ‘Hamites’ here is not to be confused with ‘Hamites’ as an obsolete term for speakers of Afroasiatic; modern linguistics also reckons the Semitic speakers (Hebrew, Arabic, Akkadian, etc.) under Afroasiatic. The specialist linguistic use of the terms Hamitic and Semitic however derives from a literalist or figurative reading of Genesis 10 by European linguists from the 19th century CE on.)

Ever since the 19th century CE, Biblical scholarship has recognised that the Hebrew Bible is a bricolage from various source documents. The effect of the various redactions is already apparent from the fact that halfway the Table of Nations the text gives up the pretence of presenting a historically correct genealogy of individual persons (even though, already here, the contemporary reader would have recognised names that are unmistakably not personal proper names but toponyms, such as Cush, Canaan), and begins to speak in terms of the relationships between what, in terms of the morphology of the Hebrew language (the use of the plural personal suffix -im), are clearly and explicitly collectivities: all expressions concerning the names which in our Table 6.1 have been numbered with the bracketed figures 32–40, and again 45–53.

So much for a literal, biological reading, in terms of individual real persons, of this apparent genealogy. However, if the table is conceived not so much as a quasi-biological genealogy of individuals but as a gauge of social distance in the contemporary perceptions of its authors (the priestly caste of Ancient Israel in the course of the first millennia BCE), then a number of interesting observations may be made.

I have already questioned the tripartition and the order of seniority of Noah’s alleged three sons on etymological and comparative mythological grounds. To this argument I can now add genealogical grounds. In the first verse of Genesis 10, the order is given as Shem, Ham and Japheth, whereas in the more extensive treatment as from verse Genesis 10:2 Japheth’s descendants are treated first, then Ham’s, and only then Shem’s. In the genealogical tradition of the Middle East and North Africa (which I got to know by collecting and painstakingly analysing hundreds of full genealogies and genealogical fragments in the highlands of North-western Tunisia), the full enumeration of the descendants of the senior brother would normally precede a similar enumeration for the junior brother; in this respect Japheth is implied, in Genesis 10:2, to be the senior brother. This suggests that the authors realised that putting Shem in the first place, as the senior brother, was an act of their chauvinism as members of their own particular ethnic group or descent branch, – an act that, even in their own consciousness, was considered to be at variance with historical truth. The extensive nature of the enumeration of the

---

As, outside the Table of Nations, in Genesis 5:32:
‘And Noah was five hundred years old: and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth’.

---

After Dolphin 2009; I have removed the descendants of Peleg, who are not mentioned in Genesis 10.
descendants of Shem is primarily to be found at the level of the grandchildren of Salah, himself a grandson of a grandson of Noah. This is a generational level at which, for Japheth and Ham, no descendants are specified. All this suggests a case of genealogical manipulation: against better knowledge, Shem is put at a place equivalent to that of Ham and Japheth, while much more likely he is to be subsumed in a much more junior position under one of the other sons of Noah, i.e. under either Japheth or Ham. On formal grounds, Shem could even be considered an alien descent group artificially grafted, by genealogical manipulation, onto the dominant local group.

It is equally puzzling that Shem, who allegedly belongs to the generation immediately under Noah, is declared to be ‘the father of all the sons of Eber’, whom a literal reading of the genealogical statements would make Noah’s great-grandson.

Whatever the meaning and etymology of the name Eber, in order to account for the statement on the fatherhood of his sons, one could opt for a less literal reading, according to which ‘father’ (‘28) could also mean ‘grandfather’, ‘ancestor’; such a reading would jeopardise any literal reading of the rest of the genealogical statements in Genesis 10, but considering that, there, ethnonyms and names of towns and countries feature mixed with names of persons, no literal reading would be possible anyway: it is very obvious that also for the contemporary actors, Genesis 10 constituted not a literal genealogy but a classificatory geopolitical statement.

Alternative explanations could be offered. The suggestion of genealogical manipulation, and the dummy nature of Shem’s name (‘Name’…) make it conceivable that, with Shem, not a real historical person was meant but perhaps the deity (to whom the later Jews piously referred to as ‘the Name’ anyway). The Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (although not the Hebrew tradition in the narrower sense) abound with mythical accounts of deities siring humans who would then lawfully boast both their divine ancestry and the genealogical filiation of their mother’s mortal husband, whose social child they officially were. Above we have seen how various Biblical scholars including Gordon have stressed the exceptional nature of the Table of Nations. However, the contrast with other ancient literatures is rather more limited than Gordon suggests, and the Hebrew writers less than totally original.

That there is something irregular here is also brought out by the fact that in Genesis 9, where an older priestly recension is reflected, Japheth is implied to be not the third but the second son of Noah. It is Ham, not Japheth, whose position is really at stake here. I propose that in the consciousness of the contemporary writers, who themselves must have identified as Beny Shem – i.e. as a third identity next to Japheth and Ham, they could not afford anymore to admit what yet seems to lurk underneath the story as the more likely truth: that the nations subsumed under Shem in fact had more in common with the nations subsumed under Ham than with those under Japheth. Perhaps, Shem was a cognate of the latter word – in line with the fact that, since (as a specific application of the general principle of sibling equivalence, which also applies to mothers and mother’s sisters, and to spouses) the same term tāía covers both meanings, and specification is needed if one wishes to unequivocally identify the biological father (e.g. in Nkoya: ba tāía bakibidiekii, ‘the father who begot me’). Given the considerable evidence for Bantu in the Bronze Age Levant (Chapter 4), the puzzle of Shem’s fatherhood over Eber’s children is solved if we simply assume that the original narrative was not in Hebrew and not even in Afroasiatic, but in a language that, like Bantu, did not distinguish between F and FB. Perhaps that original language was, simply, proto-Bantu, but a further comparative survey of kinship terminology (out of scope here) would have to indicate in which other macrophylla / culture areas F–FB equivalence is found.

Meanwhile, what appears to be a popular and ideological appropriation of recent genetic research has however suggested the existence a ‘Caucasian’ clade (‘mutation CCR-5-delta-32’) in, among other people, present-day Jews who, by virtue of their surname Cohen, could be plausibly considered to be, largely, the direct descendants of the endogamous, priestly caste of Ancient Israel; the other group apparently characterised by this clade consists of … Ancient Egyptian pharaohs, of all people – bien étonnés de se trouver ensemble, for Jewish ritual identity is predicated on the opposition between Israel (the name of the Patriarch Jacob, received at Peniel / Jabbok, Genesis 32:28-30, and increasingly used as a pars pro toto to indicate all of Jacob’s putative descendants, the ‘Israelites’) and the suppressing Pharaoh. Cf. Anonymous, n.d. [1998], ‘A European gene?!’. This source is clearly
initially perceived as a descendant of Ham, *i.e.* the Shem people were initially perceived, by the historical actors, as a branch of the Ham people. In *later* Hebrew usage, *goyim* in *Genesis* 10:5 would tend to be read not neurally as ‘nations’, but as ‘non-Jews, Gentiles’, and such a reading would all the more suggest that the true place of Shem was certainly not among the descendants of Japheth; however, the common reading in terms of ‘Gentiles’ here would seem to be anachronistic – and after all, Ham’s claimed descendants (ranging from Nubia to Mesopotamia and Anatolia – an enormous area) were, in great majority, not Jews either. It would be more to the point to remark that 

distinction between predominant pseudo-genealogical format, and the apparently genuine genealogical format, yet in the specific case of Arpakhshad and his descendants, for whom Pett proposes this distinction in the first place, it turned out to make much more sense if we read this genealogical fragment, too, as a pseudo-genealogical ethnic classification. We may conclude that the personal proper names in the Table of Nations do not refer to real individuals as real historic ancestors, but to states, administrative districts, lands, and especially nations and ethnic groups. Therefore whatever I had learned about the social manipulation of genealogies over time as a reflection of individual and group interests and alliances, simply did not apply – even though, superficially, there were the nominal signs of genealogical manipulation as in a real genealogy of individuals, especially in the multiple occurrences of Havila, Seba and Lud / Ludim, and in the contradictions attending the birth order of the three sons of Noah.

In *Genesis* 10:21, the Masoretic (7th-10th century CE) copula between יֶפֶת and יִתְנָבָג implies that traditionally the standard reading has been ‘[Shem, being the] elder brother of Japheth’. However, the syntactic flexibility of Biblical Hebrew does allow us to read this passage also as ‘Japheth, since Japheth was the elder brother [of Shem] – and this is in fact the Septuagint377 reading, with a tell-tale dative

---

376 Notably, Friedman’s (1988)

377 The Septuagint (‘Seventy’), abbreviated *LXX*, is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, made in Alexandria between the 3rd and the 1st century BCE, and named after the traditional number of 70 or 72 translators *(cf. Swete 1899; Brooke et al. 1906; Brenton 1844)*. The *LXX* deviates in many textual details from the
analysis of the names of patriarchs in the Pentateuch. It turned out that the number of patriarchs happened to match exactly the number of different letters in the Hebrew alphabet. This suggests a cosmological or numerical order that must be totally artificial and performatively literary and simply cannot reflect a real-life situation involving genuine historical actors. Instead, one is reminded of another classification system that, as the Pan-Babylonist Orientalist Stucken (1913) claimed already a century ago, may have been at the root of the invention of the alphabet: the system of lunar mansions that measured time by fixing, for every day of the lunar month, at which exact point of the heavens the moon would find itself. Moreover, whereas c. 25% of all names in the Hebrew Bible consist of 5 Hebrew letters (consonants or semi-vowels), none of the names of patriarchs does. In other words, the Table of Nations is not a true genealogy and not true history but a highly encoded, esoteric construct. Bodenstein’s finding is no doubt correct, but one would have wished that a more insightful literary and historical understanding of the text of Genesis 10, in the light of the enormous amount of sound scholarship invested in Biblical studies, had made this conclusion already so inevitable as to make it unnecessary to reach for the uninspired fetish of mechanical, numerical proof in quasi-mathematical fashion.

6.7. Genesis 10 as the potential carrier of very ancient historical knowledge in mythically encoded form

The proper appreciation of Biblical genealogies has a direct bearing on the important question, already touched upon above, of the historical value which we may or may not attribute to Genesis. Here there has been a major battle between on the one side the fundamentalists who take Genesis literally, and on the other side modern scientists, and scientific laymen articulating what they take to be the scientific point of view (which sometimes, alas, boils down to articulating the science of yesteryear, mediated by secondary school curricula and, recently, by the internet). Towards the end of the 19th century CE this battle – acerbated by the debate around Darwin’s (and Wallace’s)
evolution theory – appeared to be decided in favour of an allegorical and mythical reading (cf. the Homeric epics which we discussed in the preceding chapter!), in favour therefore of science. Today, over a century later, the fundamentalists have still not given up, and their literalist arguments are now broadcast via the very same internet. The self-evidence with which, around 1900, prominent Biblical scholars like Thomas (1906) and Driver (1904) denied *Genesis* all historical content, was largely an aspect of the apparent triumph of ‘positivist’ scientific rationalism, a direct product of the Enlightenment. However, in the meantime the advance of archaeology, and the new documentary sources made available not so much from Ugarit (although initially a Bible-inspired reading of the Ugarit material seemed very promising), but especially those from Tell el-Amarna, Mari and Ebla, produced much new evidence to support the view that, particularly, *Genesis*’ description of the world of the Patriarchs *grosso modo* was based on authentic historical information. It was certainly not a mere ‘invented tradition’ (Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983) produced entirely by projecting back into the remote past the details of contemporary Bedouin life as it was in the much later period of the kingdoms of Israel. Meanwhile, and largely as a result of the historicism that took a hold on North Atlantic society under the impact of Vico, Hegel and Marx in the 18-19th-century CE, history as an academic discipline has made great advances, and in collaboration with anthropology it has confidently developed methods to extract, from mythical knowledge, such kernels of historical information as it may yet contain.381

It is an accepted idea382 that the personages featuring in myths may carry, in their mythical movements in space, and in their mutual relationships, the reminiscence of the historical migrations of ethnic groups, and of the historical interactions between ethnic groups and between states. It is therefore obvious to extend this perspective also to *Genesis* 10. Such an application is all the more warranted in view of the oriental tendency, explicitly recognised by Biblical scholars from at least the late nineteenth century CE on, for groups to be personified in their apical ancestor. However, if Biblical genealogies represent a genre that only becomes prominent in the middle of the first millennium BCE under the influence of contemporary socio-political pressure in the Exilic and post-Exilic period (keeping the dispersed people of Israel together, legitimating claims to the priesthood), then at least for these genealogies we would be correct in relegating them, largely, to the domain of the ‘invention of tradition’; if they are at all a reflection of actual socio-political relations, then these relations must be situated in the time in which these genealogies were written, and not, as they pretend, one or more millennia earlier.

For our purpose in the present study this is not a problem: even if they would contain only mythical or contemporary Early to Middle Iron Age knowledge, this would not make the genealogy of *Genesis* 10 any less suitable as illustration of ethnic patterns in the Early to Middle Iron Age, and possibly even, by extension, in the Late Bronze Age, especially as relates to the existence of an ethnic classification system that encompasses the entire world of West Asia and the Eastern and Central Mediterranean region. The individual personal names mentioned would be mythical and would not refer to real historic persons, but they would still stand for ethnic groups or nations. This gain we must not give up lightly.

However, when we read these genealogies with the practised eye of a modern anthropologist, we cannot escape the impression that the historical actors, when handling this (quasi-)genealogical material, effected certain manipulations, in direct reflection of these historical actors’ political, ethnic, social, economic and religious concerns. Must these manipulations be entirely conceived within a contemporary framework? In so far as they seem to reflect the relation between the people of Israel and their wide socio-political environment, it is interesting that the Israelites felt the need to bring out, explicitly, extensively and in detail, both the differences but especially (given the format of an integrated genealogy which makes the whole of humanity into descendants of one ancestor, Noah) the similarities and continuities between the Israelite people and the rest of the world as known to them. Such an integrative attempt is admittedly unique within the known literatures of the Ancient Near East. This may be a reason to consider the authentic historical reality that seeped through into this invented tradition, as primarily contemporary *i.e.* Early to Middle Iron Age. One additional problem, however, is that of independent external confirmation. Some names in the Table of Nations appear nowhere else in the ancient literatures. Many others appear to have parallels or equivalents in other ancient documents, but scholars have for centuries fought over such identifications and continue to do so (Ta-


382 E.g. for the Mediterranean as a whole: Karst 1931a, who invariably (with some typical exaggeration, yet not totally without grounds) interprets the exploits of gods and heroes as indicative of the objective history of migration and conflict of the groups associated with these mythical characters; for the Aegean: Farnell 1895-1909, Fauth 1979b; for Islamic North Africa: van Binsbergen 1980a, 1985b.
ble 6.15). Therefore, in most cases we can hardly be certain that the Table of Nations features contemporary authentic ethnic and politico-geographical knowledge – it is, for instance, most remarkable that only a handful of the nearly eighty names in the Table of Nations can be traced in the contemporary Egyptian sources, although it is evident (Ahituv 1984) that Egyptian scribes had a very extensive knowledge of Syro-Palestinian topography in the Late Bronze Age. For other cases, we may suspect that the knowledge purports to be authentic and historically true, but refers, not to the historical authors’ own time (Early to Middle Iron Age) but – as they themselves insist – to some unspecified period in the remote past. In principle, even, we need not attribute historical truth to such a genealogical construct even though it features contemporary geographical entities, much in the same way as we would not for a moment be tempted to see any historical truth in some imaginable present-day European, equivalent of the Biblical Table of Nations – i.e., in a literary genealogy that presents an apical ancestor Europe with the children ‘Eastern’ and ‘Western’, with Rhine and Danube as children of ‘Western’, etc. (Fig. 6.10).

However, the argument of contemporaneity does not give an exhaustive explanation for those cases of contradiction in the pseudo-genealogical material of Genesis 10 which we have learned to recognise as signs of manipulation. A people that situates itself among other peoples within one and the same genealogy, for the sake of forgivable chauvinism would tend to attribute seniority to its own descent branch, by declaring the ancestor of that branch to be the eldest son of the apical ancestor (not to mention other conditions that may grant seniority, e.g. descent from the union of the apical ancestor with a lawful wife, with the senior wife, with a freeborn wife, etc.).

In Genesis 10, however, this obvious chauvinism has not been applied consistently. At two points even the opposite was indicated: depending on a particular but mainstream reading, Japheth is called the elder brother of Shem in Genesis 10:21, and Japheth’s sons are the first to be enumerated which in terms of the format conventions of Semitic / Arabian genealogies also suggests his seniority. Thus Genesis 10 attributes the senior position to a different group than Shem’s descendants, to which the Middle Iron Age editors of Genesis 10 yet reckoned themselves to belong. This already suggests that the material in Genesis 10 somehow antedates Iron Age ideiitary concerns in Palestine.

There are more indications to that effect. The exceptional position which Nimrod occupies in the general treatment (his biographical details are relatively extensive, and his genealogical position markedly deviates from the geographical position that is implied for him), the twofold mention of Asshur (Genesis 10:11, 22), the fact that Shem is an empty name devoid of content, the fact that the names of the other two patriarchs directly under Noah, notably Ham and Japheth, have complementary meanings, as of a cosmological pair; the suggestion of major internal strife among Shem’s descendents; the possible leopard and leopard-skin association of the names of Nimrod, Eber and Peleg – all this suggests that, despite the strong contemporary component from the 1st millennium BCE, in Genesis nevertheless substantial fragments circulate from much older, largely mythical, sources – fragments which might well be the carriers of some, mythically encoded, valid historical knowledge about a very remote past, which was no longer understood as such by the Early and Middle Iron Age authors of Genesis 10. But because they did not recognise them as conveying a historical message, and one that ran counter to these authors’ own view of what had happened in remote history, these fragments have not been filtered out by them either.

In this connection, Cook (1961b) occupies an interesting position. He posits that Genesis contains, not so much historical knowledge, but contemporary popular representations about the remotest past; moreover, he suggests that these old fragments were so firmly anchored in popular be-

---

383 Albright (1960) follows F.S. Fisher in letting the Palestinian Early Iron Age end at 900 BCE. This would mean that Genesis was largely written in the Middle Iron Age II (900-600 BCE).
belief and were so dear to the people, that the prophetic orthodoxy was not able to remove these fragments, even though it disliked them. The difference between Cook’s and my own interpretation is slight, and the historical effect the same: a recognition of the presence, in Genesis 10, of fragments that could be of a very high age which, even though they have become mythical, might still be carriers of objective historical information about the remote past.

Admittedly, there are archaeological indications that, from the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob onwards, Genesis gives a reasonably correct image of local life in Palestine in their times, and therefore is in large part based, not on invented tradition, but on real tradition. As Albright put it:

‘The patriarchal stories have a thoroughly historical core’

These archaeological indications include the depiction of the procession of ‘Asiatics’ in the tomb of Khnum-Hotep at Beni Hassan (Fig. 6.11).

To these indications of faithfully rendered local Palestinian elements, we may add the documentary sources from Mari and Ebla, where we encounter characters like the Patriarchs, and with similar or identical names; and the retrieval, from Palestinian soil, of numerous artefacts that parallel Biblical descriptions. So there is reason to take seriously the Abrahamite tradition according to which significant original population segments among the Iron Age Israelites originally hailed from Mesopotamia. In that case they are likely to have brought with them Mesopotamian myths and traditions, which in part may still be recognisable as such.

Not everyone shares this view. Soggin (1997) claims that the image of Abraham as a Bedouin-type pastoralist is an imposition: Abraham would have shared in the urban life-style and knowledge of Northern Mesopotamia, and be more of a merchant or a prince (cf. Gordon 1958). The contradiction between these positions does not appear so great as Soggin suggests, though. From Ibn Khaldūn (1377 / 1980) onwards, the sociology of the Arabic world and of the Mediterranean has recognised the complementarity and continuous oscillation between politically highly organised urban sedentarism, and politically segmentary rural nomadism (cf. Gellner 1969a, 1969b).

**Fig. 6.11.** Detail from a depiction of a group of Asiatics from the tomb of Ḫnum-Hotep, Beni Hassan, Egypt

Just as not all traditional material that found its way into Genesis has to derive from Mesopotamia, neither is groupwise migration (in other words, demic diffusion) the only method by which cultural influences can travel. For, as Albright stresses, and as students of Phoenician art have long recognised, Palestine has for millennia undergone the peripheral but effective cultural influence from both Mesopotamia and Egypt, although Egypt’s influence on the world of the Bible has often been played down in favour of the Mesopotamian element. Mesopotamia and Egypt constitute the two great focal points of cultural initiative in the Ancient Near East, and from, or via, these two areas much could have percolated to Palestine in the many centuries between the time associated with the Patriarchs, and a millennium later the final redaction of Genesis. Also cultural traditions from much further afield could have been filtered through to Syro-Palestine, in part via Egypt or Mesopotamia. Even in Palestine itself, from the mid-second millennium and earlier, widely divergent cultural influences were available in the form of Indo-European, West Asiatic, Central Asiatic, South Asiatic and even African traditions and religious elements. Hittites and Ḫurrites, the latter probably largely with an Indo-Iranian culture and religion, were available not just at considerable distance, in Ḫatti and Mittani (Central and East Asia Minor), but also in Palestine itself (Albright 1960: 160 f.).
6.8. At long last: The Table of Nations from a perspective of ethnicity studies

6.8.1. Extensive analytical table of Table of Nations scholarship

Unfortunately, there is no more convincing way of bringing out just how enormous the scholarly disagreement is about the modern identification of the names in the Table of Nations, than by giving a comprehensive selection of such scholarly identifications in tabulated form (Table 6.15). Any attempt to interpret the Table of Nations from a sophisticated ethnic perspective will shipwreck on this disagreement, unless a totally different approach offers a way out.

6.8.2. The impossibility of consensual identification: Insurmountable difficulties posed by current Biblical scholarship of the Table of Nations

Table 6.19 brings out the endless contradictions and disagreements that arise when we try to interpret the names of persons, peoples and places in the Table of Nations in terms of geographical and ethnographic identifications that make sense by today’s analytical scholarship, and in doing so try to remain as close as possible to the Biblical lands.

Part of the problem has been identified in Chapter 2 as that of trying to impose, upon the essentially ideological, mythical, inclusive and poetic ethnic discourse (A) of actors who are remote from us in both space and time, the strict classificatory rationality of modern North Atlantic or global academic scholarship (B). It is not possible to make, in our modern scholarly arguments the translation from (A) to (B) without inflicting severe violence on the actors’ discourse, distorting it beyond recognition and with probably fatal loss to its original meanings and intentions. There are a number of possible ways to try and take this difficult hurdle.

1. One radical way of negotiating this dilemma whilst holding on to the canons of modern scholarship is by simply declaring the entire contents of Genesis 10 to be a product of poetic invention, or to be merely mythical, and nothing more. This view, popular by the end of the 19th century CE, is no longer so attractive because, after two millennia in which the Bible was privileged as scholarship’s main or only source on the Ancient Near East in the Neolithic and Bronze Age, the rise of Egyptology, Assyriology and modern archaeology has brought an abundance of non-Biblical data, whose correspondence with the Biblical contents is far too great to continue to dismiss the latter as merely mythical. Therefore, Biblical vindicationists yet have a point, even though they are often motivated by a combination of religious conviction and scholarly professional doubt, which makes them not our best guides in the academic construction of truth. ³⁸⁴

2. Moreover, the second half of the twentieth century CE has brought us a more relative approach to scientific epistemology. No longer do we hold the view that there is one objective, immutable Truth out there whose task it is for scholarship to gradually discover from under the misleading layers of myth by which it is hidden. Instead, both scholarly discourse and the actors’ original discourse are, essentially comparable, forms of truth construction that reflect the mind-sets, ongoing concerns and interests of these intellectual producers as individuals, members of their gender, class, ethnic group, nation and language group, without being completely determined by these informing factors. In this light, both emic and etic discourse is essentially mythical, in the sense that narrative meaning, not objective truth, is their main goal. They certainly do not contain ‘the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth’; instead, they contain a usable, acceptable truth that has some currency in the intellectual producer’s immediate social and professional circle, without being therefore patently and wholly untrue. Myth – both the actor’s emic myth, and the scholar’s etic myth about the actor’s emic myth – is usually truer than meets the sceptical eye. ³⁸⁵

(continued p. 182)

³⁸⁴ A notorious case of ostentatious, popular vindicationism is Keller 1956 (‘over a million copies sold in Germany alone’, as the blurb of another of Keller’s books claims). But also Albright (1949) may be cited in this connexion: writing in the middle of the 20th century, his seminal work on Biblical archaeology was widely acclaimed by Biblical scholars because it seemed to confirm the historical truth of the Biblical descriptions. Moreover, his work has the unmistakable orientation of a believer, and he explicitly claimed, with great naivety, that it could not make a difference whether a Biblical scholar was or was not a believer.

³⁸⁵ Cf. van Binsbergen c.s. 2008. Characteristically, I am indebted to my wife, Patricia van Binsbergen, for this essential point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>proper name</th>
<th>number in Table 6.1</th>
<th>Common identification in Biblical scholarship (cf. Rienecker 1991)</th>
<th>Identification by others (only specified if absent in, or different from, Rienecker)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abimael</td>
<td>[69]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almodod</td>
<td>[61]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorites</td>
<td>[46]</td>
<td>group inhabiting Palestine, and also a dominant group in Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Millard 1976a adds: in late 3rd mill. BCE; general Mesopotamian term for desert people; also cf. McNamara 1957; also cf. Clay 1919; Bauer 1926; Dhome 1928a, 1928b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anamites, Anamim</td>
<td>[34]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Van der Born 1966-69: 56; people in Egypt, perhaps in the oasis Kuntt (now ḫaḥfe); Simons 1954: 546. Ahituv 1984: 60 declares the name to be unidentified, and rejects Noah’s387 identification with ‘Ayūm, 15 km south of Tripoli, on linguistic grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aram</td>
<td>[75]</td>
<td>Syrians</td>
<td>Kitchen 1976a: ‘Syrians’ is misleading for 1st mill. BCE; rather: population east and north-east of Mesopotamia (hence grouped with Elam and Assyria in Genesis 10:22-23) – added as a sign of the antiquity of the text of Genesis 10; cf. Dupont-Sommer 1953, Moscati 1959: 66 f.; McNamara 1957; and from early 2nd mill. BCE possibly used to designate ḫaḥfian westward migration into Mesopotamia and Syria. Aram is one of the few names in the Table of Nations that is attested in Egyptian sources, for the first time under Amenhotep III (Ahituv 1984: 66); also cf. Malamat 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkites</td>
<td>[49]</td>
<td>inhabitants of the Syrian town of Arka (today’s Tell Arqa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpakhshad</td>
<td>[56]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albright (1975 / 1987: 531: ‘the putative non-Semitic ancestor of the Hebrews’), Soggini (1997: 170): a non-Semitic name, often associated with Babylon and its predecessors, cf. Ugaritic arsqphtr, Greek Arsqphtria, region between Lakes Urmia and Van; Mitchell 1976b suggests that Arsqphtr may specifically be identified with modern Kirkuk. However, the name comes back in Jubilees 9:4 f.; as the ancestor of the arsqphtrā of the Chaldeans. Van der Born 1966-69: 89; cf. Assyrian capital and province Arrsqphtr, perhaps today’s Kerkić, Hölscher 1944 = ‘ṣp kīd’: ‘Land of the Chaldeans’, Torczyner (1961: 96) = Egyptian urp kīd. Cf: Simons 1954: § 24. Van der Born 1966-69: 1511 supports the association between Arpakhshad and Babylonia, especially on the grounds that otherwise the omission of Babylonia from the Table of Nations remains unaccounted for. This argument is not very valid, because several other names in the Table of Nations can easily be identified with Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvadites</td>
<td>[51]</td>
<td>inhabitants of the Syrian town of Arvad</td>
<td>Hoskin 1976: modern Rului; independent from Tyre until 9th century BCE; (which seems to suggest the antiquity of some of the data in Genesis 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashkenaz</td>
<td>[04]</td>
<td>Scythians,388</td>
<td>Scythians (Akkadian: Alkara) or Phrygians (Soggini 1997: 169); in the Talmud (Neubauer 1965-401): Asia as a whole. Identification of Ashkenaz with the Phrygian Ascians implies another meeting point between our two case studies: the Ascians are mentioned in the Homeric Trojan Catalogue of Ships, Iliad II, 863 – which we did not discuss in detail in the previous chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assur</td>
<td>[31]</td>
<td>Assyria</td>
<td>Soggini 1997: 192: its mention in verse 22 with Nineveh as capital gives a terminus post quem of the reign of Tiglath-pileser I (1116-1078 BCE) for the information in this verse. Wiseman 1976a: 101 claims that Assur / Assyria was always carefully distinguished from Babylonia in the Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babel</td>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Cf. entry ‘Babel’ in Table 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calah</td>
<td>[31c]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soggini 1997: 192: Mesopotamian town of Kalhu or Kalah [Tell Nimrud]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaan, Canaanite</td>
<td>[42, 42]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. entry ‘Canaan’ in Table 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caphthorites, Caphthorim</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>Cretans</td>
<td>Rendsburg (1987; cf. Soggini 1997: 173) thinks, not of Cretans who have migrated to the Egyptian delta, but of Egyptians who have migrated to Crete; Wainwright 1956, cf. 1931: not Cretans but Cilicians. Cf. entry ‘Caphthorites’ in Table 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caskluhites, Casluhum</td>
<td>[38]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell 1976c: 201: unknown outside Bible; in LXX: ἱππόμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cush</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>Ethiopians</td>
<td>Soggini 1997: 170: probably Ethiopia, but possibly Kassites in Mesopotamia; Kitchen 1976b: 284 remarks that in Genesis 2:13 a Mesopotamian region encompassed by the river Gihon is thus named, unrelated to usage of the name Cush for Nubia, which occurs many times in the Bible outside Genesis 10. Ahituv 1984: 85: ‘Upper and Lower Kushu of the Excavation Texts, where tribal chieftains (w.r.w) governed their clans (wbr), are equated with Biblical Cush – an archaic name for Midian [ref. to Ha-habak 3:7 and Numbers 12:11]. Albright 1941a: 34, n. 8) proposed to locate the lands of Kain south of the river Anon, stretching into the land of Midian. Mazar (1969) suggested a location in southern Israel, since the tribes of Midian roamed in the Negeb and northern Sinai, as is evident from the story of Moses. Cf. entry ‘Cush’ in Table 6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

386 In this connection I have greatly benefited from (but have far from limited myself to) the references in Soggini’s (1997: 167 f.) general discussion of the Table of Nations.


388 This identification was first made by Maspero 1900: III, 343; cf. Cusance 1975 / n.d., n. 42. From the Middle Ages onward the name has been projected onto the Yiddish speaking Jews in Europe.

177
case of nomads – scatteredness’, which in Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic languages such as Semitic and Old Egyptian often attaches to the form mathim [57], inhabitants of the Syrian sand desert in West Asia (Soggin 1997: 66, 167), appears as descendant of Semitic, e.g. Syrians, Syrians.

Havila [53b] Gazam, (Philistine city, originally inhabited by the Avim, driven out by the Cappadocians (Deuteronomy 2:23) [see those names as listed]. Gaza is another of the few names in the Table of Nations that are attested in Egyptian sources, cf. Ahituv 1984: 97; Dowling 1913


Gether [78] not same as Getes = Chetites, Heites, Syria; the Hebrew text has יחל

Gigasite [47] group inhabiting Pales-
tine, e.g. Garamant, Garames in Assya, Midrash and Targumim, by contrast, interpret this name as African, which however is considered a copyist’s mistake (Neubauer 1965: 421) but may have a further significance in view of the association of this part of South Eastern Europe with a highly pigmented population that, in the Afrocentrist literature, is usually considered to have African connotations, 1940 also cf. Balse-Cochois 1982; Bury 1906; Hoffmann & Artemidors 1838

Gomorra [53a] Traditionally identified north of the Dead Sea [Remarkable that the tense is present; yet Sodom and Gomorra are still presented as extinct – as if these were real cities [the common view is that the legend of Sodom and Gomorra was invented to explain the spectacular features of the landscape near the Dead Sea, see Soggin 1997, or as an archaising device suggesting that the Table of Nations was written not in the 6th century BCE but in Abrahamic times, when, according to legend, these cities were still intact]

Hadoram [65]

Hamathites, Hamathim [57] inhabitants of the Syrian town of Hamath

Havila [20] Havila Of [72] sand desert in West Asia (Soggin 1997: 66, 167); appears as descendant of Ham; Mitchell 1976d: 506: means ‘circle, district’, and suggests that the two Havilas are on both sides of the Red Sea

Hazaraveth [63] Hadramaut Soggin 1997: 174 accepts Hadramaut, but adds that, as an accidental result of segolation, the name has been interpreted as ‘Garth of Death’ in Hebrew

380 It is tempting to suggest a connection here with the semantic cluster (see Chapter 29, below) around ‘speechless, granulation and – especially relevant in the case of nomads – scatteredness’, which in Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic languages such as Semitic and Old Egyptian often attaches to the form *prđ / *prg (cf. Kammerzell 1994).


391 Segolation is the phenomenon, associated with a development in the Late Bronze Age, when, especially in the last syllable of a word, an otherwise silent aleph is pronounced e, as if a segol (a Masoretic sign consisting of three dots) were written underneath it; such signs however were not written until the Masoretic redaction of the Bible (7th-10th century CE). Because of segolation, otherwise different words could become homophones. I am indebted to Peter Broers for this clarification.
Instead of their geographical distance on the ground. After the invasions of the Sea Peoples the map of Palestine (agreement with the placing of this name in the Table of Nations.

396. Their place in the context of the Table of Nations would suggest that the Ludites are situated in or near the Egyptian Delta. All peoples to the north-west, especially the Hitites (Soggin 1997: 167; cf. Lipitinksi 1990). Van der Born (1966-69: 656 f. my translation): ‘Noah’s blessing [Genesis 9:26 f.], King James: ‘And he said, Blessed be the LORD God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant’ gives expression to the conviction that the Indo-Europeans [orig. ‘Indogermanen’] (which together with the peoples of Asia Minor are derived from Japheth) constitute the dominant population class in the region of Asia Minor, Northern Mesopotamia and Palestine.’ Cf. Dhome 1932

Javan [09] Greeks Talmud: Ephesus or Macedonia; Midrash: Isenia, possibly Asumnia (Central Italy) (Neubauer 1965: 422)

Jebusites, Jebusim [45] group inhabiting Palestine, around Jerusalem

Jebus [64] Mitchell 1976f: connected with tribes in South Arabia


Kittim, Kittite [12] Cyprus

Kittim [20] Cyprus Soggin 1997: 169: the Cypriot capital was Kition, now Larnaka; others propose Magna Graecia, on the basis of Hebrew usage by the end of the first millennium BCE; the latter is also Targum usage (Neubauer 1965: 413); Talmudic usage however interprets this name as Achaia, i.e. Greece (Neubauer 1965: 424). Mitchell (1976f: 701 f. Daniel 11:30, and Dead Sea Scrolls, all point to an identification as Rome.

Lasha [53g] Mitchell 1976f: 717: unidentified, ‘probably lela’; context suggests near Dead Sea, but modern scholars often identify it with Layish, the northermmost Israelite city

Lehabim, Lehabites [35] Libyans Mitchell 1976f: 728: unknown but often identified with Lubim, Libyans (also LXX), perhaps Ludim (Genesis 10:15) is a scribal error for Lubim [although d and h, mirrored in Latin script, are quite dissimilar in Hebrew and in Greek writing – WvB]

Lud [74] appears as descendant of both Ham and Shem, cf. [33]. Soggin 1997: 170, Libya, but is unclear why they appear here under Shem, in verse 13 under Ham. Van der Born 1966-69: 888 believes that the two different Luds in the Table of Nations do refer to two different peoples. Inter-textuality (Lad is also mentioned in 1 Chronicles 1:11; Jeremiah 46:9 and Ezekiel 30:5 next to Ethiopia and Put, cf. Ezekiel 27:120, which suggests that the location is meant to be in north-eastern Africa or South Arabia. The second Lud, son of Shem, is equated with Lydia. Incidentally, in 1 Maccabees 8:6; this Lud is mentioned next to India and Media. Mitchell 1976f: 755: usually identified with Lydia (which suggests Semitic influences there) but may be Lubim, Libya

Ludim, Ludites [396] [33] Lydians Appears as descendant of both Ham and Shem; cf. [74]; it is remarkable (van der Born 1966-69: 1511) that they are not classified under Japheth, for which the explanation is offered that there were intensive relations between Lydians and Mesopotamia (Gyges / Assurbanipal; Croesus / Cyrus). Mitchell 1976f: 755, see previous entry


Magog [07] Scothynians (Josephus Antiquities of the Jews I. 123; Soggin 1997: 169): in the Jerusalemic Talmud: Godzilla, Bab. Talmud: Candia, i.e. Crete, which however is considered a copyist’s mistake – while the ps-Jonathan Targum has Germania, by allusion toomer (Neubauer 1965: 422). Nelis 1966-69c: 898: according to Delitzsch, Streck, and Sayce: mitz pog = land of Gog, which the Amarna letters suggest to be Northern Syria or further north, and might be a general term for ‘barbarian’; ‘Because of the ominous connotations of the names of the northern peoples mentioned in Genesis 10, they were very suitable to symbolise Israel’s enemies in apocalyptic literature’ [my translation]; Ezekiel 28:2: ‘Gog of the land of Magog’, Gog identified with Gyges of Lydia (Ellison 1976: 480 f.), which would also fix Magog


393. To Fred Woudhuizen I owe the illuminating suggestion that in Luwian hieroglyphic kitu is used for the Malatya region in the Neo-Hittite period.

394. As is confirmed by the fact (pointed out to me by Fred Woudhuizen) that the most important Lydian text consists of a Lydian-Aramaic bilingual (Lyd. no. 1).

395. On the principle that the Table of Nations gives a classification on the basis of political geography, this is not so difficult to explain. Some of the Lydian immigrants into the Levant had been forced to accept Egyptian rule, hence became children of Ham; the others had effectively been incorporated in, or associated with, the Davdian state, and thus appear under Shem. The classificatory distance between the two Levantine Lydian groups in the Table of Nations need not be an indication of their geographical distance on the ground. After the invasions of the Sea Peoples the map of Palestine (cf. Woudhuizen, this volume) was a checker-board of regions still under Egyptian domination, and regions where immigrating Sea Peoples had defined Egyptian rule

396. Their place in the context of the Table of Nations would suggest that the Ludites are situated in or near the Egyptian Delta. Cf. the name Lud [74] below, identified as a descendant of Shem, not Ham. Commonly, Lud and Ludites are both identified with the Lydians of the west coast of Asia Minor. Again it is brought out that the Table of the Nations classifies on the basis of geographical propinquity, largely regardless of cultural or demographic origin. However, it is quite possible that instead of lud (77), lub (219) should be read here, which is generally considered to stand for Libya (Neubauer 1965: 411); such a reading would be much more in agreement with the placing of this name in the Table of Nations.
Mesha [73a] Mitchell 1976: 810: perhaps *masālî* in Northern Arabia, but South Arabia is suggested since Mesha is mentioned with Sephar.


Mizraim [32] Egypt Kitchen 1976e: 337 f.: Mizraim as name for Egypt attested from Ugaritic and Amarna sources from 14th century BCE. The word could be a dualis but that is far from certain. How came it to be a first mill. BCE Assyro-Babylonian texts speak of Muṣur or Muṣrî (‘marčes’?), cf. Pritchard 1969: 279 n. 9), but this could refer both to Egypt and to a region in Northern Syria / South East Anatolia. Spiegelberg 1899: 39 f. however preferred to derive muṣrî from *muṣur* (‘fortification’-walls’). Karst (1931a) speaks of a Greater Mizraim, which, beyond the narrower confines of Ancient Egypt (between Libya, the Mediterranean, Sinai and Nubia) would extend all the way into Africa Minor, South Italy, Greece, Anatolia and Syro-Palestine, and thus would more or less coincide with the Pelasgian realm as postulated in my Pelasgian Hypothesis (van Binsbergen 2011b)

Naphthuhim, Naph-thuhim [36] inhabitants of Lower Egypt Midrash: not proper names, but ‘pirates and strong men’ (Neubauer 1965: 424); Kitchen 1976f: 865: several Egyptological interpretations possible, referring to Delta or western oases, but identity uncertain.

Nimrod [26] Wiseman 1976d: 888: no certain identification yet possible; cf. Levin 2002: [The designation Tell al-Nimrud for Calah is post-Biblical.] Nimrud seems to have a different status from the other sons of Cush, for he is not mentioned in the same sentence; this passage has all the appearances of an insertion by a different hand, in a different idiom: it is no longer genealogical (or toponymy disguised as genealogy), but straightforwardly toponymical. The suggestion of an insertion is borne out by Biblical scholar Speiser (1958), claims Nimrod to be a specific historical figure, notably Tukulti-Ninurta I, king of Assyria by the end of the 13th century BCE. Von Rad (1972) suggests that Nimrod may be a mystification of the great Egyptian king Amenemhet III, of the early 12th century BCE, whom he was reputed as a hunter, extended his reign to Mesopotamia, and whose throne name neb-ma-re may have been pronounced in Akkadian as *num-muria*. Prokshch derives the name Nimrod from *numutur, the Babylonian hunting god to which Assur-nasir-pal II’s ziggurat at Nimrud was dedicated; this god was identified with the asterism of Orion, which however does not explain Nimrod’s ‘Hamitic’ connotations in Genesis 10. Further attempts to interpret Nimrod include Skinner 1930; and Jacob 1934 (who thinks the list of Nimrod’s achievements is ironic, an evocation of the futility of human creation in the face of God’s) Building upon Wellhausen, later recon envising proposal to read Nimrod as a transformation of the name Marduk, of the Babylonian chief deity, on the spur of the literal Hebrew meaning of nimrud: ‘let us rebel’, here there is further linkage with the rebellion of Genesis 11:1-9; in that case Cush would stand, not for northeastern Africa, but for the Kassites (cf. Genesis 2:13), so that the suggestion that Nimrod crossed over, so to say, from Africa to West Asia would be spurious. Cf. Prince 1920; van der Toorn & van der Horst 1990; Thieme 1955. Against the background of my global comparison of leopard-skin symbolism (van Binsbergen 2004-11) I would suggest a connection between Nimrod and proto-Semitic namir and *baruwd, both meaning ‘leopard’ (Staroscik & Staroscik 1998-2008, ‘Semitic etymology’, with numerous attestations and commentaries), and explain the name perhaps as [\(\text{\textit{[subduer, or emulato\'r, of the \'}]] \text{\textit{leon}}\), or simply as a contamination of the two roots, of which only *namir is recognised to go back to proto-Afroasiatic *mary-. ‘wild cat’, which in turn is recognised to go back to *barūd is far from isolated (cf. Kammerzell 1994), and appears to have cognates ramifying through virtually all modern macrophyla, in a way we shall consider in detail in Chapter 29 below.

Nineveh [31a] Ninevah.

Noah [01] Van der Born 1966-69: 1024: ‘The words of Noah over Shem, Japheth and Canaan (Genesis 9:25-27) implying the division of Palestine’s population over three categories of people, probably do not originally make part of the present context, but are probably older than the Table of Nations: from the times of Salomo, according to Rost (1953 – WvB ), in view of the parallels between Noah and Mesopotamian Flood stories, Burrows (1937) seeks to derive the name Noah from a Hurritic Flood hero. Cf. Hoffijzer 1958, Rost 1953, and entry ‘Noah’ in Table 6.2

Obal [68] 

Ophir [71] Southwest Arabia Goerg 1976: fantasy land; Soggin 1997: 174 however stresses that Ophir counts as the destination of seafarers and traders, therefore by implication is likely to represent a real community; van der Born 1966-69: 1044: also stresses intra-Biblical inter-textuality, and while acknowledging identifications as far afield as Somatua and Transvaal (South Africa), sets for the Bah al-Mandab and surroundings, Wiseman 1976e: 911: known from pre-Islamic inscriptions, Rykamms 1934: 298, 339 f., ‘Their area lies between Saba in the Yemen and Hawilah (Hawāli) as described in Genesis 10:29’ – is considered to be different from the Ophir as gold land

Pathrusim, Pathru-sites [37] inhabitants of Upper Egypt Midrash: not proper names, but ‘pirates and strong men’ (Neubauer 1965: 424); Kitchen 1976g: 938: Egyptian *p’-ren* (\(\text{\textit{.[subduer, or emulato\'r, of the \'}]] \text{\textit{leopaht}}\)), South Land, ‘Patris’ for Upper Egypt, and Cush (\(\text{\textit{.[subduer, or emulato\'r, of the \'}]] \text{\textit{leopaht}}\)) for Bithynia (Northeastern Sudan) occur in this significantly geographical order both in a prophecy of Isaiah (11:11) and in a subsequent inscription of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, who also boasts himself ‘king of Muṣur, Patrisi and Cush’.

Peleg [59] Soggin 1997: 174: may be any region of Mesopotamia; Wiseman 1976f: 957: name suggests splitting up of the earth’s population in tribes, or the division of the soil in irrigated plots (Assyrian palpa, irrigation channel)

Philistim, Philistines [39] inhabitants of the coastal area of Palestine Albright 1975: 512 f.: Pelasgians

Put [41] Punt, i.e. both shores of the southern Red Sea but more especially the western shore Soggin 1997: 170: formerly (Simons 1954) identified with Libya (which however is supported by Nahuin 39), where Put warriors alongside Libani, Egyptians and Ethiopians fail to save Thebes from Assyria; for this and similar reasons Kitchen 1976h: 1066 prefers Libya. If we were to map Put in terms of political geography, a more or less logical sequence on the map would allow us to choose be-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semitic Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ra'gima</td>
<td>South Arabian tribe</td>
<td>Soggin 1997: 170: region in Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboth-ir</td>
<td>[31b]</td>
<td>Dar Sarrukin (‘Sargon’s fortress’), Soggin 1997: 172; Nineveh (Sasso 1983); Wiseman 1976g: 1083 lists a number of similar interpretations but stresses that the identification remains uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphath</td>
<td>[05]</td>
<td>Talmud: Hadad, i.e. Adiabene, Jewish kingdom in Mesopotamia; Targumim: Parsoi, Perse (Neubauer 1965: 423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saba</td>
<td>[23] South Arabian tribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seba397</td>
<td>[19] Erithrea</td>
<td>Appears as descendant of both Ham and Shem, cf. (70); Soggin 1997: 170; Erithrea, or the Sabaeans of northern Arabia; van der Born 1966-69: 1512: anachronistic, did not yet exist in the time the Table of Nations pretends to describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheba</td>
<td>[70] Erithrea</td>
<td>Appears as descendant of both Ham and Shem, cf. (19); Soggin 1997: 170; Erithrea, or the Sabaeans of northern Arabia; van der Born 1966-69: 1255-7, remarks that Genesis 10:7; Issaiah 43:3; Issaiah 45:14; Psalm 72:10, distinguishes between šēḇa‘ and šēḇā‘, by guessing that the latter refers to a people-land of the Red Sea; van der Born 1966-69: 1512: anachronistic, did not yet exist in the time the Table of Nations pretends to describe. Kitchen 1976i: 1157 however posits that šēḇa‘ and šēḇā‘ are probably the Hebrew and Arabic forms of the same name, cf. Psalm 72:10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebonim / Sebois397</td>
<td>[53]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelelah</td>
<td>[57]</td>
<td>Van der Born 1966-69: 1305: meaning unknown. Cf. entry ‘Selah’ in Table 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem</td>
<td>[54]</td>
<td>‘Name’, as eponymus of the Semites; Mitchell 1976j: 1175: according to Poebel and Kramer, derives from ša’m, i.e. K I. E N. G I in Sumerian, but this theory only has minority support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semarim, Šemarite</td>
<td>[52]</td>
<td>inhabitants of the Syrian town of Simyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sephar</td>
<td>[73b]</td>
<td>Mitchell 1976m: 810 probably in South Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>[43]</td>
<td>Phoenicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinear</td>
<td>[30a] Babylonia</td>
<td>Soggin 1997: 192: Mesopotamia; Wiseman 1970b: 1178, LXX: Babylonia, and although the Syrian Sen’a denotes the country around Babylon, no earlier name for Babylonia corresponding with Shinar is yet known, the equation with Sumer (South Mesopotamia) being unproven, perhaps West Semitic Sangar in Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinite</td>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>One of the few names in the Table of Nations to be attested in Egyptian sources, cf. Ahituv 1984: 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinite</td>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>Babylonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinine</td>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>Wiseman 1976i: 1194 distinguishes between Simin as an ethnonym for Chinese more commonly associated with East Asia (cf. Isaia 49:12); whereas Sim, as in Genesis 10, would merely be the ethnonym of a Canaanite people near Arpa, Lebanon; Karsus 1931a suggests that the Sinites of Genesis 10 are actually of Sino-Tibetan speaking stock, but that is little plausible, although (given the proximity of the Caucasus, and the more general argument concerning Sino-Caucasian presence in the Late Bronze Age – cf. Chapter 4 above) it cannot be ruled out that they did speak North Caucasian – a language cluster constituting another phylum of the Sino-Caucasian macrophylum. Meanwhile, Ezekiel 30:15 f. speaks of the Egyptian city of Sin, which the traditions of Bible exegesis have variously interpreted as Sais (the Delta town associated with the goddess Neith; this in LXX), or Pselion / Pseudonion (in the Northern Eastern Delta), as is now commonly accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodom</td>
<td>[53c]</td>
<td>One of the few cities [the common view is that the legend of Sodom and Gomorrah was invented to explain the spectacular features of the landscape near the Dead Sea, see Sogg 1997], or as an archaic device suggesting that the Table of Nations was written not in the 6th century BCE but in Abrahamic times, when, according to legend, these cities were still intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarshish</td>
<td>[11] Phoenician harbours in the Central and / or Western Mediterranean</td>
<td>Soggin 1997: 169: Tastessus [Southwestern Spain], but probably with Aegean rather than Phoenician connotations; Garbini 1980: 67 n. 1: Tarsus, Cilia (Southern Anatolia), which is much more in accordance with the specific placing of this name in the context of the Table of Nations; tršš, later Nora, now Pula, on the Sardinia, as centre of metalworking (Albright 1941), by a reading which is no longer accepted by scholars; another relevant connection in the context of Sea Peoples studies, see below; merely symbolic and fictitious (Görg 1976): Targum (Neubauer 1965: 401): Africa, more specifically the Maghreb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiras</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>Tyrrhenians or Tyrrhenians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togarma</td>
<td>[06] eastern Anatolia</td>
<td>Soggin 1997: 169: ‘no identification’; Tal’mud: Germania, probably the city near Commageae in Cappa-docia (Neubauer 1965: 423), Wiseman 1976j: in the time of Mursilis II, 14th century BCE, a Tegaramah is described as Carchemish and Ījarān – an identification proposed by Delitzsch 1888 and supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

397 Like Lud / Ludites, Seba is one of the names that occur twice in the Table of Nations at different places. If the two Lydia groups may be explained by reference to the specific political geography of Syro-Palestine after the Sea Peoples’ invasion, also the double mention of Seba may have an explanation in political geography: probably the Seba that is a son of Rama son of Cush is considered, in the Table of Nation’s redaction, to be under Egyptian domination at the time of the Nubian Pharaohs, while the Seba that is a son of Joktan son of Abir son of Selah, etc. belonged to the segmentary stateless societies of the Arabian peninsula.
...the actors’ emic discourse is all mythical’, with
...‘but so is the scholar’s’ (2),
would seem to invite an unbounded poetics of postmodern pseudo-scientific inventiveness, along the lines of ‘everything goes’ – the end of scholarship as we know it. Therefore, a more convincing way-out of the dilemmas of contradiction and disagreement that arise in connection with the Table of Nations, would be to invoke additional methodologies and theories that might allow us to extend our analytical space and to postpone the moment when we have to make a choice between arguments (1) and (2).

Through the centuries, the field of Biblical studies, although usually dominated by believers, has accommodated, and in its turn has generated, many agnostics, heretics, renegades and downright atheists; it has been a pioneering context for the development of textual criticism (in the 15-17th centuries CE Renaissance in Europe) and hermeneutics (late 18th century CE, *ibidem*); even anthropologists could learn here, already around 1900 CE when the specifically anthropological analysis of genealogies was still in its infancy, how to read a genealogy with an eye to genealogical manipulation. The incessant negotiations between the literalist tendencies of the believers, and the figurative, symbolic, hermeneutical interpretations of scholarly sceptics, have made Biblical studies one of the growth points of North Atlantic rationality, historicity, scientific spirit, and hermeneutical method. But in addition to liberating effects, the field of Biblical studies has also had a limiting and narrowing effect on scholarship. The very focus on the Bible would tend to suggest that the referents of most, if not all, contents in the Bible, more specifically of most onomastic contents, would have to be sought in ‘the World of the Hebrew Bible’ or in ‘the Lands of the Bible’, almost invariably defined as that of Syro-Palestine, with carefully drawn extensions into the Ancient Near East, increasingly also

Ancient Egypt.

Hence the tacit assumption that the names in the Table of Nations must be interpreted, exclusively or largely, in terms of population groups and locations that could be known, from personal experience, toward historical actors in Palestine in the Late Bronze / Early Iron Age. Inevitably, the wide availability and high social prestige of the Biblical texts have invited appropriations and interpretations from any esoteric movement, doctrine or idiosyncrasy that the extremely prolific genre of the Geheimwissenschaften has seen over the past two and a half millennia – but from the Biblical-studies standpoint such approaches could easily be relegated to ‘crackpot’ status, especially if their alternative, esoteric interpretations led beyond the well-defined Biblical region just indicated.

In the interpretation of the Table of Nations, therefore, much depends on the geographical scope one attributes to it. I have already pointed out that emic ethnic systems have a tendency towards localisation – they may claim to be about the entire world, but in fact that usually turns out to be the world as known to the local historical actors. The Table of Nations itself is a case in point, for whereas it suggests to deal with the entire world as known to the Israelites of the Early to Middle Iron Age, in fact its aim seems to be to regulate, and incorporate, three major ethnic sections of ancient Palestine: the Indo-European speakers, the Semitic speakers, and a Black group speaking proto-Bantu and other now exclusively African language macrophylla and leaving a number of onomastic traces in the landscape and in the Bible.

Most studies in the tradition of Biblical scholarship tend to assume that the Table of Nations conveys the actual, conscious, integrated knowledge of a specific set of historical actors at a specific moment of time. Older, literalist and fundamentalist conceptions of the Pentateuch may identify this as the time of Exodus, enabling such authors

399 At least, such is suggested by a passage like Genesis 9:25-27, cf. van der Born 1966-69: 1024.
to claim that the Table of Nations conveys the geographical
to claim that the Table of Nations conveys the geographical
knowledge of an educated Egyptian when it

‘was compiled in the 13th century BC, perhaps by Moses’
(Mitchell 1976a: 869).

As stated, today’s, more prudent and critical, Bible
commentators have almost completely given up the idea
of Moses as author, and would situate the redaction of the Ta-
ble of Nations rather late, even as late as the sixth century
BCE (thus Soggin 1997), although the inclusion of material
from a much older document is admitted as a distinct pos-
sibility. The innumerable Biblical studies seeking to iden-
tify modern academic equivalents for the nearly eighty
names mentioned in the Table of Nations, do so implicitly
at the level of the historical actors’ conscious distinctions:
‘this is the locality meant by the author’. This standpoint
has implications for the time and space parameters of the
Table of Nations: the Table’s geographical scope has to be
that of the authors’ personal geographical experience, di-
rectly or from hearsay, in their own time. Having matched
the names in the Table of Nations with their probable mod-
ern academic equivalents, such studies proceed to explain
the local political geography and ethnicity of the table in
terms of the political experiences and the signifying ration-
ality of a historical actor. Such an actor would be living, for
instance, at a time when the Hittite and Egyptian empires,
one to the north the other to the south of Israel, offered
some kind of obvious division of the known world between
‘the sons of Ham’ and ‘the sons of Japheth’ (both expres-
sions to be understood as perfectly viable ethnic categories
rather than genealogical ones), in which the Israe1ites as
‘the sons of Shem’ would claim for themselves a nice cen-
tral geographical place in agreement with their centrality as
the author’s own group. Intra-textual correspondence be-
tween the same or similar personal names and place names
elsewhere in the Bible would help their academic identifi-
cation, and would enhance the hermeneutical impression of
a rational, integrated whole, meaningful to the original au-
 thor as a conscious reflection of his own wider environ-
ment, as the world as he knew it. From this perspective,
each the three ethnonyms that occur at different points the
Table of Nations under two identical or very similar forms
(Lud and Ludim / Ludites; Havila; Sheba) must necessarily
to refer to two different manifestations of the same people,
for otherwise the historical actor from whose consciousness
their usage springs, would have distinguished them more
clearly.

Perhaps the idea of a conscious actor presenting his
integrated knowledge in the Table of Nations may be ex-
ploded in the following manner. Rhodians and Ascanians
constitute meeting points between the Table of Nations,
and the Catalogue of Ships. Now, my reading of the Cata-
logue of Ships conveys the sense of an ancient historical
actor who in his or her mind traces the real or imaginary
progress of an emissary party soliciting support for (what is
presented in the narrative as being) the Greek cause against
Troy at dozens of communities and princely courts all over
the Western Aegean, and thus establishes the order in
which the allied forces will be mentioned in the Catalogue.
A similar idea of a gradual progression informs Woud-
huizen’s (this volume) reconstruction of the advance of the
Sea Peoples along the northeastern shores of the Medi-
terranean. If we were to take the Table of Nations as a unitary
historical record consciously conceived in the mind of one
particular historical actor (or of a group of such actors),
then we could hope to arrive at an identification of the
many trouble cases in Table 6.19 for which Biblical schol-
arity has proposed many different alternatives. Assuming
that, here again, the conscious and rational historical actor
mentioned the groups in emulation of some real or imag-
ined progression along the northern and southern shores of
the Mediterranean and along overland routes, we could
simply try to determine which particular combination of
specific identifications of the groups mentioned would give
the best possible fit with the order of enumeration in the
Table of Nations.

However, one would soon have to give up such an ex-
ercise, for even by the most consensual identifications of
Biblical scholarship the order in the Table of Nations turns
out not to make sense, oscillating (for Japheth and his
‘sons’) between Northern Mesopotamia and Asia Minor
(Gomer, Magog, Madai), to the Aegean, Central and West-
ern Mediterranean if not beyond the Pillars of Hercules
(Javan and his sons), back to the northeastern inland re-
 gions with Tubal and Meshech, and back to the maritime
Western lands with Tiras ... For the sons of Ham and Shem,
a similar pattern of oscillation occurs, making clear that the
order in the Table of Nations is just not geographic and
ineal as I have argued it to be in the Catalogue of Ships. It
is for reasons like this that one is tempted to reject the idea
of one integrative conscious mind, one historical actor or a
 group of such actors, behind the Table of Nations. Nelis
came to the same conclusion400 on the basis of what he
finds to be the extreme heterogeneity of the Table of Na-
tions:

‘It is generally assumed that the Table of Nations does not
constitute a unity. Seba, Havila and Lud are connected with
Ham in vs 7 and 13, with Shem in vs 28 f., and 22; in vs 2, 6

400 So did Karst, 1931a.
and 22 a list of peoples is introduced, which in vs 20 and 31 is concluded with the formula ‘sons of’, but vs 8, 13, 15, 24 and 26 use the formula ‘a begot b’: vs 16-18 only contains ethnonyms in singular, vs 13 f. in plural, whereas in all other places in the Table of Nations the peoples are designated by personal names (in 4 two ethnonyms occur in plural: Kittians and Rhodians); the narrative, anecdotal style of vs 8-12 contrasts sharply with the arid enumerations that forms the context in which these are embedded; moreover, these verses intend to say something about the origin of Mesopotamian empires, whereas the Table of Nations seeks to describe the descent of all peoples from Noah; vs 19 f. are out of tune because they are descriptions of boundaries; moreover vs 19, by contrast with vs 5 and 6, speaks not of Canaan but of the Canaanite, to which people here a smaller area is assigned than in vs 15, where also the Northern Syrian Hittite states are reckoned under Canaan, as well as Sidon, which (as in Deuteronomy 3:9; Joshua 13:4, 6; Judges 3:3, etc.) seems to designate the whole of Phoenicia’ Nelles (1966-69a, my translation).

Within the narrow paradigmatic and geographical confines of mainstream Biblical studies no convincing solution to the problems posed by the nearly eighty names in the Table of Nations may be found, and as long as that is the case, we cannot push our ethnic analysis of that text beyond our present, admittedly meagre results.

After this very extensive analysis of the format and the context of the Table of nations, we are finally ready to consider that text from the perspective of ethnicity studies. A number of points may be made:

1 The main result of our analysis of the Table of Nations (extremely welcome for our present context of Late Bronze Age Mediterranean ethnicity) is that that ancient document constitutes extensive positive evidence of one comprehensive ethnic classification system through which, from the perspective of the authors (Early to Middle Iron Age priests in Palestine), the geographic space from the central Mediterranean to West Central Asia, and from Greece to Nubia, is structured in ethnic terms, and is thus very systematically rendered in a genealogy. Such a genealogical format is primarily a classificatory device yet it also implies the historical actors’ idea of a shared origin of all these ethnic groups. For the study of ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean this means that Woudhuizen’s (this volume) implicit assumption of a consistent ethnic classification system encompassing the eastern Mediterranean in the Bronze Age is quite plausible: here we have (albeit from an Early to Middle Iron Age source) a perfect example of precisely such a classification system.

2 We see again the dynamics between purely geographical designation, and ethnic designation, especially when we give in to the temptation (like so many scholars before us, cf. Fig. 6.12) to project the names in the Table of Nations onto a map of the protohistorical Mediterranean.

3 We have evidence of more or less conscious manipulation in the rendering of specific groups and their interrelations.

4 As a highly formalised document cast in the rigid form of a genealogy which is patently untrue as a rendering of objective historical process, it is difficult to proceed from the Table of Nations to the two other themes of ethnic research beyond classification: actual socio-economic-political structure, and particularly the ethnic processes (including ethnogenesis and ethnicisation) informing that structure.

5 Before we could arrive at these relatively disappointing results, we had to invest much space and energy into the construction of an interpretative framework (involving the recognition of White Gods of Creation and Second Creation, Flood heroes, long-range linguistics in general and as specifically applied to the main protagonists in the Table of Nations, the tentative periodisation of ancient modes of thought such as ‘range semantics’ and recursion, and the more recent format of the triad) – all in the absolutely necessary attempt to recognise the very strong cosmological and mythical element in the Table of Nations, the rooting of some of its key ingredients in very remote times (perhaps 10ka BP or older) and in regions (especially in West and Central Asia) arguably very remote from Syro-Palestine. While this central part of the present chapter can hardly be recognised as an exercise in ethnic studies (it might be recognised as interesting and illuminating by some Bible scholars, comparative mythologists and students of ancient philosophies and worldviews, though), it could not be skipped lest we fall in the ancient writers’ own trap and interpret as local, contemporary, and therefore subject to consistent and sustained ethnic classification – what was in fact a worn, no-longer-understood cosmological and cosmogonic statement. The ethnic element is certainly there – but it needed to be peeled loose from its thick layer of myth and cosmology.
After these general observations, we are finally ready to look at the ethnic implications of the Table of Nations in some detail.

We have already mentioned the remarkable omission of some neighbouring ethnic groups (e.g. Edom, Moab, Ammon) vis-à-vis which the Israelites had minimum social distance as compared to the many other groups that do feature in the Table of Nations; we also noted the omission of Israel itself (which is merely implied under Shem and his descendants). From a contemporary perspective on social-cultural distance, it is remarkable that Nimrod is so clearly situated, as another son of Cush, in what is formally a northeast African section of the Table of Nations, although yet Nimrod is presented as a Mesopotamian culture hero. Likewise, it is remarkable that under the personal proper name of Heth, presumable Indo-European speakers in Syro-Palestine are classified as descendants of Canaan (i.e. are classified as fully-fledged inhabitants of Canaan), without the Table of Nations making a link with the Hittite empire of Ḫatti which by the logic of the Table of Nations should have Japhetic connotations. Probably that empire (collapsed c. 1200 BCE, presumably – so at least is the mainstream specialist consensus – under the impact of the Sea Peoples) had, as Nelis suggests, already passed from memory. The Philistines appear as brothers of the Caphthorites, who often have been equalled with the Cretans – in recognition of the great similarity of Philistines and Cretans, long recognised by historians and also confirmed by archaeological research. However, as far as these groups and the other listed groups are concerned, their specific identification is so problematic and, in many cases, so utterly contested, that any pronouncements as to the geographical and political merits of their particular placement in the Table of Nations would simply beg the question.

What is puzzling is that these dozens of nearby and distant ethnico-regional groups should be subsumed in a grand overarching tripartition, between the descendants of Japheth and those of Ham, with those of Shem forming an intermediate category in the centre. It is difficult to find in contemporary ethnic and political relationships a prima facie reason for this division at the second genealogical level, immediately below the apical ancestor Noah. Grosso modo, descendants of Japheth could be made to correspond with Indo-European speakers, those of Ham (and Shem) with Afroasiatic speakers. But that is merely an externally imposed categorisation, without meaning to Ancient Israelites. They were not modern linguists.

Fig. 6.12. ‘The world as known to the Hebrews, according to the Mosaic account’: A dated scholarly attempt to assign geographical locations to the names mentioned in the Table of Nations (Genesis 10)\textsuperscript{401}

The Ancient Egyptian language was undoubtedly known at the major population centres in Bronze Age Palestine (when Egyptian state power often extended there); yet the Israelites had no means of realising that, as another branch of Afroasiatic, that Egyptian language (which was unintelligible to them without specific training)\textsuperscript{402} was more closely related to their own West Semitic tongue than the languages of Indo-European speakers, some of which were spoken at their very doorstep. Nor is it likely that the broad distinction, in the Table of Nations, between the de-

\textsuperscript{401} The map derives from Coleman 1854; I gratefully acknowledge Dolphin 2009, which drew my attention to this map.

\textsuperscript{402} Albright 1960: 158 f. But any glace at an Old Egyptian text, even if transliterated into Latin script, would confirm this point: to understand Old Egyptian it is certainly not sufficient to know Hebrew, although both Semitic (of which Hebrew is a branch) and Old Egyptian constitute phyla within the Afroasiatic macrophyllum, which makes for many lexical and syntactic similarities.
scendants of Japheth and those of Ham was based on a perceived difference in culture, life-style and somatic features: local cultural traits may not have been known in detail, and the somatic variation within each of these, essentially Mediterranean, clusters is so wide that they largely overlap. In the absence of a contemporary ethnic, cultural or political reason, one would suspect a cosmological factor to be at work here. On the basis of my etymological explorations into the names of Japheth, Ham and Shem I have suggested that (given the dominant cosmogony of the Separation of Heaven and Earth) this cosmology was to be conceived as a system of superimposed binary oppositions: Light-Dark, Heaven-Earth, Sun-Moon, with less systematic elements accruing secondarily and introducing additional referential registers – such as Smooth-Granulated, Cool-Hot, Lowly Pigmented versus Highly Pigmented. However, also other classification principles come to mind. We could simply have a division of the world in terms of four cardinal directions, such as informs cosmological views virtually everywhere in the three continents of the Old World. However, a cardinal cosmology would have given rise to four, instead of three, broad sub-divisions at the second genealogical level; cf. the Ancient Egyptian case, to be discussed shortly, of the overall division into Egyptian, Libyans, Nubians and Asiatics. The distinction in the Table of Nations is between

(a) people in the North – and by extension Northwest –, notably the descendants of Japheth;

(b) people in the South – and by extension Southwest – notably the descendants of Ham, with – since no rigid classification system can be without exceptions on the ground – Nimrod crossing over to the Northeast, and finally

(c) the people of the Centre – the descendants of Shem, the empty Name.

The proposal, made by some Biblical scholars, to identify this tripartite division with the distinction between the Ḫatti empire to the northwest (Japheth), the Egyptian empire to the South (Ham), and the Israelites themselves in the centre, is not convincing either, in the first place because there is every indication that Ḫatti had disappeared from memory by the time the Table of Nations received its final redaction, and secondly because under Japheth many peoples were subsumed which, however contested their identification, could never be reckoned as part of the Ḫatti empire.

Fig. 6.13. Five Ancient Egyptian plaques from the time of Ramses III, depicting five stereotypes of national enemies: from left to right Libyan, Nubian, Syrian, Shasu Bedouin, and Hittite; Mathilda’s Anthropology Blog n.d.

The threefold overall division of the Table of Nations (into the descendants of Shem, Ḫam and Japheth) is one of its main features, and I have suggested that its tripartite nature results from the grafting of what was realised to be a junior group, the Shem people, probably of distant Eastern provenance, onto a dualist overall classification of the world between Ham people and Japheth people. We have seen that the Catalogue of Ships has an implicit tripartite division, but not at the emic level – Homer is quite unaware of it.

Fig. 6.14. Copy made by the Minutoli couple in the tomb of Seti I in 1820 CE of depictions of (from left to right) four Libyans, a Nubian, an Asiatic and an Egyptian.

The Minutoli couple travelled in Egypt c. 1820 CE, and published their account together. Today the wall painting is in very poor condition.

For the rest, despite the preponderance of triads in the religious repertoire of the states of the Ancient World, most of the ethnic and geopolitical divisions and cosmologies of the Ancient Near East would appear to be dualist rather than tripartite. The division of Egypt in Upper and Lower (attested massively from the earliest dynastic period onward) is a case in point. Now, by analogy with the Biblical pattern, recent discussions among Egyptianising Afrocentrists have applied the term ‘Table of Nations’ to an icono-
graphical convention in the New Kingdom of Ancient Egypt (coinciding in part with our Late Bronze Age), where in tombs a set is shown of typical male representatives of the four main ‘nations’ as distinguished by the Ancient Egyptians, always, from left to right: an Egyptian, a Libyan / Caucasoid, a Nubian, and a Semite / Asiatic. The casus classicus is to be found in the tomb of Ramesses III, KV 11. Although the KV 11 tomb as investigated by Lepsius was only published half a century later, in 1913, still in the 19th century CE, early Egyptologists projected their own racism onto similar scenes (Morton 1844; cf. Young 1996). Recently, in the context of the Black Athena debate, scenes of this kind have regrettably played a considerable role in the highly politicised debate as to whether the Ancient Egyptians can be called ‘Black’ in the modern North American sense, or not. Unfortunately (considering the total discrediting of the concept of ‘race’ in modern science), the societal circulation of the emic concept of ‘race’ as a collective representation of modern USA (and South African) society has yet made it possible that such debates would pass under the heading of ‘ethnicity’.

Critically adducing evidence, Manu Ampin (n.d.) has rightly stressed the considerable variability of this iconographic convention.

Still, the existence of this convention demonstrates that, as a collective representation, Late Bronze Age Egyptians held that the human world as known to them could be meaningfully subdivided into four major ethnic categories. However, any overlap with the Table of Nations in Genesis 10 is entirely lacking: of the four Egyptian conventional types, three (Egyptian, Libyan and Nubian) would be sub-Palestinians, and Tutsi) have been among the greatest victims of racism in the Modern Era. Even a well-intended, affirmative-action-type racist argument is still objectionable because it implicitly adds scientific credibility to the delusions of racism.

407 From Lepsius 1849-59 / 1897-1913, Diop 1991, Yurco 1996, and Hornung 1990 (pp. 147-9, plates 105, 107-9), as well as Ampin’s own data collected locally.
sumed under Ham, one (the Semitic / Asiatic) would be divided over Shem and Ham, whereas there would be no Egyptian equivalent for Japheth and his descendants, who, however, in type (and perhaps in cultural affinity) would come closest to the Libyan / Caucasoid variety.

Under these conditions, it is somewhat misleading to apply the term ‘Table of Nations’ to the Egyptian convention. Even so, it is clear that also the Late Bronze Age Egyptians possessed an interregional ethnic classification system encompassing initially the entire human world as known to them. In fact, the Egyptian ethnic system and its representational conventions go back virtually unchanged to Early Dynastic times.

Meanwhile, we should not attach too much significance to our Egyptian four-fold ethnic division. One of the major sites of Sea Peoples documentation is Medinet Habu (Ramesses III: texts published in Nelson c.s. 1930; Edgerton & Wilson 1936; Kitchen 1982, 1983; Widmer 1975 – the relief picturing the naval battle was discussed in Nelson 1943, also cf. O’Connor 2000.) From that site we also have (Schulz & Seidel 1998) five tiles with different stereotypical depictions of such enemies, from the 20th dynasty c. 1170 BCE, i.e. the very period of the Sea Peoples, and they comprise (see Figure 6.13): a Libyan, a Nubian, a Syrian, a Shasu Bedouin, and a Hittite. Since here, contrary to the four-fold division, Egyptians themselves have been omitted, this five-fold system is in fact, by implication, six-fold. The overlap with our foursome is considerable, but not total.

Lest we might get the impression that such rendering of ethnic stereotypes is primarily an ancient or Egyptian weakness, Fig. 6.15 offers a modern example.

After the titanic efforts that have gone into our creating an empirically-grounded and critical interpretative context for the Table of Nations, the conclusion of the last section comes as an anticlimax. But even so the exercise has served its purpose, as a reminder of the complexities of philological, comparative and hermeneutical analysis attending any attempt of making sense of ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean.

It is time to give the floor to my co-author Fred Woudhuizen, who in Part II will concentrate on the Sea Peoples in that connection – but only after the following Appendix has set out the textual base for our analysis of Genesis 10 in the present Chapter.

6.9. Appendix: The Table of Nations, Genesis 10 – Hebrew text and English translation

The following digitalised Hebrew text is based on Mechon Mamre 2005. The English text below and that used in Table 6.1 is based on the King James translation, which has circulated widely and freely. As indicated in Sections 6.1-2, I have deviated from the King James translation in the interest of a precise rendering of the meaning of the Hebrew text. I have however retained the translation’s specific English rendering of the proper names, even if in the rest of my argument I have adopted a different orthography. The following typographical segmentation of the (English) text has been implemented:

*italic* = source document P (cf. Soggin (1997: 164 f.; late 7th century BCE))

*space* = source document J (early 8th century BCE)

*underline* = J according to the identification of Soggin (1997: 164 f.)

However, Soggin (1997: 174) admits that there is no general consensus that verses 24-30 should be considered as ‘J’, and allows for the possibility that they contain somewhat older material than the ‘P’ sections of the Table of Nations.

1. ומִי יָוָן הַלָּאֹתֵר תּוֹלְדֹת חַמ וָיָפֶת וַיִּוָּלְדוּ חַר הַמַּבּוּל

2. וְיָוָן וְתֻבָל וּמֶשֶׁך בְּנֵי יֶפֶת גֹּמֶר וּמָגוֹג וּמָדַי וְתִירָס

3. שְׁכֲּנַז וְרִיפַת וְתֹגַרְמָה

4. נֵי יָוָן אֱלִישָׁה וְתַרְשִׁיש כִּתִּים וְדֹדָנִיםוּבְ

5. רְצֹתָם אִישׁ מֵאֵלֶּה נִפְרְדוּ אִיֵּי הַגּוֹיִם בְּ

Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and unto them were sons born after the Flood.

The sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tabal, and Meshech, and Tiras.

And the sons of Gomer; Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarma.

And the sons of Javan; Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim.

These were scattered over the islands of the peoples in their lands; every
And the sons of Ham: Cush, and Mizraim, and Put, and Canaan.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth.

He was a mighty hunter before the LORD: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the LORD.

And the sons of Cush; Seba, and Havila, and Sabta, and Rama, and Sabtokalchah: and the sons of Rama; Sheba, and Dedan.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one on the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Nimrod dwelt in the land of Babel. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Nimrod dwelt in the land of Babel. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

He was a mighty hunter before the LORD: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the LORD. And Nimrod dwelt in the land of Babel. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And he was a mighty hunter in the earth. And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth, and he was a mighty hunter in the earth.
And Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab: all these were the sons of Joktan.

And their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar a mount of the east.

These are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, after their nations.

These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the Flood.
PART II. THE ETHNICITY OF THE SEA PEOPLES:

AN HISTORICAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND LINGUISTIC STUDY,

BY FRED C. WOUDHUIZEN
CHAPTER 7. INTRODUCTION TO PART II

7.1. Significance of the topic

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

7.2. The argument in Part II

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

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

As such, the work aspires at a historical synthesis, in which the Masperonian thesis of a homeland for the Sea Peoples in Asia Minor and the Aegean is balanced with the opinion of others who rather attribute such a role to the islands of Sardinia and Sicily and the Italian peninsula in the central Mediterranean. It will be shown that both the ‘Anatolian thesis’ and the ‘central Mediterranean antithesis’ are partly valid, and that some of the groups of the Sea Peoples originated from Anatolia and the Aegean, whereas others rather came from the central Mediterranean region. It will further be argued that the ‘prime mover’, which set into motion the whole process leading to the upheavals of the Sea peoples, is formed by the truly massive migration of bearers of the central European Urnfield culture into the Italian peninsula c. 1200 BC.

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

7.3. Acknowledgments for Part II

The work I have been engaged with let us say about the last eight years could not have been accomplished without the help of good friends and colleagues.

First of all, my sincere feelings of gratitude are due to my supervisor Wim van Binsbergen, who initiated the project, arranged a stipendium to work it out granted by the Erasmus University, and, in addition to stimulating supervision, provided a theoretical framework on ethnicity suitable for the analysis of the Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age. He also undertook the complex task of formatting our joint book, for which I wish to thank him specifically.

Next, the Indo-Europeanist Frits Waanders was so kind to proofread an early draft of the entire manuscript and saved me from many errors in spelling and judgment – needless to say that remaining ones are my sole responsibility. Furthermore, I am greatly indebted to the specialist in Linear A, Jan Best, who so to say raised me in the interdisciplinary field of protohistory and kindly proofread an early draft of the sections on the Greeks and the Pelasgians. For the systematization of the transliteration of the Ugaritic texts, I am much obliged to the Assyriologist Frans Wiggermann, whereas in matters of Egyptian hieroglyphic I was guided by the Egyptologists J.F. Borghouts and Willem van Haarlem. Also of much help was the letter (d.d. 11 January 2002) by the archaeologist Manfred Bietak on the sensational find of Minoan tephra at Tell el-Dab’a / Avaris. Unfailing support came from the members of the editorial board of Talanta, consisting of Jan de Boer, Ton Bruijns, Roald Docter, Jorrit Kelder, Vladimir Stissi, Jan Stronk, Reinier Telling, and Maarten de Weerd, which not only generously facilitated
a prepublication of the section on the Etruscans, but also brought to my attention relevant literature and, where necessary, severe criticism. My work also profited from the collaboration with Winfried Achterberg, Kees Enzler, and Lia Rietveld, as duly acknowledged in the bibliography. Further, my thanks are due to the Etruscologist Bouke van der Meer, the Classical archeologist Eric Moormann, and the Mediterranean archeologist Jacques Vanschoonwinkel, for kindly bringing relevant literature to my attention.

7.4. Note on the transcription in Part II, especially of proper names

In the transcription of proper names, I have in most instances preferred one closest to the Greek original: thus Akhaïans, Herakles, Herodotos, Homeros, Korinthos, etc. – accepting that as a result, orthographic divergences may occur between my text and that of my co-author Wim van Binsbergen; such divergences will be resolved in our Index of Proper Names. Encouraged by the German saying that ‘Jeder Konsequenz führt zum Teufel’, however, I have not aimed at being entirely systematic in this respect, since I found it hard to transform the current English forms of Cilicia, Crete, Crimea, Cyclades, Mycenae, Thucydides, Tiryns, Troy, Tyre, etc. into less familiar ones closer to the Greek original. The same license has been adopted with respect to the ending of the ethnonyms, now using the Greek one, as with Danaoi and Teukroi, then using the English one, as with Pelasgians. When originating from a Latin source, the Latin forms of the proper names are preferred, as in the section on the Aeneas’ saga. As far as possible, I have preferred to use (in general discussions outside the context of my presentation of original texts) the simple s instead of the cumbersome sh for the transcription of the sibilant š in Hittite personal names and Philistine place names, thus Ḫattusilis, Suppiluliumas and Askelon, Asdod. However, for the sake of clarity sh is maintained for Eshtaol, Kadesh, and Laish as well as for the ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples from the Egyptian sources, hence Ekwesh, Teresh, etc.
CHAPTER 8. DEFINING ETHNICITY

In a work which deals with the ethnicity of the Mediterranean population groups which attacked Egypt at the end of the Bronze Age, commonly referred to as the Sea Peoples, it should first of all be specified what ‘ethnicity’ actually means and how we will put this concept into practice. To this aim, it is interesting to note that the word is derived from Greek 

ethnos (plural ethnē), ‘number of people living together, body of men; nation, people; foreign, barbarious nations; class of men, caste, tribe’.\(^{411}\) According to Werner Sollors in his *Theories of Ethnicity, A Classical Reader* of 1996, the modern formation *ethnicity* came into use during the Second World War (1939-45 CE), being first attested in a publication by W. Lloyd Warner (p. vii). As a definition of this term, the same author presents the one formulated by R.A. Schermerhorn in 1970, which runs as follows *(ibid., p. xii)*:

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

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

In the study of ethnicity, various approaches can be encountered. In the first place, the ethnic group under consideration can be studied from the perspective of the members of this group themselves. This approach is called *emic*. Alternatively, the ethnic group under consideration can be studied from the perspective of outsiders. The latter approach is called *etic*. As explained by Wim van Binsbergen, these terms are rooted in the field of linguistics, where *phonetics* furnishes a purely external description of a language (hence -etic), and *phonemics* deals with the smallest units of speech sound distinguished by the language users themselves (hence -emic).\(^{412}\) Another pair of concepts is formed by primordialism and instrumentalism. According to the *primordial* approach, the ethnic features of a specific group are immutable qualities, inherited from father to son and mother to daughter, and thus an historically ‘given’. As opposed to this, the *instrumentalist* approach, initiated by Frederik Barth in his classic *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* of 1969, holds that ethnic features can be manipulated for certain causes by the members of a specific group and that hence the ethnic boundaries are permeable. Accordingly, instrumentalists will stress the dynamic and negotiable nature of ethnicity, whereas primordialists will do the opposite. In reality, the truth lies somewhere in between these opposites, some ethnic boundaries being difficult to cross or even impermeable in a certain period of time, especially when there is a high ethnic conscience (= *ethnization*), and others, or the same but in a period of time when there is a low ethnic conscience, being easy to cross. Furthermore, dynamism also needs to be called into play in order to account for the fact that an ethnos can die out (= *ethnothanasia*) or be newly created (= *ethnogenesis*).

The determination of an ethnic identity is in essence an historical process. As we will be working in the protohistory, which lacks contemporary works of history, the definition of ethnicity needs to be translated into protohistorical categories of evidence. In addition, these categories of evidence should be workable in the context of the eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age, which with societies ranging from highly developed multiethnic empires through individual kingdoms and city leagues to merely tribal forms of organization\(^{413}\) is far more complex than, for example, the modern African one where the various ethnic groups are all of a similar degree of organization – in the words of van Binsbergen: like cookies shaped with different cookie moulds from one and the same large rolled out slab of dough.\(^{414}\) Hence, following in the tracks of Jonathan Hall in his *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* of

\(^{411}\) Liddell & Scott 1968 (LSJ), s.v.; in modern literature, one also finds the plural *ethnoi* or *ethnēs* (from singular *ethnē*) or the originally French form *ethnie* used for both singular and plural.

\(^{412}\) Van Binsbergen 1999b: 43.

\(^{413}\) For the definition of *tribe* as an ethnic group within the global space but outside the politically dominant civilization, see van Binsbergen, this volume, Chapter 2.

\(^{414}\) Van Binsbergen 1999: 69, cf. *idem*, this volume, Chapter 2; the same observation to some extent also holds good for Europe during the Bronze Age.
1997, we might – apart from ethnonyms – suitably adopt the following indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups: 1. kinship or ‘race’, 2. language or dialect, 3. religion, and 4. material culture (= the materialization of shared cultural traits). As we will see in the next section, these indicia for ethnic groups are very close to the categories of evidence distinguished by the ancients themselves to this aim.

Of the given indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups, the first one, kinship or ‘race’ is a tricky one, as one has to steer carefully between the Scylla of ‘Blut und Boden’ theory of indigenous development and the Charybdis of an invading ‘Herrenvolk’. In effect, however, although Egyptian artists do distinguish phenotypal features in their reliefs, the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age appears to be not particularly preoccupied with the ‘race’ issue. To all probability, this results from the fact that the eastern Mediterranean population is thoroughly mixed: even the Ionians, who were so proud of their pure blood, had killed the male Carians and taken the female ones as their wives at the time of their colonization of western Asia Minor, as Herodotus sily remarks (Histories 1, 146). In the course of our investigations, we will experience that in all cases of a migration some measure of mixing between the invaders and the indigenous population took place, so that the category of ‘race’ will not figure prominently in our treatment – not in the least also because we lack the sources whether the population groups under discussion considered themselves of pure descent (= emic point of view).

A complicating factor in our work with the remaining three indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups is the fact that, as duly stressed by Hall, the boundaries of speech communities, religious entities, and material cultures are not always coterminous. Thus, to stipulate the extremities of the entire spectrum of possibilities, a language can be shared by two or more ethnic groups, like in the case of the English and the Americans or the formerly west- and east-Germans, or a single ethnic group can be characterized by two or more languages, like the Franks on the east (Germanic) and the west (Romance) side of the Rhine or the Swiss (German, French, and Italian). Similarly, a religion can be shared by two or more ethnic groups, like in the case of the Orthodox religion adhered to by the Greeks and numerous Slavic population groups, or a single ethnic group can be characterized by two or more religions, like the Dutch by Protestantism and Catholicism. In certain cases, the differences of religion may cause a once united people to break up into different ethnic groups, like in the case of the former Yugoslavia, now being split up into Serbia (Orthodox), Croatia (Catholic), and Bosnia (partly Muslim). And finally, a material culture can be shared by two or more ethnic groups, like in the case of the Flemings and the Walloons in Belgium, or a single ethnic group can be characterized by two or more material cultures, like in the case of the Phrygians using grey ware in the west and so-called matt painted ware in the east (see Fig. 8.1).

Given this complicating factor, it cannot be denied, however, that the different indicia for the distinction of ethnic groups often overlap and that precisely here we may find a nucleus of an ethnic group (see Fig. 9.1, below): if we would assume otherwise we would throw away the child with the bathwater (for an elaboration of this point of view, see Chapter 9, below)! The latter observation should not be mixed up with Gustav Kossinna’s adagium that ‘cultural provinces clearly outlined archaeologically coincide in all periods with precise peoples or tribes’, which simplifies the actual state of affairs in an irresponsible manner. In similar vein, to accuse Georges Dumézil of racialism, as Tim Cornell does, because he discovered the remnants of a tripartite Indo-European religious ideology among...
variuous peoples speaking an Indo-European tongue, means an irresponsible mixing up between the categories of kinship or ‘race’ and religion, elements of the latter of which namely can also be inherited by genetically mixed descendants. On the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that in the overlap of our protohistoric indicia for ethnic groups lurks yet another ethnic group, which, notwithstanding the fact that it shares in with the same phenotype, language, religion, and material culture of a particular ethnic group, simply considers itself distinct, like some of the Dryopes in Greece\(^{421}\) or the Asturians – who, while speaking Spanish, being Catholic, and sharing the Spanish material culture, consider themselves Celtiberians – in Spain.\(^{422}\)

As we will also see in the next chapter, here our protohistoric method by its mere definition simply fails to help us out.

As cogently argued by van Binsbergen in Part I of the present book, the shortcomings of our protohistorical method can be partly compensated by working within a theoretical framework, based on experience with ethnic studies from the historical period. In the following, then, I will present a summary of van Binsbergen’s attempt at such a framework.

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

1. a system of classification into a finite number of specific ethnic names;
2. a socio-political structure, notably the devise to turn the overall, neutral geographical space into an ethnically structured space, accommodating a number of concrete named groups in interaction; and
3. a process, involving both the interaction of these ethnic groups over time, and the dynamics (emergence, maturation, change, decline, replacement, etc.) of the overall ethnic space they constitute together; of this process, we distinguish at least three important movements:
   a. ethnegnosis, as the redefinition (through changes in the classification system) of the overall ethnic space so as to accommodate a new ethnic group (often with repercussions for the other groups already recognized within that space);
   b. ethnicization, as the internal process of ‘taking consciousness’ through which members of an essentially non-ethnic category in the socio-economic-political space redefine their identity increasingly in ethnic terms (usually under the influence of a local elite);
   c. ethnothanasis, the decline and eventually loss of ethnic consciousness by an ethnic group, which merges with another ethnic group already existing in the same geographic space or having newly arrived there.

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

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

We would call a named set of people an ‘ethnic group’ only if certain additional characteristics are present, namely:

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

The social process creates boundaries, but also in order to cut across them. Thus, most ethnic groups include a

\(^{421}\) Hall 1997: 74-77.
\(^{422}\) Fernandez 2000.
minority of members who have gained their membership not at birth but only later in life, in a context of marriage, migration, language acquisition, adoption, the assumption of a new identity and new life-style, religious conversion, etc.

Boundary markers include:

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

In general, ethnicity is conceived as holistic and bundled, involving language, cultural customs, somatic features, territory, and political leadership, which integrated package is claimed to determine the total mode of being of that person. In reality, however, ethnic groups often differ from each other only with respect to a very limited selection of cultural features functioning as boundary markers. Now, ethnicization displays a remarkable dialectics which one might consider its engine: on the one hand, the binary opposition through nomenclature offers a logical structure, which is further ossified through ascription (i.e. being made into a birth right) and which presents itself as unconditional, bounded, inescapable, and timeless (= primordial); on the other hand, the actual processual realization (through the construction of a culture coinciding with the group boundary, through distinctive cultural symbols, through a shared historical consciousness, through that part of membership which is non-ascriptive but acquired) means flexibility, choice, constructedness, and recent change (= instrumental). Both, entirely contradictory, aspects of ethnicization belong to ethnicity. As a result, ethnicity is often of a highly kaleidoscopic nature, constantly changing in shape and difficult to pin down to specific, general analytical formulae. Above all, it should be realized that for every set of historical actors involved their particular vision on ethnic relations and ethnic history is per definition that of partisans, and therefore must be subjected to severe historical criticism before it can be used as an historical source.

The given

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

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

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

(3) The conquest model, found in all continents throughout history as a variant of the immigrant model, in situations where an immigrant dominant minority (of pastoralists, metal-workers, warriors with superior skills and weapons, etc.) has imposed itself as a distinct ethnic minority upon a pre-existing local population, retaining its distinct identity and thus its prerogatives of inequality through a package that, in addition to military, technological superiority, may include a language and customs different from the local majority, special ritual functions, and a strategy of endogamy.

(4) The millet system that was the standard form of ethnic space under the Ottoman empire in the Middle East and eastern Europe from the late Middle Ages to the early 20th century AD (although in fact this may be traced back to the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Achaemenid empires of the second and first millennium BC, as mediated through Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and early Islamic empires): the state’s overall political and military space encompasses a number of
distinct ethnic groups (Turks, Jews, Greeks, Circassians, etc.) each of which are largely self-contained in cultural, linguistic, marital, judicial, and religious matters, and each of which displays – both in life-style and in physical appearance – a distinct identity (perpetuated over time because these ethnic groups are endogamous), although they share the overall public economic space production, exchange and state appropriation, often against the background of a lingua franca.

The colonial plural societies of Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the 19th and 20th centuries AD, which mutatis mutandis are rather similar to the millet system, but whose top-ranking ethnic groups in terms of political power (the European civil servants, agricultural settlers, and industrialists, with their secondary entourage from the distant metropolitan colonizing country) in fact function as an example of the conquest model (3).

The melting-pot model of the urban society of North America in the late 19th and 20th centuries AD, where very heterogenous sets of numerous first-generation immigrants rapidly shed much of the cultural specificity of their society of origin, although it is true to say that the descendants of many of these immigrant groups, rather than disappearing in the great melting pot of Americanness, continue to stand out with a distinct ethnic identity, to inform especially the more private, intimate aspects of life (family, reproduction, recreation, religion) and maintained by a selection of language and custom and a tendency to endogamy.

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

More models could easily be added to this list. Each of these models displays a different mix, a different package of cultural, linguistic, and ritual elements, with differing degrees of explicit ethnic consciousness at the level of the social actors involved. It is therefore important to repeat that the specific composition of the distinct package in a concrete ethnic situation in space and time, can never be taken for granted and needs to be established by empirical research in each individual case.
CHAPTER 9. ETHNICITY AND PROTOHISTORY

9.1. Towards a protohistorical method

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

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

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

In similar vein, Jonathan Hall distinguishes ‘race’, language, religion, and shared culture as factors in the self-expression of ethnic groups. Rightly, he stresses in this connection that these factors are not defining criteria of ethnicity, but indicia, as he goes to great length to show that, for example, a language may have a more restricted distribution than the ethnic group or, vice versa, may have a wider distribution than the ethnic group, or that the ethnic group may be bilingual or multilingual, or change from one language to another altogether (cf. Chapter 8).

Another point rightly emphasized by Hall is that the determination of ethnic identity is in essence an historical process. Thus it can happen that individuals consider themselves as members of an ethnic group without distinguishing themselves from other ethnic groups by any of the ethnic indicia: ‘Someone is a Lue [= ethnic group in Thailand] by virtue of believing and calling himself a Lue.’ It is clear that we are at a loss to trace this type of ethnic group with a protohistorical method, as the contemporary epigraphical records or literary sources of a later period we will be working with often fall short in presenting the so-called emic point of view. The best thing we can do is to reconstruct distribution patterns of language groups and archaeological cultures, and assume that where these two overlap the nucleus of an ethnic entity will to all probability be lurking at the background (cf. Fig. 9.1).

Fig. 9.1. Diagram of the partial relationship between ethnicity and its indicia, kinship, material culture, language, and religion

According to Hall, this latter approach is fallacious, because linguistic and cultural boundaries are seldom co-terminous. However, in my view that is overstating the

---

427 I am indebted to Wim van Binsbergen for drawing this diagram.
428 Hall 1997: 23.
evidence: there are numerous instances in which archaeological cultures overlap with language groups, especially in contrastive situations like, for example, the colonization by the Greeks of culturally different regions in the Early Iron Age.

As far as the Black Sea area is concerned, there is uncertainty about the 8th century BC colonization of Sinope and Trapezus on the northern Anatolian coast, because this cannot be backed up by archaeological evidence. But the refoundation of Sinope by the Milesians Kretinos and Koos after the period of the Kimmerian invasion coincides with late 7th century BC east-Greek and a little Korinthian pottery from graves. Similarly, the Milesian colonization of Histria in present-day Romania, which is variously dated to 656/5 BC (Eusebios) or the late 7th century BC (pseudo-Skymnos), is archaeologically matched by Middle Wild Goat (= east-Greek) style pottery dating from c. 630 BC onwards. Furthermore, the likewise Milesian colonization at Borysthenes or Berezan, an emporion near the mouth of the river Bug, the foundation of which is dated to 646/5 BC by Eusebios, produced a wide variety of east-Greek (besides some Attic and Korinthian) pottery from occupation deposits dating from the second quarter of the 7th century BC onwards. Here were also found Milesian coins (late 7th century BC) and a Greek inscription on a bone plaque (late 6th or early 5th century BC). As a final example from the Black Sea region, we may point to Khersonesos in the Crimea, which was founded by Dorians from Herakleia Pontica (the latter being a Megarian colony) in 422/1 BC, but used already before this date as a trading station. Next to burials in amphorae from Samos and Thasos dated to the beginning of the 5th century BC, 'ostraka' from about the same time were found here inscribed first in the Megarian alphabet and later in the Milesian one with Doric personal names.429

If we turn to Egypt, it so happens that pharaoh Psammetichos I (664-610 BC) granted Greeks, who had served him as mercenaries, the right to settle in a trading colony called Naukratis – a site 3 km from present day el-Niqrāš along the western branch of the Nile delta. The validity of this historical information is underlined by the fact that Greek pottery is attested for the earliest layer of the site dating from c. 630 BC onwards. The privileged position of the Greeks at Naukratis is subsequently reinforced by Amasis (570-526 BC), under whose rule the Greeks built a joint sanctuary, the Hellenion. In this sanctuary pottery has been found inscribed with the Greek text 'to the gods of the Greeks'. Next, there have been excavated temples of individual states, like that of Aphrodite (Chian), Hera (Samian), Apollo (Milean), and the Dioskouroi (unspecified), whereas pottery finds range from Rhodian, Chian (one inscribed with a dedication by Sostratos [= Aeginetan trader who also dedicated an inscription at Graviscae in Etruria] to Aphrodite), Samian, Clazomenian, Lesbian (bucchero) from the Aegean islands to Spartan, Korinthian, and Attic from the Greek mainland. Interesting also is a faïence factory producing scarabs and other Aegyptiaca for the Greek market.430

Finally, the Greeks also expanded into the western Mediterranean. The earliest site in this area is Pithecussae on the island of Ischia before the coast of present-day Naples. This emporion produced Euboian and Korinthian ware next to Greek inscriptions (among which the famous Nestor cup) dating from c. 770-675 BC, which coincides nicely with the fact that according to literary evidence Euboians from Khalkis and Eretria were once stationed here. Of these two Greek population groups, the Khalkidians went over to the Italian mainland and settled at Cumae – 'the oldest of all the Sicilian and Italiotic cities'431 –, an event reflected in the archaeological record by Greek inhumation graves dating from c. 725 BC onwards.432 But as Naxos in Sicily is the earliest Greek colonial foundation in the west, we should refrain from considering Pithecussae and Cumae as purely Greek enterprises. In Pithecussae, next to Greek inscriptions, Aramaic and proto-Etruscan ones came to light, indicating the presence of Aramaean and Tyrrhenian merchants and/or resident aliens from North Syria and the Aegean, respectively, whereas Cumae is named after Kume in Aiolia on the coast of western Anatolia, and, next to Greek graves, produced a very rich Etruscan cremation burial, the so-called fondo Artiaco, and an Etruscan inscription in the earliest period of its existence.433 The story of the subsequent colonization of Naxos (by the Khalkidians, 734 BC), Syracuse (by the Korinthians, 733 BC) and the other sites in Sicily, and their importance for the absolute chronology of Greek (especially Korinthian) pottery, may be considered familiar by now.434 Still interesting to adduce is that the historical tradition of the Phokaian pottery from Aiolia in western Anatolia sailing all


431 Strabo, Geography V, 4, 4.


the way to Tartessos just outside the pillars of Herakles in southern Iberia is reflected in the archaeological record of Huelva by north-Ionian bird bowls and Aiolian bucchero dating from c. 630-580 BC.\textsuperscript{435} Apparently to accommodate this long-distance trade the Phokaians founded colonies along the route at Marseilles (= Massalia, c. 600 BC) and Ampurias (= Emporion, also c. 600 BC).\textsuperscript{436}

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

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Distribution of the Greek dialects (from Hall 1997: 154, Fig. 25)}
\end{figure}

Thus far our interdisciplinary method to detect protohistorical ethnic groups, notwithstanding its shortcomings, seems to work fairly well. But what about less contrastive situations, when a population shift takes place from one point to another within a cultural continuum? The best example of such a case is the migration of the Dorians from various regions in Phokis and Thessaly to the Peloponnesos under the leadership of Heraklid kings, who, as the myth goes, return to their ancestral lands some time after the Trojan war. In fact, the evaluation of the historicity of this event is a central theme in Hall’s study of ethnicity in Antiquity.

The problem of the coming of the Dorians and the return of the Heraklids involves three categories of evidence: linguistic, historical (or mythical),\textsuperscript{437} and archaeological. The linguistic thesis is presented by the map of the distribution of the Greek dialects (see Fig. 9.2). What strikes us about this distribution is that speakers of Arkado-Cyprian—which is the dialect closest to the Mycenaean Greek language as attested for Linear B tablets from the Late Bronze Age—besides their extension to Cyprus (not on the map), are locked up in the Arkadian upland plain in the centre of the Peloponnesos and entirely surrounded by speakers of the West Greek or Doric dialect. From this distribution pattern it may be extrapolated that Arkado-Cyprian was once spoken in a wider area including the coastal regions of the Peloponnesos in order to explain the maritime connection with Cyprus, and that West Greek or Doric is a latecomer in the region, having been introduced in the Peloponnesos and spread to Crete, the Dodekanesos, southwest Asia Minor, and Rhodes after the downfall of the Mycenaean civilization.

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

---


\textsuperscript{436} Shefton 1994: 61-63 (east-Greek and Korinthian wares reported for the earliest layer); 70-71

\textsuperscript{437} In general, concerning the category of the historical or mythical evidence as presented by the literary sources, Forsdyke’s (1957: 162) adagium that ‘Plausible fiction can only be distinguished from fact by external evidence (…).’ should be applied whenever possible.
divided the Peloponnnesos in three parts, Temenos himself taking Argos, the sons of Aristodemos (whose father had been killed by a thunderbolt) receiving Sparta, and Kresphontes being allotted Messenia.

Apparently, the literary traditions tally very well with the linguistic evidence, but the missing link to solve the riddle of the Dorian invasion once and for all is formed by the archaeological side of the story. Like others before him, Hall is not able to find archaeological evidence for a migration from the region of Thessaly to the Peloponnnesos and gets so frustrated that he altogether denounces the mythical linguistic evidence, but the missing link to solve the riddle of the Dorian invasion once and for all is formed by Gustav Kossinna and the subsequent abuse of the latter’s views for the ‘Blut und Boden’ propaganda of the German Nazis.

In Chapter 8 above we have seen how Kossinna’s adagium that ‘cultural provinces clearly outlined archaeologically coincide in all periods with precise peoples or tribes’ falls short of explaining the complexities of reality and that the different categories of evidence need to be tackled individually.

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

9.2. Homeros and history

An important literary source for the reconstruction of the early history of the region of Greece and the Aegean is formed by Homeros’ epics the Iliad and the Odyssey. As related forms of six from the total of nine ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples figure in them, the Homeric poems also have a direct bearing on our topic. The fundamental question is, however, which period do the Iliad and the Odyssey reflect, the Late Bronze Age or the Early Iron Age, or both, or none at all?

A lot of ink has been spilled on this question, and I am not aiming to present an exhaustive treatment of the relevant literature, but only to briefly adstruct my own position in this matter. One work needs to be mentioned here, however, and that is Martin Persson Nilsson’s Homer and Mycenae (1933), which, in my opinion, offers the best in-
troduction to the Homeric question.\(^\text{445}\) As the latter author goes at great length to explain, the Homeric poems are the result of a long lasting epic tradition, in which bards constantly rehandled their material for instant public performances and old and new elements were mixed together like currants and raisins in a well-kneaded dough. Consequently, the efforts made by many a scholar to distinguish early and late passages are altogether futile: there can, with the help of archaeological, historical, and linguistic data, only be distinguished early and late elements!

Among the late elements, the first that comes to mind is iron. This metal is mentioned 23x in the *Iliad* and 25x in the *Odyssey*.\(^\text{446}\) Now, it is clear that in the Homeric poems a conscious attempt is made at archaizing by having the weapons made of bronze. Only in two instances, *Iliad* IV, 123 and *Odyssey* XIX, 13, the poet (= poetic tradition epitomized in Homerōs) makes a slip of the tongue and speaks of weapons of iron. In this respect, then, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* may be assumed to have reached their final form in about the same period and not the one earlier as is often assumed. Note further in this connection that the iron club of Areïthoös (*Iliad* VII, 141-4) is a special case: it may have been made of meteoric iron, which was already known in the Bronze Age, or it may be one of those rare objects of mined iron on the production of which the Hittites had a monopoly during the Late Bronze Age.

Another definite Early Iron Age element is formed by the close association of the Phoenicians with the Sidonians – the latter being mentioned 4x in the *Iliad* and 13x in the *Odyssey*. Although George Bass makes a strong case for Canaanite shipping to Greece and the central Mediterranean already in the Late Bronze Age on the basis of the shipwrecks found by him off the coast of Lycia at Uluburun near Kaş (c. 1300 BC) and at cape Gelidonya near Finike (c. 1200 BC),\(^\text{447}\) Jacob Katzenstein convincingly demonstrates that the prominent position of the Sidonians among the Phoenicians dates from the refoundation of Tyre by the Sidonians in 1197 BC to the Assyrian conquest of the city at the end of the reign of Eloulaïos, 694 BC: in this period the kings of Tyre were addressed as ‘king of the Sidonians’.\(^\text{448}\)

Next, it so happens that the standard burial rite in the Homeric poems is cremation. The latter rite is already known in the Late Bronze Age for Hittite royal burials.\(^\text{449}\) and there are more than 200 cinerary urns reported for the cemetery of Troy VII.\(^\text{450}\) But for Greece, one is especially reminded of the burial of the hero of Lefkandi in the 10th century BC and the burials at the west gate of Eretria from the 8th century BC.\(^\text{451}\) In general, it may be stated that the popularity of the rite of cremation in Greece is an Early Iron Age feature.

A further Early Iron Age feature is the use of the term *basileus* as a mere substitute for *anaks* ‘king’. Both these titles are already found in Linear B, where they occur as *qa-ṣi-re-u* and *wa-na-ka*, respectively, but only the latter renders the meaning ‘king’ here, whereas the former denotes a functionary of lower rank in, so far specified, the bronze industry.\(^\text{452}\) It is interesting to observe in this connection that the titular expression *anaks andrôn*, with only one exception in which it is associated with Eumelos of Iolkos (*Iliad* XXIII, 288), is reserved for the supreme commander of the Greeks, Agamemnon.

Also in the field of armory and fighting methods Early Iron Age elements have slipped in. Thus the warriors are often equipped with a round shield, two spears, and greaves – the latter in one instance from tin (*Iliad* XVIII, 613). As Robert Drews cogently argues, the innovative round shield is introduced into the eastern Mediterranean by Sherden mercenaries from Sardinia fighting in the Egyptian army from the beginning of the 13th century BC onwards. Its earliest attestation in Greece is on the warrior vase from Mycenae, dated to Late Helladic IIIIC, i.e. just after the end of the Bronze Age.\(^\text{453}\) Drews further shows that the round shield is used together with a slashing sword, two spears or javelins, and metal greaves in hand-to-hand fighting by skirmishers.\(^\text{454}\) In an earlier period, Greek infantrymen were used to the towershield, which covered the entire body. The latter shield also turns up in the *Iliad* particularly in association with the Salaminian hero Aias. But sometimes the poet (= poetic tradition epitomized in Homerōs) gets confused and calls the towershield (*sa-kos*) ‘small’ (*Iliad* XIV, 376) and wrongly associates it with greaves (*Iliad* III, 330-5), whereas the round shield


\(^{446}\) Gehring 1901, s.v. *sidēreios, sidēreos, sidēros*.
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(aspers) is stated to ‘reach the feet’ (Iliad XV, 645-6).\textsuperscript{455} Another striking Late Bronze Age reminiscent besides the towershield is the boar’s tusk helm (Iliad X, 261-5). An important factor, however, in Late Bronze Age fighting is formed by the chariot. In Egyptian reliefs it is shown that the chariot was used as a mobile platform to shoot arrows with the composite bow.\textsuperscript{456} In the Iliad the chariots are sometimes used for fighting with a long lance or spear, just as it is depicted on a Late Helladic IIA seal from Vaphio in the Argolid.\textsuperscript{457} But in general the original use of the chariot as a mobile platform from which the warrior actually fights seems no longer clear to the poet and he stages it, in line with pictorial evidence from Late Helladic IIIC,\textsuperscript{458} as a taxi for elite warriors to move to the front, where they get out and fight on foot as infantrymen (note, however, that in some instances, as at the beginning of Iliad XII, this tactic is merely determined by the terrain, because the chariots cannot possibly cross the ditch in front of the wall near the ships of the Greek camp).

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

It also seems reasonable to suggest that the use of clothing pins or fibulae, as referred to in both the Iliad (X, 133; XIV, 180 [both verbal forms]) and the Odyssey (XIX, 226; 256), constitutes an Early Iron Age feature, because these objects only turn up in graves from the later period. Note in this connection that the peronē according to Herodotos is a characteristic feature of Doric dress.\textsuperscript{459}

Finally, there are some names paralleled only for Early Iron Age texts. This has a bearing on the Arimoi in the territory where Typhoeus is situated, which probably refers to the volcanic island of Pithecusae off the coast of present-day Naples in Italy, and hence we are likely to be dealing here with Aramaeans (Iliad II, 781-3);\textsuperscript{460} the Kimmerians, who invaded Anatolia and northern Mesopotamia from the Russian Crimea at the end of the 8th century BC and therefore are thoroughly out of place in the context of Odysseus’ visit to the underworld somewhere in the central Mediterranean ( Odyssey XI, 14); lake Gygaia in Maeonia, likely to be named after the Lydian tyrant Gygês, who ruled from 685 to 657 BC (Iliad XX, 390-1; cf. II, 865);\textsuperscript{461} and the Dorians on Crete, who, as we have shown above, can only be surmised to have colonized the island at the end of the Submycenaean or beginning of the Protogeometric period ( Odyssey XIX, 177).

Notwithstanding these Early Iron Age features, which have filtered in during the hundreds of years of improvised epic performances by the bards and which no doubt can be multiplied by closer study, the heart and core of the Homeric poems reflects a Late Bronze Age politico-historical setting. One of the strongest arguments to underline this statement is formed by the fact that Heinrich Schliemann on the basis of the geographical information in Homer’s epics excavated the citadels of Troy (1870), Mycena (1876), and Tiryns (1884) – an empirical approach in the humaniora which comes closest to experiment in the natural sciences. To these epoch-making finds, Carl Blegen supplemented the discovery of the Mycenaean palace of Pylos (1939), which was destroyed at the end of the Late Bronze Age and therefore cannot possibly be accommodated in an Early Iron Age environment. To this comes that the king of Mycenae, Agamemnon, is endowed with the power to call all the other Greek kings from both the mainland and the Aegean islands to service in war – which preserves a political unity reflected in the archaeological record by the so-called Mycenaean koinē of Late Helladic IIIB, but never reached again until the unification of Greece by Philippos II of Macedonia at the start of the Hellenistic period.

The historical validity of the supreme power of the king of Mycenae is further emphasized by the recognition of the king of Aβhjyawā (= Greek Akhaians) as a great king in correspondence with the Hittites, namely in the so-called Tawagalawas letter from presumably the reign of the Hittite

\textsuperscript{455} For the erroneous coalescence of these data into a very ‘big round shield’ which can only be carried by fairy tale heroes, see van Wees 1992: 17-22.

\textsuperscript{456} Drews 1993a: 104-34; Drews 1988: 84 ff.

\textsuperscript{457} Crouwel 1981: Pl. 11; cf. Wiesner 1968: F 27; F 95.

\textsuperscript{458} E.g. Crouwel 1981: Pl. 59; note that Crouwel’s (1981: 119 ff.) downplaying of the early evidence for Mycenaean warriors actually fighting from the chariot, reducing it to the scene of the seal from Vaphio just mentioned to the neglect of, for example, the scenes on the stelae from the shaft graves (Crouwel 1981: Pls. 35-37), is induced by his preoccupation with the most common Homeric use of the chariot as a taxi, so that his conclusion (Crouwel 1981: 151) that the iconographic evidence agrees with this particular Homeric use is not only a simplification of the state of affairs but in effect rests on circular reasoning.

\textsuperscript{459} Lorimer 1950: 337; cf. also porpē mentioned in Iliad XVIII, 401. For the Dark Ages in general, see Desborough 1972 and Snodgrass 2000.

\textsuperscript{460} Benal 1991: 192.

\textsuperscript{461} Kullmann 1999: 192.
great king Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC). The latter source of evidence further affirms the historicity of Agamemnon’s father and predecessor, Atreus, who appears in the so-called Indictment of Madduwartas from the reigns of Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC) as Attarissiyas, the man of Ḫḫḫiyāya. Moreover, in a treaty also from the reign of Muwatallis II the kingdom of Troy is referred to as Wilusa, the Hittite equivalent of Greek Ilios (< *Wilios), and turns out to be headed by a king named Alaksandus, the Hittite equivalent of GreekAlexandros. As a matter of fact, in the aforesaid Tawagalawas letter, a conflict between the Hittite king and his Ḫḫḫiyawaw colleague over Wilusa is explicitly mentioned – an incident which inflated in Greek memory to the famous Trojan war (see further Chapter 15 below)!

In alignment with the Hittite evidence, it is of no little consequence for the historicity of the Trojan war that the Hittites, as first realized by Thomas Webster, are staged in Homer’s account of it as allies of Troy in two capacities: first in the enumeration of the Trojan allies at the end of book II of the Iliad as Halyzones from far away Alybe – a city, like the Hittite capital Ḫattuwa, associated with silver – (Iliad II, 856); and second as Keteioi, whose leader Eurypylus, the son of the Mysian king Telephos, is killed by Akhilleus’ son Neoptolemos (Odyssey XI, 521).462 To this may also be added463 the mythical Amazones, an enemy whom the Phrygians run up against when trying to carve out a territorium for themselves along the Sangarios river in Anatolia at the time when Priamos still fought himself (Iliad III, 184) and whom Bellerophon stumbles upon during his adventures inland from Lycia (Iliad VI, 186).

462 Webster 1960: 67; Meyer 1968: 12 identifies Alybe with the Khalybes from the Black Sea coast, which is linguistically possible, but chronologically inadequate as these latter are only attested for the Early Iron Age. Note in this connection that Hittite involvement in Mysia is assured by their foundation of Sarawa there, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 138.

463 Smit 1988-9: 54, with reference to Garstang 1929: 86 f. for the Amazones and 172 for the Keteioi; see further Leonhard 1911: 15-16. Note with Gindin 1999: 225-6 that the relation between Keteioi and Amazones is enhanced by the fact that the name of the leader of the former, Eurypylus, is a masculine variant of that of the queen of the latter, Eurypyle. The same author also rightly stressed the relation of the name Telephos with the Hittite royal name Telegipus (p. 248-9), and that of his second son Tarkhōn with the Luwian divine name Tarḫunta (p. 225). The close knit fabric of mythological associations is further elaborated by the fact that the wife of Telephos is recorded to fight from the chariot like an Amazone (Gindin 1999: 248-9). On top of this, the leader of the Keteioi is called a megas basileus ‘great king’ by Quintus of Smyrna, see Gindin 1999: 231.

Furthermore, another strong argument in favor of the Late Bronze Age politico-historical setting of the Homeric poems is provided by the catalogue of the ships. As far as the Greek mainland is concerned, it stands out that Aitolia and Thessaly are represented, but northwest Greece is not. This coincides with the distribution of Late Helladic IIIB ware in connection with settlements and chamber tombs with multiple burials, from which northwest Greece is excluded: apparently the latter region is not Hellenized before the Early Iron Age.464 Similarly, as duly stressed by Joachim Latacz, the Cyclades and the west coast of Asia Minor are also not represented, which, as far as the last mentioned area is concerned, is historically correct since the Aiolian, Ionian, and Dorian migrations to western Anatolia date from the Submycenaean period onwards. A problem is posed, however, by the position of Miletos (= Hittite Millawanda), which according to Homeros is inhabited by Carians and sides with the Trojans (Iliad II, 686), whereas it definitely belonged to the Mycenaean (archaeologically) or Akhaian (historically) sphere of influence at the time of the Trojan war (c. 1280 BC). As Millawanda is in the Hittite records reported to have changed sides during the reign of Tudḫaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC), the Hitteric position of Miletos may be due to an historical hypercorrection.465

Finally, the close contacts of the Mycenaean Akhaians with the Hittites as attested for Hittite correspondence can be further illustrated by the fact that Homeros in two instances has applied a standard expression from Hittite texts in annalistic tradition according to which the chief deity, in the case of the Hittites the stormgod, runs before the king and his army in battle to secure victory.466 Thus, in one passage Apollo, the chief god of the Trojans, mentioned in the form of Appaliunas as one of the local oathgods in the Alaksandus-treaty,467 precedes the Trojans with the aegis in their attempt to storm the Greek wall (Iliad XV, 307-11), and in another Athena, one of the deities on the Greek side, precedes Akhilleus when he conquers Lynnessos and Pedasos to the south of mount Ida (Iliad XX, 94-6)!

464 Smit 1989: esp. 180 (map); cf. Latacz 2003: 266, Abb. 22, and Chapter 15, Fig. 15.2a below.


466 For the earliest example, see Bryce 1998: 135 (annals of Tudḫaliyas I, 1430-1400 BC); Woudhuizen 1994-5: 181, note 131; Woudhuizen 2004a: 38, note 42 (the literal translation of Hittite πίραν ἄμβα- or ὡμάβα-) is ‘to run before’; see Yalburt, phrases 4, 7, 11, and 32 for Luwian hieroglyphic examples.

467 Latacz 2003: 58; 138 (§ 20).
CHAPTER 10. HISTORICAL SETTING

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

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

In about the same time as the Gutian onslaught on Akkad, at the end of Early Bronze Age II, there is massive evidence for large-scale destruction of settlements in Anatolia, especially in the Konya region and Cilicia later occupied by Luwians. The subsequent lack of reoccupation suggested to James Mellaart that the affected regions became the grazing grounds of nomads. The origin of the nomads in question may perhaps be indicated by the evidence of the royal burials at Alaca Höyük, which are of similar type as those of the later Mycenaean and Phrygians, and characterized by solar discs and theriomorphic standards recalling counterparts from Horoztepe and Mahmatlar in the Pontic region: all these elements have been attributed by Ekrem Akurgal to Indo-Europeans – nomadic cattle breeders and herdsmen originating from the steppe zone north of the Black Sea, the Caucasus, and beyond. Accordingly, we appear to be confronted with two concerted invasions by Indo-Europeans in the 23rd century BC: one by the ancestors of the later Tocharians across the Caucasus into Mesopotamia and another by the ancestors of the later Hittites, Luwians, and Palalans across the Bosporus into the Anatolian highland and along the western and southern coasts into the plains of Konya and Cilicia – the latter event marked by the spread of Trojan Ilg ware with as its ‘Leitmotiv’ the so-called depas amphikypellon.

The upheavals at the end of Late Bronze Age II in the 23rd century BC also affected the Greek mainland, Crete, and the Levant. In Greece, for instance the ‘House of the Tiles’ at Lerna was burned down and covered by a tumulus – a burial custom characteristic of the Kurgan culture of the Russian steppe. This event is commonly associated with the arrival of the earliest Indo-Europeans in southern Greece (see further Chapter 14). As far as Crete is concerned, the flourishing settlements at Vasiliki near the bay of Mirabello and Myrtos (Fournou Korifi) along the south coast were destroyed by fire and the ruins of the first covered by simple hovels and that of the second by a peak-sanctuary – a completely new phenomenon for the island. Against the background of the events in Anatolia and Greece, it seems not farfetched to assume that the Indo-European invasions also affected eastern Crete – an assumption which would allow us to explain the evidence for the Luwian language in Cretan hieroglyphic documents dating from the Middle Bronze Age onwards (see further Chapters 19 and 23). Finally, the Levant bears testimony of a similar lapse to nomadism as Anatolia: if Indo-Europeans were responsible for this development, as Marija Gimbutas argued on the basis of Kurgan-like shaft-tombs (among which a twin catacomb grave) at Bab al-Dra east of the Dead Sea, these have not been traced in the records which surface again from the Middle Bronze Age onwards.

468 Henning 1978.

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

473 Gimbutas 1973 groups these Indo-European migrations together as her ‘second wave of Indo-Europeanization’. As opposed to this, Best 1982: 218 associates these graves with the apsidal houses of Meşer, dated c. 3300 BC, which by and large coincides with the early 3rd millennium BC date of a comparable twin catacomb grave at Palermo in Sicily (Conca d’Oro culture) and cata-
It lies at hand to correlate the fall of central authority during the First Intermediate Period in Egypt, assigned to about 2140 BC, with the upheavals at the end of Early Bronze Age II.

Under the 11th dynasty the unity of Egypt was restored and the country rose to great power during the 12th dynasty. At that time Byblos in the Levant was drawn within the orbit of Egyptian influence, as can be deduced from inscriptions by its rulers in Egyptian hieroglyphic and the influence of the latter script on the indigenous Byblian proto-Linear script. Synchronous with the rise of Egypt under the 12th dynasty (= 20th and 19th centuries BC) was the regular trade connection between Assyria and Anatolia as exemplified by Assyrian trading colonies or kāru associated with major Anatolian towns. The cuneiform tablets from the kāru inform us that the Assyrian merchants imported annukum ‘tin’ and woolen textiles in exchange for Anatolian metals, especially silver and gold. The metal tin played a crucial role in international trade from c. 2000 BC onwards, when the bronze industry went over from arsenic bronze to the much harder alloy of copper and tin for the production of weapons and other artefacts. In response to the introduction of cuneiform writing by the Assyrian traders, the indigenous Anatolians – who on the basis of onomastic evidence were to a large extent Indo-European, in casu Hittite and Luwian – developed their own writing system, the so-called Luwian hieroglyphic, which to some extent follows the model of Egyptian hieroglyphic but derives its values acrophonically from the indigenous Anatolian vocabulary.474 Under influence of the international tin trade, the island Crete, which lies on a junction of maritime trade routes, acquired great wealth and developed a palatial civilization,475 with a script to write down the economic transactions basically derived from Luwian hieroglyphic but with a more substantial Egyptian component than the original received either through the medium of Byblos or through direct contacts with Egypt itself (see further Chapters 19 and 23).

The period of the Assyrian merchant colonies ended

474 Woudhuizen 1990-1; Woudhuizen 2004a: appendix I.
475 Note that the Mari texts from the reign of Zimri-lim (early 18th century BC) bear testimony of kaptaraim ‘to the Cretan’ (< Kaptara- = Biblical Kaphtor ‘Crete’) in the context of the tin-trade, see Dossin 1970: 99.
portunity to conquer Palestine *in toto* and brought back Byblos into the Egyptian sphere of influence, thus laying the foundations for the Empire period. This imperial policy of territorial expansion was subsequently continued by Ahmos’s successor, Amenhotep I (1525-1504 BC), who conquered Tunip along the upper Orontes river, and Tuthmosis I (1504-1492 BC), who campaigned up to the Euphrates river. However, after a lull especially during the reign of Hatshepsut (1479-1457 BC), it reached its zenith under Tuthmosis III (1479-1425 BC), who even crossed the Euphrates, defeated Mitanni, and incorporated North Syria up to and including Ugarit, where a garrison was stationed. As a corollary to Tuthmosis III’s defeat of Mitanni, the latter sought a truce with Egypt, which materialized under Amenhotep II (1427-1400 BC) in an alliance cemented by the marriage of Amenhotep II’s son, the later Tuthmosis IV, with the daughter of the Mitannian king Aratatama I. What followed is a period of consolidation by diplomacy, vividly described in the Amarna tablets covering the period from the later part of the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) to the reign of Tutankhamun (1336-1327 BC). Most striking in this correspondence is the reluctance of Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC) to comply with the desperate appeals by his loyal vassal king of Byblos, Rib-addi, and curb the encroachments on the latter’s territory by the upcoming power of Amurru under the leadership of Abdi-asirta and his son Aziru. The story ended with the death of Rib-addi by the hand of Aziru. The Amarna tablets also provide early mentions of some groups of the Sea Peoples, namely the Lukka and the Sherden – the first as pirates raiding Alasiya (= Cyprus) and the coast of Egypt and the second as body guards or mercenaries of Rib-addi of Byblos.

In the long run, however, the major concurrent of the Egyptians for control in North Syria was not the kingdom of Mitanni, but that of the Hittites. These had already cemented by the marriage of Amenhotep II’s son, the later Tuthmosis IV, with the daughter of the Mitannian king Aratatama I. What followed is a period of consolidation by diplomacy, vividly described in the Amarna tablets covering the period from the later part of the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) to the reign of Tutankhamun (1336-1327 BC). Most striking in this correspondence is the reluctance of Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC) to comply with the desperate appeals by his loyal vassal king of Byblos, Rib-addi, and curb the encroachments on the latter’s territory by the upcoming power of Amurru under the leadership of Abdi-asirta and his son Aziru. The story ended with the death of Rib-addi by the hand of Aziru. The Amarna tablets also provide early mentions of some groups of the Sea Peoples, namely the Lukka and the Sherden – the first as pirates raiding Alasiya (= Cyprus) and the coast of Egypt and the second as body guards or mercenaries of Rib-addi of Byblos.

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

After the untimely death of his elder brother, the youngest son of Suppiluliumas I inherited the throne and ruled as Mursilis II (1321-1295 BC). His main achievement was the conquest of Arzawa in western Anatolia, from where he deported as much as 65,000 or 66,000 prisoners of war to other parts of the Hittite realm. Furthermore, he rearranged the western province into four Arzawa lands, Mira-Kuwa, the Şeş River Land, Şeşapappawa, and Wilusa, each under a vassal king – an arrangement which lasted to at least an advanced stage of the reign of Tudḫaliyas IV near the end of the 13th century BC, its resilience being due largely to the fact that it was cemented by dynastic marriages so that the vassal kings in question became members of the royal family themselves. Mursilis II was followed by his son and successor, Muwatallis II (1295-1272 BC). By this time, the Egyptian throne had come into the hands of a new and militant dynasty, founded by a former general, Ramesses I (1295-1294 BC). With the accession of his descendant Ramesses II (1279-
1223 BC), it became clear that Egypt wanted to regain its former dependencies in North Syria by force. In anticipation of the coming war with Egypt, Muwatallis II moved the Hittite capital from the somewhat eccentric Ḫattusa to Tarḫuntašša in the south. Furthermore, to gather allied forces or mercenaries he launched a campaign in the west. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that at the inevitable showdown of forces which eventually took place near Kadesh in the fifth year of Ramesses II’s reign (1274 BC), the Hittites according to the Egyptian records were, *inter alia*, aided by troops from Arzawa (= later Lydia), Dardania (= Troas), Masa (= Mysia), Karkisa (= Caria), and Lukka (= Lycia). (Interesting for our purposes is that the same records bear testimony of Sherden mercenaries on the Egyptian side.) During his campaign in the west, however, Muwatallis II wanted to avoid a conflict with the Ḫattiyawans (= Akhaians or Mycenaean Greeks), who were in control of Millawanda (= Miletos) at the time, and for this reason settled his dispute in diplomatic terms, addressing the king of Ḫattiyawa as his brother and hence including him into the illustrious ranks of the great kings (see further Chapter 15). According to the Egyptian records, again, the Hittite forces at the ensuing battle of Kadesh numbered in total 3,500 chariotry and 37,000 infantry. The propaganda of Ramesses II claimed the outcome as an outstanding victory for the Egyptians, but at the end of the day the bone of contention, Kadesh, remained within the sphere of influence of the Hittites!

The eldest son of Muwatallis II, Urḫitešup, who on his ascendance took the throne-name Mursilis III, occupied the throne only for a brief period (1272-1267 BC), before he was deposed by his uncle Ḫattusilis III (1267-1239 BC). The latter distinguished himself particularly in international diplomacy, as he was responsible for the peace treaty with Egypt of 1259 BC – an entente between the two great powers which lasted till the end of the Bronze Age. Furthermore, his wife Pudušepa played a vital role in cementing the relationship by dynastic marriages, which boiled down to a one-sided affair in which Ḫatti dispatched princesses to the harem of the pharaoh, but the latter did not return the favor as no princesses of Egypt were allowed to be betrothed to a foreigner – with all possible consequences for foreign claims on the throne (the request by the widow of Tutankhamun for a Hittite prince to remarry with mentioned above was quite exceptional, indeed, and, as we have seen, doomed to fail). In the reign of Ḫattusilis III mention was first made of shipments of grain from Egypt to Ḫatti, which later under Merneptah became so important that they were claimed ‘to keep Ḫatti alive’. Evidently, the Hittite Empire suffered from food shortage, but it is a longstanding problem which cannot be hold responsible, as it often is, for its final downfall.

The son and successor of Ḫattusilis III, Tudḫaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC) exercised an active military policy in the west. In the text of a bronze tablet found during the late 80s of the last century in the capital Boğazköy / Ḫattusa, which meticulously describes the borders of the viceregal province of Tarḫuntašša under his uncle Kuruntas, a campaign against Parša (= Perge) along the Kastaraya (= Kestros) in Pamphylia to the west of Tarḫuntašša was anticipated, the spoils of which would fall to Kuruntas. Next, a Luwian hieroglyphic text from Yalburt commemorizes a campaign in the Xanthos river valley of Lycia, where the towns Talawa (= Tiós), Pinata (= Pinar), and Awarma (= Arima) were subdued, as Tudḫaliyas IV famously claims, for the first time in Hittite history. After this, the so-called Milawata letter informs us that the governor of Millawanda (= Miletos), which formerly resided under the king of Aḫḫiyawa (= Akhaia or Mycenaean Greece), turned sides and joined the Hittites.481 In this manner, then, a longstanding source of troubles in the west was eventually eliminated. Tudḫaliyas IV’s next move was in the east: in a treaty with Sausgamuwa of Amurru he forbade the latter to serve as an intermediary for trade between Aḫḫiyawa and Assyria – the new enemy in the east since Suppiluliumas I’s decisive victory over Mitanni. Bereft of his stronghold in western Anatolia, the king of Aḫḫiyawa was no longer considered a great king, which must have been a recent development as he was first enumerated among the great kings in the text of the Sausgamuwa treaty but then deleted. The ultimate goal of Tudḫaliyas IV’s campaigns in the west, and a further guarantee for the success of his economic boycott against the maritime trade between Aḫḫiyawa and Assyria, was the conquest of Alasiya (= Cyprus), which he achieved near the end of his reign. Notwithstanding a serious defeat against the Assyrians under the able leadership of Tukulti-Ninurta (1233-1197 BC) somewhere in between of the given events, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the reign of

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

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

Arnuwandas III was succeeded by his brother Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC). The latter was forced to reconquer Cyprus-Alasiya, again, which apparently had taken advantage of the mishap during the short reign of Arnuwandas III. After his victory, he set up a memorial (Nişantaş at Boğazköy / Ḫattusa) also for that of his father, who did not have the time to do so. Later in his reign, Suppiluliumas II was forced to conduct a campaign in western Anatolia against, inter alia, Masa (= Mysia), Wiyanawanda (= Oinoanda in the upper Xanthos valley), and Lukka (= Lycia), the ensuing victory of which he commemorated in the Südburg monument at Boğazköy / Ḫattusa. The same Luwian hieroglyphic inscription, however, shows him very much in control of the imperial machinery in provinces like Pala, Walma, and Tarḫuntassa. The final downfall caused by the Sea Peoples (this time the Peleset, Tjeker, Shekelesh, Denye(n), and Weshesh) as vividly described by the letters from Ras Shamra / Ugarit and Ramesses III’s (1184-1153 BC) memorial at Medinet Habu, came as a flash of lightning in a clear sky by total surprise.

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

---

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

483 See Woudhuizen 1992-3 and Woudhuizen 2004a: appendix V.
CHAPTER 11. AN HISTORIOGRAPHIC OUTLINE

In this section we will present an outline of the most important modern literature on the Sea Peoples. Special attention in this historiographic outline will be given to the identification of the individual population groups, which is still a matter of debate. Another point of interest is the cause (or causes) of their sudden appearance on the stage during the period aptly called the catastrophe at the end of the Late Bronze Age. Our main purpose, to determine whether the shortlived coalition of forces which we call the Sea Peoples consists of a number of individual cohesive ethnē, is a question barely touched upon in the literature: it surfaces only in the discussion between Gustav Adolf Lehmann and Wolfgang Helck in the 1980s and in Drews 1993. For convenience’s sake, I will in the following use standardized transcriptions for the ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples as commonly used in the English language. An example of how these ethnonyms can be written in Egyptian hieroglyphic – the writing is not standardized and therefore can vary per attestation – and their proper transliteration is rendered in figure 11.1.484 Note that the ethnonyms are distinguished as such by the deterministic of foreign people (Gardiner 1994: T 14 + A 1).

The modern literature on the Sea Peoples commences with the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphic by Jean-François Champollion in the first half of the 19th century AD. In his Grammaire égyptienne of 1836 he proposed to identify the Peleset as mentioned in the texts of Ramesses III (1184-1153 BC) in his mortuary temple at Medinet Habu (Thebes) with the Biblical Philistines – an identification which goes unchallenged till the present day. Following in his footsteps, Emmanuel de Rougé set out in his contribution to the Revue Archéologique 16 of 1867 to connect the other ethnonyms in the same texts and in the one of Merneptah (1213-1203 BC) on a wall of the main temple at Medinet Habu (Thebes) with the Biblical Philistines – an identification which goes unchallenged till the present day. Following in his footsteps, Emmanuel de Rougé set out in his contribution to the Revue Archéologique 16 of 1867 to connect the other ethnonyms in the same texts and in the one of Merneptah (1213-1203 BC) on a wall of the main temple at Karnak (Thebes) with names of known Mediterranean peoples or locations on the basis of similarity in sound (‘Gleichklang’). Thus he proposed to identify the Teresh with the Tyrrhenians or Etruscans, the Shekelesh with the Sicels, the Sherden with the Sardinians, all in the central Mediterranean, the Ekwesh with the Akhaians in mainland Greece, and the Lukka with the Lycians in southwest Asia Minor. These suggestions were subsequently amplified by François Chabas in his Études sur l’Antiquité Historique d’après les sources égyptiennes et les monuments réputés préhistoriques of 1872, who connected the Tjeker with the Teukroi of the Troas in northwest Asia Minor, the Denye(n) with the Daunians and the Weshesh with the Oscans, the latter two both at home in Italy. Moreover, he ventured to equal the Peleset, which we have seen to be identified with the Biblical Philistines since the time of Champollion, with the Pelasgians of Greek literary sources – an equation, as far as the Philistines are concerned, with a respectable history, first being put forward by Etienne Fourmont in 1747.

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

484 As the Egyptologist J.F. Borghouts assures me, the use of Gardiner 1994: T 12 ‘bowstring’ (usual phonetic value 3r) for Gardiner 1994: V 4 ‘lasso’ (usual phonetic value w3) in the ethnonym Ekwesh is a peculiarity of the Karnak text, paralleled, for example, in the writing of Meshwesh.
Only the Philistines were supposed to have turned east and settled in Canaan.

The view of Maspero that the Sea Peoples originated solely from the eastern Mediterranean has had a great influence on his successors, even up to the present day (cf. Redford 1992: 246). At any rate, it has been taken over without much critical reflection by H.R. Hall, who dominated the field in the first half of the 20th century AD. In a first contribution to the Annual of the British School at Athens 8 of 1901-2, he expressed himself in favor of Maspero’s identifications with the only noted exception of Weshesh, which he preferred to connect with Cretan Waskioi instead of Carian Wassos. Next, in a collection of papers to the memory of Champollion which appeared in 1922 Hall presented a useful summary of the literature on the topic of the Sea Peoples up to that moment. In this summary, he proposed to identify the Denye(n), whom Maspero had equated with the Danaoi of the Argolid in

---

485 I am indebted to J.F. Borghouts for providing the transliteration, and to Wim van Binsbergen for identifying the specific transliterated strings with the hieroglyphic sections, and preparing and tabulating the graphics in this table.
mainland Greece, with the Danuna of Cilicia as mentioned in the El-Amarna texts from the reigns of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) and Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC). Hall’s work culminates in his contribution to the first edition of the Cambridge Ancient History, which appeared in 1926. Here he expressly distinguished the Sea Peoples, which, as we have seen, according to him originated from western Anatolia and mainland Greece, from the Keftiu, i.e. the designation of the Cretans in Egyptian texts. Confronted with the Biblical sources, according to which the Peleset originated from Crete, he came up with the solution that they had come from Asia Minor via Crete. Furthermore, he noted in alignment with his earlier association of the Denye(n) with the Danuna, that some of the Sea Peoples, like the Sherden and the Lukka, were already mentioned in the El-Amarna texts. Of them, the Sherden were stipulated to have fought both on the Egyptian side and that of the Sea Peoples in the upheavals at the time of Ramesses III. Finally, in true Masperonian way, he envisioned the Sherden, Shekelesh, and Teresh, after their failing attack on Egypt, as being on their way to their ultimate homes in the central Mediterranean. The career of Hall ended with his ‘going Caucasian’ so to say: in his last contribution on the subject of 1929 he explained all ethnonyms of the Sea Peoples as reflections of similar sounding Caucasian tribal names – a fine example of the dangers of the etymological approach when applied without further backing.

After the second World War, the first to take up the subject of the Sea Peoples again, was Alan Gardiner. In his Ancient Egyptian Onomastica of 1947 he meticulously described all that was known at the time of a number of the ethnonyms, especially so of the Sherden and the Peleset. Remarkable is that in connection with the Denye(n) he spoke against their relation with the Danuna in Cilicia and in favor of that with the Danaoi of the Argolid in mainland Greece. Moreover, he sided with Hall in his opinion that the Peleset were not originally at home in Crete, but used this island as an intermediary station in their way to the Levant. In connection with the Sherden, finally, he remarked, with reference to an earlier contribution by Wainwright (1939: 148), that the Teresh were known to the Hittite world (probably implying a linguistic relation of the ethnonym with Tarwisa (= Troy), which, however, is dubious), but the Sherden and the Shekelesh not and hence that the latter might be assumed to originate from outside of it – the first rudimentary attempt to bring the controversy between de Rougé and Chabas on the one hand and Maspero on the other to a higher level.

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

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

Against the background of Kimmig’s answer to the question of causality, Richard D. Barnett’s treatment of the Sea Peoples in the 3rd edition of the Cambridge Ancient History, which first appeared as a separate issue in 1969 and subsequently as an integral part of Volume II, 2 in 1975, means a step back to the level of identifications on the basis of likeness in sound, in which the author sides with Maspero’s eastern Mediterranean thesis: thus the Teresh are said to originate from Lydia, the Shekelesh to be on their way to Sicily, whereas for the Sherden a homeland in Cyprus is taken into consideration, from where, of course, they departed to colonize Sardinia. As far as the Peleset are concerned, he saw no problem in identifying them with the Philistines and having them colonize cities in Canaan – in his view Gaza, Askelon, Asdod and Dor – from Crete. From an historical point of view, Barnett
pointed to the fact that the famine reported by Herodotos (Histories I, 94) as the cause of part of the Lydian population to leave their country and settle in Etruria might be a reflection of the grain shipments by Merneptah to keep the country of Ḫatti alive. Furthermore, he suggested that the naval victory of the last Hittite great king Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC) against the island of Alasiya has a bearing on his battle against the Sea Peoples having gained themselves a foothold on Cyprus.486

In the same year that Barnett’s contribution first appeared, Rainer Stadelmann put forward an interesting paper in Saeclum 19 in which he offered an alternative answer to what caused the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. In his view the prime move is made by the Phrygians, who, originating from the Balkans, overran the Anatolian plateau at the end of the Late Bronze Age and destroyed the Hittite Empire. As a corollary to this migration, the Philistines joined the Phrygians in their movement from the Balkans to Asia Minor, but, instead of settling here, they moved on to the Levant and Egypt via Crete and Cyprus. Having been defeated by Ramesses III, the Philistines settled in Palestine – an event which was previously assumed by Albright (1932) and Alt (1944) to have been orchestrated by the Egyptian pharaoh, but, taking the evidence at face value, the latter appeared no longer in control of this region. As opposed to this, Stadelmann assumed that the Sherden, Shekelesh, and Teresh went to the central Mediterranean to find their new homes in Sardinia, Sicily, and central Italy, from where they maintained trade contacts with their former comrades in arms in the Levant up to the time that the Phoenicians seized the opportunity to take these over.

The following years are dominated by a German scholar, Gustav Adolf Lehmann. In a series of works, starting in 1970 and continuing to 2005, he tried to reconstruct an historical outline of the events that led to and made up the catastrophe at the end of the Late Bronze Age, using a wide range of sources from Egyptian hieroglyphic through Ugaritic alphabetic up to Hittite cuneiform. With only slight adaptations, this historical picture forms the basic background for my own studies on the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples; for a brief summary of the main events, see Chapter 10 above. Two points are of special interest to us here, namely Lehmann’s position on the cause (or causes) of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples and that on their ethnic relevance. Now, as to what caused the catastrophe, it can be deduced from the distribution map of groups of the Sea Peoples in the central and eastern Mediterranean in Die mykenisch-frühgriechische Welt und der östliche Mittelmeerraum in der Zeit der ‘Seevölker’-Invasionen um 1200 v. Chr. of 1985 (p. 47) and the accompanying text (pp. 43-9) that he considered the Adriatic as the source of trouble for the wider Mediterranean, population groups here possibly being uprooted by developments in the Danubian area. As against this model, it might be objected that the aforesaid distribution map rather reflects the situation after the catastrophe, when the Sea Peoples had been subject to a widespread diaspora. With respect to the ethnic relevance of the ethnonyms, Lehmann pointed out that the Egyptian depictions of the Sherden in reliefs from the reigns of Ramesses II and Ramesses III with very specific features testifies to the fact that at least the nucleus of the Sea Peoples consisted of pronounced ethnic groups (p. 58; see also our motto). In a review article of Lehmann’s work of 1985 in Gnemon 58 of 1986, Wolfgang Helck reacted against this inference with the words that


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

An even more extreme position with reference to the migrational aspect of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples than the one maintained by Helck was presented by Alexandra Nibbi in her The Sea Peoples and Egypt of 1975. According to this author the Sea Peoples are all Asians living in the Nile delta, with the exception of the Peleset, the identification of whom with the Philistines from Palestine as proposed already by Champollion she accepts. At the background of Nibbi’s views lurks the interpretation of what is generally considered as the Egyptian words for the Mediterranean sea (wḏ-wr ‘great green’), islands (Iraq), and sea (yām) as references to the Nile delta and inland lakes here. She even went as far as to suggest that Retenu, which is generally considered as an indication of the Levant, is a reference to the Nile delta, too. I think it is not advisable to follow Nibbi in her extremist standpoint.487

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

487 In variant form Nibbi’s extremist point of view has recently
In the next year, 1976, August Strobel published his Der Spätbronzezeitliche Seevölkersturm, Ein Forschungs-überblick mit Folgerungen zur bibliischen Exodusthematik, which offers a wealth of detailed information on the individual groups of the Sea Peoples and the Near Eastern texts in which they appear, and hence may serve us as a valuable reference book. However, it is less outspoken about the matters which primarily concern us here, like the origins of the Sea Peoples, the causes for the catastrophe – though Strobel favors a severe drought in this respect – and the articulation of the Sea Peoples’ ethnicity.

Still a classic in the field is Nancy K. Sandars The Sea Peoples, Warriors of the ancient Mediterranean 1250-1150 BC of 1978 (reprinted in 1985 as a paperback edition), which two years afterwards appeared in Dutch translation as De Zeevolken, Egypte en Voor-Azië bedreigd, 1250-1150 v.C. – both editions being highly valuable for their rich illustrations. However, as far as the origins of the individual population groups are concerned, the author happens to be waffering between the views of de Rougé on the one hand and Maspero on the other hand. Thus the Sherden are in first instance linked up with either Sardinia or Sards, whereas later they are supposed to have migrated from Cyprus or North Syria to Sardinia. Similarly, the Shekelesh are now associated with Anatolia and then with southern Italy and Sicily. Only with respect to the Teresh Sandars straightforwardly committed herself to an Anatolian homeland, be it Lydia or the Troas. The latter region is also considered the place of origin of the Tjeker and, less persuasively, of the Weshesh, whilst the Lukka, the Ekwesh, and the Denye(n) are more or less conventionally identified as the Lycians of southwest Anatolia, the Achaeans of western Anatolia, the Aegean islands or mainland Greece, and the Danuna of Cilicia, respectively. Finally, the Peleset are, like the Teresh, traced back to an Anatolian homeland. Also as far as the causes of the catastrophe are concerned, Sandars’ position is rather diffuse, now stressing internecine war and internal decay (= systems collapse), then economic crisis and last but not least attacks from hostile tribes or states along the borders. This unsatisfactory mixture of causes of the catastrophe should not surprise us, because, as long as the problem of the origins of the Sea Peoples remains unsolved, the related problem of these causes can in fact not possibly be adequately dealt with.

In his book on Caphtor / Keftiu, subtitled A new Investigation, of 1980, John Strange also pays some attention to the Sea Peoples (pp. 138-42; 157-65). In doing so, he is exceptional in presenting the spelling of the five ethnonyms recorded for Medinet Habu in Egyptian hieroglyphic writing. As far as the origins of the Sea Peoples are concerned, however, he adheres to common views in the literature at the time according to which most of them originated from Asia Minor (Denye(n)), particularly its western outskirts (Lukka, Shekelesh, Teresh, Tjeker), but some came from farther west, the Aegean (Ekwesh), or north, the Caucasus (Sherden), and the Balkans (Peleset). Crucial to his main theme, the identification of Biblical Kaphtor and Egyptian Keftiu with Cyprus, is the fact that a substantial number of the Sea Peoples can be shown to have colonized the Syro-Palestine coast from the latter island, which Strange correlates to the well-known Biblical information that the Philistines originated from Kaphtor, hence his adagium Kaphtor = Cyprus. Although Cyprus may have functioned as a way station for some of the Sea Peoples in their trek to the Levant, it is an oversimplification of the evidence to consider it as their main sallying point – as we will see, the diagnostic ceramics in the form of Mycenaean IIIIC1b ware have a much wider distribution, including Crete and western Anatolia. To this comes that there is positive evidence, duly assembled by Strange himself, indicating that Alasiya is the Late Bronze Age name of Cyprus, and Kaptara (> Kaphtor) or Keftiu that of Crete.

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

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

been embraced by Yves Duhoux, according to whom (2003: 272) ‘la base opérationnelle des envahisseurs était le centre du Delta’. Although I am not challenging the fact that, for example, wg-wr ‘great green’ in certain contexts does refer to the Nile and the Red Sea, it certainly goes too far to deny that in other contexts, like that of the Sea Peoples, it clearly denotes the Mediterranean Sea.

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

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

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

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

One of the most important and stimulating contributions on our topic is formed by Robert Drews’ The End of the Bronze Age, Changes in Warfare and the Catastrophe c. 1200 B.C. of 1993. In this work, the author set out to treat the various causes of the catastrophe as suggested in the relevant literature, like earthquakes, drought, systems collapse, and migrations, in order to refute them all; in his criticism of the migrational explanation, he launched a vehement attack on Maspero’s identification of the Sherden, Shekelesh, and Teresh with peoples from Anatolia, maintaining instead that these are just persons from Sardinia, Sicily, and Etruria. As indicated by the subtitle of his book, according to Drews the real explanation of the catastrophe at the end of the Late Bronze Age constitutes a military innovation. In the palatial societies of the Late Bronze Age empires, chariot warfare formed the heart and core of the army, being supplemented only by infantry auxiliaries, particularly handy for special tasks like guarding the camp site or manoeuvring in mountainous terrain. At the end of the Bronze Age, however, a new style of infantry is introduced with, amongst others, round shields, slashing swords, metal greaves, and javelins, which can outmatch the until then unchallenged chariots, especially by eliminating the horses with javelins thrown in full run. In general, this shift from chariots to infantry warfare during the period from the end of the Late Bronze Age to the early phase of the Iron Age is undisputable. But it did take place more gradually than Drews wants us to believe. In the first place, especially the Egyptian pharaohs from the time of Ramesses II onwards were quick to adapt to the military innovations by hiring Sherden mercenaries from (as we will argue) Sardinia, who were specialists in the new style of fighting. Secondly, certain groups that overrun the Late Bronze Age states during the catastrophe, like the Kaskans of Anatolia and the Philistines of Palestine, still used chariots in their army during the Early Iron Age. This being so, it should not be overlooked that one of the greatest military assets of the Sea Peoples was (as their name implies) their sea power: once they had cleared the waters of the eastern Mediterranean from enemy ships, they could, just like the Vikings in a later age, attack any location of their choosing by hit and run actions, thus leaving the landlocked imperial armies no chance at a proper defence! Another point of criticism of Drews’ views concerns his denial of a migratory aspect to the catastrophe, which leads him to the assertion that the Peleset and Tjeker were already living in Palestine during the Late Bronze Age – a supposition which, insofar as the period of Ramesses III is concerned, is simply untenable. As Drews himself admits, the innovative infantry is only effective when applied in ‘overwhelming numbers’ (p. 211). Furthermore, the Peleset and the Tjeker are never mentioned in contemporary Late Bronze Age texts, thanks to which the situation in the Levant before the catastrophe is reasonably clear; for the Peleset,
Drews can only fall back on the Biblical account of the Philistine ruler Abimelech from the times of Abraham and Isaac, which, however, is a patent anachronism. Finally, as we have just noted, in the period of Ramesses III some of the groups of the Sea Peoples clearly had the intention to settle in the Egyptian delta as evidenced by the ox carts with women and children depicted on the enemy’s side in the reliefs of Medinet Habu. Of special interest to our main theme is the fact that Drews denies that the persons referred to by the ethnonyms which belonged to the Sea Peoples ‘were ever a cohesive group’ (p. 71; my italics). In my opinion, his military explanation of the catastrophe, stressing the advancement of infantry, would gain a lot if the groups were indeed cohesive. In a contribution to the Journal of Near Eastern Studies 59 of 2000, Drews elaborates his anti-migratory view on the catastrophe at the end of the Bronze Age.

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

In his work of 1999 on Ugarit, Cyprus and the Aegean, Hans-Günter Buchholz, specifically discussed the problem of the Sea Peoples, especially in his concluding remarks (pp. 708-41), where he presents a wealth of recent literature. Like many of his predecessors, however, he considers it an open question whether the Sherden and the Shekelesh originated from the West or not.

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

The latest publication on the topic I know of is Eric H. Cline’s and David O’Connor’s contribution to a collection of papers edited by David O’Connor and Stephen Quirke entitled Mysterious Lands, which appeared in 2003. This presents a handy and up-to-date overview of the Egyptian sources on the Sea Peoples, but, as it leaves out all the relevant evidence from other sources, it fails to answer the question of their origins – not to mention that of their ethnicity.

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

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

12.1. Egyptian (a)

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

12.1.1. Karnak inscription

Lines 13-15

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

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

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

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

12.2. Cypro-Minoan

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


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

495 Yon 1992: 120 dates the destruction of Ras Shamra / Ugarit
same chronological horizon is indicated by the fact that some of the persons mentioned in its text also figure in the texts of the Kalavassos cylinder seal and the tablet from Ras Shamra / Ugarit. The relationship between these three texts not only involves the mention of the same persons, but also entails the underlying structure of recording. Thus, in all three there can be distinguished basically four types of information: (1) heading(s), (2) indications of deliverers, (3) indications of recipients, and (4) indications of products. The headings are mostly singled out as such by the locative in 

\textit{-ti: ‘Unit(a)title’ at Amathus} in the texts of the Enkomi and Kalavassos cylinder seals, and 

\textit{Lamiyaneti karapiti ‘at the Lamiyan trade centre’ in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra / Ugarit.} Of the deliverers, only the name of the scribe, who identifies himself by the Luwian personal pronoun of the 1st person singular 

\textit{emu or -mu ‘I’, is purposely put in the nominative – written without its proper ending -s} according to the standards in Linear B and Luwian hieroglyphic at the time. Thus: 

\textit{Pika, tamika Likike -mu ‘Piagas, I, trader from Lycia’ in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, 

\textit{emu Sanema ‘I, Sanemats} in the text of the Kalavassos cylinder seal, and 

\textit{Wesa -mu ‘I, Wesas} in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra / Ugarit. As opposed to this, the main deliverer next to the scribe is written in the Luwian dative in 

\textit{-i,} to stress that the transactions are recorded ‘on behalf’ of the person in question: 

\textit{samuri mane<si>kaasi ‘on behalf of the Samian, representative of the Maeonians (‘j’) in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, Remi taasa wetuti wasaka ‘on behalf of Remus, governor of this town’ in the text of the Kalavassos seal, and Akami pini Mali ati pini Apesa ‘on behalf of Akamas, representative of Malos and representative of Ephesos’ in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra / Ugarit.} If there are more deliverers, as in the case of the Enkomi and Kalavassos cylinder seals, these are likewise intended to be in the dative – even if this case is not always properly indicated by oversight or because of sloppiness. The recipients, distinguished as such by the fact that they follow the deliverers after a punctuation mark and / or a transaction term (telu, \textit{pt}, etc.), are also rendered in the dative case, either in 

\textit{-i500} or in 

\textit{-we501} as in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, or also in 

\textit{-i} as in the text of the Kalavassos seal, or exclusively in 

\textit{-i} as in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra / Ugarit – with only a few exceptions from oversight or sloppiness. E.g.: 

\textit{Sanemeti Sikerisikaasi ‘to Sanemas, representative of the Shekelesh’ and 

\textit{Lemapesiti Talimetut-natewe Sekeryakati ‘to Lemapesi from Talmiteps’s town in Sangaria’ in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal, Isinitiri mititsa ‘to the servant from Smyrna’ and 

\textit{tameki Pese<we>we ‘to the Pisidian trader’ in the text of the Kalavassos seal, and 

\textit{Iisipali ‘to Isiba’al’ in the text of the tablet from Ras Shamra / Ugarit. Finally, the indications of products, often occurring in abbreviation and in combination with numbers, so far identifiable appear to have a bearing on the cloth industry: 

\textit{ketu ‘cotton’, MA for 

\textit{maru ‘wool’, PA for pharwheha ‘cloth’, pupuru ‘purple (colored cloth)’, RI for 

\textit{linon ‘linen’, and SA for sarara ‘spun flax’ – with the exception of 

\textit{e for elaiwon ‘(linseed) oil’ in the text of the Enkomi cylinder seal and 

\textit{WA or wane ‘wine’ in the texts of the Kalavassos cylinder seal and the tablet from Ras Shamra / Ugarit.}}
12.2.1. Enkomi cylinder seal (Inv. no. 19.10)

1. u-mi-a-ti-si-ti˚ ‘At Amathus.’
2. ya-sa-ne-me-te-ti˚ (On behalf of) Iasos: to
Sanemas, this,
3. te/ma-li-ki-pi-ti˚ delivery to Malkipi(ya)s,
(linseed) oil
4. i-ma-....[...] pe-pa-e-ru˚ linen’ On behalf of the Samian:
5. i1-ma[...] pe-pa-e-ru˚ this to Tispapi(ya)s, cloth to
6. ti/RI sa-mu-ri. linen’ ‘On behalf of the Samian:
7. ti/PA ti-pa-pi-ti˚ this to Tispapi(ya)s, cloth
8. ke/PA ke-ma-pi- 'On behalf of the Samian:
9. ti/Sa/pi-ka.E/ spun flax’ ‘Pli(u): (linseed) oil
10. sa-ne-me-ti/li-ki-ke(-) to Sanemas’ I, trader from
11. mu/ta-mi-ka.pu-pu- Lycia: purple (colored) cloth
12. ru/u-li-mu-te/we/u from U(wa)s from Urimu(wa)s’
13. we/MA ti-sa-we-ti˚ (and) wool to Le-ma-pe-si
14. ke-sti-yu-ka-ti ti˚ in Sangaria’ ‘Trader (from
15. mi-ka-se-wa-ro a˚ Lycia): (to) lord Akamas,
16. ka-mu a-pe-si-ka-a. representative of Ephesos,
17. si-ta-li-me-tu˚ trader (from Lycia): to
18. se-ke-ri˚ town of Rhytiassos (and) to
ta-in Sangaria’ ‘Trader (from
19. ta-mi-ka.se-wa-ti˚ Lycia): to the lord
20. ta-mi-ka.se-wa-ti˚ representative of the Maenians
21. sa-ne-me-ti si-ke-ri˚ ‘On behalf of the Samian,
22. si-ka-a-si sa-mu-ri ‘On behalf of the Samian’

12.2.2. Kalavassos cylinder seal (K-AD 389)

12. u-mi-ti-si-ti˚ ‘At Amathus, for the Samian
13. ya we-tu-ti.i-le-mi ‘On behalf of Ilm (he
brings)
14. is me-la ne-si˚ this for Samos, i.e. for the Hittite
15. ri sa-re-ki/[I] SA. from Sarawa: I (and) spun flax.’
16. i-yulpit=t[i]
17. [ ][a]
18. i-le-mu[le(?)]-mu-ne˚ ‘On behalf of Ilm to (the servant
from) Lemnos,
19. i-le-mu si-mi-ri-ti on behalf of Ilm to the servant
20. mi[s]-si-su-a 2 USA; from Smyrna: these 2 (units of)
I (and) spun flax;
21. re-mu-sa-ne/a-ti-mi-we˚ ‘On behalf of Remus he brings
divine wine in veneration to
22. mu-sa-ne/a-ti-mi-we˚ the goddess Artemis’
23. e-mu sa-ne/a-ti˚ ‘I, Sanemas, to Iasos,
24. re-mu-sa-ne/a-ti-mi-we˚ on behalf of Remus, governor of
25. wa-sa-ka/si-mi-ri-[t]i˚ this town, to Smyrna:
26. 1 SA wa-sa-ka I (and) spun flax.’
27. e-pe/-se/pi-mi-se/˚ ‘(On behalf of) the governor himself being given
11. ta-me-kilpe-se-we, PA

12.2.3. Tablet RS 20.25 from Ras Shamra/Ugarit

Side A

1. a-ka-mi/mi-pi-nil/ma-li
2. a-ti pi-nil-pa-sa PI
3. i-su-pa-li,
4. a-we-pi-ma-ka-pi-ti,
5. a-ta-to-ne/pi-nil-su-vi-ri
6. i-su-pa-ti-pi-nil-u-ri-ka-si
7. pi-nil-wa-wa-r1
8. a wa-sa PI/pi-nil-su-wa-r1
9. i-si-1-pa-li;
10. a-we-a-ri/ma-ka-pi-ti
11. a-we-si-ri/pi-nil-me-ni-wa-r1

‘On behalf of Akamas, representative of Malos and representative of Ephesos, he (= Wasas) gives to Isba’al;
(at) the entrepôt of the frontier outpost to Adadanu, representative of tasiri;
to the representative of the frontier outpost.’

12.2.4. Tablet 1687 from Enkomi

Side A

(15) a-ka-mi/le-ki/nu-ka-ra/

tu-pa-ta -mu

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

12.3. Ugaritic

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

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

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

12.3.1. RS 34.129

1. um-ma "UTU:-ši-[u-a]
   LUGAL GAL-á
   a-na "ná-ki-in-ni
   qé-bi-ma

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

5. a-n[a]-um-ma it-tu-ka
   LUGAL[EN]-ka je-[e-er
   m[i]-m[a]-la la-i-de
   a-na-ka "UTU-ši
   a-na UGU-ši lu um-da-e-ru-a

   Now, (there) with you, the king your lord is (still too) young. He knows nothing.

10. aš-šum mi-n-a-dú-šu
   ša LU₂:MEŠ₂ kur.uru ši-ka-la-uú
   a-n[u]-um-ma it-tu-ka

   Concerning Bniadu, whom the people from Šikala – who live on ships – had abducted.

15. a-nu-um-ma n[i-i]-r-ga-i-li
   it-tu-ia
   ša LU₂:MEŠ₂ kur.uru ši-ku-la-iú

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

20. a na−am-ma-pí Ammurapi, king of Ugarit:
   DINGIR-nu a-na šul-ma-ni
   PAP-ru-ka

   ‘Thus says the king [of Alasya]. Speak to Ammurapi, king of Ugarit:

25. a-ma-te ša ši-ki-la
   w-si-ku-la
   u a-na ku-ta-li-šu
   a-na-ku-ta-li-šu
   i-tu-ar-ru
   i-ta-la-ka

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

30. (three erased lines)

12.3.2. RS L 1

1. u[m-ma] LUGAL-ma
   o-na "um-ma-ra-pí
   LUGAL-ma ga-ríč
   qé-bi-ma

   ‘Thus says the king [of Alasya]. Speak to Alasya, king of Ugarit:

5. la-á[š]u-[m]a a-na UGU-ši-ka
   DINGIR-nu a-na šul-ma-ni
   PAP-ru-ka

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

Concerning what you wrote to Nougayrol 1968: 83-89.

---

They have spotted enemy ships at sea; if they have indeed spotted ships, make yourself as strong as possible. Now, where are your own troops (and) chariotry stationed?

Are they not stationed with you? If not, who will deliver you from the enemy forces?

Surround your towns with walls;

bring troops and chariotry inside. (Then) wait at full strength for the enemy.'
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12.3.4. RS 20.18

1. um-ma₇-e-šu-na-ra
   'Thus says Eshuwara, the chief prefect of Alasiya.'

5 a-na ku-a-ta KUR-ri[i]-i-ma
   la-á šal-mu
   May you and your country be well.

10 a-ba-ta an-ni-ta
   i-te-ep-šu-ni
   ù i-te-eq-ta an-nu-ti
   As for the matter concerning those enemies: (it was) the people from your country (and) your own ships (who)
   did this!

15 ù i-ti-i-a-ma
   So do not be angry with me!

20 ù i-na-an-na
   ù i-na-an-na šum-ma ⁶⁸MAŠKIM GAL ša₇₉u-la-la-li
   a-na LUgéL₇₅u-qa-li-it
   giš ME₉₉
   Now then, if there are any other enemy ships send me a report somehow, so that I will know.'

25 ù i-na-an-na šum-ma ⁶⁸ME₉₉-ki₉₉₉₉₉₉₉-a₉₉₉₉₉₉₉-ma
   ù a-shar it-ta-dú-ú
   la ni-i-de
   But now, (the) twenty enemy ships – even before they would reach the mountain (shore) – have not stayed around, but have quickly moved on, and where they have pitched camp we do not know.

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

12.4. Egyptian (b)

Our main source on the upheavals of the Sea Peoples is Ramesses III’s mortuary temple at Medinet Habu,504 which offers depictions of the battles and their description in text. However, the monument commemorates not only the wars with the Sea Peoples from years 5 and 8 of Ramesses III’s reign (= 1179 BC and 1176 BC), but also preceding ones against the Nubians (considered to be fictitious) and the Libyans (year 5) as well as successive ones against the Libyans (year 11), again, and the Asiatics (considered to be fictitious).505 The depictions of the land- and sea battle against the Sea Peoples are located central on the outer east side of the monument (nos. 31 and 37-39), whereas the texts describing the wars of year 5 and year 8 are situated on the inner west side of court 2 (nos. 27-28) and inner

504 I.e. Thebes.

505 Widmer 1975: 68.
The scenes of the land- and sea battles are embedded in a pictorial narrative, which starts with the religious (1. command of the god, 2. pharaoh leaves the temple) and military (1. equipping the troops, 2. king’s departure, 3. march) preparations and ends with the military (1. seizure of prisoners, 2. celebration of victory, 3. return in triumph) and religious (presentation of prisoners to the god) outcome. The central military action in form of the land- and sea battle is broken in two by a lion hunt in the middle, whereas this cluster is followed by a town siege.506

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

12.4.1. Medinet Habu

Inscription of year 5 (= 1179 BC)

`The northern countries quivered in their bodies, namely the Peleset, Tjeker, …]. They were cut off <from> their land, coming, their spirit broken. They were thr-warriors on land; another (group) was on the sea. Those who came on [land were overthrown and slaughtered]; Amun-Ra was after them, destroying them. They that entered the Nile mouths were like birds ensnared in the net (…). Their hearts are removed, taken away, no longer in their bodies. Their leaders were carried off and slain; they were cast down and made into pinioned ones (…).507

Inscription of year 8 (= 1176 BC)

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

Now the heart of this god, the Lord of the Gods, was prepared, ready to ensnare them like birds. He made my strength to exist, while my plans succeed. (…). I organized my frontier in Zahi [= southern Levant], prepared before them, (to wit,) the princes, the commanders of the garrisons, and the Mariannu [= charioteers]. I caused the Nile mouth to be prepared like a strong wall with warships, galleys, and coasters, equipped, for they were manned completely from bow to stern with valiant warriors, with their weapons; the militia consisting of every picked man of Egypt, were like lions roaring upon the mountain tops. The chariotry consisted of runners, of picked men, of every good and capable chariot-warrior. Their horses were quivering in every part of their bodies, ready to crush the countries under their hoofs. I was the valiant Montu [= war-god], standing fast at their head, so that they might gaze upon the capturing of my two hands; King of Upper and Lower Egypt: Usermare-Meriamon; Son of Ra: Ram[es]ses III.

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

I made the lands turn back from mentioning Egypt; for when they pronounce my name in their land, then they are burned up. Since I have sat upon the throne of Harakhte [= manifestation of Horus] and the Great Enchantress [= uraeus] was fixed upon my head like Ra’, I have not let the countries be-

hold the frontiers of Egypt, to boast thereof to the Nine Bows [= Egypt’s traditional enemies]. I have taken away their land, their frontiers being added to mine. Their chiefs and their tribespeople are mine with praise, for I am upon the ways of the plans of the All-Lord, my august, divine father, the Lord of Gods.\textsuperscript{508}

Text to the scene of the land battle (Fig. 12.2)

‘His majesty sets out for Zahi like unto Montu, to crush every country that violates his frontier. His troops are like bulls ready on the field of battle; his horses are like falcons in the midst of small birds before the Nine Bows, bearing victory. Amon, his august father, is a shield for him; King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ruler of the Nine Bows, Lord of the Two Lands (…).\textsuperscript{509}

Text to the scene of the sea battle (Fig. 12.3)

‘Now the northern countries, which were in their isles, were quivering in their bodies. They penetrated the channels of the Nile mouths. Their nostrils have ceased (to function, so that) their desire is <to> breathe the breath. His majesty is gone forth like a whirlwind against them, fighting on the battle field like a runner. The dread of him and the terror of him have entered in their bodies; (they are) capsized and overwhelmed in their places. Their hearts are taken away; their soul is flown away. Their weapons are scattered in the sea. His arrow pierces him whom he has wished among them, while the fugitive is become one fallen into the water. His majesty is like an enraged lion, attacking his assailant with his paws; plundering on his right hand and powerful on his left hand, like Seth\textsuperscript{[h]} destroying the serpent ‘Evil of Character’. It is Amon-Ra\textsuperscript{3} who has overthrown for him the lands and has crushed for him every land under his feet; King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands: Userma-re-Meriamun.\textsuperscript{510}

Depicted prisoners of war (Fig. 12.4):

1. chief of Batti, 2. chief of Amor, 3. chieftain of the foe of the Tjeker, 4. Sherden of the sea, 5. chieftain of the foe Shal[su], 6. Teresh of the sea, 7. chieftain of the Pe(leset).\textsuperscript{511}

\textbf{Südstele, year 12 (= 1172 BC).}

Mention of Tjeker, Peleset, Denyen, Weshesh and Shekelesh.\textsuperscript{512}

12.4.2. Stele from Deir el Medineh

Pharaoh boasts of having defeated Peleset and Teresh who attacked Egypt.\textsuperscript{513}

\textbf{12.4.3. Papyrus Harris}

‘I extended all the boundaries of Egypt: I overthrew those who invaded them from (or: in) their lands. I slew the Denyen in (= who are in) their isles, the Tjeker and the Peleset were made ashes. The Sherden and the Weshesh of the sea, they were made as those that exist not, taken captive at one time, brought as captives to Egypt, like the sand of the shore. I settled them in strongholds, bound in my name. Numerous were their classes like hundred-thousands. I taxed them all, in clothing and grain from the storehouses and granaries each year.’\textsuperscript{514}

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

\textbf{12.4.4. Golenischeff papyrus}

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

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

I got up in the morning, and I went to the place where the Prince was, and I said to him: ‘I have been robbed in your harbor. Now you are the prince of this land, and you are its investigator who should look for my silver. Now about this


\textsuperscript{509} Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 38; \textit{cf.} Pritchard 1969: 263.

\textsuperscript{510} Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 41-42; \textit{cf.} Pritchard 1963: 263.

\textsuperscript{511} Strobel 1976: 18; Sandars 1980: 106-7, afb. 68.


\textsuperscript{513} Lepsius 1900: Vol. III, 218c; Drews 1993a: 51.

\textsuperscript{514} Breasted 1927: Vol. IV, no. 403; Strobel 1976: 18.
Fig. 12.2. Land battle scene of Medinet Habu (from Oren 2000: 96, Fig. 5.5)

Fig. 12.3. Sea battle scene of Medinet Habu (from Oren 2000: 98, Fig. 5.6)

Fig. 12.4. Prisoners of war: (a) Hittite, (b) Amorite, (c) Tjeker, (d) Sherden, (e) Shasu, and (f) Teresh (from Nibbi 1975: frontispiece)
silver – it belongs to Amon-Ra, King of the Gods, the lord of the lands; it belongs to you; it belongs to Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded; it belongs to Heri-Hor, my lord, and the other great men of Egypt! It belongs to you; it belongs to Weret; it belongs to Mekmer; it belongs to Zakar-Ba’al, the Prince of Byblos!"

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

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

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

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

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

When morning came, he sent and brought me up, but the god stayed in the tent where he was, (on) the shore of the sea. And I found him sitting (in) his upper room, with his back turned to a window, so that the waves of the great Syrian sea broke against the back of his head.

So I said to him: ‘May Amon favor you!’ But he said to me ‘How long, up to today, since you came from the place where Amon is?’ So I said to him: ‘Five months and one day up to now.’ And he said to me: ‘Well, you’re truthful! Where is the letter of Amon which (should be) in your hand? Where is the dispatch of the High Priest of Amon which (should be) in your hand?’ And I told him: ‘I gave them to Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded and Ta-net-Amon.’ And he was very, very angry, and he said to me: ‘Now see – neither letters nor dispatches are in your hand! Where is the cedar ship which Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded gave to you? Where is its Syrian crew? Didn’t he turn you over to this foreign ship captain to have him kill you and throw you into the sea? (Then) with whom would they have looked for the god? And you too – with whom would they have looked for you too?’ So he spoke to me.

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

And he answered and said to me: ‘On what business have you come?’ So I told him: ‘I have come after the woodwork for the great and august barque of Amon-Ra’, King of the Gods. Your father did (it), your grandfather did (it), and you will do it too!’ So I spoke to him. But he said to me: ‘To be sure, they did it! And if you give me (something) for doing it, I will do it! Why, when my people carried out this commission, Pharaoh – life, prosperity, health! – sent six ships loaded with Egyptian goods, and they unloaded them into their storehouses! You – what is it that you’re bringing me – me also?’ And he had the journal rolls of his fathers brought, and he had them read out in my presence, and they found a thousand deben and all kind of things in his scrolls.

So he said to me: ‘If the ruler of Egypt were the lord of mine, and I were his servant also, he would not have to send silver and gold, saying: ‘Carry out the commission of Amon!’ There would be no carrying of a royal-gift, such as they used to do for my father. As for me – me also – I am not your servant! I am not the servant of him who sent you either! If I cry out to the Lebanon, the heavens open up, and the logs are here lying (on) the shore of the sea! Give me the sails which you have brought to carry your ships which would hold the logs for (Egypt)! Give me the ropes [which] you have brought [to lash the cedar] logs which I am to cut down to make you (…) which I shall make for you (as) the sails of your boats, and the spars will be (too) heavy and will break, and you will die in the middle of the sea! See, Amon made thunder in the sky when he put Seth near him. Now when Amon founded all lands, in founding them he founded first the land of Egypt, from which you come; for craftsman ship came out of it, to reach the place where I am, and learning came out of it, to reach the place where I am. What are these silly trips which they have had you make?’
And I said to him: ‘(That’s) not true! What I am on are no ‘silly trips’ at all! There is no ship upon the River which does not belong to Amon! The sea is his, and the Lebanon is his, of which you say: ‘It is mine!’ It forms the nursery for User-Net-Amon, the lord of [every] ship! Why, he spoke – Amon-Ra’, King of the Gods – and said to Heri-Hor, my master: ‘Send me forth!’ So he had me come, carrying this great god. But see, you have made this great god spend these twenty-nine days moored (in) your harbor, although you did not know (it). Isn’t he here? Isn’t he the (same) as he was? You are stationed (here) to carry on the commerce of the Lebanon with Amon, its lord. As for your saying that the former kings sent silver and gold – suppose that they had life and health; (then) they would not have had such things sent! (But) they had such things sent to your fathers in place of life and health! Now as for Amon-Ra’, King of the Gods – he is the lord of this life and health, and he was the lord of your fathers. They spent their lifetimes making offering to Amon. And you also – you are the servant of Amon! If you say to Amon: ‘Yes, I will do (it)!’ and you carry out his commission, you will live, you will be prosperous, you will be healthy, and you will be good to your entire land and your people! (But) don’t wish for yourself anything belonging to Amon-Ra’, (King of) the Gods. Why, a lion wants his own property! Have your secretary brought to me, that I may send him to Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded and Ta-net-Amon, the officers whom Amon put in the north of his land, and they will have all kinds of things sent. I shall send him to them to say: ‘Let it be brought until I shall go (back again) to the south, and I shall (then) have every bit of the debt still (due to you) brought to you.’ So I spoke to him.

So he entrusted my letter to his messenger, and he loaded in the keel, the bow-post, the stern-post, along with four other hewn timbers – seven in all – and he had them taken to Egypt. And in the first month of the second season his messenger who had gone to Egypt came back to me in Syria. And Ne-su-Ba-neb-Ded and Ta-net-Amon sent: 4 jars and 1...
go after him to arrest him.’

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

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

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

At this point the papyrus breaks off. Since the tale is told in the first person, it is fair to assume that Wen-Amon returned to Egypt to tell his story, in some measure of safety or success (Pritchard 1969: 25-29).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>El-Amarna</th>
<th>Ramesses II</th>
<th>Merneptah</th>
<th>Ramesses III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lukka</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherden</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shekelesh</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekwesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denye(n)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tjeker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weshesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.1. Overview of the mention of the Sea Peoples in the various Egyptian sources from the Late Bronze Age
CHAPTER 13. LUKKA AND THE LUKKA LANDS

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

Bryce makes an exception, though, for the Lycian coast. This seems to have formed part of Lukka according to the combined evidence of El-Amarna text no. 38 and RS 20,238 from Ras Shamra / Ugarit. Of these texts, the first one bears reference to piratical raids on Alasiya (= Cyprus) and apparently on the Egyptian coast by the people of the land of Lukki, which is therefore likely to have had a coastal zone. The second informs us that the king of Ugarit has sent his entire fleet to the waters off the coast of Lukka, presumably, as suggested by Michael Astour, in an attempt to ward off the passage of the Sea Peoples from the Aegean into the eastern Mediterranean. If this latter suggestion is correct, we are dealing here with the Lycian coast, indeed.

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

A question which remains to be answered is whether the expression ‘Lukka lands’ designates the same geographical range as Lukka or a wider one. To answer this question, we have little evidence to go on, as the Lukka………………

515 De Rougé 1867: 39.
516 Bryce 1986: 13 ‘There can be little doubt that for Homer Lycia and the Xanthos valley were one and the same’.
518 Smit 1990-1; Gunney 1990.
523 Poetto 1993: 47-48 (block 9); 78-80. Note that these identifications are only partly followed by Keen 1998: 214-20.
lands are mentioned only twice, (1) in the fragment of the annals of Ḫattusilis III, KUB XXI 6a,526 and (2) the annalistic hieroglyphic Yalburt text from the reign of Tudḫaliyas IV. Now, it is interesting to observe that in the introductory section of the Yalburt text Wiyanawanda (= classical Oinoanda in the upper Xanthos valley) appears to be included in the Lukka lands,527 whereas in the hieroglyphic inscription of Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC) from the Südburg in Boğazköy / Ḫattusa the same place name occurs alongside Lukka as a separate entity.528 This distinction may be further illustrated by the fact that in the aforementioned treaty of Mursilis II with Kupantakurunta (= hieroglyphic Perga)531 the latter’s province Mira.529 Next, as we have noted above, in the Yalburt text the region of Loanda and Xhide or Kaunos in the valley of the Indus river is likewise included into the Lukka lands. Finally, in KUB XXI 6a the hostile Lukka lands are mentioned in one and the same paragraph as Parṭa, which is convincingly identified by Heinrich Otten with classical Pergê in Pamphylia, on the eastern border of classical Lycia.530 It is interesting to observe in this connection that in his treaty with Kurunta on the Bronze Tablet from Boğazköy / Ḫattusa, Tudḫaliyas IV is announcing a military campaign against the land of Parṭa, which, when conquered, will be included in the territory of Kurunta’s province Tarḫuntaša.531 If we take this evidence at face value, it may reasonably be argued that Lukka refers solely to the lower Xanthos valley with Pata ra, Awarna, Pinata, and Talawa, whereas the Lukka lands includes the regions to the north, west, and east of Lukka proper.

In the Yalburt text Tudḫaliyas IV proudly stipulates:

\[\text{i-tā-î -pa-wa UTNA-nā-î URA-ḫ ḪANTAWAT-î Ḫ(a)(TI)}/UTNA dî-mi-î Ḫ(a)(TI) Ḫ(U)ḫ(i)-mi-nu-î ḪWA-ḑ-ṣa-ḫa ḪWA-ḑ-
\]

‘in these lands, the great kings of Ḫatti, my fathers (and) grandfathers, no one has marched’.

with which reference is made to the region of Awarna, Pi-

---

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


528 Hawkins 1995: 22-23 (phrases 1 and 4); 29; 54; cf. Woudhuizen 1994-5: 200 (phrases 1 and 4); Woudhuizen 2004a: 78; 83-84.

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

530 Otten 1988: 37-38; VIII, 60-62; Parṭa along the Kaštaraya river, corresponding to classical Pergê along the Kestros in Pamphylia.

531 Otten 1988: VIII, 63-64.
CHAPTER 14. ETHNOGENESIS OF THE GREEKS

The decipherment of Linear B by the British architect Michael Ventris has proved that Greek existed as a language from the second half of the 15th century BC onwards: the earliest tablets are in fact from the Late Minoan II-IIIA1 period at Knossos in Crete (= c. 1450-1350 BC). The question which will be addressed here is: when did the Greek language first emerge? Was it the result of an immigration by proto-Greeks into the region we call Greece, or are there other processes at work? In order to tackle this question, we will look at the relevant archaeological, historical, and linguistic evidence.

From an archaeological point of view, there are three periods which might be of relevance to our question: first the transition from Early Helladic II to Early Helladic III (c. 2300 BC), then the transition from Early Helladic III to Middle Helladic (c. 2000 BC), and finally the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I (c. 1600 BC) (for alternative opinions focussing on different periods, see additional note at the end of this section). All these three transitional periods in varying degrees show evidence of discontinuity in occupation. The type site for the transition from Early Helladic II to Early Helladic III is Lerna, expertly excavated by the Americans under the leadership of John Caskey. Here the so-called ‘House of the Tiles’ went up in flames and was covered by a tumulus, new house forms were introduced, characterized by apsidal ends, a new pottery style was developed, first hand-made only, which is baptized Minyan ware, and a new type of burial came into fashion, namely individual burials in cist graves. In the following transition from Early Helladic III to Middle Helladic, the new features characteristic of Lerna and some other sites, are also introduced at places that remained untouched in the first transitional period, sometimes, as at Eutresis, after a violent conflagration. Although related cultural traits were introduced at both periods, what distinguishes the transition at c. 2000 BC from the previous one at c. 2300 BC is the presence at some sites of Matt-painted ware, originating from the Cycladic islands, and a little imported or locally imitated Middle Minoan IA ware. It further deserves notice that at Lerna in a context to be dated after the destruction of the ‘House of the Tiles’ bones have been found, first, in the Early Helladic III period, of a horse-like animal and later, in the Middle Helladic period, of a true horse.

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

535 For the correlation of archaeological phases and absolute chronology, see Warren & Hankey 1989; note however that the lowering of the dates of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten as per Kitchen 1989 and 1996 has its repercussions for the date of the transition from Late Minoan IIIA1 to Late Minoan IIIA2, which should likewise be lowered from c. 1370 BC to c. 1350 BC.


537 Van Royen & Isaac 1979.
In order to decide between these conflicting views, it may be of relevance to determine who were the inhabitants of Greece before the arrival of the proto-Greeks. The most serious attempt to tackle this question is formed by Jan Best’s investigation into the origins of the cultural traits of the Middle Helladic culture in Greece, in *case* Minyan ware, cist graves with individual burials and apsidal houses. The closest parallels for these three features he was able to trace in the northern Balkans and in the period antedating their introduction into Greece. As this region in historical times is inhabited by Thracian tribes, Best extrapolated that bearers of the Middle Helladic culture in Greece were kinsmen of the latter.538 This conclusion could be backed up by literary tradition, according to which, as first noted by Stanley Casson, central Greece had once been inhabited by Thracians.539 Thus it is recorded that the Thracians with Eumolpos and his son Ismaros were driven from Eleusis by the Athenian Erekhtheus, and that they took refuge at the court of the Thracian king Tegyrios in Boeotian Tegyra.540 Furthermore, the Thracian king Tereus is of old situated at Daulis in Phokis, and the likewise Odrysian royal name Sitalkas is recorded as an epiklesis of Apollo at Delphi.541 The presence of the Thracian tribe of the Odrysians in Phokis is strikingly confirmed by evidence from Linear B. On an inscribed stirrup jar from the destruction layer of the ‘House of Kadmos’ at Thebes, dated c. 1350 BC, the ethnonym o-du-ru-wi-jo ‘Odrysian’ is recorded. As another inscribed stirrup jar was found in Orkhomenos, it seems not unlikely to assume that the stirrup jars from the ‘House of Kadmos’, which in fact are of Cretan type and of which as many as 120 in sum have been found, served export purposes for the at that time still predominantly Minyan hinterland of Thebes.542 Finally, the Thracian nature of the ancient population of Phokis may be further enhanced by the fact that the Thracian tribe of the Abantes are recorded to have moved from their city Abai in Phokis to Euboeia across the Euripos.

It is rightly stipulated by Casson that there is also evidence of Phrygians among the earliest inhabitants of Greece. Most famous in this respect is, of course, the case of Pelops, after whom the Peloponnnesos (= ‘island of Pelops’) is named. In later times, the presence of the Phrygian Pelops in southern Greece was no longer understood and he was considered an immigrant from Anatolia – the later habitat of the Phrygians. But the fact that the Phrygians were originally at home in southern Greece is duly indicated by scores of Phrygian place names (Azania, Mideia, Mopsopia, Olympia, Phrikion, Phiriya, Phrixos, Phrygia) and personal names (Adrastos, Akrisos),543 Areus, Azan, Azeus, Kelainos, Kharites,544 Khloris,545 Phorkys, Phrixos, Proitos) attested in the historical records. In some instances, like a-da-ra-te-ja (= Greek Adrasteja) or a-da-ra-ti-jo (= Greek Adrastios), a-ru-pi-ja (= Greek Olumpia), ke-ra-no (= Greek Kelainos), and mo-go-so (= Greek Mopsos) the ancient nature of these names can be emphasized by their occurrence or of that of related forms in Linear B.546 With the Thracians and the Phrygians, we have by no means exhausted the historical documentaries on the earliest inhabitants of Greece. Yet another group which figures prominently in the sources is that of the Leleges, who Herodotos (Histories I, 171) identifies with the Carians from the Cycladic islands. Their presence in southern and central Greece may perhaps be reflected in the archaeological record by the Mattpainted ware, which, as we have seen above, originates from the Cyclades as well and of which the introduction, as we have just seen, distinguishes the transition from Early Helladic III to Middle Helladic. As a complicating factor, it should be realized that there are still more population groups mentioned in the historical sources which cannot positively be assigned to either of the three tribes identified so far for the lack of

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


540 Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopaedie, s.v. Eumolpos.

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


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

544 Cult installed by Eteokles of Orkhomenos, see Paussanias, Guide to Greece IX, 35, 1; cf. Old Phrygian agaritoi ‘ungracious (D. sg.)’ in G-02, see Beul & Lejeune 1984.

545 Wife of Neleus, descendant of the Minyan royal house of Orkhomenos, see Paussanias, Guide to Greece IX, 36, 4 – 37, 1; cf. the Phrygian gloss glouros ‘gold’ (< PIE *gʰlũros- or *gʰl-), see Haas 1966: 144, 209 and cf. Gümürelde & Ivanov 1995: 618, from which it follows that the personal name is of the same type as Greek Khruseeis and English Goldy.

546 Woudhuizen 1993b.
evidence. On the whole, however, it may safely be stated that with the Thracians, Phrygians, and Leleges / Carians we have discussed the most prominent of the population groups present in Greece before the Greeks or living there simultaneously with the Greeks in their earliest history.

From a linguistic point of view, it deserves attention that the Thracian language, although barely known, is considered of Indo-European stock and most closely related to Phrygian, this to the extent that one speaks of the Thracophrygian language group.\(^{547}\) As opposed to this, Carian, which, it must be admitted, also largely eludes us because the script in which the language is recorded still goes undeciphered, is generally assumed to be a member of the Indo-European Anatolian group of languages, together with Hittite, Luwian, and Palaic. As such, it may be held responsible for place names in -ss- and -nth- in Greece, which are decidedly of Indo-European Anatolian type.\(^{548}\) Furthermore, one may be tempted to point to related Lycian type of names like Glaukos (= Linear B ka-ra-u-ko), Lykaon, Pandion, Sandion, and Leda. At any rate, we obviously have to reckon with at least two distinct pre-Greek linguistic layers of Indo-European (= IE) stock, namely Thracophrygian and IE Anatolian.

If the bearers of the Minyan culture of Middle Helladic Greece are rightly identified as Thracophrygians, then it necessarily follows that the view according to which the Greeks arrived or otherwise came into being in the only remaining transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I at c. 1600 BC must be correct. Therefore, let us take a look at the various theories proposed. In the first place, Robert Drews in his stimulating monograph on the subject argued that the proto-Greeks were a chariot gang who came by boat from Pontos to Thessaly, from where they colonized the rest of Greece.\(^{549}\) Secondly, Jan Best defended the thesis that the proto-Greeks were identical with the Hyksos, the foreign conquerors of lower Egypt in the Second Intermediate Period (c. 1720-1550 BC), who were driven from the country by the founder of the 18th dynasty, Ahmose, and with their kinsmen from Canaan and Syria took refuge to the southern shores of Greece.\(^{550}\) Finally, Frank Stubbings likewise painted the picture of a conquest of the Argolid by displaced Hyksos leaders from Egypt, only he did not consider them proto-Greeks, but a foreign warrior caste who, like they did in Egypt, adapted to the culture and language of the host country.\(^{551}\) Of these three theories, the last two take into consideration the well-known historical evidence of Danaos, the ancestor of the Danaoi, coming from Egypt to the Argolid, and of Kadmos with his Phoenicians founding the city of Thebes. The validity of this literary evidence is strengthened a great deal by the fact that the Mycenean Greeks are referred to by the name Tanayu (Tinți) ‘Danaoi’ in the Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions from the funerary temple of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) at Kom el-Hetan in Egyptian Thebes.\(^{552}\)

Which of the three models about what happened in Greece c. 1600 BC is the right one? In order to answer this question, we will examine them a little closer, starting with the one presented by Drews. This author takes as his starting point the view of the linguists Thomas Gamkrelidze & Vjačeslav Ivanov, who argued that the Greek language is closely related to Armenian on the one hand and Indo-Iranian on the other hand, and that the homeland of the proto-Greeks accordingly must be sought somewhere in the region of what was once Armenia, just south of the Caucasus. Here they found in abundance the different sorts of wood to build their chariots and the horses to drive them.\(^{553}\) A problem posed by this view is that at the time that Greek is supposed to have split off from the parent language and the proto-Greeks are supposed to have undertaken their journey to their new home in Greece, the Armenians are not yet living in Armenia! As related by Herodotos (Histories VII, 73), the Armenians are an apoikia of the Phrygians, who prior to their migration to the Anatolian plateau inhabited the Olympos region in the borderland of northern Thessaly and southern Macedonia on the European continent, and before this, as we have seen above, even the region as far south as the Peloponnesos. There is some evidence that the Phrygians entered Anatolia already in the Late Bronze Age, as according to Homeros they are situated along the banks of the Sangarios in the period before the Trojan war (c. 1280 BC). Moreover, a Hittite text from the reign of Tudhaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) or Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC) makes mention of a certain Mitā (= Phrygian Midas) of Paphuwa, a region to the northeast of the Hittite capital Boğazköy /

552 Edel 1966; cf. Woudhuizen 1992a: 73; pace Strange 1980: 22, note 33; 148. The ethnic name Tanayu is first recorded for the annals of Tuthmosis III, see Chapter 16 below, second paragraph.
553 Drews 1988: 32 ff.; 200-1; since 1995 the work of Gamkrelidze & Ivanov is available in English translation.
transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I. 642 is mistaken in assigning the Mycenaean palace a t Iolkos to the lasgians settles at Pylos by Kretheus, Pelias (= the brother of Neleus who wi th Pe-the 'Minyische Schicht' of its royal house as repre sented persistence of Middle Helladic traditions in Iolkos  during the earlier phase of the Mycenaean period coincides  with which Mycenaean influence radiates, ancient Iolkos in the character up to well in Late Helladic III. The cent re from land of Thebes, remains predominantly Minyan in
the Late Helladic IIB-IIIA period, whereas a Mycena ean south, is still characterized by Minyan cist graves  as late as IIIA1 onwards. The evidence may be summarized as follo ws: from an historical point of view, the persistence of Middle Helladic traditions in Iolkos during the earlier phase of the Mycenaean period coincides with the ‘Minyische Schicht’ of its royal house as represented by Kretheus, Pelias (= the brother of Neleus who with Pe-langians settles at Pylos c. 1600 BC, see further below), and Akastos. Finally, it is noteworthy that Drews heavily leans on the linguistic thesis put forward by William Wyatt, who
maintains that the Indo-European invaders of Greece knew the chariot and the horse when they first entered Greece. Wyatt arrived at this conclusion by comparing the words for chariot and its major parts to that for the four-wheel mule wagon, from which comparison it appeared that the first category is based on Indo-European roots, whereas the latter is not. However, the conclusion that the Greeks introduced these Indo-European words is only valid in case there is no evidence of Indo-European speech in Greece prior to the Greeks, as Wyatt explicitly asserts. In the previous pages, we have seen reason to believe that there were Indo-European speaking tribes in Greece before the arrival of the Greeks or their otherwise coming into being. This nullifies Wyatt’s reasoning. As we have noted in the foregoing, the horse was already known in Greece from c. 2300 BC onwards. In line with this observation, it is of interest to note that the Greeks have preserved the old cent um form for ‘horse’, Mycenaean i-qo (= later Greek hippos), instead of taking over the new Indo-Aryan satem form aśva- which came in vogue in other regions under the influence of the from the late 18th century BC onwards modern chariot warfare (cf. Luwian a-suwa-). Furthermore, the Greeks preferred their own word for the chariot itself, Mycenaean a-mo (= later Greek harma), instead of adopting the then modern Indo-Aryan indication ratha-. More in general, I do not understand why Wyatt does not take into account the evidence from Kassite, where the parts of the chariot, with only one exception, are all indicated by Akkadian instead of Kassite words (Balkan 1954: 127-30).

If we next turn to the scenario presented by Best, it first deserves our attention that identification of the proto-Greeks with the Hyksos from Egypt and their kinsmen from Canaan and Syria, contrary to Drews’ thesis, is in basic outline in harmony with the relevant archaeological and historical data. In order to estimate its validity, however, we have to go more into detail. As we have noted earlier, the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I c. 1600 BC shows evidence of discontinuity in occupation. From an historical point of view, it is highly interesting to observe that precisely the sites which show discontinuity of occupation figure prominently in the stories about the foundation of new royal houses or a memorable war (see Fig. 14.1). The evidence may be summarized as follows:

---

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

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


559 Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopaëdie, s.v. Iolkos.

560 Wyatt 1970.

561 In the centum languages the palatals c, g̃, and gʰ develop into gutturals, whereas in the satem languages they become assibilized.
site | conqueror(s) | subjected or expelled | source
--- | --- | --- | ---
1. | Argos | Danaos from Egypt | Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. Danaos.

Table 14.1. Literary traditions with a bearing on the transition from Middle Helladic to Late Helladic I, c. 1600 BC

Fig. 14.1. Distribution of centres of radiation of Late Helladic I material


With respect to this overview it must be admitted that the association of Danaos with Argos is problematic, since the latter site is abandoned in the earliest phase of the Mycenaean period. Probably Argos has seized the myth at the expense of some other site in the Argolid. Furthermore, Thebes is not included in the list of sites which lent itself to a continuity / discontinuity analysis by van Royen & Isaac, even though it might be pointed out that the different orientation of the earliest Mycenaean walls as compared to their Middle Helladic predecessors rather suggests discontinuity. However this may be, what primarily concerns us here is the fact that in three instances the conquerors are explicitly identified as foreigners, whereas in two instances these are just locals from Greece itself. From an archaeological point of view, the latter adapted to the Mycenaean culture developed under the influence of the foreign invaders pretty quickly, so that they may fruitfully be considered as local allies. In linguistic terms, these local allies can, of course, not be held responsible for the introduction of the Greek language in Greece, which, in line with Best’s scenario, must have been the privilege of the foreign invaders. Hence, let us take a closer look at them.

What can be said about the language(s) of the foreign invaders? One group, which settled in Krisa, is straightforwardly identified as Cretans from Knossos. These may safely be assumed to have spoken one of the languages current on the island before the introduction of Linear B c. 1450 BC, recorded for documents in Linear A and Cretan hieroglyphic, respectively. A good case can be made that Linear A contains a west-Semitic idiom, whereas Cretan hieroglyphic probably bears testimony of both west-Semitic and Luwian (see further Chapter 19 below). At any rate, one thing is clear: our Cretans from Knossos did not speak a Greek vernacular. Next comes Kadmos with his Phoenicians. Taking this tradition at face value, the conquerors of Thebes are likely to have spoken a Semitic tongue. In fact, the name of Kadmos himself has been cogently interpreted as representing the Semitic root *qdm* ‘east’, whereas that of his sister Europa, whom he was so desperately looking for, may likewise be based on a Semitic stem, *rb* ‘west’ (in Astour’s explanation, these names stand for the morning and evening star, respectively, of which the one seems to follow the other endlessly). Furthermore, Kadmos is held responsible for the introduction

---

562 Symeonoglou 1973: 14-15; fig. 3.
of the mystery cult of the Kabeiroi, the great gods whose name recalls Semitic kbr 'great'. Again, not a trace of the Greek language. Remains the case of Danaos, after whom the Greeks were named Danaoi. First of all, it is interesting to note that the royal house he founded in Mycenae ends with the reign of Eurystheus, after whom the originally Phrygian, but by now fully Mycenaeanized, Pelopids take over: a clear instance of a reflux, effectuated by intermarriage (the mother of Eurystheus, Nikippe, is claimed to be a daughter of Pelops). On the basis of the probable mention of Atreus in an Hittite text from the reigns of Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC), where he occurs in the form of Attarissiyas, this takeover by the Pelopids may safely be assumed to be anterior to the late 15th century BC or beginning of the 14th century BC – in fact it may perhaps even be surmised to have its archaeological reflection in the shift from shaft graves to tholos tombs, which occurred in Late Helladic II A. Because Danaos is reported to have come from Egypt, it has been plausibly assumed that he represents a conquest of the Argolid by the Hyksos, the foreign rulers of lower Egypt who were kicked out at about the time of the shaft graves in Mycenae.

Our question, therefore, is: who were the Hyksos? For sure, there was a Semitic component among them, as the first element of the name of one of their kings, Yakob-Har, strikingly recalls Biblical Jacob. In addition to this, there may have been a ḫurrian component among them: as pointed out by Wolfgang Helck, the sister and daughter of the Hyksos king Apophis bore ḫurrian names. It is even possible that there was an Indo-European component among them, to be more specific of the Indo-Aryan type: thus Drews draws our attention to the fact that the Indo-Aryan term ōrāyā is used in Egyptian texts to indicate a charioteer or chariot fighter (note in this connection that the distribution of Indo-Aryan names [especially with the elements āsīva- and ratha-] and terms over the Near East is intrinsically linked up with the spread of chariot warfare – the latter being introduced in Egypt by the Hyksos). Evidently, the Hyksos were a highly mixed company. But of all the things it may be, there is not a shred of evidence for proto-Greek among them (the comparison of the Ugaritic royal name Niqmadi to Greek Nikomedes is an ingenious but futile attempt, not taking into account the fact that, considering the royal name Niqmepu as attested for Aleppo, the first element of the name appears to be Niqm-). And this is exactly the component which according to the scenario of Best was so dominant that it planted its language on the whole population of Greece. If proto-Greeks were present among the Hyksos at all, and if they entered Greece, I think their numbers must be assumed to have thinned out to homeopathic proportions!

The third and final model is that of Stubbings, who, in line with Best, paints the picture of a military conquest of the Argolid by displaced Hyksos rulers, but, contrary to Best, does not consider them proto-Greeks but simply foreigners who were not numerous enough to cause a language shift. The immediate consequence of this view is that Greek developed from the languages of the population groups already present in Greece at the time of the takeover by the foreign military caste, in casu Thraco-Phrygian and IE Anatolian. As a matter of fact, of these two languages Thraco-Phrygian is so closely related to Greek that it must be assumed to have once formed a linguistic continuum with the latter. The similarity of Greek to Phrygian was noted already by the ancient Greeks themselves. Thus Plato makes Socrates remark in a dialogue that the Phrygians have the same word slightly changed for par ‘fire’, ḫudār

---

567 Helck 1971: 101; contra van Seters 1966: 182-3, who considers the names in question west-Semitic. It is interesting to note in this connection that, as remarked by Stubbings 1973: 637, the Egyptian name Apophis occurs in Greek mythology in form of Epaphos (or Epopheus).
569 Mayrhofer 1974; considering the personal names

---

Tarḫundaradus, Pyamaradus, and Rhadamantys, apparently based on the onomastic element ratha- ‘chariot’, the Indo-Aryan influence may even be assumed to have radiated to the Aegean, though, as we have seen, not to the Greek mainland. This latter suggestion is further enhanced by Schachermeyr’s (1984: 98) and Latacz’s (2003: 312) identification of the Cretan personal name Meriones as a reflex of Indo-Aryan marīyanu. As duly stressed by Drews 1988: 96-97, the temporary military superiority of the Indo-Aryan invaders, probably originating from the Transcaucasian steppes, during the late 18th and early 17th centuries BC is based on their combination of the Near Eastern war-chariot with horse-control in the form of the bit – a steppe innovation –, of which the seal impressions and seal depicted in Littauer & Crouwel 1979: figs. 33-34 and 36 bear testimony, whereas their Near Eastern opponents up to that time were accustomed to the technical inferior nose-ring, see, for example, the sealing depicted in Littauer & Crouwel 1979: fig. 29.

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


Fig. 14.2. Reconstruction of the split between Greek and Thraco-Phrygian on the basis of the development of the mediea aspiratae (after Haas 1966: 209).

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

14.1. Additional note: Remaining models

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

(1) during the Neolithic, c. 6000 BC (Renfrew);580
(2) at the beginning of the Early Bronze Age, c. 3200 BC (Coleman);581
(3) at the end of the Late Bronze Age, c. 1200 BC (Gumach, Hood).582

Of these models, the Neolithic option has become ‘en vogue’ lately, being further propagated by Robert Drews in his collection of papers by various scholars entitled Greater Anatolia.583 In theory, however, a connection between the spread of Neolithic agricultural economy with that of the Indo-European languages as defended by Colin Renfrew would lead us to assume a gradual diffusion of linguistic features from an hypothetical centre, Anatolia in Renfrew’s view, to the outlying districts (= wave of advance). Hence, it cannot explain the intrusion of a more developed Indo-European layer as represented by Phrygian and Greek in between conservative IE Anatolian on the one hand and an as yet undivided Italo-Celtic in eastern and central Europe on the other hand.584 Like the presence of an Hungarian speaking ‘island’ in a Slavic speaking ‘sea’, this distribution pattern indicates disruption by immigrants from elsewhere than the hypothetical centre Anatolia – the more so because it is repeated to the east, with innovative Indo-Iranian in between conservative IE Anatolian on the one hand and Tocharian on the other hand. Moreover, the more developed features of Phrygian and Greek, which these have in common with Sanskrit, like the relative *yo-, the augment in the indicative of the past tense, and the loss of medio-passive -r-, or with Iranian, like the loss of initial s, are unlikely to have been crystalized already as early as the beginning of the Early Bronze Age. My reconstruction of the relatively late split between Phrygian and Greek on the one hand and Indo-Iranian on the other would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>progressive use of the horse</th>
<th>developments in the innovative group of Indo-European languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>domesticated horse attested in mainland Greece</td>
<td>augment relative *yo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loss of medio-passive -r-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loss of initial s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chariot</td>
<td>satem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indo-Iranian only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14.2. Developments in the innovative group of Indo-European languages related to the progressive use of the horse

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

581 Coleman 2000.
584 For the reflex of PIE *kʰi- or *kʰoro- in Celtic, cf. the Celtiberian indefinite kuekue- ‘whosoever’ in kuekuetikui (D sg. in -i) ‘to whomsoever it may concern’ as attested for the so-called rešt bronze, see Meid 1996: 30-31; Meid 2000: 12; for the reflex of PIE *swe- in Celtic, cf. the Gallic reflexive pronoun of the 3rd person swe- ‘self’, see Meid 1996: 31, and the possibly related Celtiberian forms šue and šuet, see Meid 1993, Glossar s.v. Note, however, that the significance of the relative *yo- for the innovative group of Indo-European languages is somewhat undermined by the fact that its reflex is also attested for conservative (also medio-passive -r and centum, see Meid 1993: 59 and 44, respectively) Celtiberian, see Meid 1993: 96.
CHAPTER 15. THE RISE AND FALL OF THE MYCENAEAN GREEKS

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

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

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

Soon after the eruption of the Santorini volcano, the Mycenaean, archaeologically traceable by warrior graves of mainland type and their predilection for so-called Ephyraean goblets, took over control of the island of Crete, which they ruled from the palace of Knossos. As first pointed out by Fritz Schachermeyer, this takeover of power in Crete has its reflection in the wall paintings of Aegean embassies in the graves of Egyptian dignitaries. Thus, in the tomb of Rekhmire, which was finished early in the reign of Tuthmosis III’s successor Amenhotep II (1427-1400 BC), the Minoan kilts with ‘codpieces’ are replaced by Mycenaean ones without ‘codpieces’, whereas in the slightly later tomb of Menkheperreseneb a prince of the land of Keftiu (= Crete) is depicted in altogether Mycenaean style with a beard. Further proof is afforded by the Linear B tablets from Knossos, which are accidentally preserved by the fire that destroyed the palace at the end of our Minoan-Mycenaean transitional period (= Late Minoan IIIA1/2, c. 1350 BC). Owing to the decipherment of Linear B by Michael Ventris in 1952, we know namely that this script was used to write Greek. At the same time, however, a Minoan rest group is allowed to continue their own traditions in the Mesara plain, of which fact modest Linear A archives of about 150 tablets in sum at Hagia Triada (= HT) and two Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions, the famous discus of Phaistos and the double-axe of Arkalokhori, bear testimony (see further Chapter 19 below).

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

---

586 Bietak 2000: 194; this evidence now supersedes that presented by Driessen & Macdonald 1997 (end of Late Minoan IA, c. 1500 BC) and Manning 1999 (1628 BC). For an overview of the problem of the Santorini eruption, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 47-79.
590 See on this subdivision Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004, section 8.
591 Starke 1981.
are allowed to make use of the reading and interpretation of the latter document recently put forward by a group of Dutch scholars, referred to in note 586) this town is called ‘Assuwian’ (B 10-11) and in the tablets of Hagia Triada mention is made of a-si-ja-ka u-mi-na-si ‘of the Asian town’ (HT 28a), which likely refers to Phaistos, again.\(^{592}\)

The radiation of Assuwa’s influence to Crete might also account for its occurrence in form of Aṣiṣa (‘Iṣy) in the annals of Tuthmosis III for the years just after the eruption of the Santorini volcano (\(in\ casu\) 1445 and 1441-1440 BC). This subphase ends with the defeat of the Assuwian league by the Hittite king Tüdḫaliyas I (1430-1400 BC).

With the elimination of the Assuwian league by the Hittites again a vacuum of power is created in the Aegean region – thus marking the start of our second subphase. One of the parties taking advantage of this situation is Attarissiyas, the man of Aṭṭiyā, in whom we may recognize Atreus, the father of Agamemnon, king of Mycenae and leader of the Akhaians at the time of the Trojan war. According to the annals of the Hittite kings Tūdḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC), this Akhaian ruler repeatedly attacked Madduwattas – a Hittite vassal in the region of southwest Anatolia – and with the latter held a raid on the island of Alasiya (= Cyprus), using as much as 100 chariots.\(^{593}\)

The third and final subphase of the Minoan-Mycenaean transitional period is characterized by the renewed prominence of Arzawa under its king Tārtūnandaṟadu. This king corresponded with the Egyptian pharaoh Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) about the marriage of his daughter to the latter. In this correspondence, recovered at Tell el-Amarna, it is stipulated that the land of ḫṭṭī is ‘shattered’.\(^{594}\) The latter situation is plausibly connected with the historical preamble to a decree of ḫṭṭutsilis III (1264-1239 BC) according to which before the reign of Suppiluliumas I (1344-1322 BC) the realm of Arzawa reached to Uda and Tuwanuwa, which means to the territory south of the Halys river deep in the ancestral ḫṭṭī lands. Furthermore, the Egyptian pharaoh requests Tārtūnandaṟadu to send Kaskans, a people situated to the north of the Hittite capital Boğazköy / ḫṭṭusa, but at the time even occupying Nenassa south of the Halys bow. The marriage of Amenhotep III with a daughter of Tārtūnandaṟadu was part of a grander scheme, namely to curb Hittite power both in the east and the west. Another part of this scheme was formed by the political support rendered to the Mycenaean Greeks. As argued by Eric Cline, this support is emanating from the discovery of scarabs and faience plaques of Amenhotep III and his wife Tiyi in the Aegean region, a concentration of which was found in the capital Mycenae itself. Moreover, there is a remarkable correspondence between the findspots of these Egyptian imports and the places mentioned in the list of Aegean place names on a statue base found in Amenhotep III’s temple tomb at Kom el-Hetan, Thebes, which, though starting and ending in Crete, likewise attributes a central position to the Greek mainland if not actually to Mycenae itself. Interestingly, the distribution of the Egyptian imports plausibly suggested to reflect political support includes western Asia Minor, as a scarab of Amenhotep III has been discovered at Panaztepe in the Hermos valley, which conceivably belonged to the realm of Tārtūnandaṟadu.\(^{595}\) The rationale behind lending political support to both Tārtūnandaṟadu and the Mycenaean Greeks in a containment policy of the Hittites may perhaps be provided by the information from the discus of Phaistos – if, at least, one is allowed to make use of the aforesaid reading and interpretation of this hieroglyphic text as recently offered by a group of Dutch scholars.\(^{596}\) Here great king Tārtūnandaṟadu, who, although not mentioned explicitly by name, is likely to be identified as the sender of the letter, is staged as the overlord of the Mycenaeans in Crete under leadership of king Nestor of Pylos in mainland Greece\(^{597}\) – the latter no doubt also a vassal of the king of Mycenae.\(^{598}\) Hence, the political destinies of great king Tārtūnandaṟadu of Arzawa and the Mycenaean Greeks are intricately linked up with each other. An interesting detail in this connection is that with the specification of Phaistos as Assuwian Tārtūnandaṟadu refers back to the Assuwian league of his

593 Note the diffusion of Mycenaean ware from the Argolid, reaching Kos in Late Helladic IIB and I Alyssos in Rhodes in Late Helladic IIB-IIA1, thus providing us with stepping stones for Attarissiyas’ actions in southwest Anatolia and Cyprus, see Van Schoorwinkel 1991: 164-5.
594 Moran 1992: 101 (= EA no. 31); cf. Mercer 1939: EA no. 31 (‘zersplittert’).
595 Cline 1987; Cline 2001; note, however, that a scarab of queen Tiyi has also been found outside the Aegean proper in Cyprus, see Kenna 1971: 24, no. 47.
597 On the relation of Pylos with Crete, see Hiller 1996: 81-82 with reference to tablet fragments in Knossian scribal tradition from the old palace at Pylos and the mention in the Pylos tablets of the Cretan towns Amniniso ‘Anamisos’ (PY 943) and Kotwwe ‘Gottys (D)’ (PY An 233, etc.).
598 Note in this connection that according to Homeros, Iliad XI, 690-3 Herakles defeated the Pylian king Neleus and killed 11 of his 12 sons, leaving only Nestor as his successor.
predecessor of about a generation ago in order to legitimize his claim on Crete.

This intricate political situation in which Nestor of Pylos, who, as we have just noted, was a vassal of the king of Mycenae, ruled over Crete in his capacity as vassal of great king Tartandumardus of Arzawa, and in which there was some room for the continuity of Minoan traditions, was abruptly put to an end by the Mycenaeans from the Argolid at the beginning of Late Helladic IIIA2 (c. 1350 BC), when these burned down the palace of Knossos and introduced megaron houses and standardized types of pottery, the so-called Mycenaean koinê, all over the island.\(^{599}\) This expansion of Mycenaeans from the Argolid coincides with their conquest of Thebes – which had strong Cretan connections as exemplified by the inscribed stirrup jars! – and the setting up of Orkhomenos as a Minyan (= non-Greek) satellite state in central Greece.\(^{600}\) Furthermore, the Mycenaeanization of Thessaly to the northeast probably sets in from Late Minoan IIIA2 onwards.\(^{601}\) Finally, the Mycenaeans from the Argolid extend their influence over the Aegean islands and as far east as Miletos – a former Minoan ‘Akhaians’.

\(^{599}\) Schacherney 1980: 446; Woudhuizen 1992a: 75.
\(^{601}\) Smit 1989, who, unfortunately, does not distinguish between Late Minoan IIIA1 and 2.
\(^{602}\) Niemeier 1998a: 27 ff. first building phase, Late Minoan IA to Late Minoan IB; cf: Fick 1905: 29; 117.
\(^{603}\) Niemeier 1998a: 33 second building phase, Late Helladic IIIA2 to Late Helladic IIIB. Note that the extension of the Mycenaean sphere of influence in the eastern Aegean is reflected in the later Pylos tablets by ethnica like koinê, all over the island.

The history of the Mycenaeans during the period of the koinê can be followed from the sidelines by their role in the Hittite sources, where they are addressed as Aḫḫiyawa ‘Akhaians’. Basic to this role is the fact that with Millawanda (= Miletos) they have a foothold in western Asia Minor. This history begins with a major setback, since, according to his annals, the Hittite great king Mursilis II (1321-1295 BC) razed Millawanda down to the ground at the beginning of Late Helladic IIIA2 (\(\times\) Tawagalawas letter to the reign of Muwatallis II and an overview of the discussion about this, see Smit 1990-1 and, most recently, Gurney 2002.

As it seems, this sidely remarked conflict about Wilusa became conflated in Greek memory as the Trojan war\(^{604}\) – a suggestion further emphasized by the fact that the name of the king of Wilusa at the time of Muwatallis II, Alaksandus, corresponds to Greek Alexandros / Paris, at an archaeologically detected destruction layer for Miletos in the Late Helladic IIIA2 to Late Helladic IIIB transitional period.\(^{605}\) The Mycenaeans, however, retained their hold on the site, as in the next episode, under the Hittite great king Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC), a certain Piyanaradus, who is the father-in-law of the governor of Millawanda, Atpas, raided Hittite territory apparently with the backing of the king of Aḫḫiyawa. Muwatallis II, who was preparing himself for the battle of Kadesh with Egypt (1274 BC), preferred to settle the matter in diplomatic terms, and, in doing so, addressed the king of Aḫḫiyawa as his ‘brother’, which means recognition as an equal and hence great king. His Aḫḫiyawa colleague was of the same mood, as with respect to a former conflict about Wilusa (= Homeric Ilios or Ilion) he is stated to have remarked:


In der Angelegenheit von Wilusa, der entwegen der König des Landes Hattusa und ich uns feind waren, in der hat er mich umgestimmt, und wir haben uns vertragen. Ein … Krieg ist Unrecht für uns.\(^{606}\)

As it seems, this sidely remarked conflict about Wilusa became conflated in Greek memory as the Trojan war\(^{607}\) – a suggestion further emphasized by the fact that the name of the king of Wilusa at the time of Muwatallis II, Alaksandus, corresponds to Greek Alexandros / Paris, at

\(^{605}\) Sommer 1932: KUB XIV 3 iv 7-10 (cited without the numerous question marks for uncertain signs). For the dating of the Tawagalawas-letter to the reign of Muwatallis II and an overview of the discussion about this, see Smit 1990-1 and, most recently, Gurney 2002.
\(^{606}\) So also Bryce 2003: 208, who, however, wrongly dates the Tawagalawas letter to the reign of Ḫattusilis III. It is interesting to note in this connection that according to Webster 1960: 67 the Hittites are mentioned in Homeros among the Trojan allies as 1. Halyzones from Alybe – a city, like Ḫattusa, associated with silver – (Iliad II, 856) [but note that Meyer 1968: 12 connects Alybe with the Khalybians of the Early Iron Age], and 2. Keteians (Odyssey XI, 521); they may further appear as adversaries of the Phrygians along the Sangarios in form of Amazones in a retrospective passage referring to the time that Priamos still fought himself (Iliad III, 184) – the same Amazones upon whom Belcheroph stumbles during his adventures in the hinterland of Lycia (Iliad VI, 186), cf: Leonhard 1911: 15-16. See also Chapter 9, notes 462 ff. above.

\(^{607}\) Note that a reflection of these events is preserved by Stephanos of Byzantion’s remark in his Ethnika, s.v. Samylia that Motyllos, after founding this Carian city, received Helena and Paris...
any rate, a date of say c. 1280 BC for this conflict correlates perfectly with the archaeologically established destruction of Troy VI, usually assigned to c. 1300 BC.

After this glorious episode, however, it goes down with the image of the Mycenaean king in the eyes of the Hittites. It has been argued that in the reign of the Hittite great king Tudḫaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC) the Mycenaeans had lost their Anatolian bridgehead in the region of Miletos. Thus there is documentary evidence that the ruler of Miletos in the second half of the 13th century BC.610 Whatever the extent of these arguments, fact is that in a treaty with Sausgamuwa of Amurru, in which Tudḫaliyas IV ordered a ban on traffic between Aḫḫiyawa and Assyria via the harbors of Amurru, the name of the king of Aḫḫiyawa, initially summed up among the kings equal in rank with the Hittite great king, has been erased.611 Evidently, the king of Aḫḫiyawa was downgraded in the eyes of the Hittites as compared to the situation at the time of Muwatallis II. To this comes that the ban on traffic of Aḫḫiyawa as referred to in the Sausgamuwa treaty may have become more serious in the course of time. Tudḫaliyas IV had a program of incorporating all of southwest Anatolia into his realm; early in his reign he announced the plan to conquer the territory west of Parţa along the Kastaraya (= Perge along the Kestros in Pamphylia) and to add the newly won territory to the province of Tarḫuntassa (= Cilicia Aspera).612 At a later stage in his reign, he conquered the region of the lower Xanthos valley in Lycia – a country where no one of his ancestors had ever marched.613 The rationale behind this scheme is to clear the sea from pirates – the Lycians were notorious for this activity already in the time of the El-Amarna archive in the 14th century BC – as a preparation for his ultimate goal: the conquest of Alasiya (= Cyprus). In the final years of his reign, then, he ultimately launched a campaign against the island of Alasiya, but a definite result was reached only by his son and successor, Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC), who also set up a memorial for this campaign.614 Now, most of the inscriptions in Cypro-Minoan date to the period of Hittite rule, say c. 1210-1180? BC, if not actually from the last days before the conquest by the Sea Peoples. The larger texts among the inscriptions are bills of lading, registering the sea-borne traffic between western Anatolia and the Near East, especially Ras Shamra / Ugarit.615 What really strikes us about these documents is the absence of Greek names. Of course, a Greek trader may be hidden behind geographically inspired indications like ‘Iasos’ or ‘the Samian’, but the same absence of Greek names also characterizes the much more substantial archives at Ras Shamra / Ugarit.616 At any rate, it is clear that the responsible persons specified by ethnonyms are men like Piṭhas,617 trader

---

613 Poetto 1993; Woudhuizen 1994-5: 168-79; Woudhuizen 2004a: section 3; see Chapter 13 above.
617 For Luwian hieroglyphic seals bearing testimony of the M[en’s] ] N[ame] Piṭhas, see Güterbock 1942: 68, no. 66; Kennedy...
from Lycia, Sanemas,\textsuperscript{618} representative of the Shekelesh, or Akamas, representative of Ephesos and a place plausibly situated in the Troad (see Chapter 20) – members of Sea Peoples who later knew their way to the Orient, but decidedly no Greeks! Accordingly, the evidence amounts to a serious ban of the Mycenaean Greeks from the waters bordering the Anatolian peninsula in the west and the south during the final phase of the Hittite Empire period.\textsuperscript{619}

Just antedating the coming to power of Suppiluliumas II, in year 5 of Merneptah (= 1208 BC), the Akhaians in form of Ekwesh – the final -\textit{sh} is likely to be identified as a suffix also present in Shekelesh (= Sicels) and Weshesh (= Ausones or Osci)\textsuperscript{620} – are recorded to have taken part in the campaign of the Libyan king Mersey against Egypt. In this campaign the Akhaians served as foreign allies or mercenaries alongside the Teresh, Lukka, Sherden, and Shekelesh. The only one planning to settle in the Egyptian delta was the Libyan king himself who is reported to have been accompanied by his family and to have carried with him all his possessions.\textsuperscript{621} As such the Libyan campaign is clearly distinct from the later attacks by the Sea Peoples in the reign of Ramesses III (years 1179 and 1176 BC), when, according to the reliefs at Medinet Habu, the Sea Peoples themselves carried with them ox-drawn carts with their wives and children.\textsuperscript{622} Interesting to observe in this connection is that the Greeks are referred to in the Egyptian records of the Libyan campaign by a reflex of their Hittite name, \textit{Ahiyawa}, instead of their usual Egyptian designation \textit{Tanayu}, which in variant form \textit{Denye(n)} is reintroduced by Ramesses III (see Chapter 16). Another strange thing is that the fallen of the Ekwesh are explicitly stated to have been circumcized (hence their hands were cut off as a trophy instead of their penises) – a rite well-attested for the Egyptians and the Semites, but so far not for the Mycenaean Greeks.\textsuperscript{623}

The period of the Mycenaean \textit{koinē} ends in massive destructions and / or abandonment of sites on the Greek mainland: in southern and central Greece 10 important sites show a destruction layer at the end of Late Helladic IIIB (c. 1185 BC),\textsuperscript{624} 5 of which are abandoned afterwards, whereas at least 9 more important sites are just abandoned at the time (see Fig. 15.1).\textsuperscript{625} In view of these figures, the transition from Late Helladic IIIB to Late Helladic IIIC is much more discontinuous than preceding periods of an archaeological break discussed in the foregoing chapter (but note that the density of the Late Helladic IIIB sites is higher than ever before). Yet, as we know from later records, the language spoken in Greece remains Greek and the inhabitants of the Early Iron Age and following periods are Greeks, thus in this sense – give and take a few dialectic reshuffles – there is no real break, but only continuity.\textsuperscript{626} As an explanation of this paradox between archaeological evidence and linguistic data, it has been suggested that the enemy which attacked the Mycenaeans at the end of Late Helladic IIIB wasted the country but – apart from some minor exceptions indicated by the presence of handmade foreign ware (see also Chapters 17 and 21)\textsuperscript{627} – did not come to settle in it.\textsuperscript{628} At any rate, the Pylos tablets indicate that the enemy came by sea from the northwest, as ships are sent to cape Pleuron in Aitolia to cope with the emergency situation.\textsuperscript{629} This does not exclude, however, a simultaneous or slightly posterior attack from the north over land, to which the large scale destructions in Thessaly bear testimony (see Fig. 15.2)\textsuperscript{630} and

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{618} Note that this name is strikingly paralleled for a Cretan hieroglyphic sealing from Gortys (# 196), reading, with the cross at the suffix also present in Shekelesh (= Sicels) and Weshelesh (= Ausones or Osci).

\textsuperscript{619} Cf. Cline 1991.

\textsuperscript{620} Wainwright 1961: 72; Redford 1992: 252, note 54; cf. Hittite \textit{Karkissa} alongside \textit{Karkiya} ‘Caria’. On the identification of the Sea Peoples in question, see Chapter 21 below.

\textsuperscript{621} Sandars 1980: 101.

\textsuperscript{622} Sandars 1980: 117, afb. 77; 118-20. As we have seen in Chapter 11 above, the given distinction was particularly made by Hölbl 1983.

\textsuperscript{623} Barnett 1969: 11; note that the Philistines from Crete were also not circumcized, see Chapter 19.

\textsuperscript{624} Warren & Hankey 1989: 161 association of Late Helladic IIIB with Tewosret 1188-1186 BC at Deir ‘Ala.

\textsuperscript{625} Hope Simpson & Dickinson 1979; cf. Shelmerdine 1997: 581. See also Betancourt 1976: 40 with even larger figures, but without specification of the names of the sites in question.

\textsuperscript{626} For religious continuity, see Nilsson 1927: 400-14; Schnapp-Gourbeillon 2002: Chapitre IV.

\textsuperscript{627} Rutter 1975; Deger-Jalkotzy 1983; Popham 2001; for further literature, see Chapter 21, note 1008.


\textsuperscript{629} Ventris & Chadwick 1973: 185-6: PY An 12 \textit{ereta Pererónade ijote} (= Greek \textit{eiretai Pleuronānde iotes}) ‘rowers to go to Pleuron’. Further maritime measures are forthcoming from the \textit{oku}-tablets, which, notwithstanding the linguistic criticism by Risch 1958: 354 and Palmer 1998: 154, deal with \textit{holkades} ‘ships for transportation’, see Pugliese Carratelli 1954: 469; Mühlestein 1956: 36 ff.; cf. Best 1996-7: 120-7; for the state of emergency exemplified by these tablets, one of which is headed by the phrase \textit{ourato oipiaza eipkewo} (= Greek \textit{hi(h)s wruntoi op(h)ala eipkewon}) ‘Thus the watchers are guarding the coast’ (PY An 657), see Palmer 1956; Palmer 1965: 143-54.

\textsuperscript{630} Schachermeyr 1980: 393; Popham 2001: 282-3 (figs.). As an historical parallel one might point to the fact that when Dionysios...}
against which the inhabitants of the Peloponnesos tried to protect themselves by building a wall on the Isthmos.\textsuperscript{631}

\textbf{Fig. 15.2. Sites and cemeteries (a) in Late Helladic IIIB and (b) in Late Helladic IIIC (from Popham 2001: 282-3)}

As a result of the breakdown of the Mycenaean civilization, a number of people from the Peloponnesos decided to join the seaborne attackers and took the boat to the Orient in order to settle in Cyprus and in the region of Adana on the adjacent side of the mainland. For the last mentioned region this is proved by the recently discovered Luwian hieroglyphic-Phoenician bilingual inscription of Çineköy, dated to the reign of Urikki in the late 8th century BC, in which the land of Adana is called Ḫiāwa, the Luwian hieroglyphic equivalent of Hittite Aḫḫiyawa, characterized, just like it is the case for the text of the Phaistos disc, by aphaeresis.\textsuperscript{632} In the archaeological record, this event is reflected in the destruction of Tarsus at the end of the Late Bronze Age and the subsequent introduction of Late Helladic IIIC ware of Argive background.\textsuperscript{633} Another branch of the Mycenaean Greeks, referred to as Denye(n) by the Egyptians and Dan by the Hebrews, went further south and settled initially in the region of Tel Qasile – a new foundation – in Canaan, perhaps some time after the settlement of the Philistines (see Chapter 16).\textsuperscript{634} Both these migrations, however, were not massive enough to plant the Greek language: the Akhaians in the region of Adana went over to Luwian and the Danaoi of Canaan to Semitic.

Apart from emigration to Cyprus and the Orient, which may have been an ongoing process from Late Helladic IIIC to Submycenaean,\textsuperscript{635} there can be observed a clustering together of the population in Greece itself into refuge areas during this time. These refuge areas, like Akhaia, Kephallenia, and Attica, but especially the Aegean islands Naxos, Kos, and Rhodes, could bear testimony to a considerable degree of recovery.\textsuperscript{636} Moreover, the population in Crete withdrew to mountain sites like Karphi, Vrokastro, and Kastri.\textsuperscript{637} From Attica the Ionian emigration to the region of Miletos in western Asia Minor took place, probably in the Submycenaean period,\textsuperscript{638} the Aiolian migration from Boeotia and Thessaly to the coastal zone of Mysia may well have occurred in about the same period or just a little afterwards.\textsuperscript{639} The Dorians, who repopulated an almost deserted Peloponnesos at the end of the Submycenaean or

\begin{itemize}
\item Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000; for the Phaistos disc, see Achterberg, Best, Enzler, Rietveld & Woudhuizen 2004: 85; 98; 110.
\item Goldman 1956: 63; 350-1; Mee 1978: 150, who stipulates that the number of Late Helladic IIIC sherds (875 in sum) allows for the actual presence of Mycenaeans. \textit{Cf.} Strabo, \textit{Geography} XIV, 5, 12, according to which Tarsus is colonized from Argos.
\item For the absence of Late Helladic IIIC1b ware here, see Bietak 1993: 257-8.
\item Dikaios 1971: 519 (Late Helladic IIIC1b from the Argolid); Catling 1973; Vanschoonwinkel 304-5 (Paphos, Late Helladic IIIC); Schachermeyr 1980: 380 (sub-Mycenaean from the Peloponnesos). The earliest evidence of the Greek language on Cyprus is provided by the Opheltas-obelos, dating to the middle of the 11th century BC, which bears testimony of the Arcado-Cyprian genitive (\textit{Opeletau}), see Masson 1983: 408.
\item Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 156-9.
\item Schachermeyr 1980: 375; \textit{cf.} Herodotos, \textit{Histories} I, 146, who points out that the Ionians killed the male Carians and married their wives.
\item Spencer 1995: 275-7 (repopulation of Mytilene and Pyrrha on Lesbos during the Protogeometric period).
\end{itemize}
the beginning of the Protogeometric period,640 followed in the footsteps of their Ionian and Aiolian tribesmen, colonizing Crete, Rhodes, and the region of Halikarnassos still later. Not for a long time, however, the Greeks were to reach a degree of unity as we have experienced for the period of the Mycenaean koinē – and then only under foreign pressure!

640 Eder 1998. See also Chapter 9 above.
CHAPTER 16. FROM DANAOI TO DAN

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

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

In the relevant literature, the Denye(n) are often, together with the Danaoi, identified with the Danuna of the El-Amarna texts (in casu the letters by Rib-addi of Byblos and Abimilki of Tyre). However, the form Danuna corresponds to the root of Dnnym 'people of Adana' as recorded for the Phoenician version of the bilingual Karatepe text (late 8th century BC), and has nothing to do with the Danoi of mainland Greece. This conclusion is further substantiated by the fact that, according to the Ugaritic texts, the line of defence against the Sea Peoples is organized in the waters of Lycia in southwest Anatolia: there is no question of a revolt in the Hittite province of Kizzuwatna – to which the town of Adana belongs – at the time. Only after the period of the resurrection of the Sea Peoples and the fall of the Hittite Empire, the region of Adana is colonized by a number of Greek settlers – an historical fact of which the recently found Luwian hieroglyphic-Phoenician bilingual inscription from Çineköy (late 8th century BC) bears testimony, in which the land of Adana is referred to by the name Ḫḥāwa (as we have seen, the Luwian equivalent of Hittite Ḥḥḥyāwa ‘Akhaians’), and which is furthermore reflected in the archaeological record by the introduction of Late Helladic IIIC ware of Argive background in the region after the destruction of Tarsus (see also Chapter 15).

Next to this settlement by a branch of Mycenaean Greeks under the name of Akhaians in the region of Adana, another group under the name of Dan (≠ Danai) went further south and settled initially in the region of Tel Qasile – a new foundation – in Canaan, perhaps, for the lack of Late Helladic IIIC1b ware, some time after the settlement of the Philistines. As suggested by Yigael Yadin, a line from the song of Deborah, running as follows: ‘And Dan, why did he remain in ships?’, preserves the memory of the pre-colonial stage in the history of the tribe of Dan. At any rate, historical sources locate the Danites on the coast be-

---

641 Hall 2002: 53, note 98 (with specification of their frequency).
642 Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. Danaos.
643 Pindaros, Pythian Odes 4, 85 f.
646 De Rougé 1861: 145.
647 Gardiner 1947: 126.
650 Tekoğlu & Lemaire 2000.
651 Goldman 1956: 63; 350-1; Mee 1978: 150.
653 Bible, Judges 5:17; Yadin in Best & Yadin 1973: 69.
tween Asdod in the south and Dor in the north,654 and more specifically situate the region of their inheritance near Joppa.655 In the course of time, then, the Danites expanded their territory to Zora and Eshtaol in the hinterland of Tel Qasile and Joppa, from where they are recorded to have conquered Laish in the sphere of influence of Sidon to the north, of which they changed the name into Dan.656 This latter event may well be linked up with the fact that the foundation layer of Tel Qasile (stratum XII) ends with a destruction of the site.657

654 Josephus, Antiquities V, 87.
656 Bible, Judges 8:1-31.
657 Yadin in Best & Yadin 1973: 70.
CHAPTER 17. ETRUSCAN ORIGINS

17.1. Models

The problem of Etruscan origins has received scholarly at-
tention already in Antiquity. First of all, there is the testi-
mony of Herodotos of Halikarnassos (5th century BC) ac-
cording to which the Etruscans were Lydian colonists
from western Asia Minor. Hard pressed by a famine, so the
story goes, half of the Lydian population under the leader-
ship of king Atys’ son Tyrsenos mustered on ships at
Smyrna and sailed to Italy, where they settled in the terri-

658 Histories I, 94.

tory of the Umbrians.658 As opposed to this, we have the
opinion of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (1st century BC),
who, on the basis of a comparison between the customs and
the languages of the Etruscans and the Lydians, reached the
configuration that these two peoples were unrelated. He ex-
trapolated from this conclusion that the Etruscans were no
Lydian colonists, but had always lived in Italy.659

As divided as opinions were on the subject of Etrus-
can origins in Antiquity, so they are in our presen-
t era. A majority among scholars in the field holds that the
Etruscans were autochthonous. In accordance with this vi-
ew, the Etruscans are considered a remnant population sur-
viving the onset of Indo-European migrations which brought
the Umbrians, Oscans, Latins, and Faliscans to the Ital ian pen-
insula. Their language, so this line of approach continues,
is not comparable to any other in the world, except for the
one attested for the famous stelae of Kaminia on the is-
land of Lemnos in the Aegean.660 This only linguistic rela-
tionship acknowledged by the adherents of the autochthonous
thesis receives meaningful explanation in two ways. In
the first place, Lemnian is, on the analogy of Etruscan in
Italy, considered a remnant of a once widely dispersed
Mediterranean language surviving the onset of Indo-
European migrations into the Aegean basin.660 Second,
Lemnian is seen as the result of a colonization by Etruscans
from Italy into the north-Aegean region.661

A minority among scholars, but a persistent one, is of
the opinion that the Etruscans were colonists from western
Asia Minor. These so-called orientalists can be subdivided
into two groups: those who situate the colonization of Etru-

ria at the end of the Late Bronze Age (c. 1200 BC),662 and
those who rather place this event in the Early Iron Age (c.
750-675 BC).663 A representative of the first mentioned
group of orientalists is the Indo-Europeanist Robert
Beekes. However, he is exceptional in combining the idea
of an oriental origin with the linguistic analysis of the ad-
herents of the autochthonous thesis. Thus, Beekes likewise
considers Etruscan and Lemnian relics of a language once
spoken in the Aegean before the Indo-European migra-
664 Much more common among orientalists is it to
consider Etruscan related to the Indo-European languages
of Asia Minor, and in particular to Luwian.665 The latter
language was spoken in southern and western Anatolia dur-
ing the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age, and, in its
western extremity, was subject to a dialectal development
which resulted in Lycian and Lydian of the Classical
period.666

Now, there is some evidence of non-Indo-European
languages in Asia Minor, originally going back to the time
before the Indo-European migrations. In the first place,
mention should be made of Ḫattic, the language of the in-
habitants of Ḫattusa before this city was taken over by the
Hittites, as recorded in Hittite texts dating from the 2nd
millennium BC. Next, there is Ḫurrian, the language of the
realm of Mitanni, once a formidable rival of the Hittites in
their strive for hegemony in eastern Anatolia and North
Syria. This language developed into Urartian of the Early
Iron Age. Finally, we cannot omit the Semitic language,
which in the form of Akkadian was used as a lingua franca
for international correspondence between the empires of
the 2nd millennium BC – a function taken over by Aramaic
during the Early Iron Age. But, except for some bilinguals
with Aramaic for Lycian and Lydian, this evidence has a
bearing on eastern Asia Minor only. In western Asia Minor
the linguistic situation is much less complicated. Here we
find evidence of two language groups, both of them Indo-
European, namely Luwian, which, as we have seen, devel-

662 Hencken 1968.
663 Schachermeyr 1929.
664 Beekes & van der Meer 1991; Beekes 1993; Beekes 2002:
665 Meriggi 1937; Laroche 1961b.
666 For Lydian as a Luwian dialect, see Woudhuizen 1984-5a;
Woudhuizen 1990; Woudhuizen 2005a: appendix IV.
oped into Lycian and Lydian of the Classical period, and
Thraco-Phrygian, presumably the vernacular of the com-
mon people of the Troas already in the Bronze Age (see
Chapter 20, especially note 928 below) and, after the fall of
the Hittite Empire c. 1180 BC, introduced further east into
the Anatolian highland. If, for the sake of argument, we
have to allow for remnants of a non-Indo-European lan-
guage in western Anatolia, this can only entail small pock-
ets, uncapable of providing the amount of people neces-
sary for the colonization of Etruria as envisaged by the oriental-
ists. As a matter of fact, Beekes’ tenet of non-Indo-
European survivals in the Aegean is entirely based on the
linguistic analysis of the Lemnos stele as common among
the adherents of the autochthonous thesis.

17.2. Autochthonous thesis

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

At the same time, it is interesting to determine what
exactly is Dionysios’ drive to disconnect the Tyrrhenians,
as the Etruscans are called by the Greeks, from the Pelas-
gians. In previous sources, like, for instance, Thucydides
(5th century BC), these two population groups are persist-
tently identified. The answer to this question is given by
Dionysios himself in the introduction to his work: he wants
to prove that the founding fathers of Rome were actually
Greeks. Now, the Pelasgians, who played a role in the
earliest history of Rome, according to literary tradition
originate from Greece. For Dionysios, this is reason to as-
sume that they are in fact a Greek ethnos. In reality, how-
ever, the Pelasgians are a pre-Greek population group,
already present in Greece before the Greeks came into be-
ing. As they are so different from the Greeks, Dionysios
cannot use the Tyrrhenians to the same effect: to declare
them Greeks would be preposterous. The unprecedented
and rather forced distinction between Tyrrhenians and Pe-
lasgians leads to absurd consequences, like, for instance,
the assumption that the language of the inhabitants of Cor-
tona, whom Dionysios considers to be Pelasgians, was dis-
tinct from that of the Tyrrhenians. Dozens of inscript-
ions disprove this: the language of the inhabitants of Corto
na was straightforwardly Etruscan. Another ques-
tion which arises from Dionysios’ distinction between Pe-
lasgians and Tyrrhenians is where the latter were living at
the time that the Pelasgians are said to have occupied their
country. Finally, the way in which Dionysios disposes of
the Pelasgians in order to make room for the Tyrrhenians is
extremely suspect: he simply, so to say, lets them evaporate
into thin air! In short, the story on which the adherents
of the autochthonous thesis base themselves suffers from
many flaws.

Also the explanation of the relationship between
Etruscan and Lemnian within the frame of the autochtho-
nous thesis leads up to unsurmountable difficulties. The
first option, according to which the Etruscans and Lem-
nians were both remnants of population groups surviving
the onset of Indo-European immigrations, runs up against
the fact that the two languages were so closely related that
such a long period of independent development is highly
inconceivable (the Indo-European invasions in the Aegean
date back to at least c. 2300 BC, see Chapter 10). The sec-
don option, according to which the north-Aegean region
was colonized by Etruscans from Italy in the late 8th or
early 7th century BC, is, considering the slight dialectal
differences, a priori possible, but lacks a proper archaeo-
logical and historical basis.

17.3. Colonization at the end of the
Bronze Age

If the autochthonous thesis turns out to be flawed, what
about the thesis of oriental origins? As we have seen, one

667 Peloponnesian War IV, 109, 4.
668 Roman Antiquities I, 5, 1; cf. I, 17, 1; I, 60, 3. This point of
view is common among Hellenistic poets, see Sakellariou 1977: 98, note 3.
669 Roman Antiquities I, 29, 3; this view, based on a misreading
of ?Crotoniats for Crestoniats in the manuscript of Herodotos’
text, is followed, amongst others, by Briquel 1984: 101-40 (esp.
126 ff.) and Beekes 2002: 221, in the latter case without realizing
the consequence. For further literature, see Sakellariou 1977: 88,
ote 6.
1984: 133.
671 Roman Antiquities I, 20, 5.
672 Roman Antiquities I, 24, 4; 26, 1
group of orientalists situates the colonization of Etruria from Asia Minor at the end of the Bronze Age. These scholars base themselves on the chronology of Herodotos, who places the rulers descending from Atys’ son Lydos prior to those of the Heraklids. The reign of the latter, Herodotos continues, lasted as many as 22 generations or 505 years in sum before the last representative, Kandaules, was set aside by Gyges, the first ruler of the Mermnades, at the beginning of the 7th century BC. Accordingly, it follows that the descendants of Atys’ son Lydos were in power before the beginning of the 12th century BC. Herodotos, however, amplifies this information with the remark that the population of Sardis and its surroundings were called Lydians after Lydos, whereas prior to his rule they were known as Maeonians. Now, Maeonians is the form of address for the Lydians in the epic songs of Homeros, which, as we have seen in Chapter 9, primarily reflects Late Bronze Age history. Hence the name Lydians can only be surmised to have come into currency in the Early Iron Age. Ergo: Herodotos’ chronology is flawed.

Also from an archaeological perspective the colonization of Etruria at the end of the Bronze Age is highly unlikely. It is true that at this time Italy is characterized by the introduction of a new culture, the so-called proto-Villanovan (= an earlier phase of Villanovan), but, as demonstrated convincingly by Hugh Hencken, the latter shows close affinities with the European Urnfields. Thus the typical biconical urns relate to counterparts primarily discovered in the region of Oltenia and the Banat, Hungary (see Fig. 17.1). Furthermore, the house urns, which are so well-known a feature of the Latial variant of (proto-)Villanovan, find their closest parallels in northern Germany (see Fig. 17.2). In line with these observations, it seems reasonable to assume that new population groups have entered Italy, as Hencken does, only not from the Aegean, but from Europe. These new population groups can plausibly be identified as the forefathers of the historical Italic peoples of the Umbrians, Oscans, Latins, and Fal-

673 Histories I, 7.
674 Note that Hencken 1968 wrongly applies the term pre-Villanovan instead; cf. Fugazzola Delpino 1979; Ridgway 1988: 628 ff.
675 Hencken 1968: 441, fig. 452.
676 Behn 1924: 90-91; Tafel 6, d-e; note, however, that the north German house urns postdate the Latial ones.
677 Note in this connection that the introduction of proto-
iscans, whose languages show the closest affinity to Celtic and Germanic. At any rate, the Umbrians have the same name as the German tribe of the Ambrones (Jutland in Denmark), branches of which can, on the basis of related place and river names, be traced as far afield as France, Spain, and even northern Italy, whereas those of the Oscans or Ausones is obviously related to the Celtic ethnonyms Ausci (near Auch in southern France) and Ausetani (in Ausa-Vich, Catalonia). (As demonstrated by Hans Krahe, both ethnonyms are rooted in his Old European river names, the first being based on *embr-, *omb- 'moist, water' and the second on *av-, *au- 'source, stream').

This reconstruction of Italian prehistory at the end of the Bronze Age, which assumes a relation between Urnfield culture and the historical peoples of the Umbrians, Oscans, Latins, and Faliscans, collides with the view of the foremost representative of the autochthonous thesis, Massimo Pallottino. The latter put much effort in an attempt to disconnect the Italic Indo-European languages from the (proto-)Villanovan culture, the bearers of which he considers to be the forebears of the Etruscans. To this end he presents a map showing the distribution of archaeological cultures of Italy in the 9th and 8th centuries BC, which he compares with the distribution of the various languages as attested in about the 5th century BC. This is a dangerous procedure. In the first place, it leaves out the proto-Villanovan phase, which cannot be dissociated from Villanovan and which spread far to the south, reaching Apulia, the Lipari islands and even northern Sicily – regions where later evidence of Italic languages are found (see Fig. 17.3). Secondly, the use of the distinction between cremation and inhumation burial rites as an ethnic marker is, as far as the 8th century BC is concerned, an oversimplification. After the introduction of proto-Villanovan at the end of the Bronze Age, there is a revival of the rite of inhumation spreading from the south of Italy to the north, reaching Caere in the 9th and 8th centuries BC. Similarly, the Etruscans are also acquainted with both rites – be it that their cremation burials are clearly distinct from the Villanovan ones (see further below). Hence, the distinction is rather Villanovan style cremations and inhumations versus Etruscan style cremations and inhumations – a line of approach actually applied by Ingrid Pohl in her publication of the Iron Age cemetery of Caere. Finally, the identification of the bearers of Villanovan culture in Etruria with the forebears of the Etruscans disregards the historical evidence according to which the Etruscans colonized the land of the Umbrians and drove them out of their original habitat. As a matter of fact, there are numerous reminiscences of the Umbrians originally inhabiting the region later called Etruria, like the river name Umbro, the region called tractus Umbriae, the association of the Umbrian tribes of the Camartes and Sarsinates with the inland towns Clusium and Perugia, and the identification of Cortona as an Umbrian town. At any rate, the sites which have yielded Umbrian inscriptions mostly lie along the eastern fringe of the Villanovan style cremation area and there even have been found Umbrian type inscriptions in Picenum on the other side of the Appenines, whereas literary sources speak of Umbrians in Ancona, Ariminum, Ravena, and Spina to the north – regions where (proto-)Villanovan is attested (cf. Fig. 17.3).

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

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

678 Altheim 1950: 56-57.
680 Bosch-Gimpera 1939: 40.
681 Krahe1964: 90-91; 43-44.
683 For Ausones (= Oscans) on the Lipari islands and in Milazzo, see Diodoros of Sicily, The Library of History V, 7, 682 Pohl 1972.
684 Pliny, Natural History III, 14, 112.
685 Altheim 1950: 22-23.
686 Poultnay 1959: 3.
687 Pseudo-Skylaks, Peripus 16; Strabo, Geography V, 1, 11; V, 2, 1; Justinus, Epitoma historiarum philippicarum Pompei Trogi XX, 1, 11; cf. Briquel 1984: 33; 51; 88; Salmon 1988: 701.
689 Hencken 1968: 634.
Chapter 21 below). 691 These western raiders made common cause with colleagues from the east-Mediterranean basin, like the Ekwesh or Akhaians from the Greek mainland, Peleset or Pelasgians from the Aegean, Tjeker or Teukrians from the Troas, and Lukka or Lycians from western Asia Minor. The importance of bearers of the Urnfield culture, like we have suggested for the Oscans, among these Sea Peoples is stressed by the fact that their boat(s) as depicted in Ramesses III’s memorial at Medinet Habu are characterized by bird-head devices at both the bow and the stern – as convincingly shown by Shelley Wachsmann a typical Urnfield feature. 692 Furthermore, this element among the Sea Peoples can even be shown to have settled in the Levant at Hamath, where Urnfield cemeteries with more than 1000 urns have been dug up. 693 Within the frame of the autochthonous thesis, the Teresh or Tyrsenians (= Tyrrenhians) are, on the analogy of the Sicilians and Sardinians, likewise supposed to have come from Italy, but considering their Aegean location in early Greek literary sources this is unlikely (see Chapter 19). At any rate, the direction of the migrations at the end of the Bronze Age is clearly from west to east, and not the other way round. Therefore, the colonization by the Etruscans of Italy from Asia Minor as recorded by Herodotos does not fit into the period of the Sea Peoples.

17.4. Colonization in the Early Iron Age

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

First of all, it is important to note that only from c. 700 BC onwards Etruria is characterized by an archaeological culture that with certainty can be identified as Etruscan, because from that date onwards inscriptions conducted in the Etruscan language are found. 694 One of the most outstanding features of this Etruscan culture is formed by the chamber tomb under tumulus for multiple burials. The burial rites may consist of inhumation or a special form of cremation, according to which the remains of the pyre are collected in a gold or silver container which, wrapped in a purple linen cloth, is placed in a loculus of the grave. The closest parallels for such elite-cremations are found in Anatolian style chamber tombs under tumulus at Salamis on Cyprus. 695 The rite in question is meticulously described by Homer in connection with the burial of Patroklos, for which reason one often speaks of an Ho-

691 For the identification of the Weshesh as Oscans, see Chabas 1872: 299; cf. Reinach 1910: 36, note 3; Macalister 1913: 25; see further section 14 below.


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


695 D’Agostino 1977: 57-58; note that the Etruscan nature of the elite-cremations at Pontecagnano is deducible from the fact that the earliest inscriptions from this site are conducted in the Etruscan language, see Rix 1991: Cm 2.2, Cm 2.7, and Cm 2.19, all of 6th century BC date.
Chamber tombs under tumulus for multiple burials are a typical Mycenaean feature. During the Late Bronze Age this type of burial is disseminated by Mycenaean colonists from mainland Greece to western Asia Minor, where it is subsequently taken over by indigenous population groups like the Carians, Lycians, Lydians, and ultimately the Phrygians. The earliest indigenous examples are pseudo-cupolas in Caria, dated to the period of c. 1000 to 800 BC. These graves are characterized by a rectangular groundplan and a concentrically vaulted roof. The problem of the dome resting on a square is solved by the so-called pendentive. Furthermore, Mysia has produced a chamber tomb which is entirely hewn out of the soft tufa with mock roof beams in place as if it were a wooden construction. The same technique is so common for Etruria that if the photos of the Mysian example would have had no caption one could easily be mistaken to be dealing with an Etruscan grave. Unfortunately, the Anatolian examples in the last mentioned two cases were so thoroughly robbed that they cannot be properly dated. Next, it deserves our attention that Lycia from the 6th century BC onwards is typified by façade graves hewn out of the natural rock, which bring to mind the façade graves hewn out of the natural rock of Norchia and its immediate surroundings to which a similar date is assigned as the Lycian counterparts. Like the Mysian tomb mentioned above, the façade graves imitate wooden constructions. Hence, it is interesting to note that actual wooden constructions have been dug up in Phrygia. Here large wooden boxes dating to the late 8th and early 7th centuries BC serve as a replacement of the stone built chamber tomb in like manner as in Vetulonia during the 7th century BC. Finally, mention should be made of a Lycian chamber tomb from the 5th century BC with paintings which bear a strong resemblance to the Etruscan ones in Tarquinia – be it that the Lycian paintings, in contrast to their Etruscan counterparts, show Persian motifs.

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

The inference that colonists from various regions of western Asia Minor migrated to Etruria may receive further emphasis if we take a look at the script. As mentioned in the above the earliest inscriptions in the Etruscan language date from c. 700 BC onwards. In general, it is assumed that the Etruscans have borrowed their alphabet from the Greeks, in particular from the Euboians at Pithecusae and Cumae. This view, however, runs up against serious difficulties, since the local Etruscan alphabets are characterized by signs and sign-forms unparalleled for Greek inscriptions. In the first place we have to consider in this connection the sign for the expression of the value [f] as attested for an early 7th century BC inscription from Vetulonia (Vn 1.1) in north-Etruria, which consists of a vertical stroke with a small circle on either top. As time goes by, this sign develops into the well-known figure-of-eight [f], which spreads from the north of Etruria to the south ultimately to replace the digraph of wau and ēta (< hēta) for the same sound in the south-Etruscan alphabets. The origin of this sign can be traced back to the Lydian alphabet, where during the same time it knows exactly the same development! Next, a late 7th century BC inscription from Caere (Cr 9.1) in south-Etruria bears testimony of a variant of the tsade which is closer in form to the Phoenician original than the Greek san. The closest parallel for this sign can be discovered in the local script of Side in Pamphylia. On the basis of these observations it lies at hand to infer that various groups of colonists from various regions in western Asia Minor, ranging from Lydia in the north to Side in the south, simply have taken (features of) their script with
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The colonists not only introduced their own type of grave and their own type of alphabet, they also settled themselves, just like the Phoenicians and Greeks, in urban centres founded according to neatly circumscribed rituals. An often heard argument in favor of the continuity between the Villanovan and Etruscan Orientalizing periods is that the Etruscan cities are founded on locations where in the previous period Villanovan villages are situated. It should be realized, however, that the Greek colony in Cumae is also preceded by an indigenous Italic settlement and that there is ample evidence for intermingling between the original inhabitants and the new arrivals. The same model is applicable to the Etruscan colonization, as suggested by the large number of Italic names in Etruscan inscriptions dating from the 7th and 6th centuries BC onwards. To give some examples, one might point to: Cventi, Ekname, Venelus, Vete, Vipie, Kavie, Katisie, Marmerce, Namesie, Petrus, Pupna, Papiaia, Puplie, Spurie, Flavie, and tribal names like Latinie, Sapina, and Sarsing. As a matter of fact, the colonists from western Asia Minor constitute an elite, who impose their superior culture on the by far more numerous indigenous Italic population. A vital component of the colonial culture is formed by their language.

A first hint at the nature of the language can be derived from the name of some of the newly founded cities. Thus Tarquinia (= Etruscan Tarq̣ṇa-) is, on the analogy of Greek colonial names like Posidonia, Apollonia, and Herakleia, which are also based on a divine name, named after the Luwian storm-god Tarḫunu. In addition, a number of Etruscan personal names, like Arṛṇ, Mezentie, Muʔzie, Əfaṛie or Əfarie, can be traced back to Luwian counterparts (Arsawa Anti, Mukasa) or Luwian onomastic elements (masana- ‘god’, Tiwata- or Tiwara- ‘sun-god’); the same applies to family names like Caṇiḷṇa (< Luwian tænta- ‘in front of’) and Velaešna (< Luwian wala-‘lion’), be it that the diagnostic element -na— though originating from Luwian hieroglyphic na- ‘son’ is an Etruscan innovation unparalleled for Anatolian onomastics. Furthermore, Etruscan vocabulary shows many correspondences with Luwian, like for instance the very common verb muluvane- or muluvani- ‘to offer as a vow’, the root of which is related to Luwian mulava- ‘thank-offering’. Of a more profound nature are similarities in morphology (adjectival suffixes -s- and -l-), the system of (pro)nominial declension (genitive-dative singular in -s or -l, ablative-locative in -τ(l)i or -r(l)i), nominative plural in -i, genitive plural in -ai > -e) and verbal conjugation (3rd person singular of the present-future in -τ(l)i), the use of sentence introductory particles (va-, nac, nu-), enclitic conjunctions (-c or -γ, -m), negative adverbs (n'ex or n'ix), etc. On the basis of these features, Etruscan can be classified as most closely related to Luwian hieroglyphic of the Early Iron Age (adjectival suffixes -asi- and -ali-, sentence introductory particle wa-, negative verb nas), but in certain aspects already showing developments characteristic of Lycian (genitive plural in -ai > -e) and Lydian (dative singular in -l, loss of closing vowel in the ablative-locative ending, sentence introductory particle nak, enclitic conjunction -k) of the Classical period. Finally, Etruscan shows a number of deviations from Luwian which it shares with Lemnian, like the 3rd person singular ending of the past tense in -ce, -ke or -γe, the vocabulary word avil(l)- ‘year’, and the enclitic conjunction -m ‘and’. Considering the fact that the Lemnos stele contains a dating-formula bearing reference to a certain Holiaie from Phokaia, who is specified as king (va-nacastal < Greek (v)anaks) over the Myrmians and Seronians, the places of which, on the analogy of Phokaia, are likely to be situated in Aiolia, these deviations may plausibly be ascribed to the dialect of the indigenous population of Mysia. If so, the linguistic evidence coincides remarkably with the results from our archaeological investigation according to which we were already able to posit a crucial role for Mysia in the colonization process. Notwithstanding...
standing his mistaken chronology, Herodotos, while not telling the whole story in all its nuances, has certainly transmitted a tradition which in its nucleus may safely be considered historically correct.

We still have to answer the following question: why did Luwian population groups from western Asia Minor take the boat and sail to Italy in order to settle in the country of the Umbrians? In an attempt to address this question, it is important to note that the excavations at the island of Pithecussae, alongside Phoenician (to be more specific Aramaeans)\(^\text{711}\) and Greek inscriptions, have produced what should be called proto-Etruscan ones dating to the period of c. 750 to 700 BC.\(^\text{712}\) Apparently, the Luwians of western Asia Minor were involved in trade with the indigenous population of Italy for the same reasons as the Phoenicians (to be more specific: Aramaeans)\(^\text{713}\) and Greeks: the metaliferous (especially iron) nature of the regions of the Tolfa hills near Tarquinia, Elba, and Populonia. This situation of precolonial offshore trade in Italy is described by one of our earliest sources with respect to the Tyrsenians, namely Hesiodos. In his Theogony, which dates from the 8th century BC, he informs us that the indigenous kings Agrios and Latinos ruled over the famous Tyrsenians who live very far off mukhāti nēsōn hieiraōn ‘in a recess of the holy islands’!\(^\text{714}\) The motivation to let these trade contacts culminate into actual colonization comes from domestic difficulties: at the end of the 8th century BC Anatolia suffered heavily from the Kimmerian invasion, which overthrew the Phrygian realm of king Midas and terrorized the Lydian realm of the tyrant Gyges.\(^\text{715}\) If you were living along the coast and were acquainted with the route to more peaceful regions, this was the time to pick up your belongings, board on a ship and settle in the metaliferous zone of Italy, where, from a military point of view, the indigenous population was by far inferior!

### 17.5. Additional note: The Indo-Europeanization of Tuscany

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

Thus in the early 3rd millennium BC, Tuscany is characterized by the Rinaldine culture. Typical for this culture is the Tomb of the Widow at Porte San Pietro, which consisted of a single chambered stone-cut catacomb grave of North Pontic steppe type, in which a man was buried with his wife. The skeleton of the man was associated with a stone battle-axe, copper daggers, an arrowhead, and a pot. Skull injuries attested for the skeleton of the woman suggest that she was dispatched on the death of her husband to accompany him in the afterlife according to the likewise North Pontic rite of suttie. Other Rinaldine tombs produced horse remains – a feature pointing once again in the direction of the North Pontic steppe where the animal in question was not only abundantly found but also suggested to have been already domesticated from the 4th millennium BC onwards.\(^\text{716}\)

From a linguistic point of view, it has been observed by Hans Krahe that Tuscany, with names like Alma, Armenta, Aventia, Albinia, Arnus, Elsa, Auser, Ausenna, and Visentios, is included in the distribution of his Old European river names.\(^\text{717}\) These names, which are based on well-attested Proto-Indo-European roots, may well be rooted in the 3rd millennium BC, as their overall distribution, as rightly stressed by Peter Kitson, coincides remarkably with that of the Bell Beaker culture.\(^\text{718}\) Accordingly, the bearers of the Rinaldine culture are likely to be held responsible for the given layer of Old European

\(^{711}\) Buchner 1982: 293.

\(^{712}\) Woudhuizen 1992b: 154 ff. Contra Johnston 1983: 63, who tries to get rid of the un-Greek features by reading the combination of sigma and san in one inscription as sigma and four stroked unstressed nu and byemending the sequence [mi maion] in another inscription as ei[mi + MN ] in the genitive, but the four stroked unstressed nu occurs only in inscriptions of later date (as in the maker-formula jinos m’epotev from c. 700-675 BC) and the verbal form ei[mi], in all of its occurrences in Jeffery 1998, turns up after the personal name it is associated with. Similar criticism also applies to Bartonê & Buchner 1995.

\(^{713}\) Bernal 1991: 192 (with reference to Homerö, Iliad II, 783). For the distinction of Phoenicians at Pithecussae by their burial rites, see now Docter 2000.

\(^{714}\) Theogony 1011-6.

\(^{715}\) Sauter 2000.

\(^{716}\) Mallory 1989: 93-94; 198-201; in my opinion Drews 2004: 15-19 goes too far in discrediting the Dereivka bone cheekpieces as evidence for horse control.

\(^{717}\) Krahe 1962: 304; note that Auser and Ausenna may have been introduced later by the Ausones or Oscans, just like the Ombrone is likely to be named by the Umbrians. The Tiber is the Etruscan and hence latest name of the foremost river in Tuscany (< Luwian Tiwātra– ‘sun-god’), which used to be called Albula (< PIE *alb-, ‘white’) in an earlier period, see Krahe 1964: 53.

\(^{718}\) Kitson 1997: 204-5; cf. Tovar 1977: maps 1-6 with Harrison 1988: 12, map 1. Note that Tuscany is not included in the distribution of the Bell Beaker culture, but the inclusion of the region of Palermo, where a twin catacomb grave from the Aeneolithic Conca d’Oro culture has been found (see de Vries 1976: 210-11), may suggest a connection between the Bell Beaker culture on the one hand and the catacomb culture on the other.
river names in Tuscany.

All in all, then, there can be distinguished at least three different layers in the process of Indo-Europeanization of Tuscany: (1) the bearers of the Rinaldone culture of North Pontic steppe affiliations (3rd millennium BC onwards), (2) the Osco-Umbrians and Latin-Faliscans, which we have held responsible for the introduction of the European Urnfield culture in Italy (12th century BC onwards), and (3) Luwian population groups originating from the north-Aegean and southwest Anatolia, introducing the Orientalizing culture (c. 700 BC onwards). And all this in a region which Massimo Pallottino in a lifelong effort would have us believe (and succeeded in making his fellow Etruscologists believe) to be the home of a pre-Indo-European rest group!

17.5.1. Postscriptum

In an article about Etruscan origins which appeared in BABesch 79 (2004) 51-57, the Etruscologist Bouke van der Meer speaks out in favor of the orientalist thesis, but he does not choose between the two variant models of colonization as presented here, viz. at the end of the Bronze Age or during an advanced stage of the Early Iron Age: in fact, he posits three waves of colonization in sum, namely one c. 1100 BC, a second c. 900 BC, and the third c. 700 BC (p. 55).
CHAPTER 18. THE AENEAS’ SAGA: ETRUSCAN ORIGINS

IN PARVO

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

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

Having pitched their camp in Latium, there evolves a war with the local population, which wants to get rid of the intruders. The war entails a truly epic coalition of forces. On the side of the Latins fight the Caeretan king Mezentius with his son Lausus, who had been driven out of their hometown and had taken refuge with the Rutulians, Aventinus with followers from the Aventine hill, Catillus and Corus with followers from Tibur, Caeculus with followers from Praeneste, Messapus with Faliscan Aequi, Clausus with Sabins, Halaesus with Osci from the region of Cales and the Volturnus, Oebalus with Teleboans from Capri, Ufens with Aequiculi, Umbro from the Marsian hills, Virbius from Egeria’s woods, Camilla with Volsci, Volcens with Latins, and Turnus with his Rutulians. The help of the Greek hero Diomedes (Aeneas’ foe in the Trojan war), residing at Arpi, is called upon, but he refuses to join in. On the side of the Trojans fight Evander with his Arcadians, declared enemies of the Latins, Tarchon with an Etruscan army of undetermined origin, Massicus with followers from Clusium and Cosae, Abas with men from Populonia and Elba, Asilas with men from Pisae, Astitus with followers from Caere, Pyrgi and Graviscae, Cinyrus with Ligurians, and Ocnus and Aulestis with an army from Mantua. In sum, this basically Etruscan coalition is reported to comprise 30 ships. The war ends with the death of the leader of the Italic coalition, Turnus, by the hand of the Trojan leader, Aeneas. (In the version by Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Aeneas – who is married with Latinus’ daughter Lavinia and rules both the Trojans and the Latins at the time of the war with the Rutulians and Mezentius – simply disappears, and the Latins subsequently build a hero-shrine for him.) In the course of the following peace, preluded to in Vergilius’ version of the
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myth, the native Latins will not change their name into Trojans, nor will they change their language and alter their attire and customs, but the Trojans will sink down and merge in the mass, leaving them only the introduction of some new religious rites.728

Some of the elements of the Aeneas’ saga as summarized above can be corroborated by archaeological, epigraphical or historical data. Thus, the reported sojourn of Aeneas with his Trojans on the Thracian coast, according to Hellanikos in Pallene on the Khalkidike, is reflected in the archaeological record by tetradrachms from the nearby city of Aineia, dated to the period before 525 BC, which depict the flight of Aeneas and his wife Creusa from Troy.729 Next, their stay at the court of Dido in the newly founded city of Carthago can only be dated to the period after 814/3 or 813/2 BC – the historical foundation date of the city according to Timaios.730 As the fact that, according to Homeros’ Iliad, Aeneas already fought in the Trojan war, which may well be assigned to c. 1280 BC, is incompatible with a visit by the same person of Carthago in the late 9th or early 8th century BC, i.e. some 5 centuries later, Dionysios of Halikarnassos, whose focus is on chronology, quite consistently rejected the historical validity of this event.731 It should be realized, however, that we are dealing with myth and that in this category of evidence episodes from various periods can be telescoped into a single lifetime. Furthermore, the historical validity of one of the adversaries of the Trojans in their war with the Latins is greatly enhanced by the discovery of an Etruscan inscription from Caere, dated to c. 680/675-650/640 BC, reading

\[ \text{mi Laucies Mezenties} \]

‘(I am) of Lucius Mezentius’.732

Again, this evidence points to a date in the Early Iron Age of the vicissitudes of Aeneas and his Trojans in the west. Finally, in Lavinium, 100 metres southeast of the 13 altars of the Latin League, a heroon has been found dated to the 4th century BC, which has been identified as the heroshrine of Aeneas reported by Dionysios of Halikarnassos in his version of the myth. Now, this heroon is connected with a grave from c. 675-650 BC, containing a few fragments of bone, some 60 vases of impasto and bucchero sottile, and the remnants of a chariot (see Fig. 18.1).733 Clearly, it was believed that the person commemorated by means of the heroon had been buried in the grave underlying the monument, which once again points to a date in the Early Iron Age of Aeneas’ arrival in Latium.

More in general, the alliance of Aeneas with the Etruscans finds its expression in the archaeological record in a scarab734 and a large number of vases from Etruria with scenes from the Aeneas legend, dated to the late 6th and / or early 5th century BC.735 The Etruscan town of Veii even produced cult statues depicting Aeneas carrying his father Anchises, dated to the early or mid 5th century BC.736 As it seems, then, the Etruscans considered the Aeneas saga as part of their cultural heritage. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the poet who fashioned the legend into its most famous form, Publius Vergilius Maro from Mantua, ultimately originates from an Etruscan background, his family name being derived from Etruscan Ver- cna-.737 Yet, the aforesaid heroon at Lavinium should warn us against the oversimplified conclusion of Karl Galinsky, written, it must be admitted, before this sensational find, that ‘when Aeneas appeared in Italy, (…) he belonged to the Etruscans.’738 Rather, we are dealing with a genuinely Latial tradition, which radiated to south Etruria.

The earliest historical source connecting Aeneas with the west is provided by the work of Stesikhoros (early 6th century BC) as preserved for the Tabula Iliaca, which
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shows Aeneas with his father Anchises (holding the *cista sacra*) and son Ascanius bording a ship *eis tēn Hesperian*.\(^{739}\) Next, Hellanikos of Lesbos holds that Aeneas came to Italy from the land of the Molossians, either with Odysseus or after him, and founded the city of Rome, which he named after a Trojan woman called Rōmē.\(^{740}\)

When the date of the foundation of Rome became fixed at 753 BC, however, chronographers and historians faced the problem that one person could not possibly be staged as a combattant in the Trojan war and at the same time be held responsible for the foundation of Rome some five centuries later. Hence, authors from the 4th century BC onwards prefer to attribute the foundation of Rome to a descendant of Aeneas (or of a woman from his Trojan followers),\(^{741}\) culminating into Dionysios of Halikarnassos’ calculation that Romulus is the 17th in descent from Aeneas!\(^{742}\) This process of filling up the time between the Late Bronze Age and an advanced stage of the Early Iron Age is of doubtful historical value: the Italic people had, for instance, almost no separated historical episodes. Considering the aforesaid hero-shrine, the association of Aeneas with Lavinium seems prior to the one with Rome. According to the inscription reported by Dionysios of Halikarnassos to belong to this hero-shrine, Aeneas was worshipped here as a god.\(^{743}\) Further evidence for an Aeneas cult is provided by a cippus from Tor Tignosa, 5 miles inland from Lavinium, dated to the late 4th or early 3rd century BC, which carries the legend

*Lare Aineia d(onum)*

‘Dedication to Lar Aineias’.\(^{744}\)

One of the outstanding deeds with which Aeneas is credited concerns his introduction of the cult of the ancestral Trojan gods, the Penates.\(^{745}\) According to the imagery, he is responsible for saving the *sacra* of the Penates, carried either by his father Anchises in a *cista*\(^{746}\) or by his wife Creusa in a *doliolum*.\(^{747}\) From destruction at the time of the fall of Troy. Now, Timaios (early 3rd century BC) informs us that the holy objects of the sanctuary at Lavinium were kept in a *keramos Trōikos* ‘a Trojan earthen jar’.\(^{748}\)

Rightly, Galinsky connected this information with Livius’ account that during the Gallic invasion in 390 BC the *sacra* of the Roman Penates were placed in two *doliola*, earthen jars.\(^{749}\) That the sanctuary of the Latin League at Lavinium with its 13 altars, which, as we have noted above, lies at a 100 metre distance of Aeneas’ heroon, was indeed dedicated (at least partly) to the cult of the Penates is confirmed by a 6th century BC inscription associated with altar no. 8, reading

Castorei Podloquei-que queris

‘to the kouroi Castor and Pollux’;\(^{750}\)

the Greek Dioskouroi, namely, were identified in literary tradition with the Penates.\(^{751}\) In Etruria, these were also venerated as testified by an early 5th century BC inscription from Tarquinia, reading

*iūn turuce Venel Atelinas Tinæs cliniiaras*

‘Venel Atelinas has given this to the sons of Tin’.\(^{752}\)

It is therefore no contradiction that the inscription of the Dioskouroi is Greek inspired, whereas the altars of the sanctuary are of Etruscan type.\(^{753}\) On the contrary, this threefold identification facilitates us to further explain the popularity of the Aeneas’ saga in southern Etruria.

In our summary of Vergilius’ *Aeneid*, we have seen that as a corollary to the peace between the Trojan colonists and the native Latins, there will, with the exception of
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some new religious rites, be no change of the name of the inhabitants of Latium, nor in their language, customs, and dress. Evidently, the Trojan colonists, in contrast to their Lydian colleagues in Etruria, were not numerous enough to cause a language shift: at any rate the epigraphical evidence shows decisively that the current language remained Latin, not to say that there is not a trace of the language of the Trojan colonists left. What could it have been? To answer this question, it is interesting to note that the name ‘Trojans’ is used to indicate a motley crowd from various regions. Most explicit is the distinction of Lycians, whose Trojan colonists left. What could it have been? To answer

Lydian colleagues in Etruria, were not numerous enough to inhabitants of Latium, nor in their language, customs, and time of Gyges. The only hard evidence comes from another direction: Elymian. In this language, once spoken by

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

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

18.1. Additional note 1: Aeneas’ realm in the Troad

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

This very same region south of mount Ida with which
Aeneas seems to be associated, is also reported to be inhabited by Leleges and / or Kilikes. Thus according to one passage, Altes, the king of the Leleges, is stated to have his residence in Pedasos along the river Sati/noeis, whereas according to another Eition, king of the Kilikes, once lived in Thebes at the foot of the wooded Plakos, where he was killed by Akhilleus during the latter’s afore-mentioned raid in the region. Both the ethnonyms Leleges and Kilikes are indicative of Luwian speaking population groups – the Kilikes for their origin from Cilicia and the Leleges for their being identified with Carians. The latter inference receives further confirmation from the fact that the region south of mount Ida is characterized by place names in -ss-(Lynnessos) and -nth- (Sminthe). Evidently, we are dealing here with settlers from Luwian speaking areas to the south and southeast, who moved across the language border as determined by Dainis (< Luwian tâini- ‘oily’) being the indigenous name of later Greek Elaia (= harbor of Pergamon) into a presumably Thraco-Phrygian milieu.

If our association of Aeneas with a Luwian speaking region south of mount Ida is correct, the information from the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite that the Trojan language as spoken by Aeneas’ father Ankhises is other than Phrygian receives further confirmation as being one of a kinship nature!

18.2. Additional note 2:
Dardanians: A form of Etruscan self-designation

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

The inscriptions run in retrograde direction and read as follows:

2. Z[etus to]k[ar] (dedicated) the boundaries (of)
3. D[ardan]i[v]m the territory) of the Dardanians
4. T[ins] to Dionysos,
5. F 1000 (paces).

In this text, then, the Etruscan settlers in question call themselves Dardanians (Dardanivm, characterized by the Latin genitive plural -om in Etruscan disguise), after Dardanos, the mythical ancestor of Aeneas. Now, in form of Drdny the latter ethnonym is first recorded as an indication of the allies of the Hittites from the Troad in the Egyptian memorial of the battle at Kadesh (1274 BC). Furthermore, Dardanians is synonymous with Trojans in Homeros’ Iliaid, and more in specific used here for the
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followers of Aeneas. The ultimate homeland of their mythical ancestor Dardanos is reported by the literary sources to be situated in Arkadia in the Greek Peloponnese – which coincides with our assumption that the inhabitants of the Troad were kinsmen of the Thraco-Phrygian or Pelasgian population groups of Middle Helladic Greece.

Whatever the extent of this latter deduction, there can be little doubt that Vergilius’ location of Dardanos’ ultimate homeland in Italy results from a secondary intervention to stage Aeneas’ peregrination as a return to his ancestral lands.
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CHAPTER 19. PHILISTINES AND PELASGIANS

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

This information from the literary sources can be backed up by evidence from archaeology. It occurs, namely, that the archaeological culture of Philistia shows signs of discontinuity in the transitional period from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age. Asdod, its harbor Tel Mor, and Askelon are characterized by destruction layers, and Ekron by at least some local destruction at the time. The level after the destruction at these sites (with the exception of Tel Mor) contains locally produced Mycenaean IIIIC1b pottery – the hallmark of the settlement of Sea Peoples –, which subsequently develops without a break into the so-called Philistine ware. Moreover, the Egyptian influence which typifies the Canaanite material culture from before the break does not recur. As it appears, then, conquerors from the Aegean region (including Cyprus), where Mycenaean IIIIC1b is ‘en vogue’ at the time, have wasted existing Canaanite sites, driven out most of the original inhabitants and settled themselves instead. Considering this close correspondence between literary and archaeological data, the projection of the Philistines back in time to the period of the patriarchs probably constitutes an anachronism.

In the Papyrus Harris, Ramesses III claims to have settled the vanquished Sea Peoples, among which our Peleset or Philistines, in strongholds bound in his name. This has induced scholars like Albrecht Alt and William Foxwell Albright to assume that the settlement of the Philistines in Canaan took place under Egyptian supervision. Rightly, Manfred Bietak pointed out that the absence of Egyptian influence in the material culture after the break indicates otherwise. Nevertheless, the continuity of Egyptian influence in the hinterland of the Philistine pentapolis might suggest to us that the Egyptian pharaoh maintained a nominal claim on the land conquered by the Philistines and considered them as vassals guarding his frontiers in like manner as the Frankish kings did with the Normans in the European Middle Ages (see Fig. 19.1).

As duly stressed by Ed Noort, the break between the Canaanite Late Bronze Age and Philistine Early Iron Age in the region under discussion is not an absolute one: the continuity of Canaanite pottery in the Philistine sites indicates that to a certain extent the newcomers from the Aegean mixed with the local Avim population. To this comes that four of the five place names of the Philistine pentapolis, viz. Gaza, Askelon, Asdod, and Gath, are already recorded for Egyptian sources from the El-Amarna period.
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After their settlement in Palestine, the Philistines rose to a position of power in the region owing to their military superiority over the local population, as exemplified by the famous engagement between David and Goliath – which the first mentioned miraculously won against all odds. This military superiority of the Philistines was based on their monopoly of iron production in the region as recorded by the Bible. In the end, however, they were outmatched by a coalition between the Hebrews and the Phoenicians, and became subject to a rapid process of assimilation. There is little information about the Philistine language – we only know that the cities of their pentapolis were headed by a local magistrate called *seren* and that *kōba’* was their word for ‘helmet’, which is usually compared to Hittite *kupaḫ*.

After their settlement in Palestine, the Philistines rose to a position of power in the region owing to their military superiority over the local population, as exemplified by the famous engagement between David and Goliath – which the first mentioned miraculously won against all odds. This military superiority of the Philistines was based on their monopoly of iron production in the region as recorded by the Bible. In the end, however, they were outmatched by a coalition between the Hebrews and the Phoenicians, and became subject to a rapid process of assimilation. There is little information about the Philistine language – we only know that the cities of their pentapolis were headed by a local magistrate called *seren* and that *kōba’* was their word for ‘helmet’, which is usually compared to Hittite *kupaḫ*.
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*Fig. 19.1. Settlement of the Sea Peoples in the Levant and the remains of the Egyptian sphere of influence (from Bietak 1993: 295, Fig. 4)*

---

799 1 Samuel 13:19-23. For the distribution of iron objects in the eastern Mediterranean largely neglecting Anatolia, see Buchholz 1999: 710-11, Abb. 109-10.

800 Bonfante 1946: 258; Machinist 2000: 63-64.


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

804 Waldbaum 1966.


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


sources – a view first ventilated by Etienne Fourmont in 1747 and since then defended by a substantial number of scholars. The Pelasgians, namely, are recorded among the population groups on Crete since the time of Homeroes, who, as we have seen in Chapter 9, in many respects reflects Late Bronze Age history. Now, the Pelasgians are a population group which inhabited mainland Greece prior to the first Greeks, and were driven by them first to Thessaly and later to the Aegean islands and the western coast of Asia Minor. As far as the evidence goes, the Pelasgians came to Crete under the leadership of Teutamos (corrupted into †Tektamos in most manuscripts), who married the daughter of the Cretan king Kretheus and with her begat Asterios, the father of the later kings Minos, Rhadamanthys, and Sarpedon. As king Minos epitomizes the period of the Cretan thalassocracy, the Pelasgian colonization of Crete must hence have occurred before c. 1600-1450 BC. This emigration from Thessaly to Crete can be backed up by toponymic evidence, since the region of Gortyn in the Mesara plain is characterized by a number of place names, like Lethaios, Boibe, Magnesia, Phalanna, and Phaistos, which are also recorded for Thessaly, whereas an alternative name of Gortyn is Larisa – a typical Pelasgian place name. Moreover, Gortyn itself is based on the same root as Thessalian Gyrtone. On the basis of this evidence, the Pelasgians referred to by Homeroes are likely to be considered as (a component of) the Late Bronze Age population of


811 Odyssey XIX, 177; note that, as argued in Chapter 9, the mention of the Dorians in this passage probably constitutes a later interpolation.

812 Andron of Halikarnassos in Strabo, Geography X, 4, 6; Diodorus of Sicily, The Library of History IV, 6b, 2; cf. ibid. V, 80, 1.


814 In casu Proto-Indo-European (= PIE) *gʰordʰ- ‘town’, which is also present in the Italian TN’s, reportedly diffused by the Pelasgians, Croton and Cortona, Phrygian Gordion, Slavonic gard-, etc., see Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995: 647; Phoenician qrt- as in Carthago (< qrthdšt ‘New Town’), see Eisler 1939.
the Mesara plain – a region, by the way, which like the rest of Crete is characterized by Mycenaean IIIC1b ware in the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples (Fig. 19.4).815

Another advantage of the identification of the Biblical Philistines with the Pelasgians from Greek literary sources is that we can account for the alternative tradition as recorded for the Lydian historian Xanthos according to which the Philistines originated from Lydia.816 This tradition has come down to us in two forms, both of which focus on the Philistine town Askelon. First, Athenaios remarks that according to Xanthos the Lydian Mopso captured Atargatis and sunk her with her son Ikhthys in the lake of Askelon.817 Secondly, Stephanos of Byzantion notes with respect to Askelon that according to Xanthos this town was founded by Askelos, the son of Hymenaios and brother of Tantalos, in the reign of the Lydian king Akiamos.818

Now, these traditions only make sense if we realize that the Pelasgians which in Homeros’ Iliad II, 840-3 sided with the Trojans are plausibly situated by Strabo in the region of Larisa Phrikonis along the Hermos river – far enough from Troy to justify the use of the word tēle ‘far away (from his home town Larisa)’ in connection with the death of the Pelasgian leader Hippothoos.819

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

816 Albright 1975: 512.

817 Deipnosophistai VIII, 346e. Note that the personal name Mopso, which on the basis of the related geographical name Mosopia originates from *Mopsops, belongs to the same type as Phrygian Pelops, Phainops, and Merops, all showing as second element a reflex of PIE *h₂ekʷ- ‘to see’. Hence, the Phrygian place name Mosoupolis and the ethnonym Mosolanoi, with the breakdown of the original labiovelar [kʷ] (cf. Linear B Moqoso) into velar [k] like in Luwian hieroglyphic Mūkas instead of into labial [p] like in Greek Mopsos and Phoenician Mpš. For attestations of Mopso in the intermediary regions of Pamphylia and Cilicia, see Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 316-22.

818 Etnnica, s.v. Askelôn.

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

820 Mee 1978: 148; cf. Hope Simpson 1981: 206, who distinguishes as many as three building phases in Mycenaean IIIC1b for
As such, it is certainly possible that the Pelasgians, either from Crete and/or the west coast of Lydia (especially for Askelon), are responsible for the introduction of Mycenaean IIIIC1b ware in Philistia.

If our identification of the Biblical Philistines with the Pelasgians from Greek literary sources applies, we enlarge our basis for linguistic analysis considerably. According to Herodotos, the Pelasgians of Kreston, who originated from Thessaly, speak the same language as their tribesmen in Plakia and Skylake on the Hellespont, who once lived with the Athenians. Thucydides adds to this information that the Pelasgians of Akte, who are of origin Tyrrenhians once living in Lemnos and Attica, are bilingual and speak Greek next to their own language. Now, as the Pelasgians in mainland Greece appear to be ancestral to their kinsmen in the north-Aegean region (and western Anatolia), it seems advisable to have a look at them first. An interesting tradition in this respect is formed by the story of the Pelasgian king of Argos, Akrisios, son of Abas and brother of Proitos, who in fear of his grandson Perseus flees from his hometown to Larisa in Thessaly under the rule of the like-wise Pelasgian king Teutamides. Here we encounter at least one clearly Indo-European name, Teutamias, which is based on the PIE stem *teut- ‘society, folk, people’. The same root is also attested for the name of the leader of the Thessalian Pelasgians in their journey to Crete. Teutammos, referred to above, and that of the grandfather of the Pelasgian leaders in the Trojan war, Teutamidēs, probably a patronymic. It is particularly relevant to our purposes to note that this root occurs in the New Phrygian form teutous and in the Thracian man’s name (= MN) Tautomedes, etc. Furthermore, Abas is the hero epo-nym of the Abantes, a Thracian tribe. Finally, Akrisios and Proitos have closely related Phrygian counterparts in the divine name Arkiasia and the root of the magistracy proîtavos respectively. The impression we gain from these examples, is that Pelasgian, insofar as onomastics is significant in this respect, may well be an Indo-European language of Thraco-Phrygian type. Further instances can be adduced to emphasize this point, like Adrastos, corresponding to the Phrygian MN Adrastos, and Arkas, related to the root of the Phrygian patronymic Arkiae-vas.

The situation is different with the Pelasgians in western Anatolia. Thus, it is reported by Strabo that at the time of their foundation of Kume, the Aiolian Greeks have to cope with the resistance of the local Pelasgians under the leadership of Piasos. The latter personal name is clearly based on the root of Luwian piya ‘to give’ as present in Luwian names of the type Piyamaradus and Natribijemmi (= the Lycian equivalent of Greek Apollokoros or Apollo- dotos). An Anatolian background seems also plausible for the Pelasgians who according to Hellanikos of Lesbos under the leadership of Nanas, son of Teutamides, are reported to have colonized Cortona in Italy. At any rate,

821 Strabo, Geography XIII, 3, 3; Dionysios Periegetes as presented by Lochner-Hütenbach 1960: 59.
822 Herodotos, Histories I, 57.
823 Peloponnesian War IV, 109.
824 Since the expression Pelasgikon Argos is used both for the Thessalian (Homeros, Iliad II, 682) and Argive (Sakellariou 1977: 205, note 4) town of this name, Argos (cf. PIE *ḥerδ-, ‘bright, white’) may well be considered a Pelasgian place name, which would add further substance to the Indo-European nature of this people.
825 Lochner-Hütenbach 1960: 3 (Pherekydes of Athens, Fragmente der griechischen Historiker 3 F 12); 4 (Hellanikos of Lesbos F 91); 29-30 (Apollodoros of Athens); cf. 23 (Kallimachos); 160 (general discussion).
827 See note 812 above.
828 Homeros, Iliad II, 840-3. Note that the Late Bronze Age date of this onomastic element is emphasized by its presence in Linear B ta-ut-ak-ro-ro, see Charniater 1958: 127.
the personal name *Nanas, which is paralleled for Lydian, Lycian, and Cilician sources, ultimately originates from the Luwian kinship term *nani- ‘brother’ – a typical Luwian reflex of PIE *n-gén-h₂. Finally, it deserves attention in this connection that the king of the Pelasgians at Lemnos at the time of the invasion by the Athenian Miltiades (c. 510 BC) is called Hermòn⁸⁴¹ – a name paralleled for a Lydian king⁸⁴² and likely to be based upon the Luwian onomastic element *Arna-.⁸⁴³ If we confine ourselves to this latter class of evidence, the Pelasgian language might well come into consideration as an Indo-European vernacular of Luwian type.

Is it feasible to assume that the Pelasgians from Greece, who at the outset spoke a Thraco-Plyrian language, with the change of their habitat to western Anatolia also went over to speak a Luwian dialect? We can go into this matter a little further if we realize that the distinction of the Pelasgians from the Tyrrhenians is a futile one: for almost every location where Tyrrhenians are attested,⁸⁴⁴ one finds evidence for Pelasgians as well.⁸⁴⁵ Apparently, Thucydides is right in considering the Tyrrhenians a sub-group of the Pelasgians – who after all have a wider distribution over the Aegean. In line with this deduction, the Lemnos stele (c. 600 BC), which is generally agreed to be conducted in the Tyrrhenian language, may inform us about Pelasgian just as well. At any rate, the two versions of the dating formula inform us that the monument was erected during the reign of the Phokaian Holai (= Pelasgian Holaiatς)⁸⁴⁶ who is specified as king over the Myrinians and Seronians in the Aiolian coastal zone of Mysia – i.e. precisely the region where we situate the Pelasgian allies of the Trojans at the time of the Trojan war (see above).⁸⁴⁷ Now, the language of the Lemnos stele shows some features, like the titular expression *vanaca-‘king’ and the 3rd person singular of the past tense in -ke, which are unparalleled for Luwian and rather point to a relationship with Phrygian (dating formula midai lavagai evanaktei ‘during the military leadership and kingship of Midas’)⁸⁴⁸ and / or Greek (Mycrenaean wa-na-ka, Homeric anaks ‘king’; kappa-perfectum).⁸⁴⁹ This relation of the Tyrrhenian or Pelasgian language with (pre-)Greek can be further illustrated by pointing to the correspondence of Etruscan hutʰ ‘4’, netivis or netvis ‘haruspex’, puia ‘wife’, purðhe or purtsna ‘prytanis’, tura (form of address of Aphrodite), to (pre-)Greek ἡττηνία ‘Tetrapolis’, νέδας ‘entails’, oπαῦ ‘to take as wife’, prutanis ‘ruler’, and turannos ‘tyrant’, respectively.⁸⁵⁰ On the basis of this evidence, then, it may safely be concluded that the Tyrrhenian or Pelasgian ancestors of the later Etruscans, although basically speaking a Luwian vernacular at least since the time of their move to western Anatolia,⁸⁵¹ had a long history of contact with (pre-)Greek, which can only be accounted for if the literary tradition about the original habitat of the Tyrpheno-Pelasgians in Attica is historically valid.⁸⁵²

What remains to be discussed is the language of the Pelasgians whom we have seen reason to identify as (a component of) the Late Bronze Age population of the Me-

⁸⁴² Strabo, Geography XIII, 1, 65; Beekes 2002: 214.
⁸⁴³ Houwink ten Cate 1961: 131-4.
⁸⁴⁴ Thucydides, Peloponnesian War IV, 109 (Attica, Lemnos, Akte); Stephanos of Byzantion, Εθνικα, s.v. Μετασ = town named after the Tyrrhenian Μετασ (Lesbos); Philogoras, frg. 5 (Imbros); Neanthes, frg. 30: the brother of Pythagoras is called Τυρρήνος (Samos); Suidas, s.v. Τερμερία κακά (Termerion on the coast of Caria); Stephanos of Byzantion, Εθνικα, s.v. Ελυμία (coast of Macedonia); Lycophron, Αλέξανδρα 1245-9 (Mysia); Herodotos, Histories I, 94 (Lydia); and Conon, Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker 26 F 1 (Kyzikos); cf. Schachermeyr 1929: 262-76. Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopaedie, s.v. Τυρρηνεα; and Beekes 2002: 226-7.
⁸⁴⁵ Herodotos, Histories I, 137-40 (Attica, Lemnos); ibid. I, 57 (Kreston in Akte); Diodoros of Sicily, The Library of History 5, 2, 4 (Lesbos); Herodotos, Histories V, 26, Antikleides of Athens in Strabo, Geography V, 2, 4 (Imbros); Dionysios Periegetes (Samos); Menekrates of Elaia (Mykalé in Caria); Strabo, Geography XIII, 3, 2-3 (Larisa Phrikonis); Scholia Graeca in Homerī Ilaudem (Adamyttion); Conon, Fragmenta der griechischen Historiker 26 F 1 (Antandros, Kyzikos); cf. Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960, passim.
⁸⁴⁶ Fick 1905: 104.
⁸⁴⁸ Brixe he & Lejeune 1984: M-01; Woudhuizen 1993a: 2.
⁸⁴⁹ Charsekin 1963: 28; 48; 65 compares Etruscan τουροῦ to Greek διδρόθε (‘to give’); for code-mixing in a bilingual environment, see Adams, Janse & Swain 2002.
⁸⁵⁰ Schachermeyr 1929: 248; van der Meer 1992: 68; see further Chapter 24.
⁸⁵¹ See Chapter 17 on Etruscan origins above.
⁸⁵² Note that if the story of the building of the wall on the Athenian acropolis by the Pelasgians (Herodotos, Histories VI, 137-40) is correct, their presence in Attica can even be dated archaeologically to the period of the 15th to 13th century BC, see Broneer 1956: 12-13.
sara plain in Crete. Now, there are three types of script recorded for Crete: hieroglyphic, Linear A, and Linear B. Of these, Linear B is either introduced from the Greek mainland or developed at Knossos after the period of the desastrous Santorini eruption at the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC), which marks the end of the Minoan thalassocracy and presents the Mycenaean Greeks the opportunity to take over control of the weakened island. It is found mainly in the palace of Knossos, but also at Khania. 853 Since its decipherment by the British architect Michael Ventris in 1952, we know that it is used to write an early form of the Greek language, the so-called Mycenaean Greek. 854 Simultaneously with the Linear B archives at Knossos, which date to the period of Late Minoan II to Late Minoan IIIA1/2 (c. 1450-1350 BC), modest Linear A archives of about 150 tablets in sum are found in Hagia Triada – the harbor town of the palace of Phaistos in the Mesara. 855 This latter script is recorded for Phaistos from the Middle Minoan II period (c. 1800-1700 BC) onwards, 856 but in the course of time spread all over the island and, in the time of the Minoan thalassocracy, even beyond to the islands in the Aegean, Ayios Stephanos in mainland Greece, and Miletos and Troy in western Asia Minor. 857 As first suggested by Cyrus Gordon, Linear A is used to write a Semitic language. Thus, Gordon pointed out that the Linear A equivalent in the Hagia Triada (= HT) corpus of Linear B to-so ‘total’, in his reading with Linear B values ku-ro, corresponds to Hebrew koll ‘all’. Furthermore, he convincingly identified pot names, which appear in direct association with their image on tablet HT 31, with Semitic counterparts. 858 This work was supplemented by Jan Best, who, amongst others, showed that the Linear A equivalents in the HT corpus of Linear B a-pu-do-si ‘delivery’ and e-pe-ro ‘deficit’ read, with their original Linear A values, te-lu and ki-lu, which forms recall Akkadian išār ‘Einkünfte, Ertrag’ and kalû(m) as in ešša kalû(m) ‘Pachtgabe schuldig bleiben’, respectively. 859 In addition to this, he compared the transaction term pu-kā in HT 31 to Akkadian pūtu ‘exchange’ and the element pū-tū, which is used in association with ku-lū on the back side of tablet HT 122 in a similar way as Linear B pa with to-so for to-so-pa ‘grand total’, to Akkadian pātu ‘front side’, leading to the interpretation of pū-tu-ku-lū as ‘total with the front side included’. 860 Definite proof, however, of the west-Semitic nature of the language of Linear A came with Best’s unravelling of the libation formula frequently attested for wash-hand stone-basins from peak-sanctuaries destroyed at the end of Middle Minoan III (c. 1600 BC), which presents a full phrase and reads

(y)a-tu-nū-û wa/u-ya (y)a-di ḥi-te-te (y)a-sa-sa-ra-ma/he

‘I have given (Ugaritic yēd, -t) and (Ugaritic wā, -y) my hand (Ugaritic yēd, -t) has made an expiatory offering (Ugaritic ytn, -t), Oh Assara (Hebrew GN Asherah, Ugaritic ytn, -m).’ 861

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

a-tu-nu-i de-ka a-re ma-re-na ti-ti-ku

‘I, Titikos, have given this to our guild-master’

on a pithos from Epano Zakro, usually assigned to the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC). 862

However, the fact that Linear A records a west-Semitic language is not the end of our inquiry into the languages of Crete. We still need to discuss the hieroglyphic script. This is found from the beginning of the Old Palace phase in the Early Minoan III / Middle Minoan IA transitional period (c. 2000 BC) onwards both in the regions of Knossos and Malia in the north and the Mesara plain in the south. 863 Hieroglyphic archives are attested for the palaces of Knossos and Malia in the Middle Minoan II (c. 1800-1700 BC) period, when the script is even exported to Samothrace in the north-Aegean. 864 Most of the seals with an hieroglyphic legend consist of chance finds, and are

856 Vandenabeele 1985: 18.
857 Vandenabeele 1985: 18 (Kea, Melos, Thera, Kythera); Niemeier 1996 (Miletos); Godart 1994 and Faure 1996 (Troy).
859 Best 1973: 54-55.
860 Best 2000: 29, note 8. For the identification of the transaction on HT 31 as an exchange of tens of vessels for silver and hundreds and thousands of vessels for gold, respectively, see Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 1-7.
862 Best 2000: 3a; for yet another Linear A inscription with a-re, see the gold ring from Mavro Spelio (= Best 1982-3ab: 22-25).
therefore not archaeologically datable. But from the fact that some of the hieroglyphic signs are taken over by the Cyprians at the time they devised the Cypro-Minoan script (= c. 1525-1425 BC), it can be deduced that the use of the script continued into the Late Minoan I period (c. 1550-1450 BC). Finally, the double-axe of Arkalokhori and the famous discus of Phaistos, which bear hieroglyphic inscriptions of unusual length, can positively be assigned to the period of Late Minoan II to Late Minoan IIIA1/2 (c. 1450-1350 BC). After this period, the tradition of writing in hieroglyphs, like that of Linear A, is discontinued – having succumbed to the Mycenaean koinē.

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

1. SASA UTNA/2. /sâ-ḫur-wa/ 3. la+PÁRANA TARKU-MUWA

‘seal (with respect to) the land (of) Skheria, king Tarkumuwas’.

As Skheria can be identified as the ancient name of Hagia Triada, the seal, although found in Malia, nonetheless informs us about the situation in the Mesara. The second seal is # 296 of undetermined findspot, which for the use of three Linear A signs may be assigned to the period after c. 1800 BC and reads:

1. SASA UTNA SARU 2. PÁRA-tá-rú 3. pi-ni 4. pa-ya-ki

‘seal (with respect to) the land (and) official(s) (of) the Phaiakians, representative Bartaras’.

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

The foregoing conclusion can be further underlined if we take a look at the evidence from the Late Minoan IIIA1
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period. As noted above, the corpus of Hagia Triada texts is conducted in the Semitic language. From slips of the pen, however, it is deducible that the primary language of the scribes happens to be Luwian. Thus, in the sequence te-li-da-ku-se-ne-ti ‘delivery to Taku-šenni’ from HT 104 the dative singular is expressed by the ending -ti, which recalls the Luwian hieroglyphic pronominal ending of the dative singular – used in the realm of the noun as well in the related Cyprian dialect (te- lu sa-na-me-ti ‘delivery to Sanemas’).877 Furthermore, in HT 28 and 117 mention is made of u-mi-na-si, which appears to be an adjectival derivative of the Luwian hieroglyphic root umina -‘town’.878 Finally, the functionary in the heading of HT 31 is designated as mi-ti-sa – an honorific title paralleled for Luwian hieroglyphic texts.879 The Luwian nature of the primary language of the inhabitants of the Mesara plain is further exampified by the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the double-axe from Arkalokhori and the Phaistos disc, especially the latter of which bears testimony of a local Luwian dialect (a- tu instead of ă- tă ’in’, u- pa instead of APA- ’after, behind’).880 Now the Phaistos disc, which, as we have seen in Chapter 15, according to the reading and interpretation recently put forward by a Dutch group of scholars (cf. note 876) consists of a letter to the Akhaian king Nestor by an Anatolian great king likely to be identified as Tarḫündaradus of Arzawa, is particularly of interest to our purposes as it informs us that the king of Phaistos is called Kunawa. This name, which in the form ku-ne-u is also attested for the Linear B tablets from Knossos,881 bears a close resemblance to Gouneus, the leader of the Peribians and the people from Dodona and the Peneios region in Thessaly at the time of the Trojan war.882 To all probabil-

877 Meijer 1982: 60; Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 123; Woudhuizen 1992a: 96. See also Chapter 12, note 500, above.
879 Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 4. For Luwian hieroglyphic, see Karkamis A6, phrase 7; Kuhlu I, phrase 1; Sultanhan, phrases 1 and 13; Karatepe, phrase 1; Bulgharad, phrase 1, as presented in Hawkins 2000; cf. Woudhuizen 2004a: EIA [Early Iron Age] index, s.v. In the light of the Luwian hieroglyphic evidence, the final syllable -sa is the communal nominative singular ending. On the topic of code-switching in a bilingual environment, see Adams, Janse & Swain 2002.
881 Ventris & Chadwick 1973: glossary, s.v.
882 Homer, Iliad II, 748-55; Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 76; 83. According to Simonides (= Strabo, Geography IX, 5, 20) the Peribians (= Homeric Peribians) are Pelasgiotes. Note that the

19.1. Additional note 1: Pelasgians in Italy

Pelasgian population groups are not only recorded for the Aegean, but also for Italy.885 Of the latter, it is absolutely

883 Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie, s.v. Philister; Dothan 1982: 22; Machnin 2000: 63-64; Indo-European more in general is the genitive in -š as recorded for the patronyms in a Philistine inscription from Tell Gemme, dated to the 7th century BC, see Garbini 1997: 244.
885 For an overview, see Briquel 1984.
clear that they ultimately originated from the Aegean, and hence bear testimony of migration from east to west. When did such a migration take place? In order to answer this question it is relevant to note that Pelasgians colonizing the north of Italy were confronted with Umbrians, whereas their colleagues preferring the south had to drive out Auronissi (= variant form of Aurunci, a Latin indication of Oscans). Accordingly, the migration in question can only be situated after the arrival of the Umfeld ancestors of the Oscans and Umbrians in Italy at the end of the Bronze Age (see Chapter 17), which means in the course of the Early Iron Age. In southern Etruria and Latium, the Pelasgians are reported to have stumbled upon Sicels, which is more problematic to situate in the Early Iron Age, because the latter were already kicked out of this environment by the Umbrians and the Opicans (= Greek indication of the Oscans) apparently at the turn of the Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age. Their presence in central Italy at the arrival of the Pelasgians may therefore well be due to an anachronism of our source, Dionysios of Halikarnassos, basing himself on antiquarian relics.

As we have seen in the above, there is reason to believe that the Pelasgians in the Aegean region are actually identical with the Tyrrhenians recorded for the same area. This identification by and large holds good for their kinsmen in Italy as well, but not in every case. Thus, the Pelasgian presence at Caere is clearly distinct from the subsequent one of the Tyrrhenians, identified as Lydians. At the time of the Pelasgians, the site is called Agylla. When the Lydians attacked the site, so the story goes, one of them asked how it is called. A Pelasgian, not under-standing the question, saluted him in Greek: khaire. As a consequence, the Lydians believed the site to be called like this and rebaptized it Caere. Similarly, the Arkadians at Rome headed by Evander, who are likely to be identified with the Pelasgians reported for the same site, are clearly distinct from the Tyrrhenians to the north at the time of the arrival of Aeneas and his Trojan companions (see Chapter 18). As a final example of relevance here, it may be put forward that the Pelasgians at Pisa, called Teutones, Teutoni or Teutae, are considered to be Greek speaking, whereas at a later time the dominant language here became Lydian.

If we realize that the name of the leader of the Pelasgians at Rome, Evander, constitutes a Greek formation, being a compound of eu ‘good’ with anēr (G andros) ‘man’, the distinctive feature of these Pelasgian groups as opposed to the Tyrrhenians appears to be their Greek or Greek-like language. In the present chapter, however, we have experienced that language is not a defining ‘criterium’ for Pelasgians in the Aegean during the Late Bronze Age, as they may speak either Greek-like Thraco-Phrygian when in an European environment or Luwian when in an Anatolian environment, or even Semitic as a secondary language when in a Cretan environment to keep up with the international standards of the time. As such, the distinction between Pelasgians and Tyrrhenians in the given Italian situations results from secondary interference by later historians. Nevertheless, it allows us to assume that the homeland of some Pelasgians must be sought in those sections of the Aegean where Greek or Greek-like Thraco-Phrygian was spoken at the time of departure, whereas that of others in sections of the Aegean where Luwian or Luwian-like then predominated. Finally, it deserves our attention that the Greek-like language of some of the Pelasgians in Italy for the presence of the roots *h₂nēr- ‘man, strength’, *sal- or *sēh₂- ‘salt’ (as in the T[own N[ame] Alsiu[m]), and *teut₂- ‘society, folk, people’ may further underline its overall Indo-European nature.

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

In his Geography, Strabo informs us about Regisvilla – the

886 Justinus, Epitoma historiarum philippicarum Pompei Trogi XX, 1, 11 (Spina); Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Roman Antiquities I, 20, 4 (Cortona); II, 49, 1 (ager Reatinus).
887 Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Roman Antiquities I, 21, 3.
889 Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Roman Antiquities I, 22, 4-5.
890 Cf. Briquel 1984: 300-1. Note in this connection the Sicel nature ascribed to Saturnus at Cutiliae in the text of an oracle once given to the Pelasgians about their future homeland and recorded on a tripod from their sanctuary at Dodona (Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Roman Antiquities I, 19), whereas, as we have seen four footnotes up, the population of the ager Reatinus, to which Cutiliae belongs, in effect consisted of Umbrians at the time of its actual colonization by Pelasgians.
891 Strabo, Geography V, 2, 3.
892 Eustathius in his commentary on Dionysios Periegetes 347; cf. Briquel 1984: 456, esp. note 83. Note that according to Strabo, Geography V, 2, 4 an Arkadian origin is already attributed to the Pelasgians by Hesiodos.
893 Briquel 1984: 304-5.
The Tyrrhenian Pisaios was ascribed to the Pelasgian or Tyrrhenian Maleos, but also to Lydian kings. In the late Archaic period, it is interesting to note that a Tyrrhenian Maleos or Maleoteōs is actually recorded for Attica in connection with the feast of Aiora. Now, the Tyrrhenians who once lived with the Athenians were notorious for their piracy, and it hence comes as no surprise that an excellent site for piratical raids like cape Malea is reported to have been named after their leader Maleos. This very same Maleos, then, is also credited with the invention of the trumpet – a handy instrument for the coordination of military and piratical action. (The dedication of a stone in the harbor of Vulci – that it once used to be the seat of the palace of Maleos, a Pelasgian king. After having reigned here, this king is said to have moved with his Pelasgian followers to Athens. In line with the latter reference, it is interesting to note that a Tyrrhenian Maleos or Maleoteōs is actually recorded for Attica in connection with the feast of Aiora. Now, the Tyrrhenians who once lived with the Athenians were notorious for their piracy, and it hence comes as no surprise that an excellent site for piratical raids like cape Malea is reported to have been named after their leader Maleos. This very same Maleos, then, is also credited with the invention of the trumpet – a handy instrument for the coordination of military and piratical action.

(The dedication of a stone in the harbor of Phaistos to Poseidon is also ascribed to a certain Maleos, but we do not know whether this refers to one and the same person. Note in this connection that in form of Marewa or Marevo (genitive) or Mareu the name in question is already attested for Linear B inscriptions from Malia and Pylos, respectively.

The invention of the trumpet, however, is not only ascribed to the Pelasgian or Tyrrhenian Maleos, but also to the Tyrrhenian Pisaios or Tyrrhenos or his son – which evidently keeps us in the sphere of influence of the Tyrrhenian-Pelasgian, or the Lydian Mēlās, a son of Herakles and Omphale. The latter name cannot be dissociated from that of Mēlēs, a predecessor of the Lydian king Kandaules (= the one murdered by the first ruler of the Mermnades, Gyges) who ruled in the second half of the 8th century BC. The Lydian nature of this name is further emphasized by the attestation in an epichoric Lydian inscription of Me-la-ē-, an adjectival derivative in -ē of Me-lā-ēs.

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

Anyhow, whatever the merits of the Tyrrheno-Pelasgian or Lydian claims, one thing seems clear, namely that the priority of the use of the trumpet lies with the Egyptians, as in the reliefs of Medinet Habu we see an Egyptian trompeteer coordinating the movements of a contingent of foreign (in casu Sherden and other Sea Peoples’) mercenaries (see Fig. 21.1.b)!

---

984 Strabo, Geography V, 2, 8.
987 Scholiast ad Statius, Thebaid IV, 224; VII, 16; VI, 382; cf. Briquel 1984: 266.
988 Soudas, s.v. Maleos; cf. Briquel 1984: 266.
989 Best 1996-7: 123 (who less likely connects Mareus, etc.).
994 Strabo, Geography 22, 1; Pedley 1972: 19; Briquel 1991: 82-83 and note 285.
996 Strabo, Geography 22, 1; Pedley 1972: 19; Briquel 1991: 82-83 and note 285.
997 Woudhuizen 1982-3: 99-100, Fig. 7a-c (distinct type of meander); Woudhuizen 1992a: 155-7, Fig. 2 (inscription mi Maion).
CHAPTER 20. TEUKROI, AKAMAS, AND TROJAN GREY WARE

The Tjeker of the Egyptian sources, who are mentioned among the Sea Peoples attacking Egypt in the fifth and eighth year of Ramesses III (= 1179 and 1176 BC), and are later recorded in the Wen-Amon story (1076-1074 BC) as inhabitants of the region of Dor in the Levant, have been identified with the Teukroi of Greek literary tradition by Lauth in 1867.908 This identification was subsequently taken over by François Chabas,909 and after him, the majority of the authors on the topic.910 As a minority view, however, it has been proposed by Harry Reginald Hall to identify the Tjeker rather with the Sikeloi of Greek literary tradition.911 The latter view received new impetus by Elmar Edel’s argument that Egyptian [t] as a rule corresponds with the Hebrew samekh.912 However, a serious disadvantage of the latter line of approach is that the Shekelesh would remain without proper identification. Moreover, the equation of Tjeker with the Teukroi receives further emphasis from archaeological as well as historical evidence (see below), whereas the one with the Sikeloi does not, for which reason in the following we will stick to the majority view.

The Teukroi and their heros eponym Teukros are definitely at home in the Troad. According to Herodotos, remnants of the ancient Teukroi are, under the name of Gergithai, still traceable for the Troad at the beginning of the 5th century BC.913 A problem is posed, however, by the fact that the Teukroi are not straightforwardly associated with the Troad in our Late Bronze Age sources. Thus,914 in the Egyptian list of the Hittite allies at the battle of Kadesh (1274 BC) troops from the region of the Troad are referred to as Drdny ‘Dardanians’. It is, of course, possible that, like in the case of the Mycenaean Greeks being called Tanarw ‘Danai’ by the Egyptians but ἀθῆσαν ‘Akhaiai’ by the Hittites, the Egyptians preferred a different ethnonym from the Hittites, but because of the silence in the Hittite sources on this point we do not know for sure. What the Hittite sources do tell us is that in the reign of the Hittite great king Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC) the region of Wilusa (= Greek Ilion) is reigned by a certain Alaksandas, whose name recalls the Homeric Alexandros alias Paris.915 Now, in Herodotos’ version of the story of the abduction of Helena, according to which an unfavorable wind brings Paris and his company to Egypt, Paris is called of Teukrian birth.916 In this manner, then, a direct link between Alaksandas of Wilusa from the Hittite sources and the Teukroi from the Greek ones can be established.

As far as the ultimate origins of the Teukroi are concerned, there are three different versions of myth. In the first place, we have the autochthonous version according to which the heros eponym Teukros is the son of the river-god Skamandros and a nymph of mount Ida; in this version his daughter Bateia married with Dardanos, the heros eponym of the Dardanians – as we have seen the Egyptian demomination of the inhabitants of the Troad.917 Secondly, we have the Cretan version which holds that the Teukroi were colonists from Crete who settled in Hamaxitos918 and introduced the cult of the goddess Kybele.919 In archaeological terms, this version of the myth might be linked up with the radiation of Minoan influence to nearby Samothrace as deducible from the discovery of Cretan hieroglyphic sealings of the ‘libation formula’-type, dated to the end of Middle Minoan II or to Middle Minoan III920 and even to Troy itself in form of Linear A inscriptions found there.921

908 Wainwright 1961: 75.
909 Chabas 1872: 296.
913 Herodotos, Histories V, 122; VII, 43.
915 Gurney 1990: 46.
916 Herodotos, Histories II, 114.
917 Apollodoros, Library III, 12, 1; Diodoros of Sicily, Library of History IV, 75; 1; cf. Strobel 1976: 50.
918 Strabo, Geography XIII, 1, 48; Strobel 1976: 50-51.
919 Vergilius, Aeneid III, 104 ff.; Vürtheim 1913: 4-8; Strobel 1976: 50.
921 Godart 1994; Faure 1996.
It is interesting to note in this connexion that Phrygian Kybele is attested in Luwian form Kupapa for a magic spell to conjure the Asiatic pox in the language of the Keftiu (= Cretans) as preserved in an Egyptian medical papyrus presumably from the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) or one of his forerunners.\textsuperscript{922} Thirdly, there is the Athenian version according to which Teukros ultimately originates from the Attic deme Xytepē\textsuperscript{923} or is staged as the son of Telamon, king of Salamis in Greece.\textsuperscript{924} As duly noted by Einar Gjerstad, this last mentioned form of the myth may have received emphasis from the Athenian policy vis-à-vis Cyprus in the 5th century BC.\textsuperscript{925} At any rate, from an archaeological point of view the mythical relation between the Troad and southern Greece might be reflected in the formal resemblance of the so-called Minyan ware, characteristic of mainland Greece for the Early Helladic III and Middle Helladic periods, with Trojan grey ware (from the beginning of Troy VI onwards)\textsuperscript{926} – a relation which in fact is so close that numerous archaeologists used the term Minyan ware for the latter as well.\textsuperscript{927} This would lead us to the assumption that the inhabitants of the Troad from c. 1800 BC onwards are kinsmen of the Thraco-Phrygian population groups of Middle Helladic Greece – a thesis materialized to some extent by Leonid Gindin.\textsuperscript{928} Note in this connection that in Chapter 14 above on the ethnogenesis of the Greeks we have seen reason for Thraco-Phrygian penetration of Salamis.\textsuperscript{929} The literary tradition on Teukros also contains a number of what appear to be dim reflections of the Tje ker’s partaking in the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. Thus, it is related that Teukros, after the sack of Troy and the banishment of Salamis from Greece by his father Telamon, visited Egypt where he received an oracle about his ultimate destination, Salamis in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{930} Next, the story goes that Teukros visited Sidon on his way to Cyprus and received help from its king Belos (< Semitic Ba’al ‘lord’) in the colonization of Salamis.\textsuperscript{931} Finally, tradition has it that Teukros takes Gergines from the Troad and Mycia with him as prisoners of war during the colonization of Salamis in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{932} Considering the fact that Gergines is an ancient form of Gergithei,\textsuperscript{933} under which name, as we have seen, the Teukroi were living in the Troad at the beginning of the 5th century BC, their being taken as prisoners of war probably results from a rationalization which tries to cope with the situation that Teukros, although being at home in the Troad, fights on the Greek side in the Iliad.

Like the Philistines and Danaoi, a part of the Teukroi evidently founded themselves new homes in the coastal zone of the Levant. At least, in the Wen-Amon story from the first half of the 11th century BC, we are confronted with the fact that the Tje ker, in their new guise, are related that Teukros, after the sack of Troy and the banishment of Salamis in Cyprus,\textsuperscript{934} which here mustered along the banks of the Sangarios about a generation before the Trojan war (c. 1280 BC), became a growing threat to the Hitites from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom period (= early in the 15th century BC), onwards, see von Schuler 1965: 27. Finally, Phrygian penetration into the province of Azzi-ţayasa to the northeast of the Hitite capital Bogazköy / Hattusa in the times of Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC) is personified by Mitra of Pańa, see Chapter 14, esp. note 554, above.

\textsuperscript{922} Woudhuizen 1992a: 1-10; see also Chapter 25 below.

\textsuperscript{923} Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Roman Antiquities I 61; Strabo, Geography XIII, 1, 48; Vürtheim 1913: 8-11; Strobel 1976: 50.

\textsuperscript{924} Euripides, Helen 87-88.

\textsuperscript{925} Gjerstad 1944: 119; cf. Strobel 1976: 52.

\textsuperscript{926} Blegen 1963: 111 who attributes the introduction of grey Minyan ware to the arrival of a new population.

\textsuperscript{927} Heuck Allen 1994: 39 with reference, amongst others, to Schliemann, Blegen, Caskey.

\textsuperscript{928} Gindin 1999: 57-58 (Skauia gates); 62-64 (Kebrionēs); 263 (Laomedōn ho Phrux, and his wife Strumōs), to which may be added the Thracian nature of the personal name Paris. cf. Detusch 1976, s.v., and the Phrygian descent of Priamos’ wife Hekābē (Iliad XVI, 718). Note that the analysis of Priamos < Luwian Pariya-mwas by Watkins 1986: 54 is dubious and that the first element of this personal name is rather linked up with that of local place names like Prōapos, Priēnē and Phrygian Prietēs as stipulated by Kullmann 1999: 197 and Neumann 1999: 16, note 3, and / or the root of the New Phrygian vocabulary word priēs ‘carae’ as per Haas 1966: 225, the latter from the PIE root *priyā- ‘(be)love(d)’, cf. Mayrhofer 1974: 18-19.

\textsuperscript{929} The expansion of the Mycenaean civilization to the north and northeast coincides with population pressure in the direction of northwest Anatolia. Thus, according to Homeros, Iliad III, 184-7, Phrygian forces originating from the European continent had already mustered along the banks of the Sangarios about a generation before the Trojan war (c. 1280 BC). Furthermore, the Kaskans, who are characterized by a Thracian type of onomastics (see Woudhuizen 1993b: passim), became a growing threat to the Hitites from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom period (= early in the 15th century BC), onwards, see von Schuler 1965: 27. Finally, Phrygian penetration into the province of Azzi-ţayasa to the northeast of the Hitite capital Boğazköy / Hattusa in the times of Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) and Arnuwandas I (1370-1355 BC) is personified by Mitra of Pān, see Chapter 14, esp. note 554, above.

\textsuperscript{930} Diodorus Siculus, Library of History IV, 75, 1; cf. Apollodorus, Library III, 12, 1.

\textsuperscript{931} Euripides, Helen 87 ff.

\textsuperscript{932} Vergilius, Aeneid I, 619 ff.

\textsuperscript{933} Athenaios, Deipnosophistai VI, 68, 256b.

\textsuperscript{934} Athenaios, Deipnosophistai VI, 68, 256c.
with Tjeker settled at Dor. According to Wen Amon’s vivid testimony, they still were a maritime force to reckon with at that time, since eleven Tjeker ships were blocking his way from the harbor of Byblos when, having accomplished his mission, he wanted to return to Egypt.  

The maritime adventures of the Teukroi presumably dating to the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples call to mind the career of the Trojan hero Akamas as recorded in Cypro-Minoan texts from Enkomi and Ras Shamra / Ugarit dated to the final phase of the Late Bronze Age. Here we encounter Akamas at first in Linear C texts as a representative of what appears to be the Trojan town Malos (between Palaecepsis and Achaeium, opposite the island of Tenedos) and of Ephesus engaged in maritime trade, receiving goods at Enkomi and delivering goods at Ras Shamra / Ugarit. Next, he turns up in the more evolved Linear D texts as *Akamu Ilu* ‘the Ilian Akamas’ and *Akamu Eleki nukar -ura* ‘Akamas of Ilion, the great enemy’, who in the latter instance is recorded to have defeated (*tupata* ‘he smote’) the principal of the text (*-mu ‘me’) in what from the context appears to be a naval battle. This last mentioned passage strikingly correlates to the information from the correspondence between the king of Ugarit and his superior, the king of Cyprus-Aslasiya, as unearthed in Ras Shamra / Ugarit, and Tell Abu Hawam (= Haifa) in the neighborhood of the Tjeker town Dor, in a variety dated to the late 13th or early 12th century BC (see Fig. 20.1). The impetus for the Trojans to find new homes abroad is formed by the invasion of their territory by new settlers from the European continent, causing the destruction of Troy VIIa (c. 1180 BC) and the subsequent (in Troy VIIb1-2) introduction of Buckel ceramic. Unfortunately, the Tjeker town Dor is not well excavated: at least it seems clear that the site was destroyed in the Late Bronze Age and subsequently characterized by Philistine ware. As opposed to this, the nearby Tell Abu Hawam has been better explored and shows, next to a destruction layer at the end of the Late Bronze Age, some, no doubt subsequent, Late Helladic IIIIC1b ware – the hallmark of the settlement of Sea Peoples. If I understand Susan Heuck Allen correctly in that the Trojan grey ware arrived in Tell Abu Hawam already before the aforesaid destruction layer, the Trojans evidently prospected the site in the period of their trade connections with the Levant and hence very well knew where to go to find themselves a better place to stay!

---

935 Pritchard 1969: 25-29; see Chapter 12, above.
936 Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 108; 116-7; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 53-54; 59; 62; 64.
937 Cylinder seal Inv no. 19.10, see Woudhuizen 1992a: 110 ff.; 115, lines 15-17; cf. Chapter 12, above. Like that of Alexandros (*Greek alesō ‘to ward off, protect’ and anēr ‘man’), the name of Akamas is of Greek type, being derived from Greek akamas ‘unerring’, see LSJ, s.v. This cannot be attributed to poetic license of Homer, as these names, next to in the Homeric epics, appear in contemporary texts. Apparently, therefore, representatives of the Trojan nobility had intermarried with Greek colleagues as early as the Late Bronze Age – be it on a voluntary basis or involuntarily as exemplified by Alexandros / Paris’ rape of Helena.
938 Tablet RS 20.25, see Woudhuizen 1994: 519; 530, lines 1-2; 15; cf. Chapter 12, above. For *Malos* in the Troad, see Cramer 1971: 88. In line with a suggestion by Jan Best, the element *ati* in *aitipini* is interpreted as a reflex of PIE *eti ‘and’ as represented in Greek eti, Phrygian eti- and Latin et, see Frisk 1973, s.v., as well as Celtic eti, see Delamarre 2003, s.v.
939 Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 104 (Tablet Inv. no. 1193, line 3).
940 Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 105 (Tablet Inv. no. 1687, line 15); cf. Chapter 12, above.
944 For the twofold destruction of Troy, first at the end of VIb (c. 1280 BC) by the Mycenaean Greeks and then in the time of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples at the end of VIIa (c. 1180 BC), see Schachermeyr 1980: 460; Schachermeyr 1982: 106.
945 Rutter 1975, who likewise attributes the presence of this ware in southern Greece at the beginning of Late Helladic IIIIC to Balkan invaders.
946 Dothan 1982: 69.
947 Sands 1980: 161; 165.
948 Heuck Allen 1994: 40; and note 8: Trojan grey ware is not found in association with Late Helladic IIIIC1b.
CHAPTER 21. THE CENTRAL MEDITERRANEAN CONTRIBUTION

21.1. Sherden

The Sherden\textsuperscript{949} are first mentioned in the correspondence of the king of Byblos, Rib-addi, with the Egyptian pharaoh, presumably Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC), as preserved for the El-Amarna archive. Thus a Sherdan-man is staged in the context of a futile assault on Rib-addi, possibly as the latter’s body-guard.\textsuperscript{950} Furthermore, Rib-addi complains that people of Sutu – a contingent of mercenaries of the Egyptian pharaoh – have killed men of Sherdan.\textsuperscript{951} The use of Sherden for their fighting skill in the Levant can be further illustrated by texts from Ras Shamra / Ugarit, roughly dated to the 14th or 13th century BC, where in alphabetic form ṭ内马尔 they occur in the context of ṭNewItem ‘hand-to-hand fighters or skirmishers’, mirjNewItem ‘chariot fighters’ and mḏרNewItem ‘guardians’.\textsuperscript{952} Interesting detail is that when specified by name, as in case of Amar-Addu, son of Mutbaal, the Sherden can be shown to be fully acculturated to their new Semitic milieu.\textsuperscript{953}

After the El-Amarna interlude, the Sherden appear as seaborne raiders of Egyptian territory in the reign of Ramesses II (1279-1213 BC), who in the Tanis stele speaks of ‘the rebellious-hearted Sherden’ ‘in their war-ships from the midst of the sea’, ‘none [being] able to stand before them’.\textsuperscript{954} This information coincides with the text of a stele from Assuwan, dated to the second year of Ramesses II (= 1277 BC), in which the pharaoh claims to have ‘destroyed warriors of the Great Green (= the Mediterranean sea)’ so that ‘Lower Egypt spends the night sleeping (peacefully)’.\textsuperscript{955} As it seems, then, Ramesses II had to deal with piratical raids by the Sherden early in his reign. Having defeated them, he next enlisted the survivors as mercenaries in his army, for in the memorial of the battle of Kadesh, which took place in the fifth year of his reign (= 1274 BC), Ramesses II reports that a contingent of Sherden fought on his side (‘His Majesty had made ready his infantry and his chariotsry, and the Sherden of His Majesty’s capturing whom he had brought back by victory of his strong arm’).\textsuperscript{956} On the basis of close scrutiny of the Egyptian reliefs from the reigns of Ramesses II to Ramesses III, Robert Drews attributed the introduction in the orient of innovations in infantry warfare, like the round shield, the javelins, and the long slashing sword, which, when deployed in sufficient numbers, could outmatch the up to that moment unchallenged chariotsry, to the Sherden, identifiable as such by their characteristic horned helmet (see Fig. 21.1).\textsuperscript{957}

![Sherden in the Egyptian reliefs from the reigns of Ramesses II and Ramesses III with (a) long slashing swords and round shields, and (b) javelins (from Sandars 1980: 29, afb. 12 and 32, afb. 14)](image-url)

The story continues with the Sherden fighting, like the Shekelesh, Ekwesh, Lukka, and Teresh, as allies or mercenaries on the side of the Libyans, who, under the leadership


\textsuperscript{950} Moran 1992: 150 (EA 81: 16); Mercer 1939: EA no. 81.


\textsuperscript{953} Drews 1993a: 155.


\textsuperscript{955} Gardiner 1947: 195.


\textsuperscript{957} Drews 1993: 178-9; 184 (with reference to Sandars 1980: 32, afb. 14); 199 (with reference to Sandars 1980: 29, afb. 12).
of their king Meryey, made an attempt to invade the Egyptian delta in order to settle there in the fifth year of the reign of Merneptah (= 1208 BC). Subsequently, in the memorial of the invasion of the sea Peoples in year eight of Ramesses III (= 1176 BC) at Medinet Habu, we encounter the Sherden both as attackers and as mercenaries on the Egyptian side. The service of Sherden in the Egyptian army can be shown to continue into the reign of Ramesses V (1147-1143 BC), when members of this ethnic group are staged as proprietors of land granted to them by the pharaoh. As in the case of their kinsmen in the Levant, the Sherden in Egypt by then had acculturated to the extent that they all bore Egyptian names.

The final mention of Sherden in the Near East is provided by the Onomasticon of Amenope, which reflects the political situation in the 11th century BC. Here the Sherden occur in an enumeration followed by the Tjeker and Peleset. From this enumeration one has deduced that there were Sherden living to the north of the Tjeker at Dor and the Peleset in their Philistine pentapolis at the time, in a location plausibly identified with Akko. In archaeological terms, their settlement here may well be reflected in Late Helladic IIIC1b pottery – as we have noted before, the hallmark of settlement of Sea Peoples in the Levant.

Having reviewed the history of Sherden in the Near East, the question remains to be answered: where did they come from? As we have seen, the Egyptian sources inform us that they came overseas. Now, two propositions have been put forward to the origin of the Sherden: the island of Sardinia at the time of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. Some years later, in 1873, his view was challenged by Gaston Maspero.

The revised view of Maspero has been particularly influential. Thus a cautious scholar like the Egyptologist Alan Gardiner concluded:

‘Provisionally it seems plausible to accept the identification of the name Sherden with that of Sardinia, and the identification of the name Tursha with that of the Tyrsenoi, but to regard Sardinia and Etruria as much later homes of the peoples in question.’

Similarly, Margaret Guido in her book on Sardinia, after weighing the pro’s and con’s, is inclined to an eastern origin of the Sherden. As we have seen in Chapter 17 above, there is considerable evidence that Maspero’s eastern origin of the Tyrsenians is correct. In the case of the Sherden, however, the literary evidence from ancient authors to back up their eastern origin is absent: here Maspero’s thesis rests upon nothing more than a likeness in names, which might be spurious. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that de Rougé’s identification of the Sherden as Sardinians can still count on some supporters up to the present day, like Richard D. Barnett in his contribution to the third edition of the Cambridge Ancient History and Drews in his book on the end of the Bronze Age.

As it comes to the actual facts, it must be admitted that these are meagre, indeed. The often referred to mention of Šādn ‘Sardinia’ in a Phoenician inscription on a stele from Nora, dated to the 9th century BC, can only provide us with a terminus a quo for the name of the island. More revealing is the archaeological evidence presented by Roger Grosjean. He drew our attention to similarities of the depictions of Sherden at Medinet with statue-menhirs from southern Corsica, depicting so-called Torre-builders, who are identical with the Nuraghe-builders from Sardinia. These entail: (1) the helmet with horns, the latter
element of which can be reconstructed for some statue-menhirs on the basis of shallow holes once holding another material;\(^973\) (2) the corselet with five ribbons;\(^974\) and (3) the long sword (see Fig. 21.2).\(^975\)

![Fig. 21.2. Statue-menhirs from Corsica: (a) Cauria (with horns reconstructed on the helmets), (b) Scalsa Murta (from Grosjean 1966b, Fig. 5; Sandars 1980: 99, afb. 60)](image)

The statue-menhirs in question are assigned on the basis of \(^{14}C\) datings to the period between 1400 and 1000 BC, with a margin of error of 200 years.\(^976\) They give the impression of a society of which the members are proud of their martial qualities and hence excellently fit for service as mercenaries, in which capacity we encountered the Sherden in the Egyptian and Levantine sources.

Remaining archaeological evidence is of a circumstantial nature. As shown by Birgitta Pålsson Hallager, contacts between Sardinia and the eastern Mediterranean, especially Crete, can be detected for the later Bronze Age in the form of Mycenaean IIB and C (including Late Helladic IIIC1b) material discovered foremostly in the nuraghe Antigori in the south of Sardinia,\(^977\) and, as later distinguished by Joseph Shaw, Italian or Sardinian pottery from Late Minoan IIIA2-B contexts unearthed in Kommos, a harbor town in southern Crete.\(^978\) Particularly tantalizing are the oxhide ingots with Cypro-Minoan signs from the nuraghi Serra Ilixi and Sant’Antico in Sardinia, which are variously dated between the 15th and 11th century BC.\(^979\) According to Guido, one of such Sardinian type of oxhide ingot was found in Crete, where, in her words, it may belong to the thirteenth-twelfth centuries BC.\(^980\) As it seems, then, Sardinia was a source of raw materials (copper) for the international market (the Cypro-Minoan signs have only meaningful use as markers for the handling of the oxhide ingots in the eastern Mediterranean).\(^981\) Finally, it deserves our attention that Sardinia constitutes a backward area – note in this connection that a Bronze Age culture lingered into the Roman period –,\(^982\) comparable to a third world country in our present era, which is likely to provide the more developed eastern Mediterranean with mercenaries and raw materials.

On the basis of the combined evidence from Corsica and Sardinia, the one presenting the closest parallels for Sherden as depicted in the Egyptian memorial at Medinet Habu and the other furnishing evidence for contacts with the eastern Mediterranean during the later Bronze Age, it seems viable to conclude that the Sherden originated from this part of the Central Mediterranean.

### 21.2. Shekelesh\(^983\)

The earliest attestation of the Shekelesh concerns their part-taking as allies or mercenaries in the Libyan campaign against Egypt as recorded for the fifth year of Merneptah (= 1214 BC).

\(^973\) Grosjean 1966a: pls. 44-46.
\(^974\) Grosjean 1966a: pl. 46.
\(^975\) Grosjean 1966a: pls. 35-36; 40-41.
\(^976\) Grosjean 1966a: 90; cf. Grosjean 1966b: 190 (from c. 1500 BC onwards).
\(^979\) Guido 1963: 110; cf. Muhly, Maddin & Stech 1988: 283, who consider the association of oxhide ingots with Mycenaean pottery likely, even though it is not straightforwardly attested. Note, however, that Buchholz 1999: 222 variously dates the oxhide ingots to the period of 1200 to 700 BC.
\(^981\) So also Buchholz 1999: 229.
\(^982\) Guido 1963: 156.
\(^983\) Lehmann 1979: 492-4.
In the count of the dead bodies after the battle, the Shekelesh – together with the Ekwesh, Teresh, and Sherden, and in contrast to the Peleset from the time of Ramesses III –, are specified as being circumcised. Next, a representative of the Shekelesh turns up in maritime trade as recorded by Cypro-Minoan cylinder seals from Kalavassos (K-AD 389) and Enkomi (Inv. no. 19.10), which we have seen reason in Chapter 15 above to assign to the period of the Hittite domination of Cyprus / Alasia during the reign of Suppiluliumas II (1205-1180? BC). The man in question, Sanemas, singles himself out as the author of the Kalavassos seal, and hence can be shown to master the Luwian language.

This peaceful episode is followed by one of maritime aggression. A first indication of this is formed by a letter from the destruction layer of Ras Shamra / Ugarit (RS 34.129), in which the Hittite great king, who must be identified as Suppiluliumas II, urgently requests information about the Šikalāyuyā ‘who live in boats’ and about their homeland Šikila from a certain Lunadusu or Ibnadusu who had been taken prisoner by them. (Note in this connection that Sikalayu and Sikela are variant forms of Shekelesh without the additional suffix -š). We have seen reason not to follow Elmar Edel in his proposal to identify Sikela with Tjeker. Little later, we encounter the Shekelesh among the Sea Peoples who invaded Egypt in the eighth year of Ramesses III (= 1176 BC). In the memorial for Ramesses III’s victory at Medinet Habu, the Shekelesh are distinguished by a special headaddress, the ‘nach hinten gebogene Mutze’. As to the origin of the Shekelesh, two suggestions have been put forward. In the first place, de Rougé proposed to identify them as inhabitants of the island of Sicily. As opposed to this, Maspero rather connected the name of the Shekelesh with the place name Sagalassos in Pisidia – a region in between the Hittite province of Pisidia – a region in between the Hittite province of Pisidia and the Lukka lands in southern Anatolia. Like in the case of the Sherden, the Shekelesh were assumed according to this view to be on their way from their original home to their later home Sicily at the time of the Sea Peoples. Maspero’s Anatolian thesis was enthusiastically received by Harry Reginald Hall, who wrote: ‘The next tribe, the Shekelesha, are undoubtedly, as Maspero concluded twenty years ago, the Sagalassians of Pisidia. (...) The identification absolutely hits the nail on the head. (...) And the Sagalassians are not too far off, as de Rougé’s Sicels were.’

Maspero’s thesis echoes on into recent literature, as in, for example, Donald Redford’s monograph on Egypt’s relations with the Levant. The problem with Maspero’s Anatolian thesis, however, is that, as we have seen above, the Hittite great king Suppiluliumas II happens to be unacquainted with the Sikalayu or Shekelesh, whereas, as we have seen earlier (see Chapter 15), he is in full control of western Asia Minor. In other words: if the Shekelesh were Sagalassians, the Hittite great king would have known them. Consequently, it seems preferable to opt for de Rougé’s solution and identify the Shekelesh with the inhabitants of Sicily in the central Mediterranean.

Now, Sicily was in contact with the Mycenaean world during the Late Bronze Age, as Mycenaean pottery has been found in Sicilian sites. As argued by Pålsson Hallager, these contacts may have been especially close with Crete in view of the amount of Minoan pottery discovered in Thapsos. Vice versa, Khania, Knossos, and Kommos in Crete have produced Italian (no distinction is made for Sicily) ware during the later phase of the Late Bronze Age (Late Minoan IIIA2-B for Kommos and Late Minoan IIIB-C for Khania). To this comes that the Sicilians are known to the Homeric world (which, as we have seen in Chapter 9 above, mainly reflects Late Bronze Age politico-historical conditions) as sturdy traders, specialized in the slave trade.

In our literary sources, the Sicilians or Sicels are assumed to have once inhabited the mainland of Italy, up to Latium and southern Etruria, and to have crossed over to Latium and southern Etruria, and to have crossed over to Latium and southern Etruria.
Sicily either some time before the Trojan war\textsuperscript{998} or 300 years before the arrival of the first Greeks, which means in the 11th century BC.\textsuperscript{999} They are specified to have been driven out of their original habitat by either Umbrians (together with Pelasgians) or Opicans (= Greek indication of the Oscans), who, as we have seen in Chapter 17 and will further elaborate below, both make their entrance in the Italian peninsula from Urnfield Europe at the end of the Bronze Age. Therefore, Minoan and Mycenaean ware found in the Italian mainland may also be indicative of contacts of the Aegean region with the Sicels, or vice versa.\textsuperscript{1000} According to the inscriptions from the Archaic period, the language of the Sicels was closely related to Oscan at the time.\textsuperscript{1001}

\subsection*{21.3. Weshesh}

The Weshesh figure only in the attack launched by the Sea Peoples in the eighth year of Ramesses III (= 1176 BC).\textsuperscript{1002} According to a proposition by François Chabas, they have been identified as Oscans.\textsuperscript{1003} In order to fully grasp the validity of this suggestion, it is important to note that the final -\textit{sh} of Weshesh constitutes a suffix, also present, as we have seen, in Ekwesh (< Akhania) and Shekelesh (< Sikela), and that the root hence consists of \textit{Wesh}.\textsuperscript{1004} Furthermore, in spite of its general derivation from earlier \textit{Opsci},\textsuperscript{1005} the root of the Italic ethnonym Oscans consists of \textit{Os}- as exemplified by its variant form \textit{Aus}- or rhotacized \textit{Aur}- in \textit{Ausones} or \textit{Aurunci}, respectively. This root, then, is used in combination with the typically Italic suffix for the formation of ethnic, -\textit{ci} (cf. Aurunci, Etrusci, Falisci, Graeci, Umbrici, Volsci, etc.). Alternatively, inspired by Maspero’s pan-Anatolianism with respect to the homeland of the Sea Peoples, which led him to associate the ethnonym Weshesh with the place name Wassos in Caria, it has been suggested by Hall to compare the root of this same ethnonym to that of the place name Wassos in Crete.\textsuperscript{1006}

The identification of the Weshesh with the Italic Oscans can be bolstered by archaeological evidence. As we have seen in Chapter 17 above, the Italian peninsula is characterized at the end of the Late Bronze Age by a new material culture called proto-Villanovan, which, as convincingly demonstrated by Hugh Hencken, shows close affinities with Urnfield Europe and, as we have argued, is likely to be introduced by the ancestors of the historical Umbrians, Oscans, Latins, and Faliscans, whose languages are most intimately related to Celtic and Germanic. Now, as pointed out most recently by Shelley Wachsmann, the fact that the boat(s) of the Sea Peoples as depicted in Ramesses III’s memorial at Medinet Habu is/are characterized by birdhead devices at both the bow and the stern constitutes a typical Urnfield feature.\textsuperscript{1007} As it seems, then, there were bearers of the Urnfield culture among the Sea Peoples, which conclusion only applies if we are right in our identification of the Weshesh with the Italic Oscans.

The connection thus achieved with the developments in Urnfield Europe at the time, also go a long way in providing us with a model to explain the resurrections of the Sea Peoples. The invasion of Italy by bearers of the Urnfield culture – a true mass migration – caused great disruption of peoples living in the area, as the displacement of the Sicels living in Latium and southern Etruria mentioned in the above, who in turn were forced to displace other population groups in their search for new homes. Moreover, the finds of handmade barbarian ware either linked up with Italy or Urnfield Europe in various locations of the Aegean at the end of the Late Bronze Age\textsuperscript{1008} and the growing popularity of the rite of cremation from that time onwards,\textsuperscript{1009} suggest that some of the invaders, like we postulated for the Oscans, made common cause with population groups they displaced and went with them straight on to the eastern Mediterranean, with which the original population of Italy and the central Mediterranean islands, as we have seen, had been in contact. This resulted in a domino-effect. First, the region of Pylos in Greece was attacked with dev-

\begin{thebibliography}{999}
\bibitem{998} Dionysios of Halikarnassos, \textit{Roman Antiquities} I, 9; 16; 20 ff.
\bibitem{999} Thucydidæ, \textit{Peloponnesian War} VI, 2, 5; cf. Dionysios of Halikarnassos, \textit{Roman Antiquities} I, 22, 5.
\bibitem{1000} For the distribution of Mycenaean ware in Italy, see Buchholz 1999: 83, Abb. 23.
\bibitem{1001} Vetter 1953: 359-60, no. 514 (Centuripa vase, 5th century BC); \textit{bratome}; cf. Oscan \textit{brato} or \textit{bratom} (= Latin \textit{gratum} ‘pleasant, grateful’), see Pulgram 1978: 72-73: 151.
\bibitem{1002} See note 990 above.
\bibitem{1003} Chabas 1872: 299; cf. Reinaich 1910: 36, note 3; Macalister 1913: 25.
\bibitem{1004} See note 988 above.
\bibitem{1005} As based on Greek \textit{Opikoi} and Ennius’ \textit{Opscus}.
\bibitem{1006} Hall 1901-2: 184; cf. Reinaich 1910: 36; Albright 1975: 508; Redford 1992: 246.
\bibitem{1009} Vanschoonwinkel 1991: 191-6, carte 7.
\end{thebibliography}
astating results, ultimately causing Akhaians to join the eastern move and look for new homes in Cyprus and the Cilician plain. Next, the Hittite fleet stationed along the coast of Lycia to ward off the entrance of the Sea Peoples from the Aegean into the eastern Mediterranean waters was utterly defeated and the island of Cyprus / Alasiya, the southern Anatolian coast, and that of the Levant lay undefended as an easy prey for looting and plunder, and eventually settlement. Finally, as we know by now, an attempt was made to invade the richest country in the Near East, Egypt, with appetizing prospects for plunder and settlement (see Fig. 21.3). Only this last stage in the upheavals of the Sea Peoples failed ….

I am not suggesting that the foregoing model explains everything. It is highly unlikely that the Sea Peoples are responsible for, to name but two examples, the devastations in Thessaly and the fall of the Hittite capital Boğazköy / Ḫattusa. The upheavals of the Sea Peoples ultimately caused by the movement of bearers of the Urnfield culture into Italy works as a catalyst to set in motion other developments. Thus the devastations in Thessaly are likely to be ascribed to warlike Balkan tribes bordering to the north of the Mycenaean realm, always looking for an opportunity to plunder their much richer neighbor. Furthermore, the sackers of the Hittite capital Boğazköy / Ḫattusa are likely to be identified as Kaskans and Phrygians, who, when the smoke-screen had disappeared, turned up in great numbers along the Assyrian border at the time of Tiglathpilesar I (1115-1070 BC).1010 As an historical parallel for these developments one could point to the fact that when Dionysios I of Syracuse wanted to attack the Etruscans of Caere, he made a common cause with the Celts in their hinterland, who, just like the northern neighbors of the Greeks and the Kaskans and Phrygians in Anatolia, were only waiting for the opportunity to plunder the lands of their hated oppressor.

---

1010 Lehmann 1970: 34; Diakonoff 1984: 123; see also Chapter 14, esp. note 555.
CHAPTER 22. CONCLUDING REMARKS FOR PART II

Having reached the end of our quest into the vicissitudes of the Sea Peoples, it seems worthwhile to summarize the results with respect to their ethnicity.

As far as the Lukka are concerned, there can be little doubt that they originate from the lower Xanthos valley in later Lycia. This area looks out onto the Mediterranean sea in the south, but is otherwise separated from the surrounding regions by a spur of the formidable Taurus mountains. From this geographical situation alone it seems permissible to assume that the Lukka formed a close knit ethnic community. At any rate, this is the case with their Early Iron Age descendants, who call themselves Termilai and write in a distinct dialect of Luwian, the so-called Lycian A. From an archaeological point of view, however, our inference about the ethnic coherence of the Lukka cannot be backed up by a distinct material culture because archaeological data from the lower Xanthos valley are thus far lacking for the Late Bronze Age period.

The Ekwesh and Denye(n) are alternative indications for the Late Bronze Age Greeks, corresponding to Homeric Akhaiai and Danaoi. Of these indications, the one, in form of Ḫḫāwa, is preferred by the Hittites, while the other, in form of Tanayu, is most of the time preferred by the Egyptians. In archaeological terms, the ethnic coherence of the Late Bronze Age Greeks is strongly indicated by the so-called Mycenaean koinē of Late Helladic IIIB – a cultural unity unparalleled for Greece until the Hellenistic period. The latter archaeological culture cannot be dissociated from the records in Linear B, which are conducted in a distinct dialect of Luwian, or Arcado-Cyprian of later date. That the Late Bronze Age Greeks indeed considered themselves as Akhaiai may be further illustrated by an episode in Herodotos’ Histories (V, 72), according to which the Spartan king Kleomenes, being refused entrance into the temple on the acropolis of Athens by the priestess on the ground that he was considered a Dorian, replied that he was not a Dorian, but an Akhaian – a point of view which tallies with the fact that the Dorians from central Greece, when taking possession of the Peloponnnesos at the end of the Submycenaean and beginning of the Proteogeometric periods, are led by Heraklid kings with a legitimate claim on the Mycenaean throne as descendants of Perseus, who return to their ancestral lands. The cultural and linguistic unity of Late Bronze Age Greece should not induce us, however, to exclude a certain amount of ethnic diversity, as Linear B texts, next to the geographic name Akawija (KN) ‘Akhaia’, already bear testimony of the ethnonyms Rakedamonijo (TH) ‘Lacedaimonian’, Ijawone (KN) ‘Ionians’, and the personal name related to an ethnonym Doriexe (PY) ‘Dorieus (dative)’.\textsuperscript{1011} After the fall of their palatial civilization, some of the Mycenaean Greeks took the boat and looked for new homes in the eastern Mediterranean, one group under the name of Ḫḫāwa ‘Akhaia’ colonizing the Cilician plain in Anatolia, and an other group under the name of Dan ‘Danaoi’ colonizing various locations in the Levant. These migrations were not numerous enough, however, to plant the Greek language in the given regions, the Akhaiai in the Cilician plain going over to Luwian and the Danaoi in the Levant resorting to Semitic. This being the case, the Greeks in question may safely be assumed to have mixed to a significant extent with the indigenous population.

If the literary traditions about the Philistines originating from Crete and / or Lydia in western Asia Minor are correct, this particular people is likely to be identified with the Pelasgians of Greek sources. The latter were one of the numerous population groups living in mainland Greece before the Greek ethnos came into being, and hence at least partly responsible for the Middle Helladic culture with its characteristic Minyan ware. As far as can be determined from the evidence of place and personal names, the Pelasgians were of Indo-European tongue, to be more specific of a Thraco-Phrygian type. When southern and central Greece were conquered by foreign invaders from Egypt and the Levant, Pelasgian population groups who wanted to preserve their independence fled to the north into Thessaly, which remained predominantly Minyan up till Late Helladic IIIA, and to the region of Larisa Phrikonis in the Mysian-Lydian borderland of western Asia Minor. On the basis of the evidence from personal names, again, the latter group was not numerous enough to cause a language shift, but went over to the local Luwian dialect. As opposed to their kinsmen who had fled, Pelasgian population groups which stayed in southern and central Greece became thoroughly Mycenaeanized and in this process, as Herodotos

(Histories I, 57) reports, adopted the Greek language—which, considering our view that Greek is a split from Thraco-Phrygian under foreign influences, is only a small step. The exact date of the migration of Pelasgians to Crete as recorded in the literary sources and backed up by place, divine, and personal names eludes us, but, at any rate it is clear that these latter became fully Minoanized and, like their fellow Cretans, used a Luwian dialect as their first language and a Semitic one for religious and administrative purposes in order to keep up with the current international standards. At the time of their migration to the Levant and settling down in the Philistine pentapolis, the Pelasgians of Crete were in close contact with their kinsmen of western Anatolia, both producing Late Helladic IIIC1b pottery—as we have seen, the hallmark of the settlement of Sea Peoples in the Levant. This may be a sign of their ethnic coherence, though it must be admitted that the same material culture is shared with the Mycenaean Greeks. It goes without saying that the Pelasgians during their colonization of the Philistine pentapolis mixed with the local population and went over to the local Semitic dialect—with which the Cretan branch was already familiar anyway.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Teresh and Peleset are explicitly distinguished in one Egyptian text, it seems highly attractive to consider the related ethnonyms of the Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians from Greek literary sources, on the analogy of Akhaians and Danaoi being alternative means to refer to the Mycenaean Greeks, as competing forms of address of one and the same population group.1012 Under the related name of Etruscans, the Tyrrhenians are especially known to us as an archaeologically, epigraphically, and linguistically traceable entity from c. 700 BC in Italy. In all these aspects, however, their homeland can be traced back to the Aegean region and western Anatolia. A crown witness of their early history is formed by their language, which, although basically of Luwian nature, shows clear signs of a long early history with Greek—a linguistic deep layer explicable only if the literary traditions of the Tyrrhenians once living in Attica are correct. Mutatis mutandis, the evidence of the Etruscan language also goes a long way in backing up our reconstruction of Pelasgians originally speaking a Thraco-Phrygian vernacular, but going over to Luwian with their migration from mainland Greece to western Anatolia. A distinct branch of migrants from western Anatolia to Italy is formed by the Trojan followers of Aeneas. As these are likely originating from the region south of mount Ida, where to all probability a Luwian dialect was spoken, we are seemingly dealing here with kinsmen of the Tyrrhenians. However, contrary to the situation in Etruria, the Trojan followers of Aeneas, for mere lack of numbers, did not plant their name, language, culture, and customs in Latium, but were only held responsible for the introduction of the cult of the Penates here.

Tjeker or Teukroi is an indication of the population of the Troad, which alternatively can be addressed as Drisyn or Dardanians. To all probability this people spoke a Thraco-Phrygian language, and hence they likely were kinsmen of the pre-Greek population groups of Greece like the Phrygians, Thracians, and Pelasgians. The latter inference gains weight from the fact that the characteristic Trojan grey ware is closely related to the so-called Minyan ware of Middle Helladic Greece. At the end of the Late Bronze Age, this grey ware, attested from the beginning of Troy VI onwards, is distributed to Cyprus and the Levant, thus enabling us to trace the epigraphically and historically recorded trade contacts and migrations of the Teukroi archaeologically. All in all, the Teukroi form a clear case of a coherent ethnic entity according to our protohistoric criteria.

The homeland of the Sherden is likely to be located in Sardinia in the central Mediterranean, as we find statemenhirs in this region (in casu nearby Corsica) depicting the same type of warriors as the Egyptian reliefs associated with this ethnonym. The specificity of the outfit of the Sardinian warriors seems to indicate a strong ethnic bond. On the analogy of the fact that an Hittite princess betrothed to Ramesses II is rebaptized with an Egyptian name on the event of her marriage,1013 the Semitic and Egyptian names for individual Sherden mentioned in the Akkadian cuneiform and Egyptian texts bear testimony only of their acculturation in their new homelands, and tell us nothing of the Sardinian language, about which, for the lack of epichoric texts or even glosses in Greek or Latin, we are totally ignorant.

About the origin of the Shekelesh we have only circumstantial evidence that their homeland is unlikely to be situated in Anatolia, as the last of the Hittite great kings, Suppiluliumas II, is unfamiliar with them. As opposed to this negative evidence, an association with Sicily in the central Mediterranean can be underlined by the fact that the

---

1012 As we have stipulated in Chapter 17 above, Herodotos, Histories I, 57, distinguishes the language of the Pelasgians from that of the Tyrrhenians, but, as we have seen in Chapter 19, language is not a defining ‘criterium’ for Pelasgians, so that Greek-like and Luwian-like speaking representatives may all belong to one and the same ethnic entity.

1013 Bryce 1998: 312; compare Greeks in Hellenistic Egypt taking Egyptian names, on which see Goudriaan 1988.
latter island was in contact with Greece, Crete, and Cyprus during the Late Bronze Age. A representative of the Shekeleesh involved in trade with Cyprus and the eastern Mediterranean singles himself out as mastering the Cypro-Minoan script and the Luwian language, but this does not help us very much in determining his native Sicilian language about which we only know that in the archaic period it was closely related to Oscan. For the question whether the Sicilians had a pronounced idea about their ethnicity we can only draw back to the fact that the Egyptians depicted them with a special type of headdress, the ‘nach hinten gebogene Mutze’, which, to say the least, is meagre evidence.

The identification of the Weshesh with the Oscans is crucial for our understanding of the catastrophic events at the end of the Bronze Age. The invasion of Italy by bearers of the European Urnfield culture, which we have seen reason to identify with the speakers of the Italic dialects or languages Osco-Umbrian and Latin-Faliscan, entails a true mass migration which caused serious disruption of peoples living in the region, whose displacement in turn formed the ‘prime mover’ for what we call the upheavals of the Sea Peoples. Even though the Oscans may have been numerically a relatively small party among the coalition of the Sea Peoples, they nonetheless may be considered like the leaven in the Biblical bread. Thus the ships of the Sea Peoples with bird-head devices at both the bow and the stern of a typically Urnfield type, the spread of handmade barbarian ware of proto-Villanovan Italian or European Urnfield backgrounds, and the growing popularity of the rite of cremation during and after the catastrophic events may be attributed to the influence of our Oscan participants. Considering their highly specific cultural and linguistic traits, the Oscans are likely to be considered a coherent ethnic entity according to our protohistoric criteria.

By means of conclusion, we seem to be confronted with various ethnic groups, each having their own specific material culture – though Late Helladic IIIICb appears to be a combining factor, being attested for the homeland of almost every Sea People, from western Anatolia (Pitane and Larisa Phrikonis) in the east to Sardinia (muraghe Antigori) in the west – and language. That these ethnic groups were indeed cohesive entities appears from the fact that, after their abortive attempt to conquer Egypt, they settled separately in various locations in the Levant: the Peleset or Philistines in their pentapolis, the Tjeker or Teukroi in Dor, the Sherden or Sardinians in Akko, Denye(n) or Dan in Joppa and later in Laish, European Urnfielders likely to be identified with the Weshesh or Oscans in Hamath, and Ekwesh or Akhaians in the Cilician plain. Nevertheless, this conglomerate of cultures and languages was able to work together very effectively for some time, as the downfall of palatial empires caused by them may illustrate. In order to demonstrate that a multi-lingual coalition is a priori possible, one may point to the fact that the Trojan side in Homeros’ Iliad consisted of a multi-lingual coalition as well.\textsuperscript{1014}

In an earlier version of Chapter 28, below, Wim van Binsbergen formulated three hypotheses which are of relevance to our subject. They do no longer appear in quite the same form in the final version of that chapter, but since they have informed my own thinking on the matter, let me cite them here in their original form:

**Hypothesis 1.** In the Late Bronze Age, by the time of the appearance of the Sea Peoples, the geographical space of the eastern Mediterranean was ethnically structured in this sense, that an overall system of ethnic classification was generally known and generally subscribed to.

The validity of this hypothesis can be underlined by the fact that some of the groups of the Sea Peoples are referred to by the same ethnonym in various sources, like the Ekwesh as Ḍqyyawaya in Hittite and Shekeleesh as Šikalāy in Ugaritic and as Sikeri- in Cypro-Minoan: this proves that we are not dealing with the whim of an individual Egyptian scribe, but a classificatory system with a wider geographical range shared by the Egyptians with the Hittites, Ugaritians, and Cyprians. Even the fact that there are competing indications for the same ethnic group, like in case of the Egyptian preference of Tanayu or Denye(n) ‘Danaii over Ekwesh ‘Akhaians’, or their indication of the Trojans as Drny alongside Tjker does not undermine such a conclusion, as it rather signals the sophistication of this classificatory system. As to the origin of the different ethnonyms, it is interesting to note that Sherden and Shekeleesh are geographically based, being derived from the names of the islands Sardinia and Sicily, respectively, whereas for example Weshesh ‘Ausones’ or ‘Osci’ and Tanayu or Denye(n) are ultimately rooted in the hydronymy of Europe and the North Pontic steppe (PIE *au- ‘source, stream’ and *dānu- ‘river’) and hence may safely be assumed to have been introduced by the people in question themselves from that region into their new home-

\textsuperscript{1014} Iliad II, 804; IV, 437-8. Note that in this respect the title of my book The Language of the Sea Peoples is oversimplifying the reality.
HYPOTHESIS 2A. The mobilization process that led to the emergence and exploits of the Sea Peoples was a process of only partial ethnogenesis; it was not in origin an ethnically-driven process, in the sense that no role was played, in this mobilization process, by any prior ethnic identification between the various constituent peripheral groups that ultimately coalesced, albeit never completely, into the Sea Peoples.

Given the fact that, as we have noted above, various groups of the Sea Peoples settled separately in various locations of the Levant, and that they have distinct names and features in the Egyptian sources, this negative hypothesis appears to come nearer to the truth than the positive hypothesis 2B below. As a consequence, we may conclude that to a certain extent a process of ethnogenesis took place (= the emergence of the Sea Peoples as a distinct phenomenon), but was not followed by ethnicization (i.e. that prospective Sea Peoples, each in their own corner of the Mediterranean, took ideological consciousness of the fact that they had so much in common with the other eight groups that they could adopt a common destiny).

HYPOTHESIS 2B. The mobilization process bringing the nine groups to ultimately constitute the Sea Peoples, was in part based on some pre-existing basis for mutual ethnic identification between these nine groups already prior to the beginning of the Sea Peoples’ mobilization and exploits.

An argument in favor of hypothesis 2B, which we consider less likely than hypothesis 2A, might be provided by the fact that the boats of the Sea Peoples are of a common type with a bird head at bow and stern, which, as we have noted, is a typical Urnfield feature. It should be noted in this context, however, that Shelley Wachsmann suggested that the Egyptian artist who drew the boats of the Sea Peoples took one example as the norm, so that the apparent unity in type of ship may be illusory. At any rate, an Urnfield ideology would be secondary to all groups of the Sea Peoples with the exception of the Weshesh if our identification of the latter with the Ausones or Oscans applies. Another unifying element may have been formed by the fact that all members of the Sea Peoples might ultimately be of Indo-European stock. But this is by no means sure for the Sherden and the Shekelesh, and, if these might turn out to be Indo-Europeans after all, the differences between the various groups are already too pronounced to allow for the perception of a common heritage as a binding factor.

Finally, there is the question of how to classify the post-conflict ethnic situation of the various constituent Sea Peoples in the various regions of the Levant where they ended up after their unsuccessful sea- and land battles against Ramesses III. When we scan the range of possible models which van Binsbergen derived from general ethnic theory for specific application to the Sea Peoples case, it is striking that no one specific model seems to fit the bill once and for all.

One might be tempted to classify the post-conflict local accommodation between Sea People settlers and their host groups with the melting pot model (no. 6 in our Chapter 8), with this proviso that the colonists, contrary to the situation in the modern Americas, merge with the indigenous population to the extent that they ultimately become extinct as a separate ethnic group (= ethnothanasia). However, even if locally, in the Levant, all sense of a distinct Sea Peoples identity was ultimately lost, there are indications that yet some knowledge of distant Central Mediterranean origins lingered on, laying the foundations for the subsequent Phoenician exploration and colonization of the Central Mediterranean in the Early Iron Age. Perhaps their knowledge of the central Mediterranean waters stimulated the Phoenicians to explore these regions and beyond in the course of the Early Iron Age.

In the Levant itself, however, total local accommodation of the immigrant Sea Peoples groups could only have been the ultimate outcome of a prolonged process that, typically, would traverse some of the other types in our range of models:

a. immediately after local settlement, the most

1016 Of the remaining cases of colonization assumed in the preceding sections, the Pelasgian ones from presumably c. 1600 BC onwards to western Asia Minor and Crete and the one by the Trojan followers of Aeneas to Italy in the Early Iron Age seem closest to the immigrant model (no. 2 in our Chapter 8), with the noted adjustment that the former emigrate to higher developed societies, whereas the latter arrive in a lower developed one. As opposed to this, the coming of charioteering Hyksos elements to Greece c. 1600 BC and that of the Tyrsenians to Tuscany from c. 700 BC onwards rather adhere to the conquest model (no. 3 in our Chapter 8), with the noted adjustment that the Hyksos elements, in contrast to the Tyrsenians, do not plant their own language(s), but adapt to that of the indigenous Thraco-Phrygian population groups.

likely model would be that of conquest (model 3), which, as a result of progressive subsequent political and social accommodation, would soon give way to
b. the immigrant model (model 2) – to end, in most cases, with
c. a quasi-melting pot situation (model 6) where most specific Sea People cultural and nomenclatural traits would have been shed, in preparation of the total eclipse of any reminiscence of a Sea Peoples past, among the incorporated vestiges of a formerly Sea People population in the Levant.
CHAPTER 23. PART II APPENDIX I: ON THE DECIPHERMENT OF CRETAN HIEROGLYPHIC

As there are only two other hieroglyphic writing systems current in the region, from a comparative point of view the Cretan hieroglyphic (= CH) script may be assumed to be related to either Egyptian hieroglyphic (= Eg.) to the southeast of Crete or Luwian hieroglyphic (= LH) from Anatolia to the northeast of Crete. Both these two possible lines of approach have been put into practice in the past. Thus Arthur Evans, the discoverer of the script, started to compare Cretan hieroglyphic signs to Luwian counterparts, 1017 whereas at a later stage he rather preferred to look for correspondences with Egyptian. 1018 Next, three of the pioneers in the deciphering process of Luwian hieroglyphic, Ignace Gelb, 1019 Helmuth Bossert, 1020 and Piero Meriggi, 1021 pointed out numerous relationships of Cretan hieroglyphic with the script they were engaged with. Since then, Turkish scholars like Sedat Alp 1022 and Nimet Özgüç, who were involved in the earliest manifestations of the Luwian hieroglyphic script during the Middle Bronze Age, showed an awareness of Cretan connections.

The whole matter received renewed attention at the time that Jan Best definitely succeeded to place the famous discus of Phaistos in an Anatolian context, first by demonstrating the relationship of signs D 11 and D 39 to the Luwian symbols of royalty, winged sun-disc (LH *190), and of lightning (LH *199), 1023 and later by embedding the Luwian connection in a network of internal evidence in the form of a doublet and triplets and a vowel analysis. 1024 Working out this relationship, it turned out that of the total amount of 47 signs on the discus, 29 can convincingly be linked up with a Luwian hieroglyphic counterpart. 1025 However, as soon realized, the script of the discus is not an isolated phenomenon on Crete, but further attested for a double-axe from Arkalokhori and an altar-stone from Malia. 1026 As a matter of fact, as indicated by the 14 correspondences in sum listed in table 23.1 below, it is nothing but a manifestation – be it on the largest extant scale – of Cretan hieroglyphic itself. 1027 Mutatis mutandis, the possible relationship of the latter script with Luwian hieroglyphic comes to the fore again.

This relationship is a viable one, as I hope to show in my table 23.1 below. In this table I present a list of correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Luwian hieroglyphic for signs which occur in a reasonably clear context. This list, which is an elaboration of earlier efforts, 1028 includes signs from the discus of Phaistos and the aforesaid double-axe from Arkalokhori, which texts, for reasons beyond my comprehension, are omitted from the recent corpus of Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions (= CHIC). 1029 In order to overcome this omission, I have assigned to these two texts a number adding up to the last one recorded for CHIC, thus the double-axe of Arkalokhori becomes # 332 and the discus of Phaistos # 333. I further present the numbering of the signs according to Evans’ original publication (1909) next to that of CHIC, because in a number of instances he distinguishes a sign which is not recognized as such by CHIC. Finally, for brevity’s sake I refer to standard formulas by an abbreviation, thus the libation formula is referred to as LF and the profane formulas as PF 1-7. 1030

1017 Evans 1895: 33 ff.
1018 Evans 1909.
1019 Gelb 1931: 79 ff.
1020 Bossert 1932: 5 ff.
1026 Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 87, fig. 1b; Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 74, fig. 1b; 77, fig. 2c.
1028 Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 87, fig. 3; Woudhuizen 1992c: Pl. XXVI.
1029 Olivier & Godart 1996.
1030 Woudhuizen 2001b: 608-12 (= LF & PF 1-6); Woudhuizen 2002a: 124 (= PF 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evans</th>
<th>CHIC</th>
<th>LH</th>
<th>value</th>
<th>attestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMU #310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ḪARMAḪI, [bar] #328, #332, #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PARA #255, #296, #314, #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PARA #271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>miš #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ā #332, #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>#296, #314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>handleSubmit #246, #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>040</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>na #309, #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>095</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>ā #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>KAYA, Ĺ #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>PIA, pī #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>80-81</td>
<td>IARU PF 7 (8x), #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>nā PF 5 (41x), #258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>h(a) #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>TIAWA, ā #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>WALWA, ā #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>TAKU #193, #271, #310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>028</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>KURUNT, ra #255, #296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>nā #271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>MUWA, mu #253, #271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>SURNA, nā #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>MALIA, mu #139, #312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>mu #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>ḫAWA, ḫu #328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>ū #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>TINTAPU, nā #314, #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>130.3</td>
<td>ARSU, ra LF (7x), #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>[wa] #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>031</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>nā PF 5 (25x), PF 6 (11x), #314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>WIANA, wi #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>[PARNΛ, pa] #328, #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>LALA, lā #271306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>TURPI, [wa] #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>WASU, [wa] #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>sol suus #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>TAWATA, [ti] PF 2 (35x), PF 3 (4x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>TARTU, ṭā #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>061/069</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>ḪAPA, nā #196, #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>ḫ #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>034</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>UTA, nā PF 7 (10x), #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>041</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>WANA, [wa] #246, #271, #309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>scalprum #328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1031 Note that the sign is rendered in this text ‘en face’ instead of ‘en profile’ as is usually the case.
1032 Note that both Evans and CHIC present only the xoanon sign, not the man’s head itself.
1033 Note that this particular form of the arm sign is represented without the dagger, as it occurs in # 314.
1034 Note that the ship sign appears both with and without a mast as well as in form of an hippocamp.
1035 Value attested already for seals or sealings from the Late Bronze Age period, see Herbordt 1998: 313; 317, fig. 4, 3-4.
1036 Note that the sign is rendered here in a lengthened and extremely slim way so that it is almost not recognizable anymore as a tongue, but the three knobs on the top side are decisive for its identification.
Table 23.1. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Luwian hieroglyphic (values in square brackets attested for Cretan hieroglyphic only)

Table 23.2. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Egyptian hieroglyphic (values as attested for Cretan hieroglyphic)

Notwithstanding the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic is basically related to Luwian hieroglyphic, there are a number of cases in which Egyptian hieroglyphic provides the closest comparative evidence. This concerns first of all the bee-sign, which – apart from a singular occurrence – goes unrepresented among the Luwian hieroglyphic repertoire. Like in Egyptian, the latter sign turns up in combination with a floral motif, to indicate the king of Lower and Upper Egypt. This royal title is also attested for Middle Bronze Age inscriptions from Byblos, which was subject to strong Egyptian influences at the time. In Crete, the bee-sign undergoes a typical local treatment in the sense that, apart from its regular depiction from the side (CHIC no. 20), it also tends to be represented from the top (CHIC no. 21) (Woudhuizen 1997). Besides the bee-sign, the symbol of royalty in form of a winged sun-disc, mentioned among the Luwian correspondences, ultimately originates from Egyptian hieroglyphic as well, but its ductus in Crete betrays Anatolian influences in the fact that the sun-disc is repre-

---

1037 Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 8, fig. 7.
sented as a rosette. The same holds good for the ankh-sign, which, like it is the case in Anatolia, in Crete is characterized by two side stems (note, however, that in Anatolia the central stem is lost, whereas in Crete this is preserved). Apparently, these two signs, belonging to the oldest layer of Luwian hieroglyphic during the Middle Bronze Age (Woudhuizen 2006d), reached Crete via an Anatolian intermediary.

The indirect route for signs originating from Egyptian hieroglyphic may further be illustrated by the trowel-sign (CHIC no. 040). In ductus this is closest to a Byblian parallel; it also receives a value based on the translation of its Egyptian meaning, di ‘to give’, into Luwian, hence pi as acrophonically derived from piya- ‘to give’ (Woudhuizen 2002b). A similar adaptation of the value can be observed for the wine ideogram (CHIC *156), representing Semitic wainu instead of Egyptian ḫrp (Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 8, fig. 8; 13, fig. 17; 15-16), the tablet-sign (Evans no. 31), rendering the syllabic value du as acrophonically derived from Semitic tuppu ‘tablet’ (Friedrich 1946: Wörterverzeichnisse III, s.v.), and the palace-sign (CHIC no. 41), of which the acrophonic value wa6 can only be explained in terms of a mixing-up with its Luwian hieroglyphic look-alike wana ‘stele, altar’ (LH *267). Although direct contact between Egypt and Crete cannot be excluded, the given evidence is conducive to the conclusion that Egyptian signs reached Crete through the intermediary of the Levant and / or Anatolia. Or, at the very least, the handling of this category of signs in Crete is ‘more loose’ than the one received by the category of signs originating from Luwian hieroglyphic.

In Table 23.2 I present a list of correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Egyptian hieroglyphic for signs which occur in a reasonably clear context; numbering of the Egyptian hieroglyphic signs is according to Gardiner (1994).

A third source for signs from Cretan hieroglyphic is formed by Cretan Linear A (= CL). It is a general misconception that Cretan hieroglyphic constitutes a forerunner of Linear A: this is particularly true in case of the libation formula, which develops in the course of time into its Linear A descendant as attested for wash-hand stone-basins from peak-sanctuaries the destruction of which is usually assigned to the Middle Minoan III / Late Minoan I transitional period (c. 1600 BC) (Woudhuizen 2001b: 608). In most other instances, however, the representation of Linear A signs among Cretan hieroglyphic results from a merger between the two scripts, which started from the time of the earliest attestation of Linear A in Middle Minoan II (c. 1800-1700 BC) onwards, thus providing us with a terminus post quem for seals showing Linear A influences other than the libation formula (Vandenabeele 1985: 18).

Table 23.3 below presents correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic and Cretan Linear (A) for signs which occur in a reasonably clear context (cf. Woudhuizen 1992c: Pl. XXIV; numbering of the Linear A signs according to Meijer 1982: 38-47)
The relationship of Cretan hieroglyphic with Cypro-Minoan (= CM) has no bearing on the origins of Cretan hieroglyphic, but only on the date of its continuation, proving that it still flourished at the time of the earliest attestations of Cypro-Minoan in the late 16th or early 15th century BC (Woudhuizen 1992a: 87-90; Woudhuizen 2001b: 610).

The Cretan hieroglyphic contribution to Cypro-Minoan entails the following signs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evans</th>
<th>CHIC</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>value</th>
<th>attestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>049</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>044</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>047</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>ti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23.4. Correspondences between Cretan hieroglyphic with Cypro-Minoan

In his attempt to present a model for the origins of the Cretan hieroglyphic script, Wim van Binsbergen (1996-7: 134-42) took the analysis of Jan Best as his starting point. Best maintains that Egyptian hieroglyphic contributed as many as 35 signs to Cretan hieroglyphic, Luwian hieroglyphic only 30 signs, and the Byblos script 10 signs. He did not back up this analysis, however, by a further specification. As shown above, our analysis of the situation is different, with Luwian hieroglyphic providing the bulk of the material (56 signs), and Egyptian hieroglyphic (14 signs, of which 7 go without attestation in Luwian hieroglyphic) and Cretan Linear A (19 signs, of which 13 do not originate from either Luwian hieroglyphic or Egyptian hieroglyphic) rendering supplementary services only. This does not diminish the usability of van Binsbergen’s models as an aid to develop our own – slightly adapted – version, according to which a large arrow from Cappadocia and / or North Syria represents the Luwian hieroglyphic contribution, and small arrows from Egypt directly to Crete and from Egypt via Byblos to Crete represent the subsidiary Egyptian contribution (see Fig. 23.1).1038

---

1038 I am not going into the problem of the origins of Cretan Linear A, but, as we have seen, this certainly contains signs originating from Luwian hieroglyphic and from Egyptian hieroglyphic.

1039 Diagram drawn by Wim van Binsbergen.

1040 Best & Woudhuizen 1988: 30-84; Best & Woudhuizen 1989:
was seems to recall that of Trojan Ankhises.\textsuperscript{1052} Furthermore, under consideration of the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic [l] may also express [r], Tateale corresponds to Ugartic \textit{Ytr} as in \textit{Baytr} (Bin-\textit{ia-ra-ti}), \textit{Ytrhd} (Yatar-\textit{addu}), \textit{Ytr\textsuperscript{ap} (la-tar-\textit{ra\textsuperscript{s}ap})}, etc.\textsuperscript{1053} Finally, under consideration of the aforesaid interchangeability of [l] with [r] and on the analogy of Luwian hieroglyphic \textit{Mar\textless si\textgreater lis} and \textit{\textless ts\textless ttus\textgreater lis},\textsuperscript{1054} Manile may\textsuperscript{1055} be analyzed as an abridged form of Egyptian \textit{Men\textless x\textless kheper\textgreater r\textgreater -r}. Of the titles, \textit{laparnas} (= Hittite \textit{labarnas})\textsuperscript{1056}, \textit{P\textless ar\textgreater -custos} ‘vicerey’ (cf. titles like Latin \textit{pro-consul}), and \textit{tupa\textless la\textgreater } ‘scribe’\textsuperscript{1057} are of Anatolian type. Next, \textit{pini} corresponds to Semitic \textit{bn} as in Ugartic \textit{bn Lyry} ‘representative of the Lycians’.\textsuperscript{1058} Finally, \textit{bi’iy} or \textit{pi\textbar t} or \textit{pi\textbar ti} is identical to Egyptian \textit{bi’iy} ‘king of Lower Egypt’,\textsuperscript{1059} so that \textit{pinipiti} actually constitutes a Semito-Egyptian calque of Luwian hieroglyphic \textit{inf\textless ans} + \textit{T\textless a\textgreater n\textless at\textgreater awat\textgreater - ‘prince’.

The geographic name \textit{Sa\textless hur\textgreater wa} is attested in writing variant \textit{Sa\textless arr\textgreater wa} for other Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions, and occurs, in adjectival derivative, in Linear B as \textit{Sakarijo} or \textit{Sa\textless q\textgreater ar\textless e\textgreater jo}. It has been plausibly identified with Homeric \textit{Skheria}, which in turn appears to be the ancient name of Hagia Triada in the western part of the Mesara.\textsuperscript{1061} Next, the frequent \textit{Tarunu} is, considering the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic [r] may also express [l] and, as we have just seen, vice versa, and on the analogy of \textit{Titarma} being the Luwian hieroglyphic form of Hittite \textit{Attarimu}, likely to be read \textit{Atl\textless un\textgreater } – which resembles Plato’s mythical \textit{Atlantis} too much to be dismissed as accidental. On the basis of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1041} Gardiner 1957: L 2; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 117-8.
\item \textsuperscript{1042} Laroche 1960a: *326.
\item \textsuperscript{1043} Gordon 1955b: glossary, s.v.; Astour 1964: 194; Woudhuizen 1994: 512.
\item \textsuperscript{1044} Johnson 1957: L 2; cf. Best 1996-7: 118-9; Woudhuizen 1997: 107.
\item \textsuperscript{1045} Beran 1967: nos. 180 (\textit{um+r\textless si\textgreater -li}) and 186 (\textit{\textless b\textless i\textless k\textgreater -\textless nu\textless si\textgreater -\textgreater +li}).
\item \textsuperscript{1046} Laroche 1966a, s.v.; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126.
\item \textsuperscript{1047} Gismondi 1964: 264, no. 40, 2; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126; Woudhuizen 2006d.
\item \textsuperscript{1048} Cappadorian reduplicated \textit{Nu\textless ma\textgreater n\textless u\textgreater wa\textless s\textgreater}.\textsuperscript{1042} Next, one is of Kaskan type: \textit{Pitaparas} (= Kaskan \textit{Pittaparas}).\textsuperscript{1051} whereas the first element of Ankikases.\textsuperscript{1052} Furthermore, under consideration of the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic [l] may also express [r], Tateale corresponds to Ugartic \textit{Ytr} as in \textit{Baytr} (Bin-\textit{ia-ra-ti}), \textit{Ytrhd} (Yatar-\textit{addu}), \textit{Ytr\textsuperscript{ap} (la-tar-\textit{ra\textsuperscript{s}ap})}, etc.\textsuperscript{1053} Finally, under consideration of the aforesaid interchangeability of [l] with [r] and on the analogy of Luwian hieroglyphic \textit{Mar\textless si\textgreater lis} and \textit{\textless ts\textless ttus\textgreater lis},\textsuperscript{1054} Manile may\textsuperscript{1055} be analyzed as an abridged form of Egyptian \textit{Men\textless x\textless kheper\textgreater r\textgreater -r}. Of the titles, \textit{laparnas} (= Hittite \textit{labarnas})\textsuperscript{1056}, \textit{P\textless ar\textgreater -custos} ‘vicerey’ (cf. titles like Latin \textit{pro-consul}), and \textit{tupa\textless la\textgreater } ‘scribe’\textsuperscript{1057} are of Anatolian type. Next, \textit{pini} corresponds to Semitic \textit{bn} as in Ugartic \textit{bn Lyry} ‘representative of the Lycians’.\textsuperscript{1058} Finally, \textit{bi’iy} or \textit{pi\textbar t} or \textit{pi\textbar ti} is identical to Egyptian \textit{bi’iy} ‘king of Lower Egypt’,\textsuperscript{1059} so that \textit{pinipiti} actually constitutes a Semito-Egyptian calque of Luwian hieroglyphic \textit{inf\textless ans} + \textit{T\textless a\textgreater n\textless at\textgreater awat\textgreater - ‘prince’.

The geographic name \textit{Sa\textless hur\textgreater wa} is attested in writing variant \textit{Sa\textless arr\textgreater wa} for other Cretan hieroglyphic inscriptions, and occurs, in adjectival derivative, in Linear B as \textit{Sakarijo} or \textit{Sa\textless q\textgreater ar\textless e\textgreater jo}. It has been plausibly identified with Homeric \textit{Skheria}, which in turn appears to be the ancient name of Hagia Triada in the western part of the Mesara.\textsuperscript{1061} Next, the frequent \textit{Tarunu} is, considering the fact that Cretan hieroglyphic [r] may also express [l] and, as we have just seen, vice versa, and on the analogy of \textit{Titarma} being the Luwian hieroglyphic form of Hittite \textit{Attarimu}, likely to be read \textit{Atl\textless un\textgreater } – which resembles Plato’s mythical \textit{Atlantis} too much to be dismissed as accidental. On the basis of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1041} Homeros, \textit{Iliad} II, 820, etc.
\item \textsuperscript{1042} Grundahl 1967, s.v. \textit{yrtr}.
\item \textsuperscript{1043} Beran 1967: nos. 180 (\textit{um+r\textless si\textgreater -li}) and 186 (\textit{\textless b\textless i\textless k\textgreater -\textless nu\textless si\textgreater -\textgreater +li}).
\item \textsuperscript{1044} Banke 1935, s.v. \textit{mn\textless t\textgreater byr\textless r\textgreater ’}.
\item \textsuperscript{1047} Laroche 1960a: *326.
\item \textsuperscript{1048} Laroche 1966a, s.v.; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126.
\item \textsuperscript{1049} Laroche 1966. s.v.; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126.
\item \textsuperscript{1050} Laroche 1966, s.v.; cf. Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 126.
\item \textsuperscript{1051} Von Schuler 1965: Indices, 2. Personennamen, s.v.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
### Table 23.5. Seals with the categories ‘man’s name’, ‘title’, and ‘place or country name’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal no.</th>
<th>Text (the numbers indicate the various sides of the seal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 253</td>
<td>1. MUWA ya-ta&lt;-nú&gt; 2. pi-ni 3. pi-ti ‘prince Muwas has granted’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 255</td>
<td>1. a-nú SASA ta₃-ra₄-mi 2. pi₃-ni 3. pi₃-ti ‘under the seal with respect to Athunu, king Pittaparas’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 257</td>
<td>1. ma₃-nú ya₃-ta₃-nú 2. pi₃-ti 3. ta₃-ru₃-nú ‘Manes has granted, king (of) Athunu’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># 258</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 'ya-ta-le 2. pi-mi 3. ta-ru-nú 'Yatar, representative (of) Atlunu’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 271</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SASA UTNA 2. sā-ḫur-wa 3. la-PÁRANA TARKU-MUWA 'seal (with respect to) the land (of) Skheria (= Hagia Triada), king Tarkumwas’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 296</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SASA UTNA SARU 2. PÁRA-tu-ru 3. pi-mi 4. pa3-yu-ki 'seal (with respect to) the land (and) official(s) (of) the Phaiakians, representative Barta-ras’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 309</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a-na-ki-wa 2. pi-ti ma 3. ta-ru-nú 4. ya-ta-nú ‘Ankiwas, king (of) Atlunu, has granted’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I: Cretan Hieroglyphic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 310</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>SASA UTNA le SARU</strong> 2. <strong>a-ya-lū</strong> 3. <strong>AMU `TARKU</strong> soi (3X) 4. <strong>bi’äy/ši-it’</strong> seal (with respect to) the sun-blessed land (and) official(s) (of) Ayalu (= Malia), I (am) king Tarkus, (person) blessed by the sun-god'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># 312</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 23.2. Cretan hieroglyphic seals with the categories ‘man’s name’, ‘title’, and ‘place or country name’ (drawings from original publications, except in the case of # 309)

distribution of the seals with this geographic name, it probably refers to the northern zone of Crete from Knossos to Kato Zakro. Furthermore, Ayalū, which turns up in variant form Ayala in Linear A, is for its association with Semitic ajalu ‘stag’, ingeniously explained by Best as the Semitic designation of modern Malia, otherwise indicated in Cretan hieroglyphic by a deer with prominent antlers or, as a pars pro toto, by the antlers themselves (028). As the deer or antlers render the value rū, an abbreviation of Linear B Rukito ‘Lyktos’ lies at hand, which name is mentioned in the itinerary of Aegean place names from Amenhotep III’s (1390-1352 BC) temple tomb at Kom el-Hetan (Thebes) between Amnisos and Sitia – i.e. exactly where we would expect the mention of the ancient name of Malia. Finally, for its striking resemblance to Homeric Phaiakes, the form Payaki is likely to be considered an ethnonym referring to the inhabitants of Skheria – the ancient name, as we have just suggested, of Hagia Triada.

If for the sake of completeness we add that anu in the legend of seal # 255 is a Cretan dialectal variant of Luwian hieroglyphic anan ‘under’, characterized by a/u-vowel shift, that Taruni in the same legend bears testimony of the dative singular in -i of Tarunu ‘Atlunu’ as paralleled for Luwian hieroglyphic, that yatanu in the legend of seals # 257, # 312, and # 314 corresponds to Ugaritic ytn ‘he as given’, and that pititi in the legend of seal # 314 shows the dative singular in -ti as attested for Linear A (telū Dakuseneti ‘delivery to Taku-šenni’) and Cypro-Minoan (telu Sanemeti ‘delivery to Sanemas’), we arrive in sum

---

1064 Best 2000: 29; see Chapter 19 above.
1065 Laroche 1960a: *57, 2; cf. ata ‘in’, corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic ata, and apa ‘behind’, corresponding to Luwian hieroglyphic apa, from the text of the Phaistos disc, see Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 79-82.
1066 See Chapter 12, note 498 above.
1068 Woudhuizen 1992a: 96. The ending in -ti originates
at the following transliteration and interpretation of the legends of our 10 Minoan seals (cf. Fig. 23.2).

Remaining seals or sealings used in our discussion of the signs are # 003γ and # 139 from Knossos, which read bi’ty ma-sa πθA ‘the king has given to the god(s)’, with masa representing either D sg. in -a or D pl. in -ai of Luwian hieroglyphic masa(na)- ‘god’,1069 # 196, presenting the personal name sa-ná-ma, and # 246 from Kritsa, which reads pi-ii bi-i-a-wa6 ‘king (of) Akhaia’, thus presenting the earliest recorded reference to the Greek mainland.

---

1069 Note that this legend strikingly recalls ‘to the gods of the Greeks’ in inscriptions on pottery from the Hellenion at Naukratis dating from the Archaic period, see Boardman 1994: 142; cf. Chapter 9 above.
The following list of comparanda for the Etruscan language is based on Woudhuizen 1992b and Woudhuizen 1998 (with references to earlier literature), and supplemented by Steinbauer 1999 as discussed in Woudhuizen 2001a. For the comparisons with Greek and Latin I have made use of Charsekin 1963, especially 24-28, amplified, as far as Greek is concerned, by Schachermeyr 1929: 248, Fieseler 1931: 43; 51-52, and van der Meer 1992: 68. The meaning of the Etruscan words, elements and endings is in most instances secured by a comprehensive interpretation of the texts in which these appear.

### CHAPTER 24. PART II APPENDIX II: ON THE POSITION OF THE ETRUSCAN LANGUAGE

The following list of comparanda for the Etruscan language is based on Woudhuizen 1992b and Woudhuizen 1998 (with references to earlier literature), and supplemented by Steinbauer 1999 as discussed in Woudhuizen 2001a. For the comparisons with Greek and Latin I have made use of Charsekin 1963, especially 24-28, amplified, as far as Greek is concerned, by Schachermeyr 1929: 248, Fieseler 1931: 43; 51-52, and van der Meer 1992: 68. The meaning of the Etruscan words, elements and endings is in most instances secured by a comprehensive interpretation of the texts in which these appear.

#### HITTITE ETRUSCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>ETRUSCAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ak-(a)ke- ‘to drink’</td>
<td>acum., eam-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ilu- ‘bones’</td>
<td>cuxthu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ĕlu- ‘enclosure’</td>
<td>eluv-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gullu (divinities of fate)</td>
<td>Culthu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. gurta- ‘citadel’</td>
<td>Curnu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. nua ‘to make’</td>
<td>in-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. nun ‘but, and’</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. man (optative particle)</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. maniya- ‘to handle, administer’</td>
<td>meni-, meni-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. neka- ‘to diminish, become twilight’</td>
<td>nace-, nege-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. nesaniya- ‘to renew’</td>
<td>nuca-1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. nu- (introductory particle)</td>
<td>nu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. parka- ‘high’</td>
<td>pargi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. parulius- ‘new year’s feast’</td>
<td>ril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. sumanu- ‘sporadic’</td>
<td>smantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. wallu- ‘to strike, hit, smite’</td>
<td>Vele-, Vely-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. wenza, wete- ‘to build’</td>
<td>wante-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CUNEIFORM LUWIAN ETRUSCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>ETRUSCAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. anma- ‘under’</td>
<td>anua, en-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ñma- ‘under’</td>
<td>inte-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. apna- ‘behind; re-’</td>
<td>apna, epn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Asti- ‘Assiya [GN]’</td>
<td>Ast-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. anu- ‘to come’</td>
<td>anx-, ev-, hev-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1070 This category also includes onomastic material relevant to the subject, except for the subsections on the comparisons with Greek and Latin / Italic.

1071 Note that the treatment of Hittite -\(\theta\) is not consistent in Etruscan, being omitted in meni-, meni- < Hittite maniya\(\theta\), but represented by -\(\iota\) in nuca- < Hittite nesaniya\(\theta\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Syllable</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>ʾaššu-</td>
<td>'to love'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>ʾuš ‘m’</td>
<td>inter-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>ʾānātu-</td>
<td>'to come'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>ʾmANTAWAT-</td>
<td>'king'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-bitwa</td>
<td>'and; also'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>ʾmH'Abā-</td>
<td>'grandfather'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>ʾmWA 'when; because'</td>
<td>-cve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>ʾmWA-</td>
<td>'who, what'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>ʾmWA- ‘to run, march’</td>
<td>cut(vu)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>ʾmI-</td>
<td>(stem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>KATANA-</td>
<td>'bowl'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>ḫuntassa</td>
<td>-tiwra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>ḫunt[GN]</td>
<td>-tiwra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>ḫunm-</td>
<td>-tiwra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>ʾepīl ‘behind; re-’</td>
<td>apa, epn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>e-nee- ‘under’</td>
<td>ana, en-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>epi- ‘with’</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>ʾke ‘and; also’</td>
<td>-c-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>ʾmI- ‘to give’</td>
<td>-tiwra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>ḫum-</td>
<td>-tiwra-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>ʾmI- ‘to build’</td>
<td>ḫnum-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>ʾPĀ ‘before, pre-’</td>
<td>per-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>ʾPIA- ‘to strike’</td>
<td>tvi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>ʾSARLaA/š[a]ta- ‘libation offering’</td>
<td>šes( = *šerla-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>ʾSUI[-/Ruša][- ‘abundance’</td>
<td>šari-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>ʾSARLaA/š[a]ta- ‘libation offering’</td>
<td>šes( = *šerla-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>ʾšamnu ‘precinct’</td>
<td>ša-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>ʾšum- ‘to strike, hit’</td>
<td>šupi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>ʾšum- ‘to place, put’</td>
<td>šu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>-šu- ‘(introductory particle’</td>
<td>ša, šu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>ʾšu-šulab- ‘to elevate’</td>
<td>šal( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>ʾšALWA- ‘lion’</td>
<td>šelavwA-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>ʾšANATHuš- ‘mother, woman’</td>
<td>ŠHuš-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 80. | šan.wa-ti/it ‘by the grace of’ | šin-
| 81. | šawā-ti/it ‘by the grace of’ | šin-
| 46. | ʾšAWA/šawalnu- ‘wine’ | šawai-

**Word formation**

1072 Not yet in Woudhuizen 1998.

1073 Agostiniani & Nicosia 2000: 54 (= Tabula Cortonensis, section II).
### LYDIAN ETRUSCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>D pl. -a, -e (x *-ai)</th>
<th>-e (&lt; *-ai [D-G])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>ml(ve)nu ‘thank-offering’</td>
<td>muluva-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Nunu (introducory particle)</td>
<td>nuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Nana- ‘Nanas [MN]’</td>
<td>Nana-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>mi ‘not’</td>
<td>nes, nes, nis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>palmu- ‘king’</td>
<td>toga palmuta (Lat.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>pe- ‘who, what’</td>
<td>-ye-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>sill- (magistracy)</td>
<td>zila-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>tum- ‘precinct’</td>
<td>tiaia-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>tāte- ‘steele, grave’</td>
<td>tesi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Tidalis- ‘Tidals [MN]’</td>
<td>ὑφασις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>t,ar(e)- ‘to place, put’</td>
<td>τρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>ar,bi- ‘to strike, hit’</td>
<td>τυπ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>vit,vi- ‘to build’</td>
<td>vatri-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**word formation**

| Page | adjectival -si- | -s, -d-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>an m(ve)nu ‘thank-offering’</td>
<td>muluva-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 48.  | adjectival -si- | -l-
| 101. | ethnic - | -
| 52.  | ‘ship’ -k- | -e-, -k- |

**(pro)nomenal declension & verbal conjugation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Nmn(i) sg. -a</th>
<th>--, -a (geminilium)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Nmn(i) sg. -a</td>
<td>--, -a (pronoun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>D sg. -a, -i</td>
<td>-(D-G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>-l (D-G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>G sg. -l</td>
<td>(D-G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Abi sg. -di, -di, -i, -e (D-G)</td>
<td>-dl, -si(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Nmn(i) sg. -a</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>N-A(n) pl. -a</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>D pl. -ai</td>
<td>-e (&lt; *-ai [D-G])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>G pl. -ai</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>3rd pers. sg. pres./fut. -di</td>
<td>-dij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>3rd pers. pl. pres./fut. -nt</td>
<td>-nt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEMNIAN ETRUSCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>G pl. -a, -e</th>
<th>-e (&lt; *-ai [D-G])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>3rd pers. sg. pres./fut. -di</td>
<td>-dij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>3rd pers. pl. pres./fut. -nt</td>
<td>-nt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GREEK ETRUSCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>a(e)lyria ‘sun’</th>
<th>avil- ‘year’,1074</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>hulx, (G halos) ‘salt, sea’</td>
<td>als-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>askos ‘wine-skin’</td>
<td>aska (vase name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Apithos (moneth name)</td>
<td>apithos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Bakkhos ‘Bakkhos’</td>
<td>Pagie-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>bronâ ‘roar, thunder’</td>
<td>fronta,1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>deinos ‘round vessel’</td>
<td>θυα (vase name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>demou ‘to built’</td>
<td>θυμ (u)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>dâte- ‘to give’</td>
<td>τετα (u)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>hakatombe ‘sacrifice of hundred oxen’</td>
<td>ἄθιθνα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>elas(y)l ‘olive’</td>
<td>κέτωρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>emmenai ‘to be’ (Aiolik)</td>
<td>άμμ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>epiouros ‘guardian, watcher, ward’</td>
<td>ἐπιουρ-, epuru-,1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>themeros ‘holy’</td>
<td>ταμερες- ‘holy gift’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>themis ‘law, custom, right’</td>
<td>θεμι-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>klōn ‘twig, spray, slip’</td>
<td>κλαμ ‘son’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>kōlekhne ‘small cup’</td>
<td>κυληγ(α), κυληγα (vase name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>kōlhön ‘drinking vessel’</td>
<td>κωτα (vase name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>eleutheros ‘free’</td>
<td>λυτρ ‘friended’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>lyschon ‘lion’</td>
<td>λυ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>lēkathos ‘oil-flask’</td>
<td>λεγυμον(α) (vase name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>brōntos (&lt; *metos) ‘mortal’</td>
<td>μυρ- ‘to die’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>nekias ‘corps’</td>
<td>νακε-, νεγ- ‘diminishing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>nepous, pl. nepodes ‘children’</td>
<td>νΦος, νες, νεθ- ‘entails’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1074 Maroesch 1957, who further points out that related words for ‘sun’, like Latin sol, are also used for ‘year’.

1075 Note the preservation of the Greek [o] in the Etruscan form.

1076 Correspondence used by Agostiniani & Nicosia 2000: 105 without due reference to the original source Charsekin 1963.
The salient points from this list are the following:

(1) Correspondences of Etruscan with Hittite have a bearing on vocabulary alone: hence Etruscan is not to be identified with Hittite, as Vladimir Georgiev wants to have it.

(2) Considering the fact that the correspondences of Etruscan with Luwian hieroglyphic outmatch all other categories, Etruscan shows the closest affinity with Luwian hieroglyphic. Note especially that the shared use of the endings of the N(m/f) pl. in -i and D pl. in -ai exclude a particularly close relationship with cuneiform Luwian, which is characterized by N(m/f) pl. -nzi and D pl. -nza. Yet another feature which stresses the relationship of Etruscan with Luwian hieroglyphic is the phenomenon of rhotacism of the dental, as attested for the onomastic element taiwat/ra- and the ending of the Abl. sg. -t/ri.

(3) Nevertheless, Etruscan is not to be identified as a dialect of Luwian hieroglyphic, as it shares the loss of the N(m/f) sg. -s and A(m/f) sg. -n in the realm of the noun with Lycian, which also provides comparative evidence for the A(m/f) pl. in -es or -is. To this comes that Etruscan shows some evidence of the typical Lycian phonetic development [s] > [h] in the case of the verb war. Another deviation from the Luwian hieroglyphic pattern is formed by the G pl. in -ai, which Etruscan shares with Lydian and Lydian. Finally, Etruscan has in common with Lydian the use of the D-G sg. in -l and the dropping of the final vowel with respect to
the endings of the Abl. sg. and the 3rd person sg. and pl. of the present/future tense. Obviously, this leads us to the conclusion that Etruscan is a Luwian dialect *sui generis*.

(4) About the time that Etruscan separated from the related Luwian dialects it is relevant to note that, considering the form of the relative being *χ-va-* , it has not participated in the labiovelar development which characterizes Lycian *ti-* and Lydian *pe-* or *pi-*. On the other hand, we have seen that Etruscan shows some evidence of the typical Lycian phonetic development [s] > [h]. Hence, the separation likely dates to after the 8th century BC, when Luwian hieroglyphic dies out, and before the first evidence of Lycian and Lydian in the late 7th century BC.

(5) The large amount of correspondences with Greek, which cannot be explained in an Italian context, indicate an Aegean location of Etruscan when still in the Anatolian motherland. On the basis of the Aiolisms, this location may perhaps even be fine-tuned as in the neighborhood of Aiolia. Note that the influence of Greek on Etruscan, in view of the origin of the ending of the 3rd person sg. of the past tense in *-ce* or *-χe* from the Greek kappa-perfect (or -aorist), amounted to the level of code-mixing.\(^{1077}\)

(6) The correspondences with Italic and Latin are easily explained by the Italian context of Etruscan from the 7th century BC onwards. Note that, in view of the 3rd person pl. of the passive of the present tense in *-n(a)ρι* and the passive infinitive *-ri*, the interaction with the Italic also amounted to the level of code-mixing.

(7) The correspondences with Phoenician indicate a direct contact of Etruscans with Phoenicians.

---

\(^{1077}\) Adams, Janse & Swain 2002.
CHAPTER 25. PART II APPENDIX III: A LUWIAN TRIFUNCTIONAL DIVINE TRIAD RECORDED FOR CRETE

The Egyptian hieroglyphic text of a medical papyrus, probably stemming from to the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC), preserves a magical spell against the Asiatic pox in the language of the Keftiu. In transliteration, this text reads:

`santikpwpywiyym'ntirkikr,`

or, in the vocalized transliteration as adopted by Wolfgang Helck:

`sa-n-ta-ka-pu-pi-wa-ya-'a-ya-ma-n-ta-ra-ki-ka-ra.`

As argued at length in my contribution on the topic from 1992 (with references), the formula can be subdivided into six individual entities, four of which render three divine names in sum, viz. Santas, Kupapa, and Tarḫu Kara, and the remaining two of which consist of vocabulary words, viz. waya (w/y) and `ayaman (iyym'). The three divine names are all of Luwian background, whereas the vocabulary words, in conformity with the situation in Cretan Linear A, are Semitic, waya corresponding to wy

1078 Woudhuizen 1992a: 1-10; according to the expert Egyptologist J.F. Borghouts, the sign Gardner 1994: N 31 `road' does not render a phonetic value in the present context.

1079 For Luwian hieroglyphic, see Savas 1998: 41-42 (Santas); 17-29 (Kupapa); 47-63 (Tarḫu); note that Tarḫu(nt) is represented as Ṭraqqī- or Ṭraqas in Lycian inscriptions, see Melchert 1993, s.v., and as Zeus Targuēnios in Lydia, see Woudhuizen 1990: 101; Santas and Kupapa are recorded in form of Šantāš and Kūfad in Lydian no. 4, see Gusman 1964. Related onomastic elements of these three divine names together are attested for the archives of Tell Atchana / Alalakh (Goetze 1954: 74, 78; Larroche 1960b: 116) and Ras Shamra / Ugarit (Gordon 1965: glossary nos. 1186, 1777, 2607, and 2609) in North Syria (cf. Strange 1980: 132), i.e. precisely the region from where Luwian hieroglyphic disseminates in the beginning of the second millennium BC (Best & Woudhuizen 1989: 108-20; 128-37). At Karkamis in this very same region also a divine triad is venerated, this time consisting of Tarḫu(nt) (or its ȝirritic equivalent Ṭesup or its Semitic counterpart Adad), Kupapa and the stag-god Karḫušas, see Larroche 1960b: 120; this latter divine triad is mentioned together in, amongst others, a Luwian hieroglyphic inscription on a stone bowl dedicated by the Phrygian king Midas and hence dating to the late 8th century BC, which was transported as a spoil from Karkamis to Babylon, see Hawkins 2000: 394-6 and Woudhuizen 2004b: 105-6 (= Babylon 2).

`and' as recorded for a Phoenician inscription from Cyprus and `ayaman to `immanu `with us’ as in Biblical `immanu’el `with us god’, so that in its entirety the translation of the formula runs as follows: ‘Santas, Kupapa, and with us Carian Tarḫu(nt)’.

Of the three gods in question, Tarḫu(nt) is the storm- or weather-god, often depicted with the symbol of lightning in his hand. Next, Kupapa, who is likely to be identified with the Phrygian Magna Mater, Kybele, no doubt likewise represents agricultural richness and procreation. Finally, there is some evidence to consider Santas as a war-god, because (1) he is depicted armed with a bow, (2) in his capacity as chief god of Tarsus during the Classical period he is identified with the Greek war-hero par excellence, Herakles, and (3) in an Hittite text he is staged as dressed in bloodred cloths – red being the color of the warrior class. At this point, one cannot help to be reminded of Georges Dumézil’s epoch-making thesis of a trifunctional ideology of the Indo-Europeans, Tarḫu(nt) representing royal sovereignty (= F1), Santas standing as a protagonist for the class of warriors (= F2), and Kupapa acting as protectress of the class of agricultural producers (= F3). At any rate, the parallels from the pantheon of other Indo-European peoples like the Romans, the Indians, and the Germans for trifunctional divine triads are conspicuous.

Now, the present Luwian divine triad is not the only evidence for trifunctionalism in Crete. Recently, Chris Lynn and Dean Miller argued that the cup with a man with a staff (= F1), the rhyton with a depiction of boxers and other sports (= F2), and the vase with a procession of farmers (= F3) from one and the same Late Minoan IB context at Hagia Triada present yet another instance of this typical...
Table 25.1. Trifunctional divine triads among various Indo-European speaking groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LUWIAN</th>
<th>ROMAN</th>
<th>INDIC</th>
<th>GERMANIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Tarku Kara</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Mitra-Varuna</td>
<td>Thor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Santas</td>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>Indra</td>
<td>Wodan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Kupapa</td>
<td>Quirinus</td>
<td>Nasatya-Āśvin</td>
<td>Freyr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indo-European ideology. Contrary to the opinion of the latter authors, however, I would not attribute this example of trifunctionalism to the Mycenaean Greeks, who only gained possession of the island of Crete after the disastrous Santorini eruption at the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC), but to the Luwian population groups which presumably arrived with the Indo-European incursions in the east-Mediterranean region at the end of the Early Bronze Age II, c. 2300 BC.

According to the late Edgar Polomé, there is no evidence of trifunctionalism among the Indo-European population groups of Anatolia, which would underline their aberrant position in the field of linguistics as exemplified by the unique preservation of a reflex of laryngeal [h₂].

As shown in the above, however, this evidence is blatantly provided by the most southerly fringe of the Luwians,  

incides markedly with the straightforwardly Indo-European nature of the Luwian language as attested for the hieroglyphic monuments, which, apart from some individual developments like the loss of the voiced velars, is particularly related to the conservative group among the Indo-European languages consisting, next to the other IE Anatolian languages Hittite and Palaic, of Celtic, Italic, and Tocharian. Hence, the preservation of a reflex of laryngeal [h₂] in IE Anatolian may safely be ascribed to the influence of the indigenous Anatolian languages like Ḫattic and Ḫurritic on that of the Indo-European intruders. No need, therefore, to saddle the Indo-Europeans of Anatolia up with 1700 years of fictitious history, as Robert Drews, in the wake of the linguists Thomas Gamkrelidze & Vačeslav Ivanov, does in his Greater Anatolia!

---

1082 Lynn & Miller 1999.
1083 Mellaart 1971; Gimbutas 1973; Best 1981: 8-9; see Chapter 10 above.
1084 Polomé 1982b: 169 ‘(…) nothing reminds us of the trifunctional pattern in the traditions of the Luwians, Hittites, and other Indo-Europeans of the Old Kingdom, (…)’. An exception to this statement is be formed by the trifunctional colors (F1 white, F2 red, and F3 blue) enumerated in a Hittite ritual, see Littleton 1973: 95 and cf. note 1080 above.

CHAPTER 26. PART II APPENDIX IV: PELASGIAN DEMETER AND ZEUS

The earliest attestation of the divine name Demeter is on a stone ladder inscribed with the Linear A legend da-ma-te from a peak-sanctuary at Kythera, dated to the transition from Middle Minoan III to Late Minoan I, c. 1600 BC. According to Herodotus, the cult of Demeter originated from Egypt, and the rites were taught by the daughters of Danaos to Pelasgian women. As the arrival in Greece of Danaos with his daughters from Egypt can be situated in the period of the shaft-graves at Mycenae c. 1600 BC, this tallies well with the afore-mentioned date of the earliest epigraphical evidence for the divine name Demeter. In the variant of the myth by Pausanias, however, Demeter is welcomed in his home by Pelasgos, the mythical ancestor of the Pelasgians who ruled the Argolid before the arrival of Danaos and his daughters and thus brings us back to sometime in the Middle Bronze Age.

The name Demeter or Damater is variously analyzed by linguists, but all agree that the second element consists of a reflex of PIE *meh-gēr ‘mother’. Generally, this is taken for evidence of the Greek language, but the interpretation of Linear B ma-ka as Ma Ga ‘Mother Earth’ militates against a Greek solution along the line of da- in Damater being a reflex of Greek ga or gē ‘earth’. To this comes that the Phrygian language, which, as we have seen in Chapter 14 above, was presumably spoken by pre-Greek population groups of mainland Greece, is likewise characterized by a reflex of PIE *meh-gēr as exemplified by the Old Phrygian expression matar Kubileya or mator Kubileya ‘mother Kybele’. Hence, the divine name Demeter may well date back to the time before the Greek language came into being and be of Pelasgian origin as Pausanias’ version of the myth suggests.

Another deity attributed with a Pelasgian origin is Zeus.

Thus already in Homeros’ Iliad, which, as we have seen in section 2 above, basically reflects Late Bronze Age history, Zeus of Dodona – at that time still the one near Skotussa in Thessaly – is referred to by Achilleus in a prayer as ‘Pelasgian’ (Zeus Dōdōnaie Pelas-gīke). Now, the linguistic analysis of the divine name Zeus is undisputed, all specialists tracing it back to the PIE root *Dyēus for the sky-god. If, then, Zeus’ mythical Pelasgian origin applies, we are confronted with a second pre-Greek divine name based on a PIE root.

The Pelasgian nature of Demeter and Zeus may well account for their incorporation in the Lydian pantheon as Lametrus- and Levō or Lefē (< *deus), respectively. As we have seen in Chapter 19 above, namely, Pelasgians were living in the region of Larisa Phrikonis at the time of the Trojan war and for this reason may be assumed to have been in close contact with the ancestors of the historical Lydians, in which process they evidently radiated their cult of Demeter and Zeus.

The identification of Demeter and Zeus as Pelasgian gods does not exclude their ultimate Cretan origin as suggested by the Homeric hymn to Demeter and Hesiodos’ Theogony, which squares with the earliest attestation of Demeter in a Linear A inscription from a Minoan peak-sanctuary at Kythera, and the myth of Zeus being born in the cave of Dikte as we have already noted with respect to Demeter, the cult of these gods may have radiated to the Greek mainland already in Middle Helladic times! From a

1087 Sakellarakis & Olivier 1994 (= KY Za 2); Duhoux 1994-5: 290-1; Suter 2002: 164.
1088 Histories II, 171.
1089 Guide to Greece 1, 14, 2.
1092 Brixhe & Lejeune 1984: W-04; B-01.
1096 Gusman 1964, s.v.
1098 Theogony 695-74, with laisōn as parhedros; for the Minyan nature of the root of the latter name, cf. the royal names Iassos as attested for Orthomenos and Iason as reported for Iolkos, on which see Sakellariou 1977: 116-7.
1099 Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautika I, 665-6; for the association of his birth with mount Ida, see ibid., II, 1559-61; cf. Nilsson 1927: 393-4. Note in this connection that in Homeros’ Iliad Zeus is frequently associated with the Trojan mount Ida.
linguistic point of view, however, the names Demeter and Zeus should be assigned to a Pelasgian layer or group in Cretan society.


Two double-axes, one of gold and the other of silver, from the cave of Arkalokhori are inscribed with the Linear A legend L 100a-30-95-92, reading, with the values of their Linear B counterparts, i-da-ma-te.1100 This legend has received various interpretations by the different authors. In the first place, the excavator of the find, Nikolaos Boufidis, suggested to consider it as the equivalent of Greek *Ida hè matér ‘The Idaian Mother’.1101 Secondly, editor princeps of the inscription on the gold axe, Maurice Pope, took it for a variant of the pre-Greek divine name Démêrîn characterized by an enigmatic prefix i-.1102 Thirdly, Franco Crevatin explained the second part of the legend as a reflex of the onomastic element -ma-te as attested for the pre-Greek Cretan divine name Britomartis.1103 In the fourth place, finally, Paul Faure proposed to split up the second part of the legend in a theonym Ma and a reflex of the Greek vocabulary word theos.1104

Of these interpretations, the last two have a bearing only on the second element -ma-te, which the authors in question try to disconnect from PIE *mēh-tery ‘mother’. In my view, these attempts are highly dubious (we would have expected *ma- and *ma-te-o, respectively) and at any rate unsuccessful in explaining the legend in full. The latter remark also holds good for Pope’s interpretation, which, although recognizing the plausible relation of ma-te with PIE *mēh-ter, saddles us up with an enigmatic prefix i-.1105 This leaves us, by means of deduction, with the only comprehensive elucidation by Boufidis as ‘Idai Mother’. According to Elwira Kaczyńska, this runs up against the fact that the Cretan ononym Ida originates from *Wida, and hence an initial digamma should be expected for the Linear A legend1106 – an inference which even receives further support if the related Greek idê ‘timber-tree’ (leading to the interpretation of Ida as ‘wooded hill’)1107 ultimately derives from PIE *yidh- ‘tree’.1108 However, the man’s name Idaios, which, of course, cannot be disconnected from the mountain name Ida, appears in Linear B as i-da-i-jo, that is to say without an initial digamma.1109 As it seems, then, the initial digamma has been dropped already in the 14th century BC, which, needless to say, seriously undermines Kaczyńska’s objection.

The validity of Boufidis’ interpretation can be further supported by circumstantial evidence. As indicated in the above, the legend is inscribed on double-axes. Now, the double-axe is the symbol par excellence of the foremost Cretan goddess, according to her Semitic form of address is called Assara. This goddess, especially known from libation inscriptions on wash-hand stone-basins from peak-sanctuaries, is depicted on a seal with the double-axe on her head. Furthermore, her name is written with the double-axe sign for the expression of the initial vowel, which in one instance is placed between punctuation marks to stress its symbolic value as a totem for the goddess.1110 According to three Cretan hieroglyphic sealings with the first part of the name of the goddess from Samothrace, her cult was exported to the north-Aegean region in the Middle Minoan II or III period.1111 If we realize, then, that for the Luwian population of Crete the form of address for this foremost Cretan goddess


1101 LSJ, s.v. Note in this connection that in Homeros, Iliad XXIII, 110-28 and in Dictys of Cretë’s work on the Trojan war (III, 12 and IV, 13) the Trojan mount Ida is referred to as a source of wood for cremation burials.

1102 Delamarre 2003: 319 for Celtic uidhe- ‘tree, wood’.

1103 Ventris & Chadwick 1973; glossary, s.v.: cf. also i-da-me-na-jo, the female counterpart of Homeric Idomeneus, which latter is plausibly interpreted by Kretschmer (Pasubio-Wissowa Realencyclopdie, s.v.) as ‘der Mann vom Ida gebirge’ and hence likely bears testimony of the Hittite ethnic suffix -umanu-, see Laroche 1960c: 171. Note that this linguistic analysis receives further emphasis by the fact that Idomeneus’ mother is called Ido according to literary tradition, see Gindin 1999: 90. For the loss of the wau, cf. Linear A a-si-ja-ka as compared to Linear B a-si-wi-jo, both forms bearing testimony of the Anatolian geographic name Assuwa ‘Asia’.

was Kapu, a local dialectal variant of Luwian Kupapa, it seems not farfetched to assume that the Kybelea (= Phrygian form of Luwian Kupapa) cult at the Trojan mount Ida was introduced from Crete in this particular period. If so, our connection of the double-axe with the ‘Idaian Mother’ is substantially enhanced.

The question remains to be answered to which linguistic layer on Crete Linear A i-da-ma-te ‘Idaian Mother’ should be ascribed. To this aim, it is important to determine the date of the inscribed double-axes. This can be achieved by their association with pottery from the same cave, which according to the inscribed double-axes. This can be achieved by their ascribed. To this aim, it is important to determine the date of Pierce Blegen runs on from Early Minoan to Late Minoan IA or perhaps even Late Minoan IB and Late Minoan II.

If the latest possible date applies, the two Linear A legends may well be assumed to have been produced in consignment of a Greek customer, because, as we have seen in Chapter 15, the Mycenaean Greeks have earned themselves a foothold in Crete after the desastrous Santorini eruption at the end of Late Minoan IB (c. 1450 BC). If, however, the double-axes belong to an earlier period, an attribution to the Pelasgian layer or group in Cretan society, which we have just seen to be responsible for the divine name Demeter, seems preferable. At any rate, to suggest that for the presence of the divine name ‘Idaian Mother’ in two Linear A inscriptions this script in its entirety notates an Indo-European language of the Greek or Thraco-Phrygian type bears testimony of a grave methodological error and a reductio ad absurdum of the complexities of Cretan society during the Middle and Late Bronze Age.

26.2. Additional note 2: Poseidon ‘consort of Da’

In his stimulating monograph on the Greek deity Poseidon, Fritz Schachermeyr followed the linguistic analysis of this divine name by Paul Kretschmer as a compound of Greek potis or posis ‘consort’ of PIE nature (cf. Latin potis, Sanskrit pātiḥ) with a form of address of mother earth, Da, hence leading to the interpretation of the entire form as ‘consort of Da’. Now, the second element da-, which is also present in the divine name Damatēr or Dēmētēr (< da- + PIE *mēh₂-tēr), may well come into consideration as the Pelasgian indication of ‘earth’, related to Greek ga or gē and originating from the common proto-form *gda- as attested for the Phrygian place name Gdanmaa.

Demeter being the earth-mother par excellence. If so, the divine name Poseidon, just like Demeter, is likely to be attributed with Pelasgian antecedents.

The latter inference gains weight by the fact that according to literary tradition Poseidon, together with Demeter, was venerated in Arkadian Thelpusa and some other locations in horse shape – a feature which Schachermeyr plausibly explains as ultimately rooted in the time of the introduction of the horse in Greece, which, as we have seen in Chapter 14, took place in two distinct phases during the Early Helladic III (horse-like animal) and Middle Helladic (true horse) periods. Interesting to note in this connection is that the prominent position of the horse in Middle Helladic times clearly appears from the horse burial associated with a royal tumulus at Marathon. Contrary to Schachermeyr, however, and in line with a suggestion by Joost Crouwel, I think it is unlikely that this prominent position of the horse in Middle Helladic times is solely based on its function as food provider (milk and meat) or as a sacred animal per se; it must have had already military significance in this early period and hence have been used for riding.

---

1112 Woudhuizen 1992a: 4-5; see also Chapter 25.
1113 Vandenabeele 1985: 5 ‘and the decoration of the double axes belongs to the type which furnished the inspiration for the second period of the Palace Style pottery c. 1450-1400 BC’.
1114 Owen 1996: 174-5; Owen 1999: 34; 49 (claims that Minoan [in casa Linear A] is the oldest example of Indo-European); Owen 2000: 249.
1116 Haas 1966: 215 (ascribes this name to Pisidian influence, but unlikely so as Pisidian belongs to the Luwian language group).
1117 Pausanias, Guide to Greece 8, 25, 5 f.
1118 Schachermeyr 1950: 64; 143.
1119 Marinatos 1973: PIs. 13-14; Papadimitriou 2001: figs. 44-47. Doubts have been raised about the Middle Helladic date of this horse burial, and it is considered by some an intrusive element from the Turkish period, but it should be noted in this context that single horse burial is paralleled for the Middle Bronze Age at Lapithos in Cyprus, see Gjerstad 1926: 81 (Politiko tomb 3) and cf. Herscher 1978: 793.
1120 Schachermeyr 1950: 53-54; 121.
1121 Crouwel 1981: 46 ‘It is not impossible that some of the single horses buried [among which the one at Marathon – notwithstanding Crouwel’s second thoughts still considered Middle Helladic in Papadimitriou 2001, be it with doubts expressed in a note] were riding animals.’ This does not collide with Drews’ recent thesis (2004) that riding became militarily effective in the form of cavalry units only after the Bronze Age. Note that this single horse burial from the Middle Helladic period contrasts with double horse burials as discovered at Dendra (Protonotariou-Deilaki 1990), which cannot be dissociated from the war-chariot and hence must be
(note in this connection that the outcome of the sacred marriage between Poseidon and Demeter in horse shape at Thelpusa, the divine horse Areion, is reported to have been mounted by Adrastos, i.e. a king with a Phrygian name whose antecedents hence may likewise go back to Middle Helladic times, in the mythical war of the seven heroes from the Argolid against Thebes).  

The ultimately Pelasgian origins of Poseidon can be further underlined by other literary evidence. First of all, it is conspicuous that Poseidon is particularly worshipped in the regions where we have situated the local allies of the foreign invaders which arrived in Greece c. 1600 BC, viz. in Pylos (Nestor is sacrificing to Poseidon when Telemakhos visits him in the *Odyssey*), Attica (think of the contest between Athena and Poseidon, which the former won because of her gift of the olive tree), and Iolkos (as mythical father of Pelias and Neleus). Next, Poseidon is directly associated in myth with Phrygians (Pelops, at Olympia, and the nymph Midea), or Thracians (Eumolpos, Kykhreus, the Abantes and Aones, the Eteobutades), or pre-Greeks more in general (Pelasgos, Minyas). 

In the light of the given associations with the horse and with pre-Greek population groups in Greece, the connection of Poseidon with the chariot (Pelops at Olympia, Onkhestos, the two horses of Peleus named Xanthos and Balios) – as we have seen in Chapter 14, the military weapon newly introduced by the foreign invaders c. 1600 BC – and with the ones who are responsible for its introduction in Greece (Kadmos), appears to be of secondary nature.

Just like Demeter and Zeus, Poseidon is also attested for Crete. Thus, in the dative form po-se-da-o-he he occurs together with other deities on a Linear B tablet from Knossos (KN V.52). Furthermore, if our location of Skheria and the Phaiakians in the western part of the Mesara valley holds good, it is noteworthy that Poseidon had a temple here and is considered to be the father of Nausithoös, the founding father of the Phaiakians. At any rate, this latter evidence ties in perfectly with our indications of Pelasgian presence in the very same region of Crete as presented in Chapter 19 above!

---

assigned to the period from c. 1600 BC onwards.


1123 Homeros, *Odyssey* III, 1 ff.

1124 Herodotos, *Histories* VIII, 55.

1125 Schachermeyr 1950: 43.

1126 Schachermeyr 1950: 22; 41.


1128 Schachermeyr 1950: 41; 43.

1129 Schachermeyr 1950: 22; 39; 42.

1130 Schachermeyr 1950: 170.


1132 Schachermeyr 1950: 172. Note in this connection that striking evidence for the cult of Poseidon in the region in question is provided by the remark in the *Soudas, s.v. Maleos* that the latter had dedicated a stone at the entrance of the harbor of Phaistos to Poseidon, cf. Briquel 1984: 266.
CHAPTER 27. ADDENDA TO PART II

27.1. Ad p. 207

See now Woudhuizen (2006c). Note that the annalistic topoi of a deity advancing before the king in battle can already be found in a text of Ḫattusili I (1650-1620 BC), and probably originates from Babylonian practice as exemplified by texts of Hammurabi (1792-1750 BC), see Hamblin (2006: 296; 176; 189-90; 207).

27.2. Ad pp. 218-9

Contra Nibbi 1975 & Duhoux 2003: the following sections from the relevant Egyptian hieroglyphic texts, characterized by the key-words ḫḏ-wr ‘great green’ (2x), īw.w ‘isles’ (4x), and īy.m ‘sea’ (5x), are relevant to the determination of the origin of the Sea Peoples:1133

**Ramesses II (1279-1223 BC)**

**Tanis II**
14. ḫḏỳn.w ‘the (rebellious-hearted) Sherden’
15. ḫḏ.w m ḥr-ib pš ym ‘ships of war from the midst of the sea’

**Aswan, Stela of Year 2**
8. ‘b-y.w ḫḏ-wr ‘the warriors of the sea’

**Ramesses III (1184-1153 BC)**

**Medinet Habu**
Year 5
Pls. 36-43
8. ẖḏ.n.f ḫḏ.s.w.t mh.t.(y).w t nty.(w) m nty.sn īw.w ‘Now the northern countries, which were in their isles,’
Pl. 42
2. (...) nī 3. ḫḏ.s.w.t ī.ṭy m ṭš.sn m īw.w hr-ib ḫḏ-wr ‘As for the countries who came from their land in the isles in the midst of the sea,’
Year 8
Pl. 46
16. ḫḏ.s.w.t ī.y.w īḏ.t m nty.sn īw.w ‘As for the foreign countries, they made a conspiracy in their isles.’

**B. northern captives**

d. ʾšrdšt n pš ym ‘Sherden of the sea’, f. ʾwrštš n pš ym ‘Teresh of the sea’

1133 For the transcription of these sections, based on their edition in Kenneth Kitchen’s Ramesside Inscriptions (1983), I am greatly indebted to professor Borghouts; for their translation whenever included in the present work I have followed Edgerton & Wilson (1936).

**Rhetorical stela from Deir el Medineh**
8. ḫḏst t wšt m ḥr-ib pš ym ‘the Peleset and Teresh from the midst of the sea’

**Papyrus Harris**
Pl. 76
7. dštnm n m nty.sn īw.w ‘the Denyen in their isles’, ʾšrdštš wšššt n pš ym ‘the Sherden (and) Weshesh of the sea’

In my opinion, there can be little doubt that the key-words ḫḏ-wr ‘great green’, īw.w ‘isles’, and īy.m ‘sea’, in the given cases refer to locations outside the Egyptian Delta. Note that Duhoux’s suggestion of a temporary base in the Delta from where action was undertaken is ruled out by the evidence of the Tanis II and Aswan stelae, which antedates that of Medinet Habu by almost a century.

The probability of an origin of the Sea Peoples from outside the Egyptian delta is further enhanced by the following phrases:

**Medinet Habu**
Year 5
Pls. 27-28
53. nī ’q m īw ḫḏ.t ‘they that entered the Nile mouths’
Pls. 36-43
10. ’qā.sn īw.w.t īw.w īw.w ‘They penetrated the channels of the Nile mouths’
Pl. 42
5. ’q m īw īw.t ‘They that entered into the Nile mouths’

Clearly, it is stipulated here that enemies coming from outside the Delta went into its branches.

From the material presented by Jean Vercoutter (1956), it can be deduced that the expression īw.w ḫḏ-s.w.t ḫḏ-wr ‘the isles in the midst of the sea’ is directly associated with Keftiu (kftw) ‘Crete’1134 on the one hand and ḫḏ-w-s.w.t (ḫḏw-nbt), an indication of the Aegean, on the other hand (stele of Gebel Barkal also from the reign of Tuthmosis III; see Vercoutter 1956: 132, no. 33). Definite proof, however, that the Egyptian expression ḫḏ-wr may indeed refer to the islands in the Mediterranean more in general and to Crete more in particular, is provided by Creto-Egyptian glyptic where we come across Egyptianizing or Egyp-

1134 Tomb of Rekhmire from the reign of Tuthmosis III, see Vercoutter 1956: 57, no. 9b or 1956: 133, no. 35.
toid inscriptions on scarabs dating from the Early Minoan III/Middle Minoan I transitional period with this legend and that of ḫw-nbt as references to the homeland of the owner of the seal, see below, our remarks ad pp. 301-11.

27.3. Ad p. 226

On the date of the destruction of Ugarit, Manfried Dietrich & Oswald Loretz (2002) argue in a breath-taking way for the 21st of January, 1192 BC on the basis of their improved interpretation of a document in the Ugaritic cuneiform alphabet (KTU 1.78) surfaced near the palace gate. In this document there is question of a solar eclipse, which allows for the precision in absolute chronological terms. Note that the given date coincides reasonably well with the evidence from the Egyptian king-list as most recently fine-tuned by Kenneth Kitchen (1996), according to which the carreer of Bay, i.e. the last Egyptian magistrate who sent a letter (RS 86.2230) to the latest king of Ugarit, Ammurapi, can be situated between 1200 BC and 1190 BC. Note also in this connection that in the Philistine city of Asdod a scarab of Sethos II (1200-1194 BC) is associated with Late Helladic IIIC1b material—the hallmark of settlement of the Sea Peoples in the region—, see Klaas Vansteenhuyse (2008: 116). If the given date of the fall of Ugarit applies, it lies at hand to assume that the reign of the Hittite great king Suppiluliumas II did not extend to c. 1180 BC, as suggested by me with a question mark, but ended earlier, say c. 1190 BC. In any event, the given scenario provides the Sea Peoples with more time to rally forces in the Levant and prepare themselves for their ultimate attacks on Egypt in years 5 (1179 BC) and 8 (1176 BC) of Ramesses III.

27.4. Ad p. 248

The long-standing problem of the distinction between the Hittite kings Tudḫaliyas I (1430-1400 BC) and Tudḫaliyas II (1390-1370 BC) has now been satisfactorily solved by Jacques Freu (cf. Freu 2007 in Freu & Mazoyer 2007). According to this solution, my attribution of the campaign in the territory of and subsequent peace with Aleppo to Tudḫaliyas I (p. 211) is correct, but the campaign against the Assuwian league, to which reference is made on p. 248 must be attributed to Tudḫaliyas II instead of his namesake and predecessor. In Achterberg et al. (2004: 115) I observed that the leader of the Assuwian league, Piyamakuruntas, is a forerunner of the later king of Arzawa, Kupantakuruntas; this observation remains valid to the extent that the defeat of the Assuwian league belongs to the beginning of the reign of Tudḫaliyas II whereas the Arzawa campaign in question occurred at the time of his co-regency with his adoptive son and successor Armuwandas I (1370-1355 BC), i.e. near the end of his reign.

27.5. Ad p. 251

In connection with the fact that according to the Egyptian hieroglyphic information (see p. 223) the fallen Ekwesh were circumcised, it may be relevant to note that at the peak sanctuary at Atsipadhes Korakias models of phalloi have been found, dated to the Middle Minoan II-III period, which bear testimony of the rite of circumcision, see Marina L. Moss, The Minoan Pantheon, Towards an understanding of its nature and extent, BAR International Series 1343, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports 2005, p. 98. Possibly, therefore, the Ekwesh in question were Mycenaean Greeks from the island of Crete, who had been subject to a process of Minoanization. Notwithstanding so, as pointed out in note 623, the Philistines, who at least partly also originated from Crete, are explicitly reported not to abide to the rite of circumcision.

The possibility that Mycenaeans already featured as mercenaries in the army of the Egyptian pharaoh at the time of Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC) is strongly suggested by a battle scene on a fragmentarily preserved papyrus from Tell el-Amarna, which shows warriors with Mycenaean type of helmets (probably the well-known boar’s tusk helmet) and tunics, see Schofield (2007: 125-6) and most recently Jorrit Kelder (2009b: 9, n. 61).

27.6. Ad p. 252

The Luwian variant of the Hittite ethnic ḫḫi-a-úwa, characterized by aphaeresis, is now also attested for Akkadian cuneiform letters from the Urtenu archive at Ugarit, dating from the final phase of the Late Bronze Age. Here it turns up in form of ḫḪ-ia-a-ū or ḫḪ-ia-a-u-ū in the singular and ḫḪ-meḫḪ-ia-a-u-ū in the plural, see Singer (2006). From these letters it is further deducible that trade between Ugarit and the Akhaian was indirect, merchants of the latter sailing to a port in the Lycia and waiting there for their consignments to be shipped to this particular destination by their Ugaritic colleagues. Note that this indirect nature of the trade between Ugarit and the Akhaian Greeks might explain the absence of Greek personal names in the Ugaritic sources as noted on page 250, esp. note 616.
27.7. Ad p. 255

The earliest mention of Tanayu ‘Danaoi’ concerns that in the annals of Tuthmosis III for the 42nd year of the latter’s reign (1437 BC) and records the offering of a set of metal vases (amongst which one of Cretan manufacture) by wr n tiinly kḥsr ‘the chief of Tanayu’. Possibly, this entails an effort by the dignitary in question to open up trade contacts between Egypt and his own country, Greece. In his dissertation on The Kingdom of Mycenae Jorrit Kelder argues cogently (2009b: 36) that reference is made here to a king of Mycenae and that this king by this particular action exhibits his superiority over other rulers in his home country.

27.8. Ad p. 258

Note that the Indo-European nature of the language of the inhabitants of northwest Anatolia more in general can be deduced from toponyms like Wilusa and Tarwisa, two comparable formations in -sa of which the root is related to Hittite wēllu- ‘meadow’ and taru- ‘wood’, respectively, as well as Ida < PIE *widi-u- ‘tree’.

27.9. Ad p. 258, note 669

Note that Beekes corrected this mistake in his more elaborate contribution on Etruscans origins (Beekes 2003: 38).

27.10. Ad p. 260-1

The influx of bearers of the European Urnfield culture into the eastern Mediterranean region during the upheavals of the Sea Peoples has now received stunning confirmation by the decipherment of one of the Eteocretan inscriptions from Praisos as being conducted in an Osco-Umbrian vernacular, see Luuk de Ligt (2008-9). Contrary to the opinion of de Ligt, who attributes the text in question to the Peleset or Philistines, I think we have direct evidence here for the Weshesh or Oscans.

Note that the Aegean background of the Tyrsenians is further stressed by the personal name Iun-Tursa as attested for an Egyptian text from the 14th century BC, see Wilhelm Brandenstein (1948), because the element Turs- appears here in combination with Iun ‘Ionia(α)’. Associations of this type in Egyptian are indicative of a geopolitical relationship, like that of R/Luwana (river name); for yet another Philistine personal name of Anatolian background, cf. Picol < Piha-ū.Ä.

27.11. Ad p. 268, note 730

Note that the traditional foundation date of Carthage is now confirmed by calibrated radiocarbon ones, see Docter et al. 2004 [2005].

27.12. Ad p. 281

For the first element of Goliath, cf. Anatolian Ḫulaia- (river name); for yet another Philistine personal name of Anatolian background, cf. Picol < Piha-ū.Ä.

27.13. Ad pp. 291-2

On trade contacts between the Aegean, on the one hand, and the central Mediterranean islands Sicily and Sardinia, on the other, see most recently Vianello 2008b.


As to the possibility that the Sea Peoples were all of Indo-European stock I can now express myself more firmly because the language of the Sicels at closer study turns out to be distinct of the Osco-Umbrian attested for the north-eastern part of the island of Sicily and of a non-Italic, proto-Celtic nature, whereas that of the Sardinians to all probability may be classified with Ligurian, which likewise can be classified as proto-Celtic, see Woudhuizen 2010a, and Woudhuizen 2010b, section 7.

The suggestion that the Phoenicians in their explorations of the far West may have benefited from Sea Peoples’ knowledge of the central Mediterranean may be underlined by the discovery of a fragment of a Philistine type of sarcophagus in the necropole of Neapolis in Sardinia as published by Bartoloni (1997).

27.15. Ad pp. 301-11


In reading Brinna Otto’s König Minos und sein Volk, Das Leben im alten Kreta (1997), my attention was drawn
to the following seals, which may be of interest as a supplement to the ones treated in the aforesaid works.

The first seal concerns a three-sided prism bead from Rhytion presented by Otto (1997: Abb. 89, p. 255). This particular seal is catalogued by Victor E.G. Kenna (1960: 112 and Pl. 7), as no. 168, and subsequently reproduced in drawn form taking each side separately by Yule (1981: Pl. 5, deer no. 1, Pl. 7 dogs no. 10, and Pl. 9 birds no. 6). Following Otto’s rendering of the seal (see our Fig. 27.1), we are confronted with a branch and a dog with protruding tongue on side 1, a deer with prominent antlers on side 2, and a non-predatory bird on side 3. In terms of Evans’ (1909) system of numbering, this concerns the signs nos. 100, 73, 99, and 82, which correspond to the Luwian hieroglyphic counterparts Laroche (1960a) nos. 172 (+)?t, 13 FÁRA, 102-3 KURUNT, ?t, and 128 TINTAPU, ?t, respectively.

In accordance with this analysis, then, the sides 2 and 3 bear testimony of the sequence ?t?t, which, considering the find spot of the seal, no doubt renders the geographic name Rhytion. If so, it next lies at hand to assume that the combination of the first side of the seal renders either the name or the title of its owner. Now, considering the fact that it reads ?t-FÁRA, the first option seems preferable, as it allows us to bring about a connection with the Anatolian titulary expression tlabarna-, which in shorthand form tapar(t) is attested for a Linear A inscription from Hagia Triada (HT 104.1). Note in this connection that the close parallel from the Indilima seal, which I have read as ta*?+FÁRANA, may, on the basis of the fact that the Luwian reflex of PIE *dékm- is títita- ‘title’, just as well be read as ?t?+FÁRANA, the weakness of the first vowel being underlined by Lycian ?lera- (see Houwink ten Cate 1961: 159). At any rate, the execution of the deer-sign in my opinion is quite ‘modern’, and we may hence well be dealing with the seal of the vassal-king of Rhytion mentioned in the text of the discus of Phaistos, which dates to Late Minoan IIIA1. Úwas, or that of his predecessor, A-ḥarkus, mentioned in the same text as well as that of the double-axe of Arkalokhori.

A second seal of relevance here is that presented by Otto (1997: Abb. 50, p. 159). It concerns a bone scarab from Tholos II at Lebena also in the Mesara valley, published by Nikolas Platon (1969, no. 201) (see our Fig. 27.2). This seal bears testimony of a legend in Egyptian hieroglyphic, but in a local Cretan style, characterized by an antithetic arrangement of the signs at either side of the central one. The latter one has been identified by Gardiner (1994) M 13 rendering the value wjd. But it did escape notice thus far that this central sign is antithetically associated with Gardiner (1994) Z 7 w and D 21 r, to form the geographic notion wjd-wr ‘great green’. There can be no doubt that this geographic notion refers here to the homeland of the owner of the seal, viz. Crete. The same verdict also accounts for the legend of a scaraboid from Tholos A at Hagia Triada (Platon 1969: no. 95, see our Fig. 29.3). This starts with the central M 16 ḫt and continues with Z 7 w and V 30 nbw likewise placed antithetically alongside it. In sum, then, it presents us with the geographic name ḫt-nbw, a reference to the Aegean which only in its latest use, during the Ptolemaic period, became the form of address for the Greeks (see Vercoutter 1956: 15-32). As to the dating of these two seals, it is of interest that the use of Z 7, the hieratic variant of G 43 w, from the IXth dynasty onwards serves as a terminus post quem.

The fact that in the two foregoing cases we are actually dealing with a local Cretan form of Egyptian hieroglyphic (which, of course, is of relevance to our assumption of an Egyptian hieroglyphic component in the Cretan hieroglyphic script) can be further underlined by the scarab from Tholos I at Lebena as presented by Otto (1997: Abb. 49, p. 158 [= Corpus of Minoischen und Mykenischen Siegel entitled Die Siegel der Vorpalauszeit (= CMS II I], Platon 1969, no. 180, see our Fig. 27.4). As acknowledged by her and her predecessors, the legend of this seal contains the Egyptian hieroglyphic signs Gardiner (1994) F 35 nfr and S 34 ‘nh—the latter set apart in a field and occurring in upward (at the left) and downward (at the right) position. But the so-called ‘C-spiral’ placed antithetically at both sides of the nfr-sign in fact confronts us with a Cretan hieroglyphic sign (= Evans (1909) no. 122) of Luwian hieroglyphic origin, viz. Laroche (1960a) no. 415 sa. Accordingly, the combination in between the ‘nh-signs reads sa-nfr, and renders the name of the owner of the seal, Sennefer. This name of ultimate Egyptian background, is recorded as much as twice for the Egyptian hieroglyphic text on Keltiu or Cretan names, but then written with Gardiner (1994) T 22 sn in front and with F 35 nfr complemented by I 9 f and D 21 r (see Woudhuizen 2009: 59, Fig. 2b: (j) and (l))! All in all, this seal proves that Egyptian scribes were active in Crete in the Early Minoan III/Middle Minoan I transitional period, and that these scribes were acquainted with Luwian hieroglyphic as current on the island at the time.

27.16. Ad pp. 313-7

27.17. Ad p. 319, note 1079

As rightly stressed by Manfred Hutter (2006: 84, n. 11), the mention of Kubaba in Lyd. no. 4 reads *Kufav instead of †Kufad as per Roberto Gusmani (1969).

27.18. Ad p. 321

In retrospect, I was a little bit too rash in trying to rob the ancient Greeks from one of their foremost deities. The development *dy > z in PIE *Dyevs > Zeus is, of course, typically Greek. But I would maintain that the initial d in the first element Deu- < PIE *Dyew- of the Cretan personal name Deukaliōn may be attributed to Pre-Greek, in casu Pelasgian.

27.19. Ad p. 322

For the loss of the digamma already in Mycenaean texts, see Vladimir Georgiev 1966b.

27.20. Ad p. 226

Note that the MNs i-li-mi-li-ki and i-si-pa-ti may be identified with cuneiform Ilimilkā and Siptiba’al, i.e. the names of two of the foremost functionaries of the last king of Ugarit, Ammūrapi II, see Freu 2006: 146; 152-3; 191 (Siptibā’al = Ḡal-kāri “chef du quai”!).

27.21. Ad p. 279

For an elaboration of the interpretation of Linear A texts, see now Woudhuizen 2006b: Chapter II, and Woudhuizen 2009: Chapter II.

27.22. Ad p. 294, Fig. 21.3

So already Gimbutas 1963b: Map 4.

27.23. Ad p. 323

In line with Otto’s (1997: 388) observation that Greek kubelis means “double axe”, it may reasonably be argued that the Phrygian GN Kybela is related to the given Greek word. In any case, its derivation from Luwian Kupapa is ruled out by the adjustment of the reading of Lydian †Kufad — which allowed for such a connection by means of the Anatolian d/l-change — as referred to in our additional note to page 319 in the above.

27.24. Further relevant literature

Among the relevant Sea Peoples literature not covered by Part II so far I should like to mention: Gunnar Lehmann (2001); Moreu (2003), who argues for an Anatolian, more exactly Pisidian, origin of the Philistines; Shell Peczynski (n.d.) favors earthquake storms as an explanatory model for the Sea Peoples migrations, which, to my view, leaves unexplained why population groups from one area devastated by earthquakes, like Greece, would move to another region, like the Levant, likewise destroyed; by the way, I am not aware of historical parallels for an earthquake storm affecting a region as wide as that of Greece, Anatolia, and the Levant within the scope of say 50 years; the latter publication makes reference to Barako (2001) and Birney (2007), which unfortunately I was unable to consult. Andrea Salimbeti (n.d. but last updated 10/08/2009) has made use of the digital version of my PhD thesis (Woudhuizen 2006a) without proper reference; my thanks are due to my friend and colleague Ton Bruijns for drawing my attention to this site.
27.25. Ad Chapter 19

In Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions from North Syria, dedicated by king Tatas or his wife and dating to about the 10th century BC, we are confronted with a country name variously written as Patìsàtiná- (Aleppo 6, § 1), Wata4sàtinà- (Sheizar § 1), Watísàtinà- (Meharde § 2), which, by means of t (or d)/l-change, likely represents Phalestina in phonetic terms. As duly observed by Hawkins (2009: 171-2), this name cannot be dissociated from that of the group of Sea Peoples addressed as Peleset or Philistines in the various sources. In like manner, then, as a branch of Akhaïans settled in the region of Adana during the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples at the end of the Bronze Age (see p. 252), a branch of the Peleset or Philistines may reasonably be assumed to have simultaneously settled in the coastal region of North Syria (against the backdrop of the Cretan origin of the Philistines, it deserves attention that the royal name Tatas is attested for a Cretan hieroglyphic seal, see Woudhuizen 2009: 80, # 297). What the relation of this group of settlers was with those Urnfield background as recorded for Hamath at the time (see p. 261) needs to be determined as yet. My thanks are due to Massimo Poetto for kindly drawing my attention to Hawkins 2009.
PART III. THE ETHNICITY OF THE SEA PEOPLES:

A SECOND OPINION

BY WIM M.J. VAN BINSBERGEN
CHAPTER 28. AN ALTERNATIVE INTERPRETATION OF THE SEA PEOPLES DATA:

RELATIVELY PERIPHERAL AND ARCHAIC SEGMENTARY GROUPS SEEKING TO COUNTER, BY A COMBINED EASTBOUND AND WESTBOUND MOVEMENT, ENCROACHMENT BY THE STATES OF ḪATTI AND EGYPT

28.1. An addition to the approach in Part II

In Part II of this book, Fred Woudhuizen has presented an erudite and imaginative synthetic approach to the problem of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples, arguing – largely on the basis of contemporary textual evidence from New Kingdom Egyptian monuments and from Ugarit and Cyprus (cf. Helck 1979b; Muhly 1984), and in the light of an up-to-date overview of the massive literature on the Sea Peoples and on the Bronze Age Mediterranean in general – that the Sea Peoples consisted of nine different groups, from both the Central and the Eastern Mediterranean, which could already claim their own independent existence (in terms of region, ethnic characteristics, language and culture) in their place of origin, and which retained much of that individuality when, after the violent episodes through which the Sea Peoples left their mark on world history, they settled in the Levant, in different places under different names and different ethnic characteristics. This scholarly achievement was successfully defended as a PhD thesis, under my personal supervision, and rightly earned its author a doctorate. I am deeply committed to Woudhuizen’s synthesis, and the last thing I would like to do is to cast serious doubt upon it. Particularly in the case of protohistory with its reliance on partial and heterogeneous evidence stitched together with a possibly idiosyncratic socio-historical imagination and with the theoretical inspiration of the analyst’s own particular space and time, there is room for an alternative here, challenging the admirable synthesis with which Woudhuizen has enriched the recent literature. The purpose of this penultimate Chapter is to present such additional second thoughts, in a bid to further enhance our understanding of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples.

The tantalising conundrum posed by the Sea Peoples may be summarised as follows: we only have a handful of firm data on these people and on the events in which they were reputedly involved in the Eastern Mediterranean basin by the end of the Bronze Age, and by a well-known epistemological principle, there is never only one solution for such a problem, but always several, between which it is impossible to choose on merely formal methodological grounds. Numerous have been the attempts to propose persuasive solutions for the numerous simultaneous solutions that would fit the few data points available for the Sea Peoples – and while over the past century there has been little tangible progress in the growth of these core data, the main distinguishing element between the rival theories is their differential affinity with particular disciplines, and with particular paradigms within the respective disciplines. Above I have sufficiently indicated my commitment to Woudhuizen’s transparent and painstaking approach. However, also that approach is only one of the possible solutions for a complex equation with more unknowns than we can handle with hard methods leading to unequivocal outcomes. In order to highlight the underlying dilemmas, I feel compelled to offset my own proposals against Woudhuizen’s, precisely to throw in relief the many merits of his approach.

In the following pages, what I try to contribute to the Sea Peoples debate is to look at these core data from a somewhat new vantage point, bringing to bear upon them a combination of long-range perspective in genetics, comparative historical linguistics, comparative mythology and comparative ethnography. This allows us to take the discussion out of the parochial and overheated arena of the Middle East and its ethnic politics of the last few millennia (politics that have grown into global political problems of first magnitude in the course of the twentieth century CE), and situate it in the proper long-range, transcontinental per-

perspective where I think it belongs.

For Woudhuizen, the analysis of ethnicity ends with the identification of an individual group’s ethnonym and distinctive ethnic (linguistic, cultural, socio-organisational, religious) features, whereas I (Chapters 2 and 3) have stressed the idea that ethnicity means the interactive functioning and conceptual accommodation of any number of constituent ethnic groups within an established, extensive ethnic space, whose coming into being needs to be problematised in the first place, and whose economic, political, ideological, religious and linguistic characteristics, and historical dynamics over time, further need to be explored before any true insight in the ethnicity of any of the constituent groups can be claimed. In the light of general theoretical considerations I will now seek to explore the ethnic space of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, and I believe this is a useful addition to Woudhuizen’s analysis.

In his synthesis on the Sea Peoples Woudhuizen proposes to answer the question as to the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples as follows: they were, in his opinion, members of a chain of Late-Bronze Age Mediterranean societies

1. propelled by the push of expanding Urnfielder culture in Central Europe;
2. attracted by the riches of Ḫatti and Egypt, which were well-known among prospective Sea People societies because of trading contacts and personal mercenary services in especially the Egyptian army;
3. united by a general sense of ethnic communality, whose main identifiable component lay in their belonging to the Indo-European language community.

As an analysis of ethnicity, this could only be the beginning of an answer. For given the high degree of disintegration that Indo-European without the slightest doubt already displayed by the end of the Bronze Age, one must severely doubt that sharing an Indo-European language was enough to constitute a subjective bond of ethnic identity solidarity as perceived by the historic actors themselves – a bond strong enough to brave the seas over a distance of more than two thousand kilometres (at least, if one continues to see the Šršn as hailing from modern Sardinia and the Trši from the modern Tyrrhenian Sea), and to organise themselves with such effective solidarity that rich and mili-

tarily well-organised states could be dealt a major blow. In the first place, by the Late Bronze Age the desintegration of Indo-European must already have progressed to a point that the various branches involved could no longer be mutually intelligible. Moreover, as we have seen in Chapter 4, some of the Sea Peoples are likely to have spoken languages there were not Indo-European but that belonged to any of the following macrophyla: Afroasiatic, Niger-Congo, Sino-Caucasian, or to other branches of Eurasian or Nos tratic than Indo-European, notably Uralic, possibly also Dravidian and Altaic. Such doubt remains, even if we are prepared to assume, with Woudhuizen, that, with the language group, came a whole package of attending socio-political institutions and religious beliefs and practices, including:

- a Dumézilian tripartite layered structure of society – however, my argument on binary and triadic organisation in Chapter 6 strongly suggests that the Sea Peoples lacked the Dumézilian emphasis on triads typical of statehood in the Middle and Late Bronze Age;
- the institution of kingship, – however, my stress on the Sea Peoples’ apparently segmentary, acephalous socio-political organisation suggests that they lacked the institution of a developed political kingship, although there may have been politico-ritual leaders with shamanic overtones – something I argue above for the Homeric figure of Agamemnon;
- a recognisable pantheon, – but again, my stress on the Pelasgian aspects of the Sea Peoples’ religion, dimly recognisable from such circumstantial evidence as the shape of their boats (symmetrical, and adorned with representations of white aquatic birds) suggests a pantheon that is at variance with that described for early Indo-Europeans, and one that instead gives much greater weight to a Creatrix goddess of the Primal Waters, her bird-like epiphany, a White God reduced to Flood hero as an oblique memory of one or more divinities de-throned by the Indo-European sky god, etc.

In the course of my argument in Part I of this book we have seen that these assumptions are somewhat shaky.

And apart from the presumable Indo-Europeananness, neither the pull of distant riches, nor the push (emphasised by Woudhuizen in line with earlier authors who have suggested the Urnfielder connection of the Sea Peoples)\textsuperscript{1136} of expanding neighbours to the North, would be enough to forge the apparently very heterogeneous conglomerate of

\textsuperscript{1136} Cf. Ilon 1992; Kimming 1964; Kossack 1954; Sprockhoff 1954, 1955; Matthäus 1980; Roymans 1995; several of these approaches discussed in Romey 2003.
Sea Peoples (hailing from at least nine different geographical locations situations along the Northern shore of the Mediterranean over a distance of up to 2,000 kilometres), into the well-organised, ethnically self-conscious and ethnically segmented group which they clearly were in the eyes of the principal specialists:


But even Lehmann did not offer any clue as to what then, more precisely, held the Sea Peoples together as a military force and made them so utterly effective.

If Indo-Europeaness had been the only ethnically binding factor to be identified in the heterogeneous conglomerate of Sea Peoples, then these had to come from the Northern shore of the Mediterranean, from selected major islands, and part of the Levantine East coast; for on the Southern shore, probably including Cyprus, and possibly part of Crete (even in the Late Bronze Age) the top tier of the hypothetical five-tiered linguistico-ethnic system proposed in Chapter 4 was occupied by speakers, not of Indo-European but of Afroasiatic. But could genetics, archaeology, comparative linguistics, comparative ethnography, and comparative mythology not come up with a more convincing basis for subjective ethnic identity as basis commensurate to the very considerable historic achievements attributed to the Sea Peoples as an organised and effective collectivity?

28.2. Summarising the core data on the Sea Peoples episode in the Late Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean

The core data in question may be summarised as follows (they are presented and discussed in extenso in Woudhuizen’s contribution to the present volume):

1. In the Eastern Mediterranean, by the end of the Bronze Age, there are a handful of indications of violence brought against the Egyptian state, the Ḫatti state (‘the Hittites’ of Central Anatolia and Northern Syro-Palestine), and the city state of Ugarit in Central Syro-Palestine) in its last days.

2. The Ugaritic indications spring from a few letters written to the Egyptian king; they breath an atmosphere of impending doom, and can hardly be considered propagandistic fabrications; however, the Ugaritic event was, by its very nature, one at a very limited scale, and in itself does not indicate an event of world historical significance, such as modern historians have construed the Sea Peoples episode to constitute: dealing decisive blows to the two main states of the Eastern Mediterranean basin and their attending civilisations (Egypt and Ḫatti), and thus being responsible for a shift in political, economic and cultural initiative from the Eastern to the Central Mediterranean, in preparation for the rise of Carthage, the Hellenic world, the Etruscans, and Rome – and ultimately for the global dominance of Europe as a whole.

3. The Egyptian indications are limited to two temple inscriptions, one dating from Pharaoh Ramesses III, the other from Pharaoh Merneptah, and although they describe the armed encounters, both on land and on sea, with the ‘People of the Sea’ in considerable literary and iconographic detail, these sources may be just as replete with implicit Egyptian state propaganda as has been demonstrated for most other Egyptian state documents, from the New Kingdom as well as from other periods.

4. Apparently the most valuable piece of information from these two Egyptian epigraphical documents is formed by two lists of, in all, nine ethnonyms of the constituent groups of the ‘Peoples of the Sea’. These names are presented and provisionally analysed in Table 28.1. Many contributions to the study of the Sea Peoples have consisted in proposing identifications, in time and place, of these nine ethnonyms. Interpretation of these nine ethnonyms is the point of departure for any more systematic and theoretical pronouncements concerning ‘the ethnicity of the Sea peoples’, such as in the present book. Dependent upon each particular identification, a large number of specific proposals have been made concerning the nature, the scope, and the geographical direction, the world historical significance, and the long-term and short-term causes, of the Sea Peoples episode.

5. One important iconographic detail to be gleaned from the Egyptian records is that the constituent ethnic groups among the Sea Peoples stood out, not only by specific names but also by highly distinctive details of dress, headdress, and weaponry.

6. Another given is that the Sea Peoples’ seafaring vessels are depicted in considerable detail, displaying front / back symmetry in the form of a bird’s beak.

7. For the counting of slain enemies the Ancient Egyptians had the habit of cutting off their genitals and piling these up; however, this could not be done for male bodies that were circumcised and hence sacred, for male genital mutilation was the Egyptian ritual ideal (though not necessarily practice) during most of Egyptian history. It is remarkable that several Sea Peoples’ ethnic groups were singled out as circumcision, notably the Ekwesh (therefore not likely to be identical with the Homeric Achaeans), Shekelesh and Sherden, and possibly also the Meshwesh.1138

8. With the next and final point we already leave the core data and proceed to interpretation upon a much wider canvas: most modern students of the Sea Peoples episode have agreed that the Sea Peoples waging war against Egypt and Ḫatti, retained their distinct ethnic identity and its visible markers, also when, after the violent encounters had subsided, they settled down, especially along the Syro-Palestine coast. This indicates that the Sea Peoples were an ethnically heterogeneous composite to begin and to end with, and suggests as a further problem, beyond (but closely connected with) the question of ‘Sea Peoples’ ethnicity’, the question as to what (in such fields as socio-political organisation, ideology, religion and perceived ethnic self-identity) allowed the Sea Peoples, despite their ethnic heterogeneity, to organise so effectively as to be able to deal major blows to the two most powerful states in the region, Egypt and Ḫatti.

---

1138 The Great Karnak Inscription claims circumcision for three of the Sea Peoples: Ekwesh, Shekelesh, and Sherden (Brasted 1906: III, 248-50). The problem that this would preposterously make the Achaeans, commonly identified with the Ekwesh, into a circumcising group, has been occasionally recognised in the Sea Peoples literature, e.g. Wainwright 1960, 1961 (Ekwesh), 1962 (Meshwesh too?) English 1959. However, these indications of male genital mutilation could serve further analytical purposes than ethnic identification alone. Whether we opt for a westbound, an eastbound, or a combined eastbound and westbound scenario for the Sea Peoples (see the discussion further in this chapter), all four Sea Peoples groups for which there are indications of male genital mutilation have associations (either as proposed provenance or as proposed final destination) with the Central or Western Mediterranean – where circumcision yet goes completely unrecorded in historical times. Was circumcision an important source of ethnic identification among the Sea Peoples? Complementarily, was these four Sea Peoples groups’ apparent practice of male genital mutilation a major reason for their being rejected by non-circumcising neighbouring groups in the Western or Central Mediterranean environment where they either originated or ended up, and thus a cause of their further periphrases, perhaps across the Sahara and into sub-Saharan Africa? In Section 2.1 above we saw that male genital mutilation is an important ethnic marker in South Central Africa, and one that, in modern times, has led to social rejection by the non-circumcising groups (van Binsbergen 1992a, 1993), with some formerly circumcising groups (such as the Nkoya) dropping the practice for that reason. Could such a model also apply to the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean? Finally, the peculiar distribution of historic, pre-Islamic circumcision (in both the Southwestern and the Southeastern part of the Old World, cf. Fig. 28.1) prompts the hypothesis that the practice may, after all, owe much of its post-Neolithic distribution to Sundan expansion into Oceania, West Asia, Ancient Egypt, and sub-Saharan Africa. In that case, attestation in Korea would not be due to Pelasgian east-bound expansion according to the ‘cross-model’ to be discussed below. Below we shall discuss and compare Pelasgian and Sunda traits, and note their similarity; clearly also the geographical distribution of these traits overlaps to such an extent that it is not always possible to separate the two complexes and their historical dynamics – both are analytical constructs anyway, of course. We could also reformulate this apparent state of affairs in the following terms: if the presence of Pelasgian traits in sub-Saharan Africa is to be explained by transcontinental diffusion from a West Asian / Mediterranean origin, then the Northern route (across the Central Sahara or the Nile valley) is not the only thinkable one – an Eastern route via the Indian Ocean should also be considered. The relative affinity between Niger-Congo > Bantu and Austro-African may also be seen in this light: probably this is due not just to a common ‘Borean element among the ‘Peripheral’ ‘Borean macrophylla, but also to later specific borrowings.

1139 Male genital mutilation (‘circumcision’) as a religiously mandatory bodily practice plays a considerable role in the Bible.
9. Perhaps the entire idea of a Sea Peoples episode is a myth of Eurocentric self-construction comparable to that which lay at the root of Herodotus’ immensely influential (but essentially flawed) account of the Persian wars, allegedly of similar world historical significance as a decisive step in the rise of the West. It is quite conceivable that New Kingdom Egypt, and even Hatti, collapsed not by specific and identifiable military exploits such as the Sea Peoples episode, but by more gradual and diffuse, and less localised changes in technology, modes of production and exchange, and modes of state formation, as are already implied in the very transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Iron Age. In that case the questions concerning the Sea Peoples’ ethnicity, and the secret of their effective organisation, would merely be spurious ones, dictated by an outdated Eurocentric perspective and a fixation on military history of social history and political economy. This is not the standpoint occupied by the two writers of the present book, however: much of their specific explanation may differ in detail. Given the existence of a very extensive Sea Peoples’ scholarly literature; the corroborative evidence from Ugarit and Cyprus which could hardly be the product of Egyptian state propaganda and nothing more; and the nature of scientific enquiry as a collective, and collectively structured, intersubjective endeavour, – given all that, we feel justified to take seriously the questions of

a. Sea Peoples’ ethnicity and
b. Sea Peoples’ effective organisation.

28.3. The context of Sea Peoples studies

The ultimate aim of Fred Woudhuizen’s and my own, joint argument in this book has been: to explore the theoretical and methodological conditions for a study of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples. The Table of Nations already offered several links to the Sea Peoples theme: the Philistines, the Hyksos, Africa Minor, the idea of Greater Mizraim, Libya, Ludim, the origin of the Etruscans, etc. Margalith (1994) has explored the extent to which the Bible may serve as a source on the Sea Peoples. With regard to Sea Peoples ethnicity in the narrower sense, of considerable value remain Wainwright’s studies of most ethnic groups associated with the Sea Peoples. Astour (1972) and Lehmann (1983) provided useful critical overviews of the earlier literature. Lehmann (1979) and Wente (1963) specifically turned their attention to Sikalayu

Here a considerable number of studies can be mentioned. ethnicity shades over into that of Iron Age Syro-Palestine, and form in the present volume. The study of Sea People ethnicity makes considerable impact via the Internet and deserves to be mentioned here even though it is included in updated form in the present volume. The study of Sea People ethnicity overlaps into that of Iron Age Syro-Palestine, and here a considerable number of studies can be mentioned.1141

In 2000 the prominent Ancient historian Robert Drews published a sceptical re-assessment of the Medinet Habu reliefs, in which he showed himself completely dismissive of the idea of ‘Sea Nations on the move’, and of Sea Peoples ethnicity:

‘As I have argued elsewhere, Maspero’s “migration of the Sea Nations”1142 was from the beginning sheer fantasy. (…) For most historians today, even nations living on land are anachronisms in the Bronze Age, and folk migrations are seen as typically late constructions, required for answering questions about national origins. (…) More generally, we may conclude that what is depicted in Panels X through XV of the military panorama at Medinet Habu has nothing whatever to do with “the migration of the Sea Peoples” ’ (Drews 2000: 162, 190).

Drews extreme skepticism1143 is an exception. There is a fairly general consensus among modern scholars as to the significance of the Sea Peoples on the Eastern Mediterranean scene c. 1300 BCE: Woudhuizen had summarised this consensus as follows.

‘Destroying the Hittite empire, and dealing Egypt a blow from which it never recovered, the Sea Peoples’ episode was crucial for a shift of the economic and political centre of gravity of the Mediterranean world (and of the Ancient World of the Late Bronze Age in general), away from the Levant and towards Greece, Africa Minor and Italy. Soon this shift was to give rise to the splendidours of archaic and classical Greece, Carthage, Hellenism, Rome, the Roman Empire, early Christianity, and in the long run the emergence of the modern world under West European hegemony, speaking a West Indo-European language, being greatly influenced by Classical Greece and by a Levantine religion (Judaism), yet arriving at a new synthesis of its own. For better or worse, the Sea Peoples’ episode was crucial in world history, comparable with the Migration of Nations that led to the collapse of the Roman Empire, or with the rise and early spread of Islam. Little wonder that the Sea Peoples have given rise to a considerable literature’ (Woudhuizen, this volume).

Before we extend our explorations of the theory and method of the protohistorical Mediterranean (Part I), into the study of the Sea Peoples, let us pause a while to look at the geopolitical and ideological mindsets that possibly, or rather, probably, have an impact on this field of study.

28.4. The geopolitical element and disciplinary paradigms in Academia as possible influences on Sea Peoples studies

While the general interests and preoccupations of a class, nation, dominant group may stipulate a specific geopolitical projection onto the analysis of the historical data, another such mind-set lies in the accepted views of a scholarly discipline at a specific moment in its historical development – what Kuhn (1962) has called a paradigm.

In the study of the Sea Peoples we are in the field of protohistory, and that means that our hard, empirical data set is extremely limited (Woudhuizen, this volume): mainly a handful of documentary descriptions mainly from potentially propagandist Egyptian sources. Most of the modern Sea Peoples scientific industry consists of inferences based on mere circumstantial evidence, however complex and largely consensual the edifice of Sea Peoples literature has become in the hands of scholars over the past thirty years. The emerging consensus of scholarship constitutes a paradigm, in the light of which new evidence may be either profitably interpreted if that new evidence fits (even if only partially), or be unwelcome if it does not fit. Despite the absence of hard archaeological evidence from the presumable actual battlefields where the naval and land battles between the Sea Peoples and the Egyptian armed forces took place, scholarly consensus has been to take the Egyptian official reports as serious evidence for the view that large-scale military confrontations took place and that Egypt came to the point of collapse – although it escaped victoriously so that the tale could be told on the monuments of Merneptah and Ramesses III. What may have been, on the Egyptian side, either royal propaganda (for which the ancient Egyptian state has been notorious) or a factual chronicle (which has been rare in the connection of Ancient Egypt), has been fitted into a scholarly mosaic along with the demise of the Hittite state, the Biblical accounts (not exactly free from chauvinistic propaganda either) of confrontations between Israelites and Philistines, upheavals in Asia Minor (Mopsus; Barnett 1987, cf. 1953), and the

1142 Maspero 1875: 429 f. – WvB.
1143 Towards which, incidentally, the present argument will show considerable sympathy.
Trojan war, for which the archaeological evidence is not impressive either.\textsuperscript{1144}

It is the task of scholarship to provide reasoned, coherent, theoretically underpinned, and hence convincing interpretations of a collection of heterogeneous data. Especially in protohistory this interpretational process never leads to absolute, unassailable truths. I have repeatedly referred to the crucial epistemological point established by Quine and Harding, to the effect that no explanation is ever dictated by a data set; there will always remain room for alternative interpretations, so that offering a scientific explanation is always like trying to solve n simultaneous equations with more than n unknowns.

With regard to another invasion and, allegedly, decisive battles that European scholars (largely in the wake of Herodotus) have consensually viewed as of the greatest world historical significance, those of Marathon and Salamis, the great poet and independent classicist Robert Graves has reminded us of the relativity of such claims in a poem entitled \textit{The Persian Version}:\textsuperscript{1145}

\begin{quote}
    • ‘TRUTH-LOVING Persians do not dwell upon
    The trivial skirmish fought near Marathon.
    As for the Greek theatrical tradition
    Which represents that summer’s expedition
    Not as a mere reconnaissance in force
    By three brigades of foot and two of horse
    (Their left flank covered by some obsolete
    Light craft detached from the main Persian fleet)
    But as a grandiose, ill-starred attempt
    To conquer Greece – they treat it with contempt;
    And only incidentally refute
    Major Greek claims, by stressing what repute
    The Persian monarch and the Persian nation
    Won by this salutary demonstration:
    Despite a strong defence and adverse weather
    All arms combined magnificently together.’
\end{quote}

In connection with the Sea Peoples Episode, the scholarly consensus as to its great significance has been substantially reinforced, in the course of the twentieth century CE, by the discovery and decipherment (Helck 1979b; Woudhuizen, this volume) of crucial Ugaritic and Cypriot source material where the more peripheral onslaught of the Sea Peoples appears to be vividly recorded in a context that is anything but propagandistic (for these documents show local rulers in unmistakable distress, at the eve of the collapse of their states), and that dramatically brings out particularly the last days of the Ugaritic kingdom. These additional sources have considerably reduced the risk that the Sea Peoples’ Episode is only an artefact of scholarship and nothing more.

The stronger the scholarly consensus, the more accepted the current disciplinary paradigm, the more the growth of scholarship will benefit from a consideration of alternatives. Understanding the social, political and ideological pressures propping up the prevailing paradigm is a first step in this process. In the case of the Sea Peoples we can see several possible geopolitical-ideological considerations working upon the scientific analysis and forcing our explanations in a particular direction:\textsuperscript{1146}

\begin{itemize}
    \item the desire to define European-ness by contrast to Africa and Asia: after Minoan Crete with its Afroasiatic overtones (however denied, pace Gordon 1966; Best 1996-7), the Sea Peoples episode definitively ushered in the Age of Europe, which apparently has continued on a global scale ever since albeit that in the course of the 20th century CE the geopolitical centre of the North Atlantic has shifted from Europe to North America;
    \item the desire to define Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age Israelite identity by contrast to the Philistines, a scholarly mission in which today’s devastating conflict around the state of Israel and the Palestinians reverberates deafeningly, even though more than three millennia separate these two confrontations on Palestinian soil. If today the field of Sea Peoples studies is largely dominated by excellent Israeli scholars, this is not only because Palestine has offered some of the most relevant archaeological sites for Sea Peoples research; it is also because Sea Peoples research provides part of the legitimating charter of the 20th-century CE state of Israel.
\end{itemize}

In principle, there is nothing wrong with these geopolitical overtones: they bring historiographers and archaeologists to write their own myths onto the myths of the past, and if these new, scholarly myths are eligible for circulation in the wider society this means financial and societal support for these disciplines, as a precondition for the further growth of the latter. However, as we have seen in Sections 2.7-2.8, scholarship is not just the production of myth and nothing more, – on the contrary, it situates itself in the tension between the production, and the deconstruction, of myth; it is in this tension that occasional glimpses


\textsuperscript{1145} Graves 1943; anthologised in: Lucie-Smith 1967: 275.

\textsuperscript{1146} Also cf. Silberman-Gitin 1998.
of a more fundamental and lasting, though unattainable, truth may shimmer through. We have to accept that scholars, in deconstructing the myths of others, inevitably create their own myths: the myth of the Greek genius; of Ex oriente lux; of Afrocentrism; of neatly compartmentalised and integrated ethnic groups that are at the same time linguistic, cultural and religious monoliths; or of unbounded, globalised, fragmented and hybrid ephemeral identities as if ‘cultures do not exist’ (van Binsbergen 1999a, 1999b, 2003a, and the present study). It is not the myth that is unforgivable, but the unwillingness to take a relativising distance from one’s own truths, realising that these, too, have a, usually strong, mythical aspect. Therefore, beyond our deconstruction of other researchers’ myths, and our supplanting the latter with our own partly mythical alternatives, we need (as the only condition under which our research can escape becoming totally ideological, tautological and deceptive) the painstaking discovery, processing, publication, circulation of empirical data, as well as the theory and methodology that enable us to identify and collect these empirical data in the first place, and to process and manage them in such a way as to optimise their being replicated, checked, corrected, rejected, and replaced – as the case may be – by other researchers, with the highest levels of explicitness and intersubjectivity.

The scholarly study of the Sea Peoples may thus be characterised as an exceptionally risky undertaking: the paucity of hard data invites the preponderance of geopolitical ideology, in other words of myth. What Artzy stated in 1987 is still true:

‘When we consider what we know about the ships of the ‘Sea Peoples,’ we must admit that indeed it is not much.’

Any paradigmatic consensus achieved in this field must therefore be considered with the greatest suspicion, and be subjected to deconstruction. Specifically, if in the past thirty years the following consensus has developed – eminently articulated in Woudhuizen’s preceding argument (Part II of this volume): ‘the Sea Peoples’ invasions were the culmination of a progressive West-East movement from the northern shores of the Central Mediterranean to the Aegean, on to Asia Minor, the Syro-Palestinian coast and finally Egypt, largely by Indo-European speakers’, then there is every reason to consider alternative interpretations, however unwelcome and controversial these may seem in the eyes of the scholars who today hold this field of study.

### 28.5. The Egyptian names of the Sea Peoples

Before we embark on a theoretical and methodological discussion of the Sea Peoples ethnicity, we need another preliminary discussion, highlighting some of the Egyptological problems attending our main sources on the Sea Peoples.

The identification of the ‘ethnic identity’ of the Sea Peoples has been a major scholarly industry ever since the times of Maspero (1875: 429 f.) and Meyer (1884). These identifications largely rely on the Egyptian names of the Sea Peoples as recorded in hieroglyphic writing on the New Kingdom monumental inscriptions of Merneptah at Karnak and of Ramesses III. Some names (e.g. those of the Šrdn, who were prominent mercenaries in the Egyptian army) appear in various Egyptian documents; others however appear only in the Egyptian monumental sources that deal specifically with the Sea Peoples, which makes the correct representation of these hieroglyphic texts, their transliteration, and interpretation, all the more precarious.

I am afraid that current scholarly practice leaves much to be desired in this connection. Vowels are usually not represented in ancient Egyptian writing (Egberts 1997; Albright 1934). However – not unlike the earliest Japanese authors, who in the eighth century CE (e.g. in the Kojiki) used the time-honoured Chinese script to render Japanese proper names whose syntax and phonology were totally alien to Chinese,— Egyptian scribes developed a special system of ‘syllabic orthography’ (Ahituv 1984: 3 f.; cf. Görg 1979) in order to render foreign place names, which to a very limited degree overcame the difficulties of vowel representation in Egyptian writing. However, disagreements abound even between the Egyptological specialists (cf. Table 28.1, where, among other things, the renderings of the Egyptologists Borghouts and Helck are compared in columns III and IV). It is much to be preferred to refrain from vocalisation altogether, rather than using a pseudo-vocalisation that is essentially a misleading artefact, but I will make this concession, since it renders the historical and archaeological texts slightly more pleasant to read for non-Egyptologists.

The non-rendering of vowels is only one of the very many peculiarities of the Ancient Egyptian script, which is very flexible, oscillates between acrophonic alphabetism and syllabic ‘group-writing’, and is fond of punning and otherwise exploring analogies in sound and meaning. In Table 28.1 I bring together handcopies of the Sea Peoples’ names from the monumental inscriptions from Merneptah’s reign at Karnak (Luxor, on the Nile’s inhabited east bank)
and from Ramesses III’s mortuary temple at Medinet Habu (opposite Luxor, on the Nile’s westbank which is uninhabited at this point) (column II); Helck’s vocalisation and identification of these names (column III); the transliteration by Borghouts (column IV); Woudhuizen’s vocalisation as used in the present volume (column Va); and his identification of each of these constituent Sea Peoples’ groups in terms of ethnic groups at home in the Central Mediterranean, the Aegean, coastal Asia Minor, and Syro- Palestine (column IVb). In column Va I humbly offer, in the full awareness of my layman status where Egyptology is concerned, my own proposed transliteration, which differs from Borghouts’ only on minor points, and in column Vb I give the vocalisation that seems best to agree with my transliteration – even though I insist that such a transliteration is misleading. A detailed justification of my proposed transliterations is in the legend to Table 28.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I no.</th>
<th>II hieroglyphic writing</th>
<th>III Helck’s vocalisation (and identification) (^\text{1147})</th>
<th>IV Borghouts’ transliteration</th>
<th>Va Woudhuizen (this volume)</th>
<th>Vb transliteration</th>
<th>Vla-b proposed transliteration</th>
<th>Vlb proposed vocalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>sardm ('the elite troops; later to Sardinia')</td>
<td>ṯrcdn</td>
<td>Sarden</td>
<td>Sardinians</td>
<td>[šh]rcdn / [šh]rreden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>sakalas</td>
<td>ᵱkrik(^1148)</td>
<td>Shekelesh</td>
<td>Sicilians</td>
<td>ᵱkrik</td>
<td>Shekersh / Shekelsch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>'aqap[u]nas ('certainly the Akhaioi') (^1149)</td>
<td>ᵱkwlsì</td>
<td>Ekwesh</td>
<td>Greeks (Achaeans)</td>
<td>ᵱkwlsì / ᵱkwlsì</td>
<td>Ikw(a)wa(l)sh / Ikw(a)wa(l)sh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>lukku / lukki (cf. damu)</td>
<td>ᵱkw / ᵱkwi</td>
<td>Lukka(^1150)</td>
<td>Lycians</td>
<td>ᵱkw</td>
<td>Lukû, Rakû</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>tursa / tursa ('only later to Itruria') (^1151)</td>
<td>ᵱwrš</td>
<td>Teresh</td>
<td>eastern Aegean ('these are the later Tyrrhenians')</td>
<td>ᵱwrš / ᵱwrsh</td>
<td>Türš / Türš / Tûlûš / Tûlûsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>pulsata ('from Crete; the elite troops; Wen-Amon: Palestinian coast')</td>
<td>prwst</td>
<td>Pelset</td>
<td>Pelasgians from Crete and Western Asia Minor</td>
<td>prwst</td>
<td>Pertûš / Pelûšet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sippaq / sikkar ('the elite troops; Wen-namun: Palestinian coast')</td>
<td>ᵱkr̥r</td>
<td>Tjeker</td>
<td>Teukro (Troad)</td>
<td>ᵱkr̥r</td>
<td>Tje(r)kûr / Tje(r)kûr / Tje(r)kûr / Cher(r)kûr / Chê(r)kûr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>sakalas ('only later to Sicily')</td>
<td>ᵱkr̥l</td>
<td>Shekelesh</td>
<td>Sicilians</td>
<td>ᵱkr̥l</td>
<td>Shekersh / Shekelsch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>danu ('absolutely not')</td>
<td>ᵱtiniv</td>
<td>Denyen</td>
<td>Greeks (Danaoi)</td>
<td>ᵱtiniv</td>
<td>Da(r)fini(lû) / Da(r)fini(lû)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1147}\) Helck 1979b: 110 ff. As the numbers 3*, 4*, 5* and 2 indicate, Helck’s vocalisation is not consistent – but that is the universal condition attending transliteration anyway. Useful Egyptological discussions of the names of the various Sea peoples were also given by Wainwright 1931a, 1931b, 1932, 1939, 1952, 1959a, 1959b, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1964.


\(^{1149}\) The possible identification of the Achaeans in Egyptian and Hittite documents has given rise to a considerable literature; cf. Muhly 1974; Bryce 1989, and references cited there. The general consensus that ᵱkwlsì should be identified with the Homeric Akhaioi, is thwarted by the clear evidence that the ᵱkwlsì practiced male genital mutilation – as I discuss elsewhere in this argument.


\(^{1151}\) Could this be identified as Tyre, which was inhabited from the Late Bronze Age on?
**Table 28.1. The Egyptian names of the Sea Peoples in the monumental inscriptions of Merneptah (marked*) / Ramesses III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>wanär</th>
<th>W[3]</th>
<th>Weshesh</th>
<th>Oscans</th>
<th>(w?)š(k)šesh / (w?)š(t)šesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- I am indebted to Fred Woudhuizen for making available the hieroglyphic hand copies as derived from Kitchen 1982: IV, 4 and 1983: V, 40, and to Professor Borghouts, chair of Egyptology, Leiden University, for kindly offering, to Woudhuizen, his own expert transliteration of these texts. A concise version of this Table also appears in Part II, above. On Medinet Habu, cf.: the reliefs rendered, Description, 1818 / 1997; Nelson 1930 (discussion of the earlier records of Ramesses III), 1943 (naval battle pictured); Edgerton & Wilson 1936 (records Ramesses III); Drews 2000 (detailed reassessment of the Medinet Habu reliefs, the author claims, p. 190, that they have nothing to do with ‘the migration of the Sea Peoples’).

- The numbers marked * are from Merneptah’s report on the Libyan War at Karnak (written right to left); the others from Ramesses III’s reliefs dealing with the Sea Peoples Campaign at Medinet Habu, during year 8 of his reign (written left to right); hence some names appear more than once. Further remarks:

  - Strictly speaking, the combinations of determinants  ‘foreign’,  ‘person’,  ‘collective’, and  ‘foreign land’ simply denote any ‘foreign men, foreigners’, and not specifically ‘named ethnic group’; their meaning, in other words cannot be equated with, e.g., the Hebrew ethnonyms on -im, English ones on -ians, German ones on -er. Also note that in some cases (Merneptah entry 5, Ramesses III entries 1 and 2) these determinatives are damaged so that our reading is not 100% certain.

  - In so-called group-writing, as is the case here (Gardiner 1994: § 60), E23 is usually read as r, not rw; and  is to be read as š, not  , hence my reading differs slightly from Borghouts on a number of counts.

  - In the Merneptah entry 3, Borghouts expertly reads  as -w-. However, this sign usually appears as a determinant at or near the end of a word, and seems to have no phonetic value beyond that of , ‘bowstring’, itself. I take it that our reading contains an element of uncertainty.

  - In the Merneptah entry 5, Borghouts ignores W, which could be read as -y-.

  - My proposed vocalisations reflect the usual sound values of the enclitic particle  .

  -  is sometimes written for t as an archaism, so T(e(r))kār / T(e(l))kāl / Ch(e(r))kār / Ch(e(l))kāl could simply be T(e(r))kār / T(e(l))kāl.

My knowledge of Ancient Egyptian is very limited, and I can only adduce Gardiner’s (1994) authority for columns Vla-b and the legend of Table 28.1; yet Gardiner’s has constituted the principal, repeatedly revised, textbook on Ancient Egyptian through three quarters of a century. However, on the basis of this humble position, I would venture two remarks.

In the first place, I am astonished at the discrepancy between the glaring uncertainty surrounding these Egyptian names of the Sea Peoples, and the display of scholarly certainty surrounding their interpretation in the existing literature. It may suit our argument to treat these names as ethnonyms, but they are not really ethnonyms in the sense that three or four different determinatives accompany them, each with its own productive semantic implications. When for instance we see a name  – all the Egyptian inscription says is that we are dealing with the ‘collectivity of foreigners associated with ’, where  on purely formal grounds (i.e., as long as we have not identified its lexical meaning) could be an ethnic group, a toponym, a language, a profession, a deity or cult, a peculiarity of attire or hairdress, a somatic trait, a cultural distinctive feature, a spurious attribute punningly or insultingly projected, by the speaker, onto those designated, etc., – in short, any qualifying attribute by which any set of foreigners could be characterised. Transposed to modern conditions, imagine monumental inscriptions like Krauts, person, collective, Spaghetti-Eaters, person, collective, and Charlie, person, collective, referring to German, Italian and Vietnamese enemies respectively – any attempt to scrutinise autophylic ethnic self-identifications.

1152 *Le* the gulf North-East of Cyprus, where the West-East Anatolian coastline gives way to the North-South Levantine coastline. A millennium later, in 333 BCE, the Macedonian Alexander the Great’s decisive Battle of Issus against the Achaemenid king Darius III was fought in the vicinity.

1153 Spelled differently, the name Alasiya – usually identified as (a principal city in) Cyprus – appears in the Medinet Habu inscription on the Peoples from the Sea. Considering the usual sound value of the enclitic particle  , it is not impossible that the, otherwise unidentified,  in reality refer to ‘Alasiya’.
in order to ascertain which people is meant, would remain utterly unsuccessful.

Similarly, names such as ‘\( \text{\textit{m\textcircled{3}y}} \)’ or ‘\( \text{\textit{Asiatic}} \)’, or ‘\( \text{\textit{strw}} \)’ or ‘\( \text{\textit{Asiatics}} \)’ employ the productive combination of ‘foreign’ and ‘people’, without one specific morphological element or determinative for ‘ethnonym’ or ‘ethnic group’ as such being available; the three hieroglyphic expressions all have the determinative ‘\( \text{\textit{foreign}} \)’, but the personal element is expressed by three different determinatives: ‘\( \text{\textit{capitive}} \)’, ‘\( \text{\textit{person}} \)’, and ‘\( \text{\textit{(foreign) people}} \)’, respectively. The situation is therefore rather different from that of place names, where a determinative appears in Egyptian, and where the tell-tale ending -\( \text{\textit{tu}} \) appears as a typical morphological element in the Canaanite context (Ahitu 1984: 201). If we overlook the linguistic caveat that the Egyptian names are not ipso facto ethnonyms, then our ethnic analysis risks becoming a vicious circle, bringing us to go and look, in the protohistorical Mediterranean, for ethnic groups that were propelled into being as a result of our own scholarly artefacts in the first place. This is not to say that \( \text{\textit{skrs}} \) could not possibly be an ethnonym in the usual sense, and could not have been intended as such by the Egyptians – all I am saying is that we do not have enough information to draw such a conclusion with confidence.

This leads on to my second point. Established ethnonyms tend to be meaningless names, or names whose meaning has become overlaid, in the course of time, with thick layers of erosion and conventionalisation. If the Egyptian monuments recorded the names of the Sea Peoples such as these called themselves, in autophylic fashion, we would not expect these names to carry any recognisable meaning in Egyptian itself – making the very plausible assumption that the Sea Peoples mainly spoke different languages than Egyptian. However, it is remarkable that most of the nine Egyptian names for the Sea Peoples, far from being totally meaningless in Egyptian, seem to have close or distant lexical correspondences in Egyptian, which suggests that these names contain (as Ancient Egyptian texts are likely to do anyway) an element of punning and nicknaming on the part of the Egyptians themselves, without necessarily reflecting the autophylic self-designations of the invading Sea Peoples’ groups. If indeed the Egyptian names of the Sea Peoples were merely nicknames, carrying a double entendre for the Egyptians without coming very close to the autophylic ethnic designations of the Sea Peoples themselves, then all our attempts to ‘identify the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples’ on the basis of their Egyptian names risk to be build on sand, sand from the Egyptian desert to be precise. Fig. 28.2 vividly illustrates this point with a fictitious modern analogy.

To contemporary locals, that would produce something like the effect of the above on modern inhabitants of the North Atlantic region (bar the Egyptian determinatives, of course). If future archaeologists / historians would spurious interpret the names in Fig. 28.2 as if they were autophylic, they would have a hard time finding back, in their sources for the twentieth century CE, people who called themselves *Kraut*[s], *Spaghetti-eaters* or *Charlie*[s], or who were so called by their original neighbours in their original homelands. Only on the basis of much more information than we have available for the protohistorical Late Bronze Age, and information of a different kind, would it be possible to ascertain that what is meant here, corresponds with, autophylic, Deutsche, Italiener, and Viet Cong.

The nickname Kraut for German, used in English from the end of World War I on, derives from the supposed German predilection for Sauerkraut, a variety of pickled cabbage. By the same token, Italians, especially when war enemies, may be referred to in English by their supposed favourite food, spaghetti, a variety of pasta (a flour product). In the spelling alphabet of the USA army in the 20th century CE, VC, i.e. an acronym for America’s Viet Cong enemies during the Viet Nam war (1955-75), was spelled ‘Victor Charlie’, whence the Viet Cong’s nickname Charlie.

My reasons for this unwelcome observation are presented in Table 28.2; but, coming from an amateur reader of Egyptian, they only deserve to be taken with a fair pinch
of salt. The fact that Helck, one of the most prominent Egyptologists of his generation, and specifically writing on the Sea Peoples, without further comment accepted the Egyptian monumental designations of the Sea Peoples to constitute ethnonyms, and even gave vocalisations, probably suggests that my point here is merely a red herring. On the other hand, even Helck was wedded to a particular interpretation, lexical parallel, or invitation to punning aspect of the Sea Peoples, without further comment accepted the ethnonyms of his generation, and specifically writing on the Sea Peoples in the context of the Aegean connections of Egypt and the Ancient Near East may have tempted him to take the ethnonymic interpretation for granted – by then it had already percolated in scholarship for close to a century.

A further argument against taking the suggestions in Table 28.2 too seriously, with perhaps one or two exceptions, is that some of the names attributed to the Sea Peoples (notably the name škn) occur in other Egyptian texts that have no direct bearing on the Sea Peoples episode; and that in those attestations these names already have the connotations of ethnonyms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I no.</th>
<th>II hieroglyphic script</th>
<th>III transliteration</th>
<th>IV possible Egyptian interpretation, lexical parallel, or invitation to punning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>šknr</td>
<td>škn appears to have no ready lexical equivalent in Egyptian, but the š in the Merneptah inscription is damaged and putative. I am unable to trace an alternative form *š[consonant]tškn, but that may just be my own ignorance. Could it be the foreigners from the Jordan River? That hydronym has been attested in Egyptian as ltrš. An Egyptian source also mentions the unidentified Canaanite settlement Šknr. So we certainly have a likely geographical context for any form *š[consonant]tškn. This connection is attractive because (Chapter 4) I believe to have identified proto-Bantu speakers in the Bronze Age Syro-Palestine, and I have specifically suggested a Bantu etymology for the hydronym Jordan. If the Sea Peoples Episode can be regarded as one step in the process that brought elements towards proto-Bantu to sub-Saharan Africa via chariot routes, then Bantu speakers would have been among the Sea Peoples. Moreover, the occurrence of š as variant of škn (see below), suggests that also *tškn may be šknr; perhaps a punning on šknr, child, possibly in the sense of unworthy adversary. This however leaves the final n unaccounted for. Also cf. šbrt, widow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>škrš</td>
<td>škrš occurs as variant of škn, ‘coutilleur’; this might be a background or punning aspect of šknš, in view of the elaborate headaddresses of some of the Sea Peoples. This however leaves the final n unaccounted for. Also cf. šbrt, widow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>škwš</td>
<td>škwšt, cf. škwš, ‘leeks’, so perhaps ‘leeks-eaters’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>škwš</td>
<td>škw could be a plural form of šk, ‘time, period’, which hardly makes sense, but cf. škwš, ‘seasonal work’. škw might have similar semantics, and remind us of the fact that some of the Sea Peoples were employed in Ancient Egypt as mercenaries i.e. labour migrants, which is a form of temporary migration comparable with seasonal work. A similar sound but with dotted š = qškw, also škwšt, ‘disaffected one, rebel’, which is semantically perfect, but could only be a punning association, not only because of the q but also because the monumental inscription lacks the ‘enemy’ determinant škwš.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>škwš</td>
<td>For škwš there are several Egyptian lexical parallels: škwš, ‘reed?’ (the vertical objects adorning the head dresses of some of the Sea Peoples have been variously interpreted, including as reeds), škwšt, ‘to be pure’, and škwš, ‘to show respect’. The last two suggestions are semantically unlikely in regard of enemies, and all three leave the final n unaccounted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>škwš</td>
<td>The expression škwšš or škwšš, pr, is a common way to denote ‘domain or realm’, therefore the most likely analysis of this form is pr-ustšš. Cf. škwšš, ‘delapidation’; which would makeškwšš mean: ‘foreigners from the House of Delapidation’, as a convincing insult to invaders. Ust is the name of the herald of the Second Atr in the Papyrus of Ani (popularly called ‘Egyptian Book of the Dead’). Ust is also cited as a possible pronunciation of the name Azt, ‘Isis’; e.g. as part of...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1155 Data derive from Gardiner 1994 unless stated otherwise.
1160 Faulkner 1962: 300.
1163 Budge 1967.
the New Kingdom personal name ḏḥ-em-Uset\(^\text{1165}\) Pelson; ancient Egyptian name Ḥnem, ‘fortress’, was a town at the eastern Nile mouth in the Graeco-Roman period.\(^\text{1166}\) My guess is that the Graeco-Roman name of this town derives from "pρω-αυτ. Although Canaanite toponyms abound in Ancient Egyptian texts, Ahituw could only find one instance of it, what he believes to be, the name Philistia in that context:\(^\text{1167}\) on a 22nd to 26th-dynasty pillar supporting a 12th-dynasty statuette. The inscription refers to a king’s envoy to “the (sic) Canaan (and) Pleset”.\(^\text{1168}\) The insertion ‘and’ should have been between square brackets because it is Ḥnem’s own amendment. The original reads ḥnem, and this can hardly be a different name than the one which, in the Merneptah inscription, gave rise – spuriously, I think – to the ethnonymic ‘Pleset’ interpretation. A reading ‘the Canaan[ite] [U]jet Realm’ seems to be preferred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hieroglyphs</th>
<th>Egyptian name</th>
<th>Lexical parallel</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ḡkr</td>
<td>ḡkr</td>
<td>ḡkr</td>
<td>‘opponent’ (Griffith 1889, pl. 4, 230; as in Faulkner 1962: 30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ḫkrı</td>
<td>ḫkrı</td>
<td>ḫkrı</td>
<td>‘confederate’; this might be a background or punning aspect of ḫkrı, in view of the elaborate headaddresses of the Sea Peoples. This however leaves the final ḫ unaccounted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ḏlīnīw</td>
<td>ḏlīnīw</td>
<td>ḏlīnīw</td>
<td>‘to dam off, restrain’ – as if these were those of the Sea Peoples that were purposely located near the northeastern border of Egypt in order to dam off the influx of other such invaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ḥw?ḥḥ</td>
<td>ḥw?ḥḥ</td>
<td>ḥw?ḥḥ</td>
<td>‘to urinate’ (reference to bodily functions, however common to all of mankind, is often used as an insult to enemies – however, given the ‘Mother of the Waters’ connotations which – as we have seen – urine has in other apparently similar contexts, this might also mean ‘Sea Peoples’), ḥw?ḥḥ, variant ḥw?ḥḥ ‘to fatten, heap praises’ (semantically improbable); ḥw ‘to be bald’ (a likely epithet considering the Sea Peoples’ emphasis on head dresses); ḥw, variant ḥw, ḥw, ‘to be shaved’, ḥw ‘to be exalted, honoured, strong’, usually used in respect of the gods, but in this connection perhaps in reference to the tall stature or other physical characteristics of some of these invaders, e.g. the quality of being circumcised, which at least three of the Sea Peoples shared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

numbering and transliteration as in Table 28.1

Table 28.2. Possible Egyptian interpretations, lexical parallels, or invitations to punning, that might be associated with the Egyptian names of the Sea Peoples

These possible lexical parallels, ludicrous as they may seem, yet cast further doubt on the scholarly consensus that in all cases listed in Table 28.1 we are dealing with fully-fledged ethnonyms.

28.6. Towards a comprehensive intercontinental space in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean

28.6.1. Ethnicity as an aspect of incorporation

We scarcely have at our disposal documents from the Sea Peoples themselves, neither documentary nor iconographic, and – although our discussion of the Pelasgian perspective, below, will offer circumstantial evidence – we do not know to what extent they self-reflexively were conscious of their own ethnic diversity, nor to what extent they perceived, or aspired to, ethnic unity. However, the available testimonies, especially from Egypt, show that during the Sea Peoples’ invasions, and despite their common designation as ‘Sea Peoples’, their diversity was unmistakable for their enemies: the constituent Sea Peoples each appear with different somatic traits, ethnonyms, weapons, etc. This means that the concept of the ‘Sea Peoples’ does not indicate some sort of a clear-cut ethnic unity. On this point we may once more compare the Sea Peoples with the Hyksos, who also in the ancient sources and in early modern scholarly treatment were presented as forming one monolithic ethnic unit, but whose heterogeneity in ethnic and linguistic terms has been increasingly recognised (Oren 1997; MacGovern

\(^{1164}\) Knt-Sesh 2004.


\(^{1166}\) Helck 1979a.

\(^{1167}\) Ahituw 1984: 155, and hand copy on p. 36.

\(^{1168}\) Ahituw 1984: 155.
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attributes also owe to Fred Woudhuizen) the accepted derivation of Mycenaean qa-si-re-u / g’asileus, considering the original labiovelar, does not compellingly point to an Egyptian etymology.

& Bagh 2000). Whatever unity of purpose the Sea Peoples may have established in political and organisatory respects, and whatever mobilising principle may have governed them (in terms of a common ideology, leadership, recognition of shared ethnic origin, religion, or cosmology), their process of mobilisation had not yet culminated in a self-reflective sense of complete unity by the time of their attack on Egypt.

Although our sources on the Sea Peoples are admittedly very limited indeed, yet it is possible to say a few things about their leadership. The wanaks form of leadership (familiar from the Homeric epics) has been suggested as typical of the Sea Peoples. That would be a distinct possibility particularly because it could be contrasted with the presumably more Egyptian-associated basileus form of leadership. But then, our reading of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships has suggested that as a form of leadership at least in the Early Iron Age (and possibly by extension to the Late Bronze Age), the anaks is flexible and protean, and therefore far from an effective ethnic marker. The Egyptian monumental sources stress that the Sea Peoples had a clearly defined purpose – which, given their unmistakable heterogeneity, can only imply effective leadership:

‘As for the foreign countries, they made a conspiracy in their isles. Removed and scattered in the fray were the lands at one time. No land could stand before their arms, from ṭḥatti, Kodi, Karkemis, Yereth, and Yeres on, (but they were) cut off at (one time). A camp (was set up) in one place in Amor. They desolated its people, and its land was like that which has never come into being. They were coming, while the flame was prepared before them, forward toward Egypt. Their confederation was the Peleset, Tjeker, Shekelesh, De-nye(n), and Weshesh, lands united. They laid their hands upon the lands to the (very) circuit of the earth, their hearts confident and trusting ‘our plans will succeed!’ (Edgerton & Wilson 1936: 53 f.; also Woudhuizen, this volume).

Also Albright (1975 / 1987: 515) perceives patterns of Sea People, specifically Philistine, leadership and, like Lehmann and Woudhuizen, stresses that they were well organised, far from a savage band of plunderers and nothing more. Barnett’s (1987, cf. 1953) discussion of Mopsus conveys a similar impression. Whatever our ultimate choice for a westbound or eastbound scenario, the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age leaders depicted on Sardinian lithic art (see Fig. 21.2) seem to confirm a leadership style, reminiscent of what I have implicitly identified as an important source on Sea People leadership: the Iliad as explored in Chapter 5 above. Finally, since shamanism will be listed among the Pelasgian traits in which the Sea Peoples will be argued to have shared, we may surmise that the leadership was not wholly secular and politico-military, but had elements of religious (more specifically shamanic) leadership, either directly (cf. the ritual functions discussed in Chapter 5 for Agamemnon, pacifying the powers of nature as a true shamanic task), or in the role of a ritual / spiritual advisor, offering divination and divine legitimation to the politico-military leaders. That the shamanistic connection is far from chimerical in the case of the Homeric poems, may be clear from the fact that, several of the great heroes of, or before, Troy, in addition to swan connotations, were reputed in Antiquity to wear leopard skins: Menelaus, Paris, Antenor, and moreover, in adjacent generations of mythical characters not directly associated with the Trojan war, Jason and Orpheus.

This takes us to the next point. The crystallisation of ethnic distinction with fixed and firm boundaries and ethnic designations normally only takes place in the context of a wider framework (e.g. incorporation) in a wider region, in a state, a trading network, etc.). It would not be an exaggeration to say that without most of the constituent regions, countries, islands, being to a considerable extent incorporated in transregional structures of some kind (political, cultural, religious, commercial), no clear-cut and consistent system of ethnic classification can be supposed to emerge. This is the reason why our case study of the Biblical Table of Nations should be read not only as a gauge of degrees of social distance, but also as an indication of a considerable degree of incorporation, of even the peripheral, northern and western communities of the Mediterranean littoral, and beyond these the inland regions of Western, Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and North Africa, into a wide, intercontinental socio-cultural-economic-political space. Without such incorporation, there could not be a comprehensive ethnic classification system encompassing a transregional intercontinental space (such as that of the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age). By the same token, the fairly negative results of our case study of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships suggests the relative absence of such wider incorporation – at least in the artificial (and probably chauvinistic, and selective) Early Iron Age reconstruction by the Homeric author(s), where any association with the ṭḥatti state is ignored even though a Trojan conflict can be traced in the contemporary Hittite documents.

On the basis of Chapter 2, we are by now familiar

1169 Cf. Bernal 2006: 167, 219, 233, on basileus; however, Bernal attributes also anax to an Egyptian origin, while (an observation I owe to Fred Woudhuizen) the accepted derivation of basileus from Mycenaean qa-si-re-a / g’asileus, considering the original labiovelar, does not compellingly point to an Egyptian etymology.
with the common phenomena of the multidimensionality, layered-ness, situationality, perspectival nature and inconsistency of ethnic designations and ethnic boundaries. Truly unequivocal distinction of boundaries and of nomenclature can only be expected in the context of the kind of formalisation that is associated with the following factors, which have occurred in mutual connexion from the onset of the Bronze Age:

- writing
- the state
- organised religion under a priesthood
- science.

We shall inspect these four factors one by one, but will first consider the question whether the individual constituent Sea Peoples were already ethnic groups prior to the Sea Peoples Episode.

In the context of the colonial and postcolonial period in Africa, and also in the context of the North Atlantic region today, ethnicity often appears as an expression of incorporation in one specific type of wider, well organised whole: notably, in a state.\(^1\) A certain amount of unification among the Sea Peoples by the time of their attack on Egypt, is demonstrated by the very fact of this concerted attack, its effectiveness, and by the apparently co-ordinated sea voyages that built up towards it. But this unification can only have been partial, to the extent to which the Sea Peoples were outside the great states of Ḫatti and Egypt; this is why, from a theoretical perspective of ethnic studies, it would be much more plausible to regard the Sea Peoples, not as total foreigners from 1000 or more kms away far outside these states, but as peripheral populations of these states, resenting and confronting the very political organisation to which they owed their emergence and self-awareness as ethnic groups in the first place. Once the Sea Peoples settle in the Levant (Palestine: Philistines), a further convergence may have occurred. Their arrival means the end of Egypt’s effective control over Syro-Palestine.\(^2\) However, Woudhuizen (this volume) compares the Sea Peoples in their post-conflict relation with the Egyptian state, with the Normans in France: peripherally incorporated, they developed into a fully-fledged distinct ethnic group within the ethnic system of a national state, and with the buffer function of defending the statal sphere into which they had recently been incorporated, against further attacks from the same ethnic group to which they originally belonged. The perception, by their enemies, of the Sea Peoples as a certain unity in itself is then considered to have initiated a process of externally imposed ethogenesis which has persisted right into modern times, in the analytical imposition of the term ‘Sea Peoples’ in scholarly literature, with the suggestion of a certain degree of unity and convergence.

28.6.2. Were the constituent Sea Peoples already ethnic groups prior to the Sea Peoples Episode?

Are the nine constituent Sea Peoples that Woudhuizen and others have identified so diligently, merely local communities characterised by a specific place of residence, language and culture, or were they already ethnic groups in the sense of being recognised, and incorporated, in a wider ethnic classification system encompassing the central and eastern Mediterranean? Or did such a classification system, and the emergence of these nine communities as ethnic groups, only come about by the very emergence of the Sea Peoples as a translocal ethnic mobilisation process? Woudhuizen, in his identification of the nine constituent groups, takes them as already constituting ethnic groups; yet in part (notably: for what he claims to be Sardinian, Tuscany, and Sicilian provenances) far outside the states of Ḫatti and Egypt.

---


Assyria and Der are written on the right-hand side. Susa is placed at the bottom. The vertical lines going through Babylon must represent the Euphrates river. The map was probably composed in about 700 BC, though this copy was made later’ (Rood 1995: 125). For a complementary, and more extensive, but less reliable, description cf. AncientX.com, n.d. Also cf. Finkel 1995, 1998; Horowitz 1998.

I agree with Woudhuizen’s implicit presupposition that the nine groups about to constitute the Sea Peoples, had already been involved in some form of wider incorporation prior to the Sea Peoples episode proper. Their self-identity is clear from the fact that, in the eyes of their enemies they preserved their distinct identities through dress, somatic appearance, specific weaponry, etc., even whilst, and after, being engaged in their inter-group exploits which were externally designated by the overarching term ‘Sea Peoples’.

We may take the evidence of the Biblical Table of Nations to remind us of the fact that, in roughly the same period (Early to Middle Iron Age), in the Ancient World, in Syro-Palestine, and far beyond, an effective, widely encompassing system of interregional ethnic classification was in existence. Also the famous Babylonian Map of the World (c. 700–500 BCE, probably from Sippar) is evidence of such an encompassing, interregional classification system (Fig. 28.3).1172

Let us review what we do know of the structure of the human space of the eastern Mediterranean at the eve of the Sea Peoples’ exploits. For that purpose we have to ask ourselves: what are the conditions under which a comprehensive ethnic classification system arises. And since, after my introductory chapters, the obvious answer appears to be: an ethnic classification system arises whenever local populations are incorporated into a wider structure, let us inspect one by one the five types of wider structure that might have provided such interregional classification in the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age:

- the state
- regional cults
- trade
- language
- a pre-existing structure of ethnicity.

A discussion of each of these factors may bring us closer to a reconstruction of the intercontinental processes that gave rise to the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples. Meanwhile it is understood that these five factors are all predicated on an implied sixth: the technological, maritime and land-transport requirements for transregional contexts in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean; but that this requirement is met is not in serious doubt (Sasson 1966a; Stieglitz 1984). There is an abundance of studies of maritime technology in this period, whereas ever since the Middle Bronze Age communications were revolutionised by the land-transport technology of the spoked chariot, about which we will speak in some detail.

28.6.3. Factors and processes of incorporation giving rise to ethnic classification (a) the state

There is a general scholarly agreement that, ever since its emergence in the Ancient Near East by the end of the fourth millennia BCE, the state has been a major, extremely effective way of organising the wider socio-political space, in terms of control over production and especially over the circulation of goods, services, and people, in such a way that the state apparatus reproduces itself both materially and symbolically through the extensive appropriation that the state elite can impose in this situation of control, while, at the same time, offering the benefits of order, notably

- a monopoly on the use of violence, and
- a symbolic apparatus that expresses and reinforces order, and that in fact is a major instrument of order in its own right.

So effective is the state, that it tends to dominate and control the ethnic processes within its territory, often to the extent of reducing the ethnic factor to an element of intra-state segmentation of sub-national population divisions, monitored by the state (as in the Ottoman millet model and the American melting-pot model).

Very often, statehood and ethnicity occur together. We are inclined (cf. Africa in the 20th century CE) to view ethnicity in the first instance as the structuring of the sub-
national space within the context of the national state – even with a detrimental fragmenting and centrifugal effect on that very state (‘tribalism’). That such a model is not entirely satisfactory even for Africa is manifest from at least two considerations: in the first place, sub-national ethnicity is not always conducive to national divisiveness but may also be an important mechanism for the enhanced incorporation of specific peripheral group into the state; and secondly, from the fact that in many African situations of the 20th century CE secession movements have arisen which precisely question the boundaries of national states, e.g.

1. within the national state, they seek to launch a secession movement, in an attempt to opt out of the national political space;
2. at the boundaries between two or more national states, they seek to effect a redistribution of territory, so as to create their own ethnically-based territory.

Anyway, the state emerged, historically, as part of a package also including writing, organised religion, and science. Among the first states we find the model of the temple-centred Sumerian states, where the temple is also the major place of agricultural and commodity production as well as the state’s main ideological instrument. There are indications that the early dynamic state in Egypt was somewhat comparable. Our concentration, in the present study, on protohistory, i.e. on the threshold of writing, lends a particular significance to state formation, for although there have been states without writing, powerful and enduring states tend to have the whole package of statehood, writing, organised religion and science; since by definition the emergence of writing and hence the possibility of written records marks the beginning of formal history, one of the typical contexts for the production of written records is the state, so that with protohistory we often operate at the borderline of emergent statehood, or in a pre-statal situation partly informed by the fact that, contemporarily, there are states present in the distance.

The latter, of course, is very much the situation of the eastern Mediterranean basin in the Late Bronze Age. Here two major states, the Hittite empire and the Egyptian kingdom, dominate the mainland of Asia Minor, the Levant and north-eastern Africa. These two major states are surrounded by a fringe of lesser states (Mitanni, the Phoenician city states, and minor other states in the Syro-Palestinian and Caucasian region including Ugarit, the Minoan state that collapsed sometime during the Late Bronze Age proper, Mycenae and similar, relatively small-scale city-states of the Aegean region, including Troy, etc.), with a somewhat greater distance from the Mediterranean major states again like the Assyrian empire, Nubia, etc. Largely beyond the effective control of all these various states of greater and lesser importance whose records have drawn them into the realm of history, we have the communities (to be designated as ‘tribal’, ‘segmentary’, but in fact all we know of their socio-political organisation is that it did not reach state level) of agriculturalists, pastoralists, fishermen, traders, hunters and collectors, about which the historical record in the Late Bronze Age is largely silent, but about which archaeology, and to a lesser extent comparative linguistics and comparative ethnography, do provide some valuable data.

Diplomatic and military contacts including wars, treaties, exchanges of emissaries, the exchange of junior royal persons for the purpose of dynastic intermarriage and as hostages, are some of the main ways (lavishly documented in contemporary writing) in which the wider, transstatal space of the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age was diffusely structured on the principle of statehood. Very clearly, these statal expressions represent only a relatively minor aspect of the existing intercontinental structures at the time. Although the influence of one state, notably Egypt, may have been felt, diffusely, all over the eastern Mediterranean (as is suggested by the ubiquitous distribution of Egyptian and Egyptianising artefacts; cf. Lambrou-Phillipson 1990), no single state could be argued to hold, over that vast region, the kind of imperial sway later to be displayed by the Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman empires.

Yet this considerable extent of statehood could not prevent that sea transport, however technologically advanced, had as it inevitable implication the ubiquitous threat of piracy – a context where some of the most intriguing ethnic groups of the Mediterranean must be situated (Leleges, Tyrrhenians, etc.) – and which may well have contributed to the rise of the Sea Peoples’ concerted

\[1173\text{ Cf. Zaccagnini 1987, and the very extensive literature on the diplomatic correspondence found at Tell el-Amarna and stretching the whole of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East.}\]
\[1174\text{ Cf. Sestier 1880; Kroll 1921; Ormerod 1924; Wachsmuth 1975; Gras 1976 (Tyrrhenian piracy in Aegean), 1977 (Etruscan piracy).}\]
military action.

28.6.4. Factors and processes of incorporation giving rise to ethnic classification (b)
Religion, regional cults in particular

Let us now have a look at the religious dimension. The interactions between the elites of neighbouring states already make it clear that there was a fair amount of religious interaction within that intercontinental space: royals would exchange their priests, healers and healing statues across great distances, if this could help improve or reinforce inter-statal diplomatic relations. The comparative study of pantheons, myths, regional cults, ritual objects, ritual vocabularies, and rituals in themselves, in the Late Bronze Age and the Iron Age, demonstrates that the extent of intercontinental religious interaction between West Asia, North-eastern Africa and South-eastern Europe was quite impressive, and that, in addition to the state-based intercontinental interactions indicated in the previous section, it did contribute to the structuring of that intercontinental space in terms of shared concepts, shared cultic objects, and shared ideas, furthering the circulation of goods (as tribute and sacrifices for shrines) and of people (as cultic personnel and as pilgrims, suppliants, etc.).

In this connection it is useful to introduce the reader to the concept of the regional cult as developed in religious anthropology in the 1970s. Centring on a shrine that is administered by a priesthood and that functions as a major focus, not only of symbolic production but also of material appropriation and power, the regional cult imposes, in its own right, a network of cultic relations upon a wider geographical space that may or may not have any comparable socio-political organisation in other respects (e.g. in terms of statal organisation, trade, etc.). In this way the regional cult brings about a circulation of goods, people and ideas, structuring the neutral geographical space into cultic space. Such power as the regional cult generates, is in principle independent from the political power invested in any state within the same region, and numerous are the examples (also from the Mediterranean basin) through the ages, e.g. Harran and (as far as Ancient Egypt is concerned) Heliopolis, Thebe, Memphis and Sais, but also Delphi, Rome, Compostella, Kairwan, Lourdes, and by only a slight geographical extension, Mecca) where states and regional cults are in competition over the control of people and material resources. Regional cults lay a web over a wide, even transcontinental, geographical space (their catchment area), and turn it into a structured region, whose organisational features may often help explain power relations, population movements, etc., and their vicissitudes over time.

When some of the earliest states, in Sumer, emerged from a regional cult (the temple complex) and for a long time retained essential features of that religious complex, and when throughout history examples may be pointed out of the relative independence of regional cults from states in their geographical environment, one is tempted to consider state and regional cult as, in principle, two different models of spatial organisation, each with dynamics in its own right. The point has specific implications for the argument on the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age. Limiting ourselves to the Aegean region at the time, what was the mix, there, of statal and regional-cultic organisation of the regional space? By the Early Iron Age, the political space is fragmented into numerous city-states, organised probably in a way that owes a considerable debt to Phoenician city-states, with larger polities in the vicinity building up their menacing power; this process was to culminate in the wars the Greeks fought with the Achaemenid empire and with Sicily in the early fifth century BCE. Meanwhile the overall coherence of the Aegean region and beyond was served, in terms of structures of negotiation, reconciliation, the maintenance of a moral order, and the circulation of essential political and military information, not by statehood but by regional cults, centring on the major oracular shrines of the Greek mainland, ultimately (from the seventh century BCE) to be dominated by the Apollo shrine of

---

1177 Realising this to be the case is one of the benefits of the Black Athena debate, although Bernal’s Egyptocentric approach position appears to be an exaggeration, and an underrating of Egypt’s indebtedness to the Pelasgian realm which was only partially (North-)African, and as much Eurasian.


1179 Werbner 1977, Schoffeleers 1979; I contributed to both volumes, also cf. van Binsbergen 1981.


1181 Bernal 1993.

1182 Delphi was a cultic centre with a succession of previous principal deities there (such deities as Gê / Earth, Python, Telephoessa,
Delphi.

Such religious structures are examples of supra-locally systems of consultation and reconciliation, such as we also find in the famous case of the Nuer leopard-skin headman in Southern Sudan (cf. Evans-Pritchard 1967). One could explain this sub-Saharan African / Hellenic parallel on the narrower grounds that recent genetic research has

and Dionysus, all have been suggested on the basis of ancient testimonies). Delphic history up to the moment when the god before Apollo became victorious there, has been studied in detail by scholarship; cf. Fontenrose 1980, Maass 1993, Sourvinou-Inwood 1987.

This is a priest of the Earth who extends, to murderers fleeing the blood feud of their victim’s kinsmen and clansmen, the sanctuary and purification of the earth (conceived as a sacred entity) so that the blood feud cannot be consummated, and in the meantime the leopard-skin headman himself begins, on behalf of the perpetrator, negotiations on compensate payments to be made by the latter in lieu of blood revenge. That this latter-day African institution has striking parallels in the Mediterranean region, is brought out by the stories of Cain in the Biblical context (his sign is explicitly meant to provide sanctuary):

‘And the LORD said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the LORD set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him’ (Genesis 4:15).

Also, in the Greek mythological context, Orestes (ritually purified after killing his mother Clytemnestra, slayer of his father Agamemnon) and Apollo (ritually purified after killing Python); in this context Peleus, Achilles’ father, is even reported to have been purified on two successive occasions, for two different murders of kin. Heracles killed Neleus and all of his sons except Nestor, after Neleus’ refusal to ritually cleanse Heracles when the latter had killed Iphitus. Many of these parallels in the field of the management of violent conflict may be gleaned from Apollodorus’ Bibliotheca (cf. Frazer 1921 / 1970). The leading African philosopher and classicist Valentin Mudimbe tells me that, independently, he recently reached the same position concerning the African affinities in Apollodorus in his contribution to the 2008 Warwick conference on the reassessment of the Black Athena thesis (Mudimbe 2008). Also other authors have noted the closeness between the cultural symbolism of sub-Saharan Africa and the Aegean: cf. Vidal-Naquet 1981, citing in approval earlier studies by Jeannaire 1939, 1951. Since leopards still occur in Nuerland (Southern Sudan) but no longer in the Aegean region, we might be inclined to see the Nuer leopard-skin priest as a proto-type, and as secondary derivations the abundance of leopard-skin-related practices in Ancient Egypt (the Tj shaman of the Namar tablet, the Shem priest, the many references to leopards and leopard-skin iconography in the tomb of Tutankhamun – cf. Carter & Mace 1923-33 –, etc.) and in the Aegean (where major deities like Dionysus, and major heroes like Jason, Orpheus, Antenor, Paris, and the latter’s opponent Menelaus, are iconographically and mythically associated with the leopard skin). However, global historical comparison (van Binsbergen 2004-11) shows otherwise: probably the Nuer leopard-skin headman owes its ritual office, and its ritual attire, to a Pelasgian influence also informing the Ancient Mediterranean and West Asia, as do leopard-skin related practices and representations in sub-Saharan Africa, East Asia, and even the New World.

brought out that, of all present-day European gene pools / peoples, that of the Greeks is the only one to have very marked sub-Saharan African affinities (Arnaiz-Villena et al. 1999, 2001a). However, considering the fact that these Greek-African affinities are very far from limited to the management of violence, whilst moreover such affinities, as far as the Mediterranean is concerned, are very far from limited to the Greeks, suggests that we have to do here with a much more comprehensive Pelasgian phenomenon. What is involved in all this is the definition of the highest socio-political unit within which it is still possible to present compensatory payments as an alternative for blood revenge; this highest unit indicates the effective scope of society, and this is also the scope of the socio-political space within which ethnic distinctions are being made.

Woudhuizen (this volume, Part II) suggests that the Early Iron Age political structure in the Aegean (notably: a condition of statal fragmentation complemented by very widely ranging regional cults) was merely an ad hoc and transitional arrangement, compensating, as it were, for the lack of a central political force after the collapse of Mycenaean, whose allegedly exalted central power is then considered, by Woudhuizen, to have been more or less at a par with the Minoan state that preceded it and whose heir it was. As a result Woudhuizen tends to view the later regional-cults structure which largely held the Greek world together in Archaic and Classical times, as a transformation, onto the religious plane, of the politico-economic unity postulated for Minoan and Mycenaean times. He even goes to the extent of suggesting that the Mycenaean king, whose central icon is Agamemnon, was an effective Pan-Hellenic military and political leader, so that his kingdom really represented a Pan-Hellenic central state only to be fragmented in post-Mycenaean times. Woudhuizen seems to be on solid ground here: in the last decades, scholarly consensus has emerged that the Mycenaean state developed into a formidable international player (e.g. Wood 1987; Gurney 1990).

Yet, as we have seen in Chapter 5, such a view does not emerge from my close reading of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, in which I have deliberately concentrated on the literary text; there images of chaos rival with, and often prevail over, images of Mycenaean order. While highlighting the unique ritual and military functions that Agamemnon discharged on behalf of the Hellenic confederacy, there Agamemnon appears as socially and economically a mere primus inter pares with – unmistakably – only very limited power invested in his own person.

The reliance on regional cults in the Mediterranean...
basin is so widespread (virtually ubiquitous), so old, and so inveterate (through saint worship it persists to this day on both sides of the Mediterranean), that the particular applicability of the regional cult model in classical Greece (where it was of vital importance in creating a social and moral space beyond the narrow confines of the city-states), cannot be explained away merely as an accidental outcome of the rise and fall of Minoan and Mycenaean polities. More probably, regional cults formed a time-honoured organisatory principle in their own right, largely independent from, and possibly older than, kingship and statehood.

It is not difficult to see how regional cults as factors of the structuration of space are conducive to an overall ethnic classification system. If such cults are about the circulation of goods, people and ideas over a vast area (‘cultur region’), the co-ordination of this circulation (for festivals, pilgrimages, sacrificial animals, tribute and votive objects, sacred endowment, the recruitment and displacement of people for the priesthood, etc.) means that within the cult, people who are otherwise strangers without any contacts whatsoever with one another, now have to interact in co-ordinated roles. This is only possible if their initial strangerhood is dissolved into named categories of specified otherness, in other words, through a shared system of ethnic classification.

28.6.5. Factors and processes giving rise to ethnic classification: (c) Trade, language, arts and crafts

In addition to the regional cults as a major organisation of the intercontinental space in its own right, three more factors have been mentioned. One is obviously trade, for which both contemporary records and, especially, archaeology has adduced an enormous amount of evidence. The literature on this point is extensive and need not be reviewed here in detail. The second factor is language; on this one we can be brief, having explored, in Chapter 4, the contemporary linguistic situation, in which connection I presented the hypothesis of a five-tiered linguistico-ethnic system in the Bronze Age Mediterranean as an expression of this proto-globalised space – bringing out that both linguistic and ethnic diversity was at the heart of the social experience of at least a large part of the litoral populations. Also arts and crafts, and the transregional movement of specialised artisans, contributed to the structuring of the globalising space within which ethnicity could function as an organising principle.

28.6.6. Beyond the state, religion, trade and language: Ethnicity

That ethnicity is a major factor to organise geographical space was stressed in the generalised accounts of ethnic theory with which this study has opened. From contemporary records in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age it is clear that the authors of these records would take recourse to designation of strangers in ethnic terms, even if these traders could not be identified as being the speakers’ specific trading partners, his fellow suppliants at a particular shrine, or his fellow citizen of a particular state.

But precisely how does ethnicity effect the structuring of a very extended geographical space (such as the eastern half of the Mediterranean, with its littoral regions)? Suppose we could subtract, from the geographical space, such structuring effects as we have indicated above for state-
hood, regional cults, trade, language, arts and crafts. What would then remain for the ethnicity as a structuring factor?

This is the point to return to our initial tripartite characterisation (Chapter 2) of ethnicity as

1. a mental classification system
2. a socio-political structure
3. a process, to be captured in terms of ethogenesis and ethnicisation.

What we see from the documentary records in the Late Bronze Age (e.g. the monumental Medinet Habu texts in which the battles with the Sea Peoples are recorded) is mainly the attribution of ethnic labels, in other words, these texts tell us something about the structuring of the transnatal intercontinental geographical space through ethnicity by imposing, upon that space, a network of ethnic classification. An obvious question to ask then is whether classification system

1. is strictly peculiar to the authors in question, i.e. idiosyncratic at the level of individual authors (this would mean for instance and in concreto: the term širdn used in Merneptah’s inscription is only used by and meaningful to the authors of the inscription – which is extremely unlikely considering that the inscription was a state undertaking); or alternatively, whether that classification system

2. is shared by most members of their contemporary society (this would mean for instance and in concreto: the term širdn used in Merneptah’s inscription is understood by many Egyptians at the time but has no wider circulation outside Egypt – a distinct possibility, especially if the term could be argued to be not just an empty name but to have a productive morphology and an identifiable, productive Semantics in Ancient Egyptian, e.g. ‘black ones’, ‘seafarers’, etc. – which happens not to be the case, apparently); or, finally, whether that classification system

3. is shared throughout the geographical space in question (the Eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age); this would mean for instance and in concreto: the term širdn used in Merneptah’s inscription would be understood as a specific ethnic label also by other inhabitants of the eastern Mediterranean, outside Egypt and non-speakers of Egyptian, and širdn may even be an original ethnic label by means of which the members of the ethnic group in question used to identify themselves self-reflectively, i.e. autophylllic.

Without going into the methodical consideration of the alternative possibilities (1) and (2), Woudhuizen takes it that (3) is the correct solution and that the širdn, in fact, are Sardinians, from an island whose inhabitants are still called by a name that already clung, or so Woudhuizen postulates,1187 to inhabitants of the same island more than three millennia ago, prior to the Sea Peoples’ episode.

Here it becomes clear that Woudhuizen’s approach, precisely where it convinces in its identification of the ethnic identity of the širdn and other Sea Peoples in the sense that as a result of a complex and well-informed, erudite argument he assigns an original home region and historical context to them, does so on the basis of a major hypothesis implicit in his argument. This hypothesis is:

In the Late Bronze Age, by the time of the appearance of the Sea Peoples, the geographic space of the eastern Mediterranean was ethnically structured in this sense, that an overall system of ethnic classification was generally known and generally subscribed to.

Identifying and making explicit this central hypothesis is a major step forward from the identification of the širdn as Sardinians, ţíkr as Teukroi / inhabitants of the Troad, etc. It means that we begin to understand, under the heading of ‘the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples’, not just the specific identity of individual ethnic groups, but, more comprehensively, the overall socio-political structure that sets the framework for the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples – as well as the theoretical and methodological assumptions of modern scholarship concerning ancient ethnicity.

However, it will be equally clear that with the explicitation of this hypothesis we have only advanced a little in our enquiry. This hypothesis may be plausible enough in itself, but strictly speaking we are still required to adduce specific and convincing empirical evidence that, in at least one or two other contexts of the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age outside Egypt, the word širdn was in fact understood as an ethnonym (the ethnic determinative

1187 Modern Sardinia was (also) known under other names in Antiquity, e.g Sardò, Sandleiotis, or Ichnusa (Radke 1979); perhaps it was the Homeric Thrinakii, the island of the sungod Helius (cf. Odyssey XI-XII), although most authorities have thought here of Sicily (von Geisau 1979c).
in the Egyptian expression would have taken care of this point if it had been totally unequivocal – but there are more indications to this effect),\footnote{1188} and was taken to refer to people hailing from the central Mediterranean – as is rather more difficult to prove. For some of the other eight ethnonyms scrutinised by Woudhuizen as designations of the Sea Peoples some evidence of this nature appears to be already available (e.g. for Danaoi), but for the confirmation of our hypothesis as a whole we still have a long way of explicit argumentation to go.

On the other hand, our case study of the Table of Nations (Chapter 6) suggests the plausibility of the idea of an intercontinental ethnic classification system encompassing much of the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age.

However, with all these forms of trans-Mediterranean connectivity in place and with proto-globalisation a tangible reality (and a credible context for ethnicity in the sense of my definition), we must not forget that by the Late Bronze Age, this increasingly connected system went through a profound crisis (Liverani 1987; Lehmann 1996; Ward et al. 1992; Sherratt 1998). Usually such a crisis in a geographically extensive and economically complex system would not have just one causal factor; Drews has pointed at the obsolescence of military technology (chariots, swords), but this has been contested by Burgess (2001). Bauer (1998) proposed that the true nature of the crisis was simply (after millennia in which trade was a state monopoly, as it was in much of pre-colonial Africa until the 19th century CE) the emergence of decentralised trade, of which he sees the Sea Peoples, especially the Philistines, as an exponent.

\section{28.7. The Sea Peoples’ boats and their bird-like ornaments}

\subsection{28.7.1. Boats and Sea Peoples}

One thing the Sea Peoples are agreed to have in common, is their nautical skills. Perhaps Karst (1931a) was right that these derived from a Pan-Mediterranean Basquoid expansion c. 2000 BCE. Perhaps we must even reach for the General Sunda thesis which the geneticist Stephen Oppenheimer advanced in 1998, and according to which early Holocene flooding of the then subcontinent of South East Asia (now insular Indonesia) caused major migrations both eastbound (contributing to the early peopling of Oceania) and westbound – allegedly reaching all the way to the Indus valley and the Persian Gulf, and hence a possible, though largely hypothetical additional source of nautical skills in Western Eurasia.

\textit{Sunda, Sea Peoples, and the Core Mythologies of the Ancient Near East?} While the preceding paragraph is an adequate summary of what I have considered – by analogy with Einstein’s (1917 / 1960) Special and General Theory of Relativity – as the General Sunda thesis (van Binsbergen c.s. 2008), Oppenheimer can also be said to have a Special Sunda thesis. Here he argues that, assuming the overall effect postulated by his General Sunda thesis, the core mythologies of the Ancient Near East including those of the Bible, ultimately go back to Sunda origins. Although I am an enthusiastic supporter of the General Sunda thesis (van Binsbergen 2011c), I have demonstrated elsewhere, on the basis of a quantitative, multivariate analysis of Flood myths worldwide, that there is hardly any empirical ground for Oppenheimer’s claims in terms of the Special Sunda thesis.

The overall suggestion emerging from our painstaking 2008 analysis is for a West Asian / Pelasgian origin of the mytheme of the Elaborate Standard Flood myth (with Flood hero, ally of a personal god, and further themes such as human transgression – often associated with the invention of sexuality –, a tower and other devices to connect, or reconnect, Heaven and Earth, and the post-Flood repopulation of the earth often through unconventional means e.g. asexual, incestuous, transpecies and even between humans and plants). There are limited indications that the Sunda context contributed to the transmission of the Elaborate Standard Flood myth to other regions and continents, but nothing indicated that this mytheme was originally invented there. Remarkably, there are some limited suggestions, however, for a (partial) New World origin. Meanwhile, what does not exactly recommend the Sunda theses is that the idea of a South East Asian / Pacific origin of the oldest form of humanity is a standard trope – sometimes under the Platonic name of ‘Atlanteans’ – in Western esoterism, from Le Plongeon, Blavatsky and Churchward to anthroposophy (e.g. von Frankenfeld 1985, who attributes such an origin even specifically to the Pelasgians, s.v. ‘Pelasgi’ – which suggests that not only Oppenheimer’s but also my own approach invites counter-New-Age suspicion); even Karst (1931a) gives

\footnote{1188} If the Egyptians would have had one clear-cut determinative that served unequivocally for the function ‘ethnonym’, this point would have been settled. However, when, above, we examined the various determinatives at play in the Egyptian designations of the Sea Peoples, we found that the case is more complicated. This at least is my impression as a non-Egyptologist. The prominent Egyptologist Wilson (1969) seeks to make a distinction, in the context of Ancient Egyptian sources on Syro-Palestine, between cases where the determinative ‘foreign people’ [\(\text{\textit{Na\text{-}\textit{\textsc{mnu}}}\)] is used, and others where the determinative ‘foreign place’ [\(\text{\textit{Na\text{-}\textit{\textsc{mnu}}}\)] is. Thus he believes he can distinguish between ‘settled peoples’ (where the place variant is used) and ‘nomadic peoples’ (where, for lack of a place, the people variant is used). Much the same view is presented by Hannig (2000 s.vv. ‘Fremd-, fremd’) and Gardiner 1994: 488 (\(\text{\textit{Na\text{-}\textit{\textsc{mnu}}}\), N25\) en p. 442 (\(\text{\textit{Na\text{-}\textit{\textsc{mnu}}}\), A1\). However, the Sea Peoples material as brought together in Tables 28.1 and 28.2 suggests that, at least for the New Kingdom, such an interpretation is artificial, since the place and people determinatives may be used in combination, as in the Medinet Habu inscription.
in to this collective representation of the late 19th century CE. Under ny Pelasgian Hypothesis, elements from the Mediterranean / West Asian, Pelasgian complex were diffused, from the Middle Bronze Age, to East Asia, and thus ramified into South and South East Asia. Later, around the beginning of the Common Era, there was (through Hinduism and Buddhism) a substantial cultural influence of South Asia upon South East Asia. Hence the cultural affinity between ‘Sunda’ and the Mediterranean / West Asia is a tangible reality, and to explain that reality I prefer the Pelasgian Hypothesis over the Sunda Hypothesis – an apt example of the fact that in protohistory we work with so many unknowns that always more than one explanation fits the available data.

However, given the mainstream, Eurocentric consensus that has been noticeable in Sea Peoples studies during the last few decades, there is also an alternative explanation, which has the advantage of being mainstream and relatively uncontroversial.

In the wake of Kimmig, de Boer, and Wachsmann, Woudhuizen makes a great deal of the specific type of Sea Peoples’ vessels, whose double ornaments at bow and stern (a theme which we can interpret in terms of the Dioscuri twins as protectors of seamen probably going back to the Bronze Age (cf. Février 1937; von Geisau 1979b), and as manifestations of the dyadics, as opposed to triadic, worldview) remind him of the Urnfield peoples.

Evidence of a boat cult in the Ancient Near East may be derived from the very extensive representation of boats on cylinder seals (Kantor 1984), and for Egypt from extensive iconography and texts relating to solar barks as well as from the central place boats occupied in the funerary complex. For Bronze Age Europe there is considerable evidence especially in iconography (rock art) and boat statuettes. In this connection, Schwarz (2004) reminds us of the association between (westbound) ships and the realm of the dead – which cannot be without symbolic implications for our discussion, below, of the specific merits of a westbound versus and eastbound scenario for the postulated Sea Peoples movement. A voluminous literature deals specifically with the Aegean ship symbolism and iconography, while also the Levant and the Sea Peoples context are well-covered. On Eurasian boats, there is still valuable cross-cultural material in G. Elliot Smith (1916), despite its unmitigated diffusionism; a recent comparison of prehistoric boat symbolism in Scandinavia and South East Asia may be found in Ballard et al. (2003).

In Woudhuizen’s opinion, the invasion and expansion of the Urnfield peoples (commonly considered as early Indo-European speakers) not only triggered the push and pull mechanism on which the Sea Peoples mobilisation depended, but also provided an internal ethnic identification among at least a selection of the Sea Peoples: they were not only victims of Urnfield people’s invasions, but were themselves also, at least in part, Urnfield peoples, chased from their relatively recently gained homes by a new wave of fellow-Urnfielders – thus invoking a ‘domino’ mechanism well-known from modern geopolitics, and comparable to the snowball mechanism associated with the rapid expansion of the Nguni (< Bantu) speaking peoples in Southern Africa in the 19th-century CE (Barnes 1951, 1954).

However, this line of reasoning is not totally convincing. Even if Woudhuizen has a point for the most westerly components in the Sea Peoples (Sardinians, Oscans), it is rather problematic to generalise this potentially Urnfield theme to all the other seven constituent groups, including those of the Aegean, Anatolia and Syro-Palestine, – including speakers of Afroasiatic (notably the West Semitic branch of that language family) or of Indo-European languages (such as Lycian) that may be greatly distinct

1189 The proposed Urnfield connection of the Sea Peoples was explored by: Kimmig 1964; cf. Ilon 1992; Matthäus 1980; Sprockhoff 1954; Romey 2003.
1190 From the very extensive literature I only mention: Lilliu & Schubart 1967; Gelling 1969; Matthäus 1980, 1980-1; Coates 1987 (a reminder that ancient ship iconography poses great methodological problems); de Boer 1991; Göttlicher 1992; Kaul 1998; Wedde 2000; Göto 2005; Vianello 2008a.

1193 There is an amusing Biblical angle to this point when we see that the Christian Church fathers tended to refer, wrongly, to the sixth book of the Hebrew Bible as that of ‘Jesus Nave [the Ship]’ < Greek Τεσσαρδών Ναύος < Hebrew Yehoshua bin Nun. The watery connotations go even further, for nun is the deity of the ‘Pri mal Waters’ in Ancient Egypt, and is moreover a word for ‘big fish’ in Arabic and Syrian; also we are reminded how in the Indian Flood myth (as recounted in the Matsya Purana and Shatapatha Brahmana (I-8, I-6), it is the fish Matsya (an avatar of the primal god Vishnu) who was saved by the Flood hero Manu, and who in turn saved the latter from the Flood. Joshua’s name (rendered as Jesus in LXX, Josephius, and the New Testament) means ‘JHWH saves’ – was this then a deliverance, specifically, from the Flood?
1194 In Section 28.9.3 I will suggest that the same postulated movement (coming from the Levant and / or Egypt, and travelling by chariot and / or by ship along the southern shore of the Mediterranean) could – by a crossing to the Northern Mediterranean shore – also have led to the ethnogenesis of the Oscans: characteristically not monolithically Indo-European, or Basque / Sino-Caucasian speaking, but multi-lingual, under the overall five-tiered linguistico-ethnic system.
from those of the Urnfielders. Admittedly, for these more easterly groups we cannot rule out the possibility of ethnic identification on the basis of their recollection of a shared origin (cf. the east-west movement of, presumably, the Lycians to become Etruscans) and therefore cultural and linguistic affinity. And more in general, Woudhuizen found several indications to the effect that some of the prospective Sea Peoples entertained a self-identity as ‘people of the sea, sea-farers’, which may also have been a basis for identification across great distances.

The type of boat with bird ornaments, although also found in the iconography of mobile art associated with the Urnfielders, is far from specific to them, as Fig. 28.5 amply demonstrates.

The Sea Peoples stand out, in the reliefs of Rameses III’s mortuary temple at Medinet Habu, by a type of long, apparently rather narrow boat, whose prow and stern are symmetrically shaped, rising narrowly and almost perpendicularly to considerable height, and ending in what looks like the representation of an aquatic bird’s head. Barnett (1987: 373) refers to a vessel from Cyprus with a depiction of a Sea Peoples’ boat: ‘Levanto-Helladic Pictorial Style vase from Enkomi, tomb 3, no. 2620’, which allegedly contains a similar picture of a duck-headed ship published by Sjoqvist 1940 (non vidi). It has long been recognised that boats answering to this general description cannot be pinpointed to any one specific peoples or archaeological context of Europe, Western Asia, or North Africa in the Late Bronze Age. Representations on artefacts and in rock art matching the Sea Peoples’ boat type have been found all over Southern, Central and Northern Europe (cf. Fig. 28.5). (Piggott 1973: 144 f.; Wachsmann 1981, 1997, 1998; Artzy 1998; Kaul 2002; Matthäus 1980, 1980-81; cf. Romey 2003, who provides an up-to-date bibliography on this question.) Also West Asian boats of the same period are often indistinguishable from this type, whereas West Asian representations of dragons and sea monsters also come remarkably close – almost as if the, much older, concept of the sea monster obtained a revised iconography in the light of the traumatic experiences with the Sea Peoples by the end of the second millennium BCE.

a. Urnfield ‘Vogelbarke’ (bird boats) on amulets, combs, ornaments, etc. from Balkan and Central Europe; after Kimmig 1964: 224, via Romey 2003; also cf. Wachsmann 1998: 174; the duck-shaped ornament top left: after Göttlicher 1978: Fig. 33: 439; source: Urnenfelder Vogel, n.d

b. Dionysus and the pirates depicted on an Attic kylix c. 540-530 BC by Exekias (Munich: Antikensammlung und Glyptothek, Inv. 8729)

c. Bronze razor from Jutland, Late Bronze Age; after Güntert 1923, via Goto 2006

d. Boat model with animals, in my opinion implying a Flood myth, Sardinia, c. 800 BCE; Lilliu & Schubart 1967

e. Kynos ship A; Wachsmann 1998: 131, fig. 7.8a. Drawing K. Bowling, via: Kynos ship, n.d. Kynos is Phthiotis, i.e. Locris coast facing Euboea. The krater was dated at Late Helladic IIIIC. The headgear of the warriors could perhaps be interpreted as that of some of the Sea Peoples. Cf. Bradtmüller n.d.
Ancient Mesopotamian seal depicting the god Enki journeying by boat to Enlil’s temple in Nippur, or Enlil in the boat in which he raped the virgin goddess Ninlil and conceived the moon god Nanna (Herold n.d.; Leroy n.d.; cf. Collon 1993: 180 no. 850).

Sacred boats, the representation of the srh palace façade, and the crown of Upper Egypt on the Qustul incense burner, Nubia, 4th millennium BCE (Williams 1986).

Sea Peoples’ boats, Medinet Habu, Egypt, Late Bronze Age; detail from Nelson et al. 1930, plate 37 via Romey 2003.

Rowers with Sea Peoples-style headgear from Cos. From Wachsmann 1998, 176, fig. 8.22.

Boat representations from Tassili n’Ajjer, Sahara, southern Algeria (source: Tassili boat, n.d.).

Boat representations in a bronze diadem, Central Europe, Bronze Age; Meller 2004.

Gold votive barque of Pharaoh Kamose, XVII dynasty, Egypt, mid-16th century BCE (Maspero & Sayce 1903: IV, 113).

Boat representation in a bronze diadem, Central Europe, Bronze Age; Meller 2004.

Fig. 28.5. Selected boat representations from the Pelasgian realm.
After our extensive discussion of Noah and his sons in the context of the Table of Nations (Chapter 6), it is interesting that further evidence on the connection between boats and birds can be derived from the Islamic tradition concerning Noah. He appears, not only in the Qur’an sura that bears his name, but especially in the occult and secret sciences that are highly developed components of the Islamic world religion (cf. Ullman 1972). These products of scholarship tend to be accompanied by a mythical list (silisila) of authorities along which each product was handed down through the ages; in these lists Noah and Enoch, along with Idrīs and the angel Jibrīl (Gabriel), tend to play a major role. While the Prophet Muhammad is generally considered, in Western scholarship, to have been greatly inspired by Jewish and Christian sources, yet the Qur‘ān and the Islamic tradition offer interesting perspectives of their own (Heller 1993; Weil 1846) on Noah (Arabic (Nūh) and the Flood. It is from the Islamic tradition that we may glean the mythical names of Noah’s unadmirable wife Waliya and his sinful son Can‘ān / Yām, who refused to embark in the Ark and was drowned on the top of a mountain. Noah carried Adam’s body into the Ark and used it to separate the men from the women; Ham was the only human aboard to transgress the rule of chastity during the boat voyage, and paid for this (rather than for ridiculing his drunken father) by having his skin turned black.

The Ark’s voyage was sacred in several ways: it was based on explicit divine election and divine warning of a small band of survivors of the Flood; the future of humankind depended on it; moreover it took place under incomparably tragic catastrophic and circumstances, during which the whole rest of humanity was being destroyed. Ritual abstinence from sexuality as the active display of life force, has been a common rule in a wide variety of sacred situations in many cultures world-wide across the ages; in the specific context of the Standard Elaborate Flood mytheme, such a taboo tends to be related to the origin of the Flood and post-Flood events (the invention of sexuality, the incompatibility of the fiery context of sexuality with the watery context of the Flood; the need to repopulate the earth, initially often by asexual means because Water still reigns supreme). The remarkable thing is only that Nuh needed such a powerful and magically charged deterrent as the dead body of mankind’s ancestor (and the first Master and Name-giver of Animals) to make the Ark’s inmates observe this ruling that should have been obvious in itself.

The same tradition of Ham’s transgression and punishment is recorded in the Haggada (Talmud). For the study of Sea Peoples symbolism the important element is that in the Islamic tradition the Ark ‘had a head and tail like a cock, a body like a bird (al-Tha’labi)’— in other words, was more or less conceived like the boats of the Sea Peoples! Also the giant ‘Udj bin ‘Anak was saved in the Ark; this is also mentioned in the Haggada, where the giant is called ‘Og. May we interpret the names of the giant as corresponding with ‘Uz and ‘Anak in the Biblical Table of Nations? For Karst (1931a) the Anākīn are, predictably, primal inhabitants with ‘Ibero-Aethiopian’, Sinic, Bantoid or

1195 al-Nūh appears in Sura LXXI named after him. In Arabic, this name is almost duplicated in that of ḳīnāh, the Biblical Enoch, who in the Islamic tradition is considered a great prophet and whom Al-Bazawi (cf. Hughes 1993: 192) has identified with the prophet Idrīs.

1196 Arab: ‘senior female relative’, ‘feminine saint’. In the Hebrew Talmudic tradition, Noah’s wife is called Naamah (Midrash Genesis Rabah 23:4); this name may be interpreted as ‘Pleasing to God’, but there is disagreement as to her piety – most Rabbis agreeing that she was idolatrous. For Jewish legends around Noah, cf. Ginzberg 1928, 1988; Landa 1919.

1197 One cannot help noticing that the name Yām comes close to ym, ‘sea’, (in West Semitic including Ugaritic and Hebrew, and Old Egyptian, but not Arabic). The sea of course is the Flood hero’s principal adversary. Another demonstration, if we still needed one, to the effect that the Biblical account of the Flood and the Table of Nations is mythical and symbolic, and not factual and historical.

1198 For the possibly Bantu etymology of Can‘ān I refer to my argument on the etymology of Canaan, Chapter 4 above. Here is another example: ‘the son who refused’, Canan or Canaan, can be considered to be literally named after this act of refusal. In proto-Bantu ‘refuse’ is rendered by *-káán, a root which is preserved in most later-day inhabitants with ‘Ibero-Aethiopian’, Sinic, Bantoid or

1199 Sanhedrin 108a-b.

1200 al-Tha’labi, died 1035 CE, was a prominent Islamic author, notably of the Tafsīr al-Kabīr, a famous Qur‘ān exegetes.

1201 Cf. Greek (Κυβερνητες), ‘Lords’? One is reminded of the Semitic reading – already going back to the 16th-century Semitic Scaliger – of the Kabeiroi / Cabiri, Aegean chthonic gods as ‘Great Ones’, cf. Arabic كابئر, ‘great’ (Faber 1803, Bernal 1993; now confirmed in an Emir text, Arnaud 1985-87). Incidentally, the Cabiri are often identified with the Dioscuri and, like the latter, may also have functioned as protectors of seamen. Also in the light of their association with the fire (and subsequently metallurgy) god Hephaestus, I would consider them eminently Pelasgian representations.
Khoisan connotations. This is a plausibility, since often giants represent earlier local people subdued by newcomers. However, Biblical scholars have preferred to pursue other associations of the name Anakim: the builders of the numerous megaliths in Syro-Palestine (rather compatible with Karst’s proposed ‘Ibero-Aethiopians’ — whose given name implies again high levels of skin pigmentation!), given the global distribution of megaliths, Aramaean speakers, and — because of their exceptional bodily length — even Philistines (Delekat 1969; numerous other specialist studies could be adduced also on the related topic of the Rephaim). However, equally often, legendary giants are the residual manifestations (e.g. Graeco-Roman Titans) of Primary Gods of creation (whom I have suggested to be typical of the *Borean realm, from c. 25 ka BP onward) and subsequently subdued, de-throned or eclipsed by a later pantheon, especially a sky god.

Fig. 28.6. Donald Duck in the role of Noah admitting pairs of animals into the Ark

28.7.2. Swan-ornamented boats

Our next step must be to identify the species of bird depicted on the Sea Peoples’ boats. The bird represented in Sea Peoples’ ship ornaments has often (cf. Yon 1992; Barnett 1987) been interpreted as a duck, presumably because the global media empire of the American entrepreneur Walt Disney has for decades imposed the template of the fictitious cartoon character Donald Duck as a filter through which, especially urban and North Atlantic, people’s perception of aquatic birds would have to pass. In fact the bird on Sea Peoples’ boats, with its very long straight neck and long bill, is much more like a swan (cf. Fig. 28.10, below). This makes the symbolic interpretation much easier, for whereas the duck is, symbolically, greatly underutilised in the European and Near Eastern tradition, the swan is richly endowed in this respect.

The peculiar headgear of the Sea Peoples has been widely discussed. Barnett 1987 sees the pr-wst as having on their helmets upright reeds, leather straps, or horsehair, not (as is often claimed) feathers. Reeds / sedge would be symbolically interesting, because in the context of an attack on Egypt it might imply a reference to the Egyptian royal title, nswt-bt, ‘the One of the Reed / Sedge and the Bee’ — which in turn may contain an oblique reference to the first reed clump growing out of the Primal Waters as an announcement of the cosmogonic separation of Water and Land (a tradition found in Egypt and in Bantu-speaking Africa, e.g. Zu-luland),1203 with the bee possibly1204 signifying the divine light inspiring this cosmogonic scene — or, more systematically, an indication that the Water-Land cosmogony is already being replaced by, hence being contaminated with, the Heaven-Earth (i.e. the celestial bee / and the terrestrial reed) cosmogony that also underlies the Egyptian royal title nswt-bt. Let us not forget that several Sea Peoples were first attested in the Ancient Near East as mercenaries to the kings of Egypt and Haiti. Both Woudhuizen (1997) and Best (1996–7) have sought to interpret other Cretan parallels of Egyptian royal symbolism (notably the bee) as indication of Egyptian overlordship. Leather straps or horsehair would (because of textual parallels in Homer) suggest Aegean connotations, but would also remind us of the Indo-Aryan, Mitanni (cf. Hyksos?) connections of horse-breedin in the Levant during the Bronze Age. It is a pity that the feather interpretation does not meet with approval on Barnett’s part, because if their ships were shaped in the form of a bird, probably a swan, swan’s feathers on the head would be ideal further gear to convey the same message as the boat’s bird symbolism. This is another reason to interpret the boats as swans rather than ducks: duck feathers would be too small to create the effect that the Medinet Habu and other representations convey, but the much larger tail

1202 Unable to entertain the idea of female politico-ritual leadership, Egyptologists have habitually translated this title as ‘He of the Sedge and the Bee’. However, morphologically the expression nswt-bt is unmistakably feminine, as marked by two feminine suffixes q3, t. My ungendered expression ‘the One of...’ is a compromise. Old Egyptian was perfectly able to express gender — contrary to the Nkoya language of South Central Africa, where similar confusion as to the rulers’ gender was exacerbated by the lack of morphological expressions of gender in that language. The resulting ideological and methodological puzzles are one of the central themes in my book Tears of Rain (van Binsbergen 1992a).


1204 By analogy with the flies discussed in Draffkorn Kilmer 1987.

Source: © Walt Disney, Noah’s Ark, animated motion picture (1999), with thanks.
feathers of swans certainly would. Moreover, of course, there is the abundance of swan motives on Philistianian pottery – which motive, however, does have Aegean counterparts.\textsuperscript{1205} A connection between Sea Peoples and bird may perhaps also be seen in the Enkomi Pyxis, cf. Fig. 28.7. The bird looks most like a goose or duck.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{enkomopyxis.png}
\caption{The Enkomi pyxis.}
\end{figure}

Source: Enkomi Pyxis n.d. Cf. Barnett 1987: 376: ‘The ivory gaming-box from Enkomi in the British Museum decorated in Mycenaean style shows a charioteering nobleman or king of Syrian type followed by a bearded Tjekker servant with “Philistine” head-dress holding an axe. B[ritish] M[useum] slide A289.’ In the context of Sea Peoples studies, the chariot might be misinterpreted as the overland counterpart of typical Sea Peoples movement – it has both the violence and the dynamism to lend credibility to such a suggestion. However, this interpretation is patently wrong. The pyxis is much longer than shown here, and the left-hand side of the scene, not shown, depicts a conventional hunting scene with fleeing wild bovines (cf. Helck 1979b: 120)! The central figure standing in the chariot is not himself a Sea Peoples’ leader, but simply a West Asian prince with a conventional elitist life-style including a predilection for hunting and for foreign (in this case, t[ik][r]) bodyguards. It is therefore doubtful whether the bird (goose?) over the horses may be interpreted as a Sea Peoples’ emblem; but this is not entirely impossible.

What all this amounts to is that the swan may be identified as an emblematic animal of the Sea Peoples, and by extension of the Pelasgians with whom we shall identify the Sea Peoples.\textsuperscript{1206} As a emblematic animal of the Sea Peoples, and by extension of the Pelasgians, the swan may also have affinities with the Northern, Uralic world and with the Eurasian shamanic complex. While echoes of these affinities perspire in the Ancient Aegean as Hyperborean / Apollinian\textsuperscript{1206} associations,\textsuperscript{1207} there is also the evidence of Eleusis, the mystery cult of Attica which, along with Lemnos, was particularly strongly associated with the Pelasgian identity in the consciousness of the Ancients. The priests of Eleusis mystery cult were considered to be of swan descent or have more general, Orpheus-related swan connotations\textsuperscript{1208} – thus nicely complementing the bee connotations (equally significant from a Pelasgian perspective) of several priesthoods in the Ancient Aegean, foremost that of Artemis / Cybele.

But while we must limit ourselves on the point of these wide ramifications, we must not miss the opportunity of using the Sea Peoples’ swan symbolism for the purpose of a further identification of their geogrophy provenance.

In proto-Indo-European, the word for the large, long-necked aquatic bird Cygnus is *Albhe(n)d- or *bh'Alet(n)d-. This word survives in many Indo-European languages, especially Slavic, Baltic and Germanic, but it is not what underlies the main word for Cygnus in modern Germanic language (English swan, German Schwane, Dutch zwaan, etc.). The latter words derive from Proto-Indo-European: *swen, ‘to sound, to speak’, with cognates in Old Indian, Avestan, other Iranian languages, possibly in Slavic,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1205} Cf. Woudhuizen, this volume, Fig. 19.4; cf. Albright 1960; Benson 1975.
\item \textsuperscript{1206} Dodds (1951; cf. Burkert 1962; Eliade 1992) initiated a spirited debate as to the extent of shamanistic influence in archaic and classical Greece. Here especially the figure of Pythagoras was highlighted, among whose (real or legendary) associates a number of ‘Hyperborean’ shamans could be recognised (especially Abaris), with whom Pythagoras and his principal followers (notably Empedocles) shared important traits himself. The cult of the sun god, whom the Greeks venerated under the name of Apollo, provided a meeting place for Greeks and Hyperboreans to engaged in transnational and transregional contact – on the one hand on Greek soil in Delphi, but on the other hand the Greeks were also aware of Apollo temples in the Hyperboreans’ own lands, including one in whose description modern scholars believe they can recognise the Stonehenge sanctuary of Southern England, first established c. 3000 BCE (Piggott 1975; Diodorus Siculus, The Library of History II, 47).
\item \textsuperscript{1207} Moreover, the story of the Swan Maiden has a very wide distribution in Central and East Asia and has strong shamanistic connotations (Harva / Holmberg 1938; Ginzburg 1992: 284).
\item \textsuperscript{1208} Rappenglück 1999: 360 n. 200, based on Verhagen 1987: 142; cf. Plato, Republic X (Plato 1975).
\end{itemize}
certainly in Germanic, Latin, and Celtic.\footnote{Pokorny 1959-69: II 524; cf. Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Indo-European etymology’} In proto-Germanic the meaning is still ‘sing, play music’,\footnote{Pokorny 1959-69: II 559 f.} and it is not before the times of Old High German, Anglosaxon and Old Islandic that for these words the meaning ‘\textit{Cygnus}’ can be attested.

Three \textit{Cygnus} species are known in Europe (and, presumably, have been known since the Upper Palaeolithic):

1. mute swan (\textit{Cygnus olor})
2. whooper swan (\textit{Cygnus cygnus}) and
3. Bewick’s swan (\textit{Cygnus bewickii})

Of these, the small type (3) is confined to the North Sea, The Channel, and the British Isles – its breeding grounds are at the White Sea; its sound is a simple, loud ‘\textit{kooh k}’. Type (1), with a typical lump at the root of its bill, is normally mute, and is therefore unlikely to have been eponymous to Germanic \textit{swan}, etc.; it occurs around the North Sea, Baltic, Aegean and Caspian Sea, and in inland Central Europe north of the Alps, with breeding groups largely in the same areas. Type (2) is eponymous (its modern German name is \textit{Singschwan}, ‘singing swan’); it occurs from Iceland to the British Isles, the North Sea and the Baltic, and then again from the Aegean, the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea further east into Asia, with breeding grounds in the northern part of that territory. That these specific regions are not without significance within the European Bronze Age is brought out by Fig. 28.8, which highlights (a) the Central Europe north of the Alps, and (b) the Western Baltic, as major centres of bronze-working. The high incidence of bird motifs in Bronze Age art from both Central and Northern Europe (Fig. 28.5), and the apparent continuity between regions (a) and (b), means that (even though Central Europe is landlocked) we cannot \textit{a priori} rule out the Baltic-North Sea region as a possible provenance of at least some of the Sea Peoples. Yet, as we shall see, the ornitological data point in a different direction.

Meanwhile, there are indications that, among Anatomically Modern Humans, the connection between the swan and sound, singing or music has been much, much older than the emergence of Old Germanic c. 1.5 ka BP. Two flutes, specifically carved from swan’s bones, and 30 ka old, were found in Southern Germany in 1990. \cite{Schneider n.d. [2000 ]}. And among the 1,153 reconstructed *Borean roots there are two pairs, each with an identical reconstructed consonantal structure (the vocal structure cannot be reconstructed), that indicate both ‘speaking’ and ‘bird’ (Table 28.3).

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
HVWV_{1a} & to speak \\
\hline
HVWV_{2a} & ‘tongue, to speak’ \\
\hline
HVWV_{1b} & bird \\
\hline
KVLV_{2b} & ‘a kind of bird’ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

NB: ‘V’ = unspecified vocal’

Table 28.3. Reconstructed paired words for ‘bird’ and ‘speak’ in *Borean

Birds, not all of them swans, constitute only 1\% of the subjects depicted in Upper Palaeolithic rock art,\footnote{Leroi-Gourhan 1968, \textit{apud} Carr 1995.} but much mobile art from that period does depict swans.

I have argued that white aquatic birds, especially swans, are evocations of the First God, the Creation God of the Primal Waters. That bird’s long-standing and explicit association with sound, in the mind of Anatomically Modern Humans, casts a new light on the word of creation – whether it is the creative word with which the Babylonian solar god Marduk created a garment as proof of his qualifying for the battle against the aquatic chaos monster Tiāmat, or the cosmogonic expression \textit{Sām} in the Vedic tradition, or a specific command as in \textit{Genesis} 1, or ‘the Word / logos’ tout court, as in the tradition of the Jewish Hellenistic philosopher Philo (1854) and the Biblical books of John (1:1) and Revelation. Do we have an indication, here, that in the Upper Palaeolithic, there was already the notion of a Primal God who was believed to have created the world with the call of the whooper swan?

It is possible to attribute the brightness of the White God to the sun; in fact, virtually all light on earth is due to that luminary anyway. But I think that the reference in that primal brightness is not so much to a concrete luminary, but to the principle of light as such. This is still captured in \textit{Genesis} 1, ‘Let there be light’. Meanwhile we must remember the complementarity between light and darkness that is build into *Borean semantics, as we have seen in Chapter 6.
The shape of the Sea Peoples’ vessels is incompatible with (1), and strongly reminiscent of (2) or (3), which are virtually indistinguishable except in size. If we may make the following, reasonable, assumptions:

1. that these birds’ distribution areas have not greatly changed since the Bronze Age, and
2. that the Sea Peoples modelled their boats after an animal species they knew from personal experience,

then we are led to identify these Sea Peoples’ area of origin. For, since we can discard the distribution areas (both brooding and wintering) of the mute swan, we are left with two possible regions of origin for the Sea Peoples’ swan-ornamented boat:

1. The brooding area of the whooper swan: the Northern Baltic, the White Sea, and Northernmost Western Eurasia in general, which is unlikely but does display the Uralic connection we have repeatedly stressed
2. The wintering area of the whooper swan, which stretches from the Eastern Maghreb to Central Asia, and therefore is virtually indistinguishable from the Pelasgian Realm whose existence I argue in Section 28.9 on the basis of elaborate cultural and genetic considerations.

This identification does not clinch the matter of the eastbound or westbound scenario (see below), but since only the western periphery of the whooper swan’s wintering area lies in the Central Mediterranean, it increases the statistical chance that the swan-ornamented boats originated from the Eastern Mediterranean, Anatolia, the Black Sea, and could even have affinities with the Caspian Sea, the Northern Red Sea and the Persian Gulf.1213

---

1212 Note that the wintering area of Whooper swan and Bewick’s swan rather coincides with the extent of the Pelasgian Realm to be discussed below.
1213 Incidentally, the region ‘from the Eastern Mediterranean, Anatolia, the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, the Northern Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf’ is conspicuous as the corridor through which storks migrate annually from North-western Eurasia to Southern Africa, and in my more extensive exposé of the Pelasgian Hypothesis I discuss at some length the popular etymology (if it is not more than that), already advanced in Antiquity, which identifies the Pelasgians as ‘People of the Stork’ (Greek: pelargós).
28.7.3. Swan symbolism and Sea Peoples’ peripheral defiance

Let us try to make full use of swan symbolism as, specifically, the symbolico-iconographic clue to Sea Peoples’ identity and origin. As food for symbolism, the duck has been rather infertile (cf. French canard = ‘practical joke’), only featuring as a symbol of conjugal fidelity in East Asia, and as an guide among Amerindians. The duck is almost absent from Celtic and Irish myths; and although it seems to be depicted in La Tène contexts, probably a swan is meant there. The latter bird has an enormous symbolic presence throughout Eurasia, including ancient Greece, as a symbol of purity, force and grace, both solar and lunar. Although the only birds associated with Noah in the canonical Bible are a dove and a raven, from the way Noah is described at birth in the Ethiopian Book of Enoch (a text from the beginning of the Common Era, that was not selected for the Biblical canon), the evocation of whiteness makes it likely that Noah shared with other divine figures the symbolism of the swan. In its lunar aspect the symbolic swan is the goose, cf. Leda who in that form sought to escape from Zeus when she was approached by him in the shape of a swan. Ancient myth recounts the struggle between dark, terrestrial Ethiopians and the white, celestial swans (often taken to be cranes), and indeed the swan features as a symbol of the Northern, Hyperborean peoples, and of their sun god Apollo. The swan is associated with the Greek primal goddesses Rhea and Aphrodite, cf. the South Asian Sarasvati. Through its association with Apollo, the swan is the symbol of poet and poetry in the Eleusis context. As ‘speaker’ or ‘singer’ according to the word’s Indo-European etymology (hence the swan’s Orpheus connection, and the ancient belief that this bird only sings in its dying moment), the swan is eminently comparable to the ‘bee’ in the Afroasiatic context (cf. Hebrew deborah, ‘bee, i.e. speaker’), reminiscent of the cosmogonic moment (cf. Genesis 1:3) when sound or light pierces the primordial darkness of the unborn chaos. In South Asia, the swan is the mount of the cosmogonic god Brahma, cf. the goose (Old Indian hamsa, cf. Latin anser) which is associated with Vishnu. Of animals sacred to Janus only the ram is known to us from the Romans’ Agonium sacrifice; but considering Janus’ similarity with the South Asian cosmogonic god Brahma, and with Apollo and Zeus (both of which have strong swan connotations), it is quite likely that the swan was also Janus’ Basojaun’s sacred bird. In Ancient Egypt, the swan or the goose (as the Great Cackler) is associated with the cosmogonic world egg. However, far from being peculiar to the Egyptian and Aegean mythological domains (which the Black Athena debate has helped us to appreciate as closely related anyway), the cosmogonic tradition of the world egg is to be found all over South Asia. Witzel (2010) counts it as one of the very few basic cosmogonic templates world-wide. It is from the Greek version of this egg, laid by Leda, that the Dioscuri were born, each with half the eyeshell on their head as a caul, but also Helen, for whose sake the Tro-
jan war was fought – which takes us close to the Sea Peoples theme. The Dioscuri are the patrons of seafarers, *i.e.* possibly of the Sea Peoples, or of their victims: the Dioscuri were reputed to protect seafarers against pirates, such as the Sea Peoples may have been. In Celtic mythology the swan is the form in which the essence of the beyond (a transcendentalised transformation of the Mother of the Primal Waters) may penetrate the world of humans. In alchemy the swan is also a symbol of Mercury.

Leda, as female swan, here is not only a symbol of the primal cosmogonic god, but is in fact that very cosmogonic god herself, notably in the role of the Mother of the Primal Waters, who produces the Land as her only Son, and (since no other males are available to fertilise her) also Lover; as we have seen, this is the cosmogonic myth that can be reconstructed for large parts of Eurasia, c. 25 ka BP to be largely supplanted, 5 to 10 ka later, by the vertical cosmogonic myth of the separation of heaven and Earth which subsequently became the key cosmogonic myth of the entire Old World (including Africa) and part of the New World. In all probability, the egg-born Dioscuri (and their South Asian counterparts, the Asvins) derive their role as protectors of seafarers from the fact that the Sea, *i.e.* the Mother of the Primal Waters, is their very mother, with whom they can intercede on behalf of whosoever invokes their protection. We can compare this with the Buddhist goddess Tara in Central Asia, who has maintained her role even though we are far from the sea here; the Tara figure makes it thinkable that it was an Asian inland sea, rather than a pelagic sea or ocean, that inspired the idea of the Mother of the Waters. The rape of Leda as female Swan, by Zeus as the male Swan, signifies in the last instance the subjugation of the cosmology and cosmogony of the Water and the Land, by the cosmology and cosmogony of Heaven and Earth – the Primal Mother is raped by Zeus in the most literal sense! But, since the conjunction of gods is usually that of the human congregations venerating them, this also suggests that there have been ‘Swan people’ (constituting the human congregation holding the Swan belief as an expression of the Cosmogony of the Separation of Water and Land), overpowered by the people associated with the later cosmology centring on the Sky god (hence with the Cosmogony of the Separation of Heaven and Earth). Could not this be the ultimate significance of the swan ornaments on the Sea Peoples’ boats: that they represent an ancient cultural cluster that has attempted to resist the subjugation to the sky god? The suggestion that these people may be Caucasian and Basque related residual population enclaves strikes me as quite plausible; once more we have to conclude that they are not Indo-European speakers, but the latter’s counterparts, victims and enemies.

In Greek mythology, in addition to the swan animal species associated with Zeus and Apollo, *Kuknos / Cygnus / Cygnus*, the personified Swan, features in at least five different ways (Schlimmer & de Boer 1920: 212 f.), often with warlike associations (Ares; cf. our discussion of the Catalogue of Ships) – in such a way as to make it plausible that the legendary reminiscences of the violence and destruction wrought by the swan-associated Sea Peoples, half a millennium or

---

1219 Despite its Orphic resonances, in Greek mythology the mytheme of Helen’s birth from an egg does not surface (Richter 1979a: col. 43) before Euripides’ tragedy *Helena* (412 BCE), however, the mytheme corresponds sufficiently with South Asian and South East Asian myths (Witzel 2010) to consider it much more ancient than classical Greek times. The recurrent swan theme in this myth holds Sea Peoples connotations – it comes back in the double swan ornamentation of their boats as depicted at Ramess III’s temple. These connotations are not thwarted by the fact that also Apollo is associated with the swan (as his mount and divining familiar spirit; Apollo was recognised to have Hyperborean connotations, and the concentration of Apollinian attributes (arrow and lyre, again both with strong shamanistic connotations) on both sides of Aquila near Cygnus only reinforces the connections made in the present Section.

1220 A virtually world-wide colour symbolism which I am elaborating in my leopard-skinline study, attributes solar and daylight symbolism to quadrupeds and birds with a smooth, evenly coloured, light-coloured coat: *swan, lion (cf. the Greek mythological heroine *Lea*, eagle); whereas both lunar and night-sky / stellar symbolism is relegated to animals and birds with a variegated or speckled skin, foremost the leopard, but also *e.g.* the hawk (whose breast is speckled).
more later, with ‘Homer’ and Hesiod and their successors, found their expression in myths about destructive swan-characters.\textsuperscript{1222}

\textit{DESTRUCTIVE CYNCUS / SWAN CHARACTERS IN GRAECO-ROMAN MYTHOLOGY:}

1. as the ill-mannered but handsome son of Apollo and Thyrria or Hyria, a lake nymph;

2. as the invincible son of Poseidon / Neptune and Calyce of Colonae in the Troad, yet for all his invincibility needfully killed by Achilles;

3. as the cruel son of the war god Ares and Pelopēa, Cycnus was a highwayman who sought to build his father a temple out of traveller’s skulls, until he was killed by Hercules (Fontenrose 1980: 29). There is a connection here with Hermes / Mercury: What Cycnus builds out of skulls is in fact a herm (a rudimentary shrine in the form of a pile of stones left by travellers at crossings and other significant spots in the landscape usually sacred to Hermes as patron of travellers – cf. Marwitz 1979); the symbol must be very old indeed: shrines of the Khoisan culture hero Heitsi-Eibib (‘Wounded Knee’) are similar piles of stone – we are somewhat justified to connect these with the herm because of Cavallo-Sforza’s (Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994) insistence on the partially West Asian origin of the Khoisan speakers has been established by genetic research. There is also a connection with the Phleghyan nation of brigands, whose statehouse is a skull-hung oak tree (Fontenrose 1980: 29, 54).\textsuperscript{1223}

4. another son of Ares, by Pyrēne, likewise killed by Hercules in a battle, in which Ares himself participated, and in such a violent manner, that Zeus had to separate Ares and Heracles with his lightning;

5. and finally as the king of the Ligurians (cf. below, Chapter 29), according to some a musician; according to others

\textsuperscript{1222} The Ancients recognised the belligerent nature of the swan (cf. Sea Peoples) and considered it one of its four claims to fame, along with its long neck, white coat and wisdom; cf. Richter 1979a.

\textsuperscript{1223} The Phleghyan’s name apparently derives from proto-Indo-European \textit{bhleleg}, which some claim to mean ‘to burn black with smoke’ (Partridge 1979: s.v. ‘black’), but which is more authoritatively associated, not with blackness but with light and fire (cf. Pokorny 1959, item 222, \textit{bhleleg}, ‘to shine, glänzen’). Rather than taking the Phleghyan as another indication of highly pigmented inhabitants of the Mediterranean plausibly associated with proto-manifestations of the Khoisan, Nilo-Saharan and Niger-Congo linguistic macrophyta, this group has connotations of fire and brightness, – perhaps merely reflecting a tendency to red or blond hair, or perhaps an association with the Pelasgian fire god Hephæstus (who, in line with his Pelasgian connotations, was also venerated by the Athenians and the inhabitants of Lemnos). Karst (1931a) identified the Phleghyans as a variant of Pelasgians. K.O. Müller (1825) demonstrated that the Phleghyans are identical to the Lapiths (cf. Fontenrose 1980: 25, 35 f.).

son of Sthenelus; and according to others again reputed to be so distressed by the death of his friend Phaeton (the sun’s son!) that Apollo (god of the morning sun) changed him into a swan and placed him among the stars.\textsuperscript{1224}

Both the swan and the goose could\textsuperscript{1225} function as symbols of Seth-Typhon, the god of the undomesticated wilds,

‘Since Set could be a goose, we need no longer be surprised that as Kyknos the enemy took the form of a swan, especially when we recall that Kyknos mated with Gerana (Crane) the Pygmy queen’ (Fontenrose 1980: 101 cf. 86).

There is another horror connection:

‘Medusa according to Lucan brought stony death to the peoples of Ethiopia. Her destructive raids on African peoples suggest Gerana’s attacks upon the Pygmies (…), Gerana, the crane-woman, a form of Lamia, was the mate of Kyknos, the swan.’ (Fontenrose 1980)

These mythical ramifications elucidate the possible connection between Sea Peoples, a cult of a solar and / or cosmogonic god, and the swan as emblem or mascot. But I believe that more is behind these images of destruction than the havoc, however unmistakable, that was wrought by the Sea Peoples. When here the swan appears as a male force of destruction, we can explain the maleness as the result of the typical Bronze Age gender shift documented in Table 6.4, above. But that also puts us on the track towards greater appreciation of the significance of the swan as adversary. It is a widely acknowledge principle of comparative religion that, when a once dominant worldview is supplanted by another (typically connected with the ascendance or arrival of a new population segment), then the gods of their earlier worldview become demonised. Initially the emblem, epiphany and essence of the world-creating Mother of the Primal Waters, the swan becomes a force of evil resentment as a result of the Watery Mother’s dethronement by a celestial, increasingly male, god in the context of the establishment of the Cosmogony of the Separation of Heaven and Earth. Thus the swan is an ideal emblem of defiance of pe-

\textsuperscript{1224} For sources see third footnote up.

\textsuperscript{1225} Fontenrose’s (1980: 101 cf. 86) claim that the goose was Seth’s animal is not generally supported in the Egyptological literature, e.g. finds no confirmation in Bonnet 1952 / 1971, s.v. ‘Gans’. However, given Seth’s closeness to Aker, and the latter’s closeness to Geb, who may be equated with the ‘Great Cackler’, the claim is not totally unfounded.
Finally, apart from being bird-like, with connotations we have explored above, the Sea Peoples’ boat decoration has another feature that fits in our comparative perspective: there tends to be rotation symmetry between the ornament on prow and stern, as there is indeed on the bird-boat ornaments found in contemporary Central Europe (Fig. 28.5). We might read this symmetry as a reminder of the cosmogonic god Baojojan / Janus, god of beginnings and (door-)openings, who in the Roman context is usually depicted as double-faced (or four-faced, to that matter – where the dual symbolism of beginnings and end, twins, transitions and doors gives way to the nearly ubiquitous symbolism of the earth with its four direc-

tions and ‘corners’). This takes us back to the world of the Liguro-Sicanians and of the second, Basqoid layer of the hypothetical five-tiered linguistico-ethnic system of the protohistorical Mediterranean.

Besides the twinning of the prow and stern ornaments of the Sea Peoples’ boats, other recursive elements are at hand: the cult of the Dioscuri, as ancient patrons of seafaring, and as children of the Mother of the Waters (with Leda as her avatār in classical Greek mythology) is essentially a cult of twins, and it is as twins that this divine pair are eternalised in the constellation of Gemini (‘twins’). Also the Pelurian / Pelasgian cult of twin craters in Sicily is a cult of twins. The cult of twins is widespread in Africa, South Asia and among Amerindians. Although I list the cult of twins, and Flood myths, as Pelasgian traits (Table 28.5), their much wider distribution has such a ring of considerable antiquity about it that it could hardly be conveniently explained by my Pelasgian hypothesis as, essentially, a Bronze Age time frame. Instead, of course, the dyadic emphasis reveals an older, Late Upper Palaeolithic orientation, in the long period of transition between *Borean ‘range semantics’ and the increasingly triadic thought structures of the Bronze Age; Flood myths create a narrative environment for the cult of twins as Flood survivors – often of complementary gender, and incestuous.

As this exploration has shown, Sea Peoples symbolism is not beyond our interpretative gaze, and it does not stand on its own. It shows extensive connections with an ancient Eurasian system of meaning centring on swan symbolism, a solar and cosmogonic deity, twinning, recursion, and shamanism. By and large, this is not the kind of package one would primarily associate with an Ancient Near Eastern cultural input, although some specialists have recognised the inroads of shamanism in the Ancient Near East by the second millennium. The case for the westbound

---

1226 Again, however, on this point an alternative explanation is suggested by the ancient cosmology of a transformative cycle of elements, which is to be found all over the Pelasgian realm from Empedocles and Aristotle in the West, to Taoism in the East, and from the Nkoya clan system in the South, to notions of transformation especially attending fire in the Uralic world as expressed in the Kālevala cycle (van Binsbergen 2009a, 2010b). Under that cosmology the substance of reality constantly and systematically transforms from one elemental manifestation into another, and this process is being governed by essentially two basic relations between two elements that are directly linked in transformation: A can destroy B, be destroyed by C, produce D, or be produced by E (with weaker varieties of ‘hindrance’ and ‘furtherance’). The most obvious form of such destruction exists between Water and Fire (Water destroying Fire – a state of affairs potentially relevant for ‘Sea Peoples’ attacking highly developed states with a solar cult or a fire cult; and for Flood myths…), and between Fire and Wood (Fire destroying Wood). Since the destruction is at the same time inevitable, ephemeral, superficial and cyclical (underneath of which the eternal substance of Being persists unaffected), it is far from total – under the transformative cycle destruction is a metaphor for strife but not for annihilation. Probably cyclical destruction only takes on the connotations of anthropomorphic enmity, hatred and viciousness once the cyclical transformative system is no longer understood as such. To judge by the very wide distribution and demonstrable application of the cyclical transformative system throughout the Pelasgian realm, that situation did not obtain in the Late Bronze Age; but it had clearly arisen 700 years later or more, when, in that particular west-erly peripheral backwater of Eurasia where Ionian Pre-Socratic philosophy saw the light, the cyclical and transformative nature of the system dropped out of consciousness, and the idea of the element (Greek: to stokheion) was hardened into four or five parallel, essentially immutable, perennial states of being that could be combined but that were mutually exclusive and did not constantly transmute into each other by the very order of things. This is largely how the four-element system was conceived and transmitted from Aristote-lian times onward in the Western tradition, even though in the original texts by Aristotle, Empedocles, and Heraclitus the original cyclical nature of the elements is still detectable. The implication of this particular, alternative argument is that the destructive nature of the Swan may only directly and obliquely derive from the dethrone-ment of the Mother of the Waters, may not be cosmogonic but cyclical-cosmological in origin, and may have little to do with the Sea Peoples Episode, specifically.

1227 Data on the distribution of the cult of twins are derived from Hastings 1908-21 / 1926, especially see the Index volume of that publication, s.v. ‘twins’. The available literature on twins relates mainly to Africa, cf. de Rachewiltz et al. 1976; Firth 1966; Hartland 1908-21; Jeffreys 1963; Junod 1996; Loucas & Loucas 1987; Milner 1951; Schoffeleers 1991; Southall 1972; van Beek 2002.

1228 Cf. Abusch & van der Toorn 1999; Oppenheim 1970; Winkelman 1990. The arrival of shamanism may be detected in a transformation of the roles of traditional ritual and healing specialists, the asu and the aispud (Ritter 1965). However,
Sea Peoples scenario is strong, and Sea Peoples symbolism confirms that we are dealing here with an ethnico-cultural expansion movement that has conspicuous West and Central Asian antecedents – to be situated in an Uralic, Altaic or Caucasian context, rather than in an Indo-European or Afroasiatic context. On the other hand, Sea Peoples symbolism does strengthen the associations that have already been perceived, with the Central Mediterranean, the Basquoid chain of Sea Peoples proposed by Karst, and (notably in the ‘Hyperboraeon’ and shamanistic elements), the signs of an old Eurasian tradition which may well have been confronted and challenged, instead of strengthened and transmitted, by the Urnfield expansion. The Sea Peoples Episode (if it ever took place in the concentrated form, in time and place, that mainstream scholarship has been inclined to grant it, largely on the basis of Egyptian state propaganda) was about the resilience of pre-existing Western Eurasian languages and cultures before, and in the face of, the ultimate establishment of the dominance of Indo-European and Afroasiatic.

28.8. Tentative alternative solutions to the Sea Peoples conundrum from a long-range interdisciplinary perspective

Let me now indicate how I propose to answer these two questions and what appeal I will make, in the process, to the auxiliary fields of scholarship at my disposal.

28.8.1. Attacking Egypt and Ḫatti

Throughout the three millennia of Ancient Egyptian history, the territory’s relatively well-defined boundaries and the awareness of specific (often stereotypically named) enemies at its borders have been among the most recurrent themes of surviving documents – often in the service of state / royal propaganda. Although extending over a far lesser time span, the same applies to Ḫatti. Attacks on these states were very regular occurrence, and we need to know a lot more about the details of the people involved and of their organisation before we can confidently speak of a Sea Peoples Episode, spelling doom for Ḫatti and near-doom (at least, the end of the New Kingdom) for Egypt. A model like Woudhuizen’s, stressing an essentially West-East movement of various, allegedly clearly identifiable ethnic groups from the Central and Eastern Mediterranean (from as far afield as Sardinia, the Tyrrhenian Sea and Sicily, to the Troas and Syro-Palestine) has the advantage of clear geographical visualisation, but it fails to identify a common factor that puts all these groups into motion at the same time. For the most Westerly groups Woudhuizen’s and Lehmann’s explanation in terms of a push from expanding Urnfielder in Central Europe may be convincing but it does not explain the Eastern Mediterranean cases. Moreover, where did these many peoples on the move (if that is what they were …) find a common purpose, enough effective organisation, and mutual identification, to make their joint endeavours a success? There is no doubt that throughout the Eastern and Central Mediterranean at the time, there was ample knowledge of the riches of Egypt and perhaps of Ḫatti: Egyptianising trade items have been identified in all these parts,1229 which are also known to have provided mercenaries for several centuries during the New Kingdom, prior to the Sea Peoples Episode. These relatively distant states functioned as sources of attractive commodities of occasional employment, hence they might conveniently feature in the leadership aspirations of some inhabitants of these peripheral regions, yet so far these two states have not been demonstrated to have interfered with social, economic, political and religious life especially in the Central Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age. Was their distant lure enough for the concerted and relatively successful warfare the Sea Peoples yet are supposed to have waged? And even if so, what brought about the unity of purpose, what was the basis of the effective military and political organisation, between groups as far apart as those from the

---

1229 Lambrou-Phillipson 1990. Although Lambrou-Phillipson’s book only appeared in 1990, and although in its title appears to echo the titles of major works by Martin Bernal and his hero the perceptive Semitist Michael Astour, yet this thorough and unspeculative book cannot in the least be accused of programmatic Afrocentrism of the Bernalian kind. It is all the more impressive that the book manages to list over 200 Egyptian finds in Bronze Age Crete, Greek mainland, and Aegean Islands, and offers a complete bibliography of these finds (up to 1990). Also cf. Brown 1975; Pendebury 1930.
I feel that a more realistic and convincing explanation is called for, based on a more subtle model of the human mind and collective motivation in history. Admittedly, history has shown us a few cases where mere greed seems to have led to raiding, often with disastrous effect to the political and economic stability of the target lands; however, for such raiding to bring together groups that are literally thousands of kilometres apart to begin with, and that subsequently, once brought into contact with each other's proximity, suddenly manifest the proverbial critical mass of an atomic bomb, the greed of leaders and followers is not enough – unifying factors are needed both to create a common ground of communication, trust and identification (grounds whose existence would anyway be most remarkable, among people thousands of kilometres apart), to create unanimity in defining the target, to accept an overarching leadership, and to ensure an orderly execution both of the military encounters and of their aftermath.

In the background is a more theoretical issue: in order to elucidate the Sea Peoples Episode as it has been constructed in modern scholarship, do we resort to systematic explanations (i.e. to generalisations appealing to principles, factors and mechanisms that would also have informed similar upheavals in very different periods and places), or do we resign ourselves to an ad hoc explanation which (for lack of a systematic generalisation aspect) is not really an explanation at all? Historians often feel that it is their privilege to stress unique ad hoc factors over repetitive, systematic ones. This also is Woudhuizen position in Part II of the present volume. I beg to differ, if only on the grounds that one does not erect (as we did in Chapters 2 to 6) a theoretical and methodological framework of Bronze Age ethnicity, not to use it but to offer an unsystematic ad hoc explanation instead.

The most convincing explanation of the Sea Peoples episode would be one according to which

1. the Sea Peoples could identify, to a considerable extent, on mixed ethnic, linguistic, cosmological and religious grounds, already prior to the moment when they waged their joint exploits; and according to which

2. the motivating factor in targeting Egypt and Ḫatti, was not sheer individual greed and consumption aspirations (an utterly ethnocentric, post-modern North Atlantic motivation, it would appear anyway), but a shared historical self-definition; considering the extent and power of these states, a likely explanation would be in terms of the Sea Peoples’ conscious self-perception as real or potential victims of these powerful state systems – which would make us look for the Sea Peoples, not in the Central Mediterranean, but in the periphery of these two states: the Aegean and Pontic regions, the Levant, the Middle East, Eastern North Africa.

In other words, I believe that Woudhuizen’s emphasis on an eastbound scenario extending all the way to Italy, Sardinia and Sicily, is perhaps unrealistically specific and unidirectional in topography, involving rather excessive distances, and not totally convincing in mechanisms. Instead I propose that the Sea Peoples’ provenance should primarily (but by no means exclusively) be sought within the peripheries of the Egyptian and Ḫatti states themselves, among disgruntled peripheral decentralised groups fearing the very real threat of the increasing encroachment of the Egyptian and Ḫatti states upon their modes of livelihood (pastoralism, trading, raiding, circulation of local produce) and their political independence. Most of the Sea Peoples would have come from the Eastern Mediterranean, and from adjacent West Asia – the very peripheries of the states of Egypt and Ḫatti; and these Sea Peoples have to have formed a self-identifying ethnic cluster already before, and as a condition sine qua non of, their concerted military exploits.

If we can identify an ethno-political cluster in the Eastern Mediterranean basin / adjacent West Asia that would qualify the conditions of (a) peripherally exposure to state encroachment and (b) ethnoc-politically self-identification, there would be reason to take the Egyptian contemporary documents seriously and not to relegating them altogether to propagandistic fiction within the mythical idiom of the ‘Peoples of the Waters’.

28.8.2. ‘Peoples of the Sea’ as an emic mythical category employed by the contemporary historical actors

Ever since ancient historians in the late 19th century CE coined the term Sea Peoples as a scholarly termius technicus, we have come to regard the ‘Sea Peoples’ primarily as a, still to be identified and analysed, highly specific cluster of people associated with dramatic events of allegedly world historical significance in the Late Bronze Age. I have reason to advance that this is not necessarily the case. As we have seen in Part I, recent developments in comparative mythology (van
Binsbergen c.s. 2008; cf. Witzel, 2001b, 2010) suggest that, from the Upper Palaeolithic onward, we have seen the succession, within a few millennia, of two fundamental cosmogonies:

1. the earlier, horizontalist one based on the separation of Water and Land,
2. the more recent, verticalist one based on the separation of Heaven and Earth.

Throughout the Extended Fertile Crescent which reached from the fertile Sahara to China, the Heaven-Earth cosmogony probably became dominant in the last phase of the Upper Palaeolithic. This state of affairs, in combination with the Back-to-Africa movement as from 15 ka BP, the trans-Bering Strait movement from the Old into the New World within a similar time frame, as well as the peopling of Oceania from East and / or South East Asia especially from 5.5 ka BP, ensured that the Heaven-Earth cosmogony also took root in sub-Saharan Africa, Oceania, and North America. However, far from immediately eclipsing the Water / Land cosmogony, the latter continued to live on for a very long time, and in fact can still be detected (otherwise we would hardly be able to speak about the Water / Land cosmogony) to underlie a great many mythologies, religious concepts and representations, and rituals throughout the Old World. The central mythical theme of the Water / Land cosmogony appears to have been the production, by the virgin Mother of the Waters, of her only son, the Land, which subsequently impregnated his mother to bring forth the rest of the world; already in this summary we see many persisting and widespread themes of comparative mythology and religion, such as virgin birth, mother-son incest, the hero and his mother, the aquatic connotations of the Mother goddess with fish and aquatic birds as her emblems, etc. – this cosmology may have gone underground but it clearly is far from extinct even today. By contrast, the central mythical theme of the Heaven / Earth cosmology was the separation of Heaven and Earth by the fission of what was originally un divided whole, e.g. a cosmic egg; while the separation into two halves, one above the other below was the constitutive event of cosmogony, it was a traumatic one, and much of mythology and religion under this cosmogonic schema was geared to restoring the lost connection between Heaven and Earth: by natural means (mountains, trees, the celestial axis, and human constructs such as towers and bridges reaching from earth to heaven), divine means (meteorites, a demiurge, angels, cattle, seeds, utensils and other cultural items, coming down from heaven to earth), or human means (specific human roles representing the connection between Heaven and Earth: the shaman, the king, the prophet, twins, etc.). The two cosmogonies are so different as to be mutually irreconciliable, and probably we should see that subjugation of the Water / Land cosmogony not so much as a gradual process of accommodation, but as an actual process of socio-political confrontation – between ‘Heaven People’ (or Sky People), representing the later cosmogony, and the ‘Water People’ (or Sea People) representing the older cosmogony. Having earlier identified (Chapter 6), on comparative grounds, the recursive world-view (based on dyadic opposition) as the post-*Borean default, and the dialectical, triadic based world-view as a Bronze-Age innovation, one can see how the mythologies and religions of the Extended Fertile Crescent became saturated with triads featuring Heaven as one of their three components; whereas the surrounding communities, relatively untouched by the political, religious and mythological transformations taking place (under the onslaught of the combined package of writing, the state, organised religion and proto-science) in the Extended Fertile Crescent, lingered on in the phase of the Water / Land cosmogony and recursion, and dyads instead of triads. This is where I situate the ‘Sea Peoples’ in a generic sense: as archaic groups, in the still relatively untouched peripheries of the advanced states of the Extended Fertile Crescent, and persisting in a Water / Land cosmology along recursive lines.

This characterisation allows us to understand that the Sea Peoples involved in the Late Bronze Age episode in the Eastern Mediterranean, did use vessels and showed considerable nautical skills, yet were far from limited to navigation as their major means of long-distance transportation, and in fact also greatly relied on overland transport, in wagons or on chariots. The ‘Peoples of the Sea’ were not exclusively navigators, and in fact one of the two major Egyptian battles attributed to them, was fought on land. On the other hand, their cosmological orientation towards water and the sea may have contributed to the development of

---

1230 Probably, i.e. to judge by the cosmogonies attested in that area in the Neolithic and after, and by the preponderance, over the same period, of the same Heaven / Earth cosmogony throughout the Old World and in most of the New World.

1231 Oppenheimer (1998, 2004) claims a time span of nearly four times longer for the peopling of Western Oceania (Melanesia), but that is immaterial in the present context.
adoption of nautical skills. Meanwhile, the recursive, dyadic orientation of their world-view centreing on the Mother of the Primal Waters (with white aquatic birds as her main epiph-

any) explains the stern mirror symmetry of the stern-ornaments of the Sea Peoples’ vessels, featuring what is essentially a swan’s head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>proper name</th>
<th>proposed Austroic etymology</th>
<th>remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neith / Nr</td>
<td>1) ‘bow and arrow’; PA (= Proto-Austroic) *nah ‘bow’; PAA (= Proto-Austric) *nà ‘shoot, bow’; cf. Miao-Yao parallel *pon.B ‘shoot’; PAN <em>paran ‘bow’; cf. proto-Thai: ZH</em>T ‘gīn A ‘arrow’</td>
<td>The bow and arrows etymology has an amazingly good semantic fit: although throughout the historical period Neith has remained clearly recognisable as, originally, the Mother of the Primal Waters hence of the Sky (= Waters Above), she is particularly the virgin goddess of the Delta, associated with weaving and warfare; her hieroglyphic determinant is a package containing two bows ((\text{\textcircled{1234}})) and her name appears already on First Dynasty funerary stelae, for instance the famous one of Mr(t)-Neith, as crossed arrows on a shield of an inflated sack with protruding tassels: (Emery 1961: 125 f.; Kaplony 1963). The semantic and phonological resemblance of the name and symbolic connotations of Neith with proto-Austric *nah ‘bow’ is remarkable but probably largely coincidental, all the more so, because it is only the oldest reconstructed proto-form that resembles the name of Neith, whereas later forms in Austronesian and Austroasiatic differ greatly from the Egyptian name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Osiris / Wsr</td>
<td>1) ‘thread’; PA *t̚vá ‘thread, string’; PAA *tvá ‘to thread’; PAN (= Proto-Austric): *SuRStR ‘drawing string to thread a drawing string’</td>
<td>Semantically not obvious for Wsr; yet threaded beads or shells play an important role in all societies along the proposed Sunda trajectory. Note the remarkable correspondence with the Cocalus myth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) ‘string’; PA *t̚vá ‘string, rope’; PAA *t̚x j̚t̚ j̚ ré ‘rope’; PAN *t̚SaR ‘string together, as beads’</td>
<td>Cf. Peiros 1998: 89 (suggesting a borrowing from Austroasiatic to Thai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) ‘salt, sour’; PA *t̚vá ‘string, rope’; PAN *gámRa, ‘salt’</td>
<td>Extensive Borean and Eurasian including Indo-European, Sino-Caucasian and Dravidian ramifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1233 This proposed Austroic etymology for Neith is predicated on the assumption that the final t may be considered a feminine suffix (quite plausible, because Proto-Indo-European *anan, for instance the famous one of Mr(t)-Neith, as crossed arrows on a shield of an inflated sack with protruding tassels: (Emery 1961: 125 f.; Kaplony 1963). The semantic and phonological resemblance of the name and symbolic connotations of Neith with proto-Austric *nah ‘bow’ is remarkable but probably largely coincidental, all the more so, because it is only the oldest reconstructed proto-form that resembles the name of Neith, whereas later forms in Austronesian and Austroasiatic differ greatly from the Egyptian name. |
1234 However, the bow also occurs in the Early Dynastic Ancient Egyptian context as evocation of the goddess Satis (Kaplony 1963: I, 393), whilst the animal determinative (the representation of a cured skin with an arrow through it) occurs as evocation of the goddess Satet, i.e. a form of Hathor in Lower Egypt (Budge 1969: I, 43); could this both be manifestations of Neith as a hunting goddess? In the early dynastic corpus as presented by Kaplony (1963: I, 632), the bow appears as the emblem of Nubia, yet emphatically in the context of the palace and shrine at Buto / Pe, in the Delta. Could it be that the Ancient Egyptian historical actors consciously combined Libyan Neith’s arrows with the Nubian bow (cf. Kaplony 1963: I, 643, the name Svt / St)?
1236 Osiris appears as a culture hero: he abolished cannibalism and taught weaving; then he left his land to civilise the world (Cotterell 1989: 145). This could be a Sunda reminiscence — both the extensive travelling and the weaving, which is an Indonesian speciality (but far from a monopoly). At any rate there is a close parallel, not only with the culture hero Oannes, but also with that other Mediterranean vegetation god, Dionysus, who also travelled to India among other places, also in the guise of a culture hero.
1237 Impressive though this Austroic etymology of Osiris may appear, it constitutes by no means the only possibility of making sense of that name. Already in the early 1930s Karst proposed what effectively amounts to an Indo-European etymology of Osiris — surprising if we consider Ancient Egypt to be uniquely Austroasiatic speaking, but in line with the West Asian connotations of the Delta (cf. Kammerzell 1994; Ray 1992; Hoffman 1979), which is one of Osiris’ privileged regions: Karst (1931b: 19) Osiris: < Skr. āsura ‘divinity, god’, also compared with Hittite: *ansis; cf., e.g., Old high German: *ansis, *ansis; Germanic: *ansis-; Gothic: Land acc. pl. ansis = sómados; cf. Old Norse: ansis < skr. āsār = Gott; Old Eng. ansis = Some; cf. ‘the God Assur in Mesopotamia. The state-of-the-art treatment of such an Indo-European etymology would be along the following lines (Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Indo-European etymology’, b) changed into b- on the advice of Fred Woudhuizen):
Phonologically perhaps acceptable, but semantically unattractive, unless as reference to the sea— but Osiris is emphatically a land-associated fertility and vegetation god. However, transposition of land/water functions we find also with Poseidon / Athena / Gaia. In some of the Eurasian semantic ramifications this root can mean ‘rotten’, and that seems interesting. The transposition of land/water functions we find also with Poseidon / Athena / Gaia. In some of the Trojansian but also in West Chadic and in Niger-Congo, the name of Talos (legendary founder of the first maritime empire in the West) with that invention – Willis 1994: 81! Others (Willis 1994: 81) give this credit to Daedalus’ adversary Minos (legendary founder of the first maritime empire in the West) with that invention – Willis 1994: 81; whilst there is also a tradition of attributing that invention to the Nile valley – Barnett 1935). According to the accounts of Daedalus as seafarer rather than airborne, Icarus meets his death not because of flying too close to the sun, but by his clumsiness as a mariner. Later Daedalus, in Pausanias’ version of the story, has to flee from Athens because of killing his nephew, a rival craftsman-inventor by the name of Talos (‘Sufferer’?) (or Perdix, Greek perdix, ‘partridge’), (cf. Ovid, Metamorphoses VIII. 236-59). The name is rationalised by letting Athena turn Talos into a partridge when Daedalus threw him off an height; however, the interpretation ‘Sufferer’ looks very much like a popular etymology without support from the mythical narrative. Perhaps Talos is Daedalus’ alter-ego not only as a fellow craftsman: the two names looks strikingly alike. Interesting, we also meet the name of Talos in another maritime and possibly Sunda-related connection: as the name of a winged man of brass (cf. Daedalus’ wings!) that was given by Zeus to the Phoenician princess Europa to guard Crete, for which purpose he would fly all around Crete thrice daily; when hurling nett 1958). According to the accounts of Daedalus a seaborne rather than airborne, Icarus meets his death not because of flying too close to the sun, but by his clumsiness as a mariner. Later Daedalus, in Pausanias’ version of the story, has to flee from Athens because of killing his nephew, a rival craftsman-inventor by the name of Talos (‘Sufferer’?) (or Perdix, Greek perdix, ‘partridge’), (cf. Ovid, Metamorphoses VIII. 236-59). The name is rationalised by letting Athena turn Talos into a partridge when Daedalus threw him off an height; however, the interpretation ‘Sufferer’ looks very much like a popular etymology without support from the mythical narrative. Perhaps Talos is Daedalus’ alter-ego not only as a fellow craftsman: the two names looks strikingly alike. Interesting, we also meet the name of Talos in another maritime and possibly Sunda-related connection: as the name of a winged man of brass (cf. Daedalus’ wings!) that was given by Zeus to the Phoenician princess Europa to guard Crete, for which purpose he would fly all around Crete thrice daily; when hurling
Though in the meantime it has proven to be extremely useful for comparative analytical frameworks. My extended edge to the full, by presenting that little we know in the Sea Peoples. Yet we can let exploit our limited knowledge.

The root of the problem of the Sea Peoples ethnicity is that, at the level of specific empirical information on culture, language and religion, we know so precisely little about the Sea Peoples. Yet we can let exploit our limited knowledge to the full, by presenting that little we know in the proper comparative analytical framework. My Extended Pelasgian Hypothesis was formulated for this purpose, even though in the meantime it has proven to be extremely useful also for the elucidation of rather different research problems, such as

- the transcontinental continuities between sub-Saharan Africa and Eurasia (in such fields as mythology, kingship, religion, socio-cultural organisation);
- the explanation of Eurasian continuities from Western Europe to Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and even Indonesia and Oceania – as an alternative for Oppenheimer’s Sunda theses;
- the specific global distribution of such cultural trade as the mankala mathematical game, geomantic divination, the spiked wheel trap, and the mythical

| 7 | Dilmun | (a) PA: *m’ymi n ‘star’; PAA: *tla’o ‘star, moon’; PAN: *talaq ‘settlement’. | The proto-Austric root has cognates in other language families descending from *Borean, including Eurasiasic such as Indo-European and Dravidian, but there the vocal never develops into *m’ymi n, especially compare Yao mup, δ ‘town, city’.
(b) –mun ‘settlement’, PA: *m’ymi n, possibly also ‘Moonland’ or ‘Sunland’ | Could not the concept of Atlantis, as a distant, idealised place of impressive planological achievement and maritime activities destroyed by flooding, be a cherished Sunda idea which the original mariners founding the intercontinental maritime network, brought with them and spread all over that network? Of course, libraries have been filled with texts about Atlantis ever since Plato, identifying Atlantis as associated with the Shott al-Jerdi salt marsh in Africa Minor (apud Karst 1931b) has a point, it is an identification well in the trajectory of any conceivable Sunda presence in the Mediterranean. So are Santorini / Thera (Bernal 1991 and references cited there) and Crete (Woudhuizen 2001; also cf. the present book, Chapter 23) as proposed Atlantic locations.

8 | Atlantis | PA: *m’ymi n ‘star’; PAA: *tla’o ‘star, moon’, PAN: *talaq, *mantalaiq ‘star, Venus’ < *Borean *tLAKV, (b) –mun ‘settlement’, PA: *m’ymi n, possibly also ‘Moonland’ or ‘Sunland’ | Crete was Talas, the man of bronze, whom Medea killed. In Pellas was he the tortured Tan-talus, from whose name the word ‘tantalize’ derives.
He further refers to the Taillian games, held in Ireland for a god Tal; and refers to the Syrian name Telmen, and to the Greek names of Atlas and Telamon, all claimed to derive from a root *tla / tal (‘dare, suffer’; however, Graves’ homespun etymologies are notorious untrustworthy. Graves adds that also the prominent comparative mythologist and religious Mac-Culloch (1911, writing on Celtic religion) considers Taliesin a theonym. The Austric etymology salvages the ‘sun’ semantics.

Table 28.4. Possible Austric etymologies of key names in the Bronze Age Mediterranean

28.9. Ethnic convergence among the Sea Peoples: The Pelasgian connection

28.9.1. Towards the Pelasgian Hypothesis

The root of the problem of the Sea Peoples ethnicity is that, at the level of specific empirical information on culture, language and religion, we know so precisely little about the Sea Peoples. Yet we can let exploit our limited knowledge to the full, by presenting that little we know in the proper comparative analytical framework. My Extended Pelasgian Hypothesis was formulated for this purpose, even though in the meantime it has proven to be extremely useful also for the elucidation of rather different research problems, such as
unilateral being (von Sicard 1968-69) – all of which turn out to combine attestations in the Pelasgian core area with a massive, apparently more recent, sub-Saharan distribution.

Looking for Austro / Sunda Influence, and Finding Pelasgians. Originally (van Binsbergen 2011c) my list of Pelasgian traits was intended to serve a very different goal: to try and demonstrate the presence of ‘Sunda’ traits both in the Bronze Age Mediterranean and among the Zambian Nkoya – interpreting both South Central Africa and the Bronze Age Mediterranean as target regions that had effectively undergone the Sunda influence postulated by Oppenheimer (1998). Was Oppenheimer right, after all, and did proto-Indonesians, or proto-Indonesian-inspired South Asian, venture all the way West to trigger the decisive cultural developments in the Indus valley and in the Persian Gulf c. 5 ka BP, and did further maritime and overland influences from there leave an indelible mark on Ancient Egypt, Crete, etc.? And could the Nkoya / Mediterranean parallels also be attributed to both regions having been exposed to Sunda influence? This interpretation could not be dismissed off-hand. The shell money found at the royal tombs of Ur, close to the Persian Gulf, is virtually indistinguishable from shell money used in historical times in Oceania. Cloves in 2nd-millennium BCE Anatolia and bananas (which can only be transplanted via carefully tended shoots) in West Africa 1000 BCE could only have derived from ‘Sunda’ contacts, because in those days these crops were only native to the Indonesian archipelago (New Guinea and the Moluccan Islands) (Wright 1982; Dick-Read 2005). Formally plausible Austro etymologies can be preferred for key names in Bronze Age Mediterranean religions and myth (such as Neith, Osiris, Men / Minos, Ra’, Co-calas, Tahus, Daedalus, Dilmun, Atlantis; see Table 28.4, above). Even if most of these etymologies would seem ludicrous, they begin to make it conceivable that, with better data as well as better tools and skills of analysis, an Austro substrate might be identified to underlay the languages of the Mediterranean Bronze Age – a claim that was made recently by Pedersen (n.d.) and Manansala (2006). Although I prefer to attribute scattered cases of head-hunting (cf. Haddon 1901) and the skull complex (e.g. Liguria, Gallia Cisalpina, and legendary early Ireland) to a Pelasgian trait particularly conspicuous in the Eurasian Steppes, e.g. the Scythians, and thus into East and South East Asia (van Binsbergen 2008b and 2010c), one could also reverse the equation and see these westerly phenomena as Sunda manifestations. It has been known for a long time that surprising parallels exist between mythical themes in the Eastern and Central Mediterranean (such as the invention of the sail (cf. Assmann 1916, 1921), the leg child, the cosmogonic fishing up of land from the sea), on the one hand, and those of South East Asia / Oceania, on the other hand. Even the global distribution of male genital mutilation (Fig. 28.1) might be interpreted as having a Sunda epicentre. Could indirect Sunda influence be one of the causes of the emergence of the Phoenicians (reputed in Antiquity to hail from the Persian Gulf), and even, three millennia earlier, of the very early harbour towns in the Aegean such as Corinth? Or Jaffa / Joppa, apparently one of the oldest harbours of the Mediterranean? And how seriously can we take the obscure report claiming close affinity between the physical anthropology of the earliest Irish (mythically depicted as ‘dark’ and with only one side to their bodies, in other words as unilateral mythical beings) and the population of South East Asia (cf. Casey et al. 1971)? While these remain points for further research, for the time being I take it that Occam’s Razor allows us to discard the Sunda hypothesis for the alternative hypothesis to the effect that Pelasgian traits from the Pelasgian core land around the Mediterranean spread both to sub-Saharan Africa and to South East Asia from the Late Bronze Age, in line with the overall cross-model I have formulated, and largely through the medium of chariot locomotion.

Regrettably, given the considerable emphasis which my argument has laid on comparative mythology as a potential source of prothistorical information, I cannot within the present scope discuss the extent to which the Primary and Secondary Pelasgian realms are expressed in epical literature, where they form the far-flung geographical context of the Odyssey (cf. Wolf & Wolf 1985), the Argonautica (cf. Clare 2002), the Alexander romance, and the Sindbad cycle. See van Binsbergen 2011b.

What Table 28.5 brings out convincingly, is the existence of a wide field of cultural affinities, extending over a considerable part of Eurasia, originating in the Neolithic, and undergoing considerable expansion in the Bronze Age, even to the extent of ramifying off into sub-Saharan Africa (I propose: from the Late Bronze Age onward, which tallies with current reconstructions concerning the expansion of proto-Bantu from West Africa into Central and East Africa1242). I am not saying that within this ‘Pelasgian realm’ there was one unique, shared culture as the basis of a mutually recognised and shared ethnic identity. Rather, the numerous Pelasgian traits can be considered to have percolated through the Pelasgian realm, to be selectively adopted and rejected as ethnic boundary markers between adjacent groups. However, the sheer number of these traits, and their unmistakable interrelations (one can make out a boat-sea-Flood-water divinity complex, a reed-and-bee complex, etc.) must have created a sense of mutual recognition and kinship between the many ethnic groups interacting within the Pelasgian realm. To avoid misunderstanding: for this model to work, it is unnecessary that, at the level of the historical actors’ consciousness, they explicitly referred to themselves or to their ethnic neighbours as ‘Pelasgian’. Yet there are ample indications, in the ancient writers and in ethnonyms, that sometimes they did – in the inconsistent, shifting, kaleidoscopic ways we have identified in the first chapters of my argument as the typical way in which ethnonyms are handled emically by historical actors themselves – as distinct from academic analysts.

Against the background of this long list of traits, it is easy to recognise that everything we know about the Sea Peoples, fits in this list as convincing indication that, in the first place, the Sea Peoples’ episode was a ‘Pelasgian’ movement, mobilising people from sometimes distant places around the Mediterranean, and organising them into effective warfare on the basis of structural principles inherent in the Pelasgian cultural substrate: the egalitarian, segmentary tendency yet structured into the amphictyonic model, and underpinned by cosmological notions and religious rites in which the main role was played by the creator goddess associated with the primal waters – with the white aquatic bird (depicted, on the stern and prow of the Sea Peoples’ ships) as her main emblem, and with the tendencies to dualist symmetry (instead of the triadic arrangements typical of Bronze Age statehood throughout Eurasia) not only implied in their rumentary political organisation but also in the symmetrical design of their boats.

A nice serological confirmation of the tangible reality of the proposed Pelasgian realm can be seen in the distribution of blood type O:

‘By far the highest proportion of blood group O is found today at the periphery of Europe, in Mediterranean islands, namely on Crete, Tinos (one of the Cycladic Islands), the Lipary Isles, on Sardinia, Corsica, in the Basque territory, in a number of Alpine valleys, in the Celtic fringe (i.e. in Britain, Wales, Ireland and Scotland) and in Iceland.’ (Viereck 1996)

Moreover, one of the most conspicuous indicators of the Pelasgian realm I present below as Fig. 28.11: the circum-Mediterranean distribution of the Rhesus factor RH*C, with very high frequencies precisely within the ‘Pelasgian’ region proposed in Fig. 28.16. Various studies have highlighted (cf. Touinssi et al. 2004; Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994 (with extensive references and maps); Leavitt 1990) the peculiar pattern of RH factors among the Basques. Further inspection of the Asian distributions of both the various RH genes and of α- and β-thalassaemias (which I selectively illustrate here with Fig. 28.13) shows (Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994: Fig. 2.14.5.A, Fig. 2.14.6.C, and p. 502) these to have epicentres of high frequency in Central Asia, as if here the Primary Pelasgian realm was situated – as postulated in my model. This far from exhausts the genetic evidence for the Pelasgian realm as a tangible reality with antecedents in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages. Thus, as we have seen, there is converging evidence that modern Greeks constitute, on the Northern Mediterranean shore, an atypical relatively recent intrusion (dating from after 2000 BCE) with strong sub-Saharan African affinities,

‘… while all other studied Mediterraneans (including Cretans) belong to an older substratum which was present in the area since pre-Neolithic times. It is proposed that Imazighen (Caucasoid Berbers living at present in the North African coast and Saharan areas) are the remains of pre-Neolithic Saharan populations which could emigrate northwards between about 8000–6000 B.C., when desert desiccation began. They also could be part of the stock that gave rise to Sumerians, Cretans and Iberians; this is supported by both linguistic and HLA genetic data.’ (Arnaiz-Villena et al. 1999, cf. 2001a, 2002).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>trait</th>
<th>attested in West Asia including (&amp;) Ancient Egypt</th>
<th>attested in Uralic world</th>
<th>attested in Mediterranean world</th>
<th>attested in Sub-Saharan Africa (Bantu world)</th>
<th>Proposed as Sea Peoples trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>tendency to egalitarianism and acephalous segmentary political organisation (cf. Lohfink 1983)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>amphictyonic organisation in federations, typically comprising 12 member groups</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>elaborate Flood myths</td>
<td>+ (&amp;)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cult of the sea</td>
<td>+ (&amp;)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>bee symbolism; also beekeeping, mead, honey</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>boat cult; boats dominate iconography (ultimately combining with Flood myths, cult of the</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Proposed traits suggested to belong to the Neolithic Primary Pelasgian realm; these traits expressed in widespread forms of art, ceremonial and ritual
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Recursion and twinning, twin gods, duality, Janus motif</td>
<td>+ &amp; + (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moon cult (cf. sun cult and cult of hanging god)</td>
<td>+ &amp; (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cult of hanging god (cf. moon cult)</td>
<td>+ &amp; (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sun cult (cf. moon cult)</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Head-hunting and the skull complex</td>
<td>+ (&amp;) + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Veneration of a Mother goddess associated with bees</td>
<td>+ &amp; +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cosmogonic mythology centring on the primal emergence of Land from Water, with the Primal Waters personified as a virgin Creator Goddess, with swan connotations but also (as in the Orphic cosmogony) those of a serpent</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + (+) (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Matrifocality / premartial female sexual license / women conspicuous in political, military and religious roles, even leadership / tendency towards gender equality; female kings and male royal escorts</td>
<td>+ (&amp;) + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Communal orgies</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tauromachy and other aspects of bovine-centred ritual</td>
<td>+ &amp; +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gendered pair of gods, associated with horses and (once) primal waters</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mankala</td>
<td>+ (&amp;) + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Throwing sticks and boomerangs</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Reed complex</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unilateral mythical figure</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Besides bee, other arthropoda (especially spider and mantis) symbolically prominent</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ceremonial and battle axes</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shaving head as sign of mourning</td>
<td>+ (&amp;) +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cult of sacred birds, especially white aquatic birds (swan, duck, goose) as symbols of primal cosmogonic god</td>
<td>(+) &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The cult of the earth: landscape (or rather riverscape) parcelled into shrine regions each served by a – typically aniconic, e.g. herm-like – cult often also dispersing divination; palladium</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Complementary to the cult of the earth: socio-political units with (aniconic?) palladium, sacred to e.g. virgin warrior goddess (= creatrix)</td>
<td>+ &amp; +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Artificial elongation of the labia</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male genital mutilation</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ancient Near Eastern / Genesis mythology besides Flood myth</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Snake cult</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Leopard cult, pardivesture</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Elaborate death industry around royals, for royals themselves funerals are taboo</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Internal regicide central theme</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Spiked wheel trap</td>
<td>+ &amp; + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fire cult</td>
<td>+ (&amp;) + + (+) +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1244 See the discussion of shrine cults in the Aegean and wider Sea Peoples’ context, in Section 28.6.4. But, as is to be expected of Pelasgian traits, such cults also extend to Ancient Israel, cf. Eissfeldt 1973; Keller 1956; also the extensive literature – cited above – on Israelite amphictyony, since this centres on the national shrine of Sichem.
VAN BINSBERGEN & WOUDHUIZEN, ETHNICITY IN MEDITERRANEAN PROTOHISTORY

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>cult of meteorites</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>tree cult, cult of the initiatory sacred forest</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Proposed traits suggested to belong to the Secondary Pelasgian realm towards the Late Bronze Age: these traits expressed in widespread forms of art, ceremonial and ritual

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>royal band with distinctive instruments: xylophones, drums, iron bell / gong</td>
<td>+ (&amp;)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>nautical skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>exalted royal courts (cf. royal band)</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>megalithic monuments</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>trumpets (copper, shell)</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>metallurgy possibly early iron-working</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>metallurgy: gold, copper</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>a transformative cycle of elements</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>diadem as status ornament</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>neck rings</td>
<td>+ (&amp;)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>literary / epic expressions: tales of interregional sea travel, adventure and exploration are prominent</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>mytheme of the artificial woman</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>mytheme of the brother-sister rivalry over kingship</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>mytheme of the cosmic egg</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>interregional shrine cults</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>chariot</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>bridal service instead of marriage payments</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Miscellaneous

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>shamanism and cults of affliction</td>
<td>+ &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>hunched statuette as a major sculptural expression</td>
<td>+ (&amp;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1245 See discussion below.

1246 Recognising the trumpet as a Pelasgian trait make us adopt a relative position vis-à-vis Woudhuizen’s (this volume) discussion of the invention of the trumpet in a specific historical context suggested by his overall interpretation of Sea Peoples’ dynamics. There is an iconographic argument for Sea Peoples’ association with trumpets, which Woudhuizen also cites and which I render here as Fig. 28.12. In the light of my Pelasgian hypothesis it is worthwhile to consider Lawergren’s (2003, cf. 2001) statement on Oxus trumpets, from the heart of Central Asia:

‘Oxus trumpets (…) differed significantly and occupied a niche usually not considered musical. Still, they were true trumpets: the player’s vibrating lips made the sound and the instrument’s acoustical properties determined the pitch. Their short lengths (< 8 cm) resulted in high pitches and soft sound, a combination that rendered them useless for signals and music but enabled them to mimick animal calls. During the 1970s many Oxus trumpets were looted from the desert region of southern Bactria and soon surfaced in the antiquity markets of Kabul. Lacking stratigraphic information, their dates and context are lost, but their lineage had been established by their similarity to trumpets scientifically excavated at Iranian sites (Tope Hissar [or Tappeh Hesar], Shahdad, and Astrabad). Since the latter are dated 2200 – 1800 BCE, this is also the likely period for the Bactrian corpus. Finally, removing any uncertainty, five trumpets were recently excavated at Gonur, a site in the region of Margiana, 400 km west of Bactria. All are similar to the Bactrian corpus. Oxus trumpets predate other extant trumpets, such as those of Tutankhamun (1350 BCE) and recently discovered examples of the proto-shofar (1300 BCE).’

1247 Cf. van Binsbergen 2010b.

1248 Helen hiding with Proteus and being replaced by a dummy is one manifestation of this mytheme, and so is: the Pygmalion myth, Eva as made from Adam’s rib by JHWH (Genesis 2:21), Pandora as made by Prometheus at Zeus’ initiative, and the Egyptian myth of Anubis’ brother Bata for whom Khnum made an artificial wife at the initiative of the Ennead, the nine Heliopolitan primal gods (Willis 1994: 53; Fontenrose 1980).
| 58 | raiding and trading | + & | + | + | + | + |
| 59 | slavery | + & | + | + | + | + |
| 60 | great magical powers attributed to royals | + & | + | + | + | + |
| 61 | cults of affliction considered to be of alien origin | + | + | + | + | + |
| 62 | female puberty rites | (+&| (+ | (+ | (+ | (+ |
| 63 | Thalassaemias α, β, RH Rhesus factors and specific other serological patterns highly conspicuous | +& | + | + | + | (+ |
| 64 | cult of giants and heroes (or dwarfs), possibly as reminiscences of supplanted populations and their gods | + | + | + | + | + |
| 65 | mytheme of descent into underworld | + | + | + | + | + |
| 66 | mythical identity of human and stone; cult of stone piles | + | + | + | + | + |
| 67 | bards | + | + | + | + | + |
| 68 | reincarnation belief | + | + | + | + | + |
| 69 | human conception is from the sun / the high god | + | + | + | + | + |
| 70 | pan flute | + | + | + | + | + |
| 71 | a god of chaos and trickery | + | + | + | + | + |
| 72 | cult of cereals | + | + | + | + | + |
| 73 | sister polygamy? | + | + | + | + | + |
| 74 | penis sheath? | + | + | + | + | + |
| 75 | explicit self-image as dark-haired | + | + | + | + | + |
| 76 | artificial moulding of the head | + | + | + | + | + |
| 77 | mytheme of the creation of humans from earth or mud | + | + | + | + | + |
| 78 | collective oath-taking as socio-political device | + | + | + | + | + |
| 79 | funerary obligations to strangers | + | + | + | + | + |
| 80 | proto-writing, ultimately developing into alphabetic script towards the end of the Bronze Age | + | + | + | + | + |

I regret that here only the results can be given in tabulated form, without theoretical discussion or bibliographic underpinning. For a full discussion, see van Binsbergen 2008b and 2011b. For a quick check of most of the entries, cf. Hastings 1908-21, Index volume.

Table 28.5. An enumeration of eighty proposed ‘Pelasgian’ traits, and the selective applicability of these traits to the Sea Peoples

Thus we see how The Pelasgian realm stands out by very high levels of the RH*C Rhesus factor; for discussion, see Table 28.5, item 63

In another recent genetic study, Arnaiz-Villena et al.’s Mediterranean genetic substrate is explicitly interpreted in terms of ‘Usko-Mediterranean’, associated with the Basque language (but, surprisingly in the light of Woudhuizen’s recent work on Etruscan, also extending to Etruscan and even to Minoan which is as yet undeciphered), and claimed to extend over the entire vast region from the Mediterranean to the Middle East and Caucasus region (Arnaiz-
Villena et al. 2001b); again we see the outlyer position of the Greeks as against all other Mediterranean populations is demonstrated. The awareness of this underlying genetic basis of the Mediterranean-Pelasgian realm can already be found with Sergi (1901) with his claim of a Mediterranean genetic complex, which he saw (Sergi 1897) in continuity with African populations, within an overarching *Eurafricana*. Sergi’s writings, like Karst’s, inevitably are cast in the idiom of their time when history had not yet proven the bankruptcy of race as an analytical scientific concept (cf. Montagu 1942 / 1974) and therefore must be treated with great caution. If we extend the linguistic evidence to *Borean*, weaving into the argument the various instances and practices world-wide, yet I submit that a Pelasgian perspective even on an aggregated concept of megaliths would be illuminating in explaining, to some extent, the intriguing global distribution, which ranges from Western Europe to Korea, Indonesia and the Fiji Islands, and from Central Africa to the Baltic and the Black Sea (cf. Fig. 28.14, which sketches a tentative global distribution of megalithic structures and practices).  

Against this Pelasgian background, considering the fact that some of the Sea Peoples ended up in Syro-Palestine and may even have originated there, and in the light of the abundance of megalithic remains in that region, I feel justified to propose, as a mere possibility, a
megalithic dimension for the Sea Peoples.

source: Maspero & Sayce 1903: IV: 235
Fig. 28.15. Transjordanian dolmen

The following series of four diagrams present a diachronic overview of the Pelasgian hypothesis, from relatively limited (but already transcontinental) beginnings in the Neolithic ‘Primary Pelasgian Realm’ to a much more extensive ‘Secondary Pelasgian Realm’ in the Late Bronze Age, from which the Pelasgian traits listed in Table 28.5 have spread into four separate directions according to what I propose to call ‘the cross-model’:

- Central Western Europe / the Celtic speaking world;
- Central and Northern Europe / the Uralic and Germanic speaking world;
- sub-Saharan Africa: the Bantu speaking world;
- East Asia, South East Asia, Oceania: the Indo-Scythian / Altaic / Austronesian speaking world.

As a result, for the past three millennia much of the Old World has enjoyed a transcontinental substrate of cultural communality marked by the percolation of Pelasgian traits. The tendencies of ethnography, linguistics, archaeology, and academic organisation in general, towards myopic localising fragmentation, have largely failed to recognise this state of affairs. Even against the evidence presented in Table 28.5 my proposal would still run a considerable risk of rejection for being counter-paradigmatic. Yet it is against this background that the question of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples must be considered.

In the light of the comparative data in Table 28.5, we have with some confidence identified the following Pelasgian traits for the Sea Peoples. As far as socio-political organisation is concerned, we believe to perceive a more or less amphiptyonic federative organisation in federations, with a tendency to egalitarianism and acephalous segmentary political organisation which however is checked by leadership patterns that seem to lie between ‘primus inter pares’ and king. On the economic and productive level, we have raiding and trading, metallurgy (certainly copper as suggested by their arms and trumpets, possibly early ironworking as suggested by their Pelasgian and, in part, proto-Bantu connotations). Sea People technologies of locomotion included a high level of nautical skills, and chariot technology. On the level of ritual and ideology, we have strong indications of a cult of the sea and of boats, probably combined with a cult of sacred aquatic birds that are likely to evoke the Cosmogony of the Separation of Water and Land. The basic worldview seems to have been dyadic, recursion based, possibly implying an ancient cult of a god of beginnings and thresholds (cf. Basojaun / Janus / Ganesh) and of twins (cf. the Dioscuri, who in classical Antiquity were still protectors of seamen even though such a dyadic arrangement would have been obsolete at the height of triadism) and to have lacked the triadic elaborations typical of the literate states against which the Sea Peoples directed their attacks. Among some of the Sea Peoples’ groups there is the general practice male genital mutilation as a sign of ethnic distinction. All this falls so excellently within the wider Pelasgian pattern which I have identified, that I dare to venture even further and impute, albeit with considerable hesitation and only as a possibility, the following additional traits to the Sea Peoples: the possession of Flood myths of the elaborate type, megalithic practices, and high levels of thalassaemias $\alpha$, $\beta$, RH Rhesus factors and specific other serological patterns typical of Pelasgians. Against the Pelasgian typology, the Sea Peoples suddenly acquire a face, an a distinct cultural identity. And although formally the Pelasgian realm stretches from Africa Minor to West Asia, and therefore touches on Etruria and Sardinia, as Pelasgians the Sea Peoples would be so much at home, typologically, in the Levant / Delta / Anatolia, that one hesitates once more to let them come all the way from the West Central Mediterranean – rather peripheral, from a Pelasgian point of view.

---


---

case in Tunisia (van Binsbergen 1971d, 1985a, 1985b; and cf. my Fig. 27.15).
28.9.2. Not a revamped Hamitic thesis: The Old World as a context of African-Eurasian continuities

I realise that my Pelasgian Hypothesis, implying the regional emergence of the extensive Pelasgian cultural package of cultural, religious, politico-organisational, linguistic, and even genetic traits during the Neolithic, and the subsequent dissemination of that package in four directions (including South, to decisively inform Niger-Congo speaking sub-Saharan Africa), comes close to the now discarded Hamitic thesis.\textsuperscript{1253} That theory was popular in the early decades of the 20th century CE, at the height of colonialism, because it seemed to offer an explanation for the ideological dilemma which was posed by African cultures: how is it possible that Africans, whom European colonialism and racialism have denied all capability of cultural and technological achievements, yet display these achievements so undeniably? The answer was sought in a model posing an influx of ‘culturally superior’ pastoral ‘Hamites’ (i.e. Afroasiatic speakers, of ‘intermediate’ somatic traits between Africans and Caucasians) from West Asia, civilising Africa in protohistorical times, allegedly in much the same way as the descendants of these Africans were supposedly being ‘civilised’ by Europeans in the early twentieth century CE. I have no need for such an antiquated model of implied African subordination, because I consider myself to be reasonably free from the delusions of colonialism and racialism, at least at the conscious level and insofar as subject to my will. If I may be permitted to present, in a nutshell, my anti-hegemonic credentials: exponent of intercultural philosophy, Editor of \textit{Quest: An African Journal of Philosophy}, who has repeatedly articulated Africa’s great contributions to global cultural history, a vocal defender of academic Afrocentrism, speaker of five African languages, the adopted son of an African king, and a certified and practising diviner-healer in the Southern African \textit{sangoma} tradition. However, the very same freedom allows me to ignore the pressures of political correctness. The Hamitic thesis, at the time, had an unmistakable colonial and racist origin, and implied to deny the cultural creativity of modern Africans; it shared

\textsuperscript{1253} Cf. Meinhof 1910, 1912; Seligman 1913; and, as later, critical reflections on the Hamitic hypothesis: Greenberg 1966; Sanders 1969; Zachernuk 1994; Sharp 2004. For early Rabbinic views of Ham, not without influence on the image of Ham as the marginalised Black, \textit{cf.} Aaron 1995.
these disreputable characteristics with anthropology as a whole. Therefore we must use these intellectual products critically, with great caution, but (as even the stern critique of colonial knowledge production, Valentin Mudimbe, admits) if we would totally ignore them we would risk obscuring, from modern state-of-the-art research, such valid factual, contemporary empirical information as may have informed these intellectual productions in addition to their ideologica
delusions – factual information which may no longer be available through other, more neutral channels today. Granted, therefore, the unsavoury connotations of the Hamitic thesis, *that does not mean that no major transfer could ever have taken place*, since the Upper Palaeolithic, of genetic, linguistic and cultural material from West Asia to sub-Saharan Africa. Sometimes scholars are right for the wrong reasons – as is often the case, for instance, with Bernal, and with the scholars from around 1900 (Eduard Meyer, Montelius, Childe) some of whose ideas he has sought to revive. The inroads south, along the Nile valley and the Sahara routes (marked by abundant rock art depicting chariots – a technology invented in Central Asia, 2000 BCE) have been recognised as such for a long time. What is more, state-of-the-art genetics and linguistics – as all too briefly reviewed here – prove beyond reasonable doubt that there was, from 15 ka BP on and especially in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages, a sizable demographic, linguistic and cultural influx from West Asia into sub-Saharan Africa (the ‘Back-to-Africa’ gene flow).

It is my impression that this influx was not imposed, in sub-Saharan Africa, as an alien package, onto ‘Africans’ as we know them today. The Palaeo-Africans of 15 ka BP probably displayed high levels of continuity with the Palaeo-African groups\(^ {1254}\) that once constituted the whole of Anatomically Modern Humans, and with their ancestral culture, – before the Out-of-Africa Exodus from 80 ka BP onward. But today’s Africans are substantially different, both culturally, linguistically and even genetically; they are to a considerable extent a product of the Back-to-Africa movement, and as such fairly continuous with the populations and cultures of West Asia and Europe. The considerable affinities between Bantu and *Borean which we have presented in Chapter 4, suggest that *major elements towards Bantu came into being, not on African soil, but in Asia; this means that these contributive elements (resulting in a 27% *Borean-derived lexicon) were transferred to sub-Saharan Africa in the very process of the ‘Back-to-Africa’ migration. Major cultural themes besides language were drawn into the same dynamics, and this explains the striking continuity (in mythology, kingship, kinship, patterns of reconciliation and adjudication, religion, etc.) between West Asia, Europe, and sub-Saharan Africa.\(^ {1255}\) The same may also apply to metallurgy, whose invention is still being contested between West Asia and sub-Saharan Africa\(^ {1256}\) – but we may contribute to the settlement of that argument by invoking a model where it was proto-Bantu speaking groups in West Asia, carrying a proto-African culture on their way to sub-Saharan Africa, that played an integral part in the invention and early transmission of metallurgy – like the specialist blacksmiths, the Sinties, on the fire-god Hephaestos’ special island Lemnos,\(^ {1257}\) like the blacksmiths that all over Africa are looked upon as mysterious strangers,\(^ {1258}\) – also *cf.* the iron-working, music-oriented Gypsies (a major subgroup of which is also called Sinti\(^ {1259}\)) of which we find traces as far inside Africa as Sudan and Zambia.\(^ {1260}\) The Hamitic thesis is predicated on an obsession with difference, with absolute and discrete distinctions between Africans, Europeans and West or Central Asians. The reality of cultural history is much more fluid, transitional, interconnected, and simply makes sub-Saharan Africa, like Europe and on similar terms, part of the world at large. Once more, we have to admit that the notion of ‘African’ as a distinct identity is (like the concept of Africa itself) mainly an invention (Mudimbe 1988), first of colonialism and racialism, but subsequently internalised by the latter’s Black victims.

At the nominal level, the allegation that my Pelasgian

\(^{1254}\) Characterised by haplogroups L1, L2 and L3; *cf.* Forster 2004.

\(^{1255}\) *Cf.* van Binsbergen 2008b, 2010c.

\(^{1256}\) *Cf.* Alpern 2005.

\(^{1257}\) Homer, *Iliad* I, 594; *Odyssey* VIII, 294.


\(^{1259}\) An alternative name is *Roma*, which may have a Bantu etymology, see below.

\(^{1260}\) Gypsy groups specialising in the scrap-iron trade were studied by B. Streck (1995). In Zambia the Nkoya royal dynasty of Kahare has distinct Gypsy connotations, including oral traditions associating them with the introduction of the specific Nkoya royal orchestra centring on the xylophone, and the introduction of metallurgy specifically royal ceremonial iron-ware (van Binsbergen 1992a; but by the ethnic mechanisms which we have identified in Chapter 2 as typical of South Central Africa, these two traits are shared by many other royal dynasties in Zambia and surrounding areas – Fagan *et al.* 1969). However, the Nkoya dynasty moreover has the alternative name of *Kale* (Smith & Dale 1920), which occurs throughout the Gypsy world with the meaning of ‘Black One’, *cf.* Arabic كحلي *khl*, ‘antimony, kohl eye make-up, black’.
model revives the despicable Hamitic thesis, is already simply dismissed by the fact that my model extends from the once Fertile Sahara to Central (and ultimately East) Asia, which means that it has included vital African material from the start. As a result, the Pelasgian diffusion I propose along the southern vector of the cross-model, was not effected by aliens bringing to Africa the northern cultural achievements which White racialists would deny Africa as local achievements. On the contrary, as Pelasgians they were proto-Africans extending a proto-African (including proto-Bantu-speaking) culture to other parts of Africa. On the other hand, the *Borean background of a sizeable portion of proto-Bantu, just like the abundance of Eurasian mythological themes, imply an undeniable continuity with Eurasia, such as is accounted for in my Pelasgian model.

Points for further debate, meanwhile, remain the southern demarcation of the Primary Pelasgian realm, and the importance of an African versus Asian epicentre in the Primary Pelasgian realm. As Fig. 28.16 indicates, I propose to see the Primary Pelasgian as extending from Central Asia to the fertile Sahara, and to date the further southward diffusion of Pelasgian traits into sub-Saharan Africa mainly to the Late Bronze Age and after. When I consider such ‘index fossils’ of Pelasgian culture as malkala, geomantic divination, the spiked wheel trap, and the belief in a unilateral mythical being, I am happy to agree that the Neolithic Pelasgian seedbed extended from the Sahara to Central Asia, but I am inclined to give somewhat greater weight to the West Asian component, seeing the Saharan element as largely contemporary but possibly somewhat dependent upon the West Asian element. My reasons for this Model A include: the evidence for a westbound population movement from West Asia from the Mesolithic onward (cf. Forster 2004) – a major dimension of the ‘Back into Africa’ migration; the conspicuousness of leopard-skin motifs both in Neolithic Anatolia (Çatal Hüyük) and in the Sahara (Tassili n’Ajjjer); the continuity between Çatal Hüyük iconography and that appearing in present-day Saharan weaving and tattooing (Vandenbroeck 2000); the West Asian genetic connotations of Khoisan speakers as detected by Cavalli-Sforza and as corroborated by what I believe to discern as the approachement between (proto-)Khoisan and North Caucasian languages and especially the massive continuity between sub-Saharan African and Eurasian mythologies – all against the background of (what I take to be the West to Central Asian epicentre of) the *Borean hypothesis as far as the linguistic domain is concerned.

But I have to admit that also an alternative Model B could be argued, one that – in line with current Afrocentrist thinking – sees Pelasgian traits (notably such massively modern African traits as malkala, geomantic divination, the spiked wheel trap and the belief in a unilateral mythical being) as having essentially a sub-Saharan African origin.

One could underpin both Models A and B with the hypothesis of the Saharan demographic circulation pump, attracting or expelling populations towards or away from the Sahara depending on varying levels of aridity.1263 However, Model B has much less explanatory power, and particularly cannot account for the massive cross-model effects extending over three continents, nor for the *Borean continuities in sub-Saharan Africa.1264

---

1262 Cf. van Binsbergen 2008b, 2010c.

Fig. 28.17. The origin and diffusion of the chariot, from Kazakhstan, 2000 BCE

Meanwhile we must not pretend that these concrete analytical details, intriguing though they may be, constitute the heart of the matter. The real issue is whether, in the face of unmistakable hegemonic, Eurocentric, initially even racist tendencies in North Atlantic scholarship throughout the 20th century CE (of which the Hamitic thesis is only the tip of the iceberg), it is yet possible to construct an approach to global cultural history that is free from such blemishes.

This concern has been central to my approach to intercultural philosophy as an epistemological and knowledge-political alternative to mainstream anthropology – and it has surfaced throughout my present argument. This helps us to focus more sharply on the dilemma presented by the work of Bernal, the African and African-American Afro-centrists, and Oppenheimer. In their courageous and timely attempts to construct a view of global cultural history that is free from hegemonic and Eurocentric bias, they may risk throwing away the baby with the bath water, and resigning themselves to less than excellent standards of historical enquir y and to a one-sided selection of data, in such a way that intersubjective, methodological scientific truth becomes secondary to a political agenda aimed at consciousness-raising and emancipation. It is certainly an admirable act of transcultural defiance and liberation to propose, as major centres of initiative in global cultural history, areas outside Europe and outside the short period (a few centuries in the Iron Age, a few centuries in the Early Modern Age) that constituted Europe’s claim to glory; and thus to make it thinkable that, instead of the Athens of Pericles and the North-western Europe of Descartes, Spinoza, Bacon and Leibniz, it is in Ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, sub-Saharan Africa, and Indonesia in the Early Holocene (or elsewhere still – South Asia, China, North America) that the true roots of modern, global civilisation must be sought and acknowledged. Where such excellent ideas tend to go wrong is not in their conception but in their scientific execution. Is it possible to recognise non-European contributions to global cultural history, and still not underrate the genuine achievements attained in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages in the Mediterranean and its immediate surroundings – in the Pelasgian realm? We are not speaking of pride and chauvinism here, not even of European justified Selbsthass in the face of a shameful history of colonialism and imperialism, but of the methodologically accountable handling of intersubjective historical truth. Bernal’s (well-taken) disgust with the myth of Greek genius as constitutive of European superiority brought him to deny the Greek contribution altogether and to put everything on the Egyptian, and ultimately on the sub-Saharan African card – a wager he could only lose, as Lefkowitz right pointed out. Oppenheimer’s (understandable) great personal admiration for the present-day cultures of South East Asia, in combination with a blinding infatuation with the antiquated writings of James George Frazer, brought him to try and rewrite world mythological history. Having accompanied, with passion and sympathy, these inspiring scholars on part of their intellectual trajectory, it is time to ask ourselves if perhaps, after making all due allowance for European hegemonic delusions of grandeur, and acknowledging the essential multicentred contributions to global cultural history from all over the world, we should not make the next step, and try and state the case (as I have done in formulating the Pelasgian hypothesis and its subsequent cross-model dissemination across three continents) for, yet, the Mediterranean’s fairly unique position of initiative in global cultural history. My quarrel with Bernal is that he did not make that final step – even though, perhaps more than anyone else in the 20th century CE, he made all the preparatory steps and deserves great credit for that. In this light Renfrew’s localist position, which above I considered in the light of his personal class position, has much to recommend it.

From a point of view of the intercultural philosophy of history, a final remark needs to be made on the possibility of a non-hegemonic, non-Eurocentric approach to global cultural history. One of the standard devises for the establishment of cultural domination in the modern world, is to take the local, emic worldview, values and beliefs of a relatively small subset of humankind (preferably, one’s own), and let these pass for the opposite of local, i.e. for universal. The globalisation of patterns of consumption, fashion, sexuality, entertainment, nominal democratic organisation, and spirituality in the last few decades has been largely of this, implicitly hegemonic, nature. We should not be too dismissive about this condition, for in the process, the initially receiving parties appropriate and transform what was once the ephemeral local culture of others, and soon a genuine step towards universalism will yet have been made in this way. When Sandra Harding asked the illuminating
question ‘Is modern science an ethnoscience?’, she was pinpointing this very process – admitting that modern science to a considerable extent (whilst amply acknowledging world-wide inputs in the formative phase) was a recent, North Atlantic product assisting North Atlantic world domination, but at the same time she had to admit that this culture-political state of affairs did not reduce to total relativism the universalisable truth claims of modern science – these truth claims turn out to rest, in large part, on translocal methodological and logical principles. Clearly it is possible to be both local, and potentially universalisable, at the same time. Now, the relevance of this digression in our present context is the following. When we clamour for a non-hegemonic, non-Eurocentric approach to global cultural history, we should ask ourselves to what extent such a desire is self-defeating in the sense that the very notion of history is a product of Graeco-Roman and Judaico-Christian-Islamic civilisation – between Herodotus and Thucydides, on the one hand, and the Biblical narrative of election and salvation, either physical (Judaism) or spiritual (Christianity). History, and historicism, as (allegedly!) the most obvious, the only permissible perspective for looking at humankind, culture and institutions, is less than three centuries old, and now resides at the heart of European / North Atlantic culture: the idea that the essence of a thing is the coherent, methodic and intersubjective narrative of its transformation in the course of its passage through time. Protohistory – our concern in the present book – even expansively seeks to impose this idea upon periods and regions that previously, for lack of data, have been considered to be totally out of reach of the overall modern North Atlantic historicism. Some of the most bitter clashes in the modern world (e.g. that between North Atlantic secular, nominally Christian and nominally democratic consumerism, and Islamism; or – within the North Atlantic region and its global satellites – that between evolution and creationism) revolve on the fact that – despite globalisation – in most local cultures today it is largely impossible, unthinkable (and this marks them as fundamentalist) to make the distinctions that are centrally constitutive of the socio-political experience in the North Atlantic region today: the distinction between myth and intersubjective, methodologically established scientific truth; and the related recognition that truth, specifically the truth of texts, should be seen relativistically within a specific, changing context of space and time, of a history. What we have done in our two case studies of Chapters 5 and 6 was to take a sacred text that its sometime believers considered true beyond history in the modern sense, contextualise it, and turn it, with varying success, into such history, depriving it of its sacredness and truth claims, in the process.

This implies that any project attempting to write non-hegemonic, anti-Eurocentric global cultural history will yet bear the marks of its European / North Atlantic roots, and will continue to do so for decades, until perhaps further globalisation has facilitated the transformation of history, as initially a local emic concept, into finally a universal one. Such a project implies that its participants and sympathisers from outside (the dominant intellectual elites of) the North Atlantic should first be persuaded to accept the North Atlantic conception of history and relativism – which would seem to defeat the entire project to begin with. The only way out would be to claim universality for modern science, but would not that be uncharitable?

28.9.3. A closer look at the ethnic resources of the ‘Peoples of the Sea’: Their objective and subjective identification (albeit situationally and inconsistently) as ‘Pelagians’

If we accept the notion of an Extended Fertile Crescent stretching, in the Middle to Late Bronze Age, from the fertile Sahara to China, our easternmost state to be able to create a push factor in ‘Sea Peoples’ peregrinations in the Late Bronze Age was that of the Shang dynasty, from where a very loose string of states leads to Central and South Asia (Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex, the Indus Valley) to Elam, Mesopotamia, Urartu, Ḫatti, and in the extreme South-West, Egypt. That communications throughout this immense belt across the entire Old World were intensive, is suggested not only from individual finds (e.g. seals, statuettes) and from language distribution, but also from the invention of the spoked-wheel chariot in Kazakhstan (in the Sintashta-Petrovka culture, some 1300 km North-north-east of the Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex) c. 2000 BCE, and its subsequent, amazingly rapid spread east and west all across the Old World (Fig. 28.17). We are here in a context substantially informed by the Indo-Iranian expansion, although Indo-Iranian dynamics should not tempt us to close our eyes to the other language groups involved, such as Uralic, Altaic, Dravidian, Sino-Caucasian, and various now exclusively African languages.

Although the Sahara, with its independent initiatives

1267 In the sense of the principle of (interpretative) charity which is one of the resources of intercultural epistemology: ‘if person A from culture B strongly believes C, who am I (as person D from culture E) to totally reject C in the light of my belief in a superior truth, F?’ Cf. McGinn 1977; Lepore 1993; Malpas 1988.
in domestication of certain animal and plant species, was ecologically and culturally in many ways part of this Extended Fertile Crescent, so far no states have been identified there for the Middle to Late Bronze Age. This means that before the expansion of Carthage into a major trading and military power (well into the Iron Age), no statal push factors can be discerned West of Egypt or West of Štātti. Therefore, to the extent to which Sea People movement was caused no only by Urnfield expansion (Kimmig, Woudhuizen) but also, and perhaps more so, by state encroachment, the state-induced vector of movement of the Sea peoples must have been largely east-west, coming from the peripheries of Štātti and Egypt, and ending up West of these states, i.e. in the Eastern, Central and Western Mediterranean, and possibly further afield: outside the Pillars of Hercules where their seaworthy vessels could carry them, perhaps all the way to Meso America (as tentatively indicated in Fig. 28.16.IV),1268 and into the Sahara and West Africa where their chariots could carry them. And the chariots did carry them South, to judge in the first place by numerous cases of Late Bronze / Early Iron Age along the Western Sahara trade routes depicting chariots, and in the second place the great many linguistic, cultural, religious, cosmological and mythological continuities between the Eastern Mediterranean / West Asia on the one hand, and Niger-Congo speaking sub-Saharan Africa on the other hand.

As long as we could believe, with Woudhuizen, in an overall eastbound movement, we could derive much inspiration from the identifications in terms of Central and Eastern Mediterranean Iron Age names which scholars, ever since the late 19th century CE, have proffered for the Sea Peoples’ ethnonyms in the Egyptian records (Table 28.1): [šw][w]šw, trw[y]š, [w]?šš, etc. In that case the question of the specific ethnic identity of the constituent Sea Peoples groups would have been solved, as Woudhuizen proposed it is, his answer being: the disparate ethnic identities which the Sea Peoples displayed during their military exploits, were based on already fully formed ethnic identities they had while still in their Central Mediterranean homes, before the attacks on Egypt and Štātti. However, once we reject the idea of an exclusively eastbound movement, some of these identifications may need to change places, too, bringing us to the following alternative statement: if by the Middle Iron Age we have records of Sardinians, Siculians, Etruscans, Tyrrhenians, Oscans, it is perhaps because these people only ended up in their Iron Age Central Mediterranean habitats in the very aftermath of the Sea Peoples exploits – perhaps they were not Sardinians from modern Sardinia attacking Egypt and being perceived by the Egyptians as Šrdn – perhaps, on the contrary, they were Šrdn from the immediate, Levantine, surroundings of Egypt who, in a further westward expansion of the Sea Peoples, and no doubt under the additional influence of their failure to entirely vanquish the Egyptian state, moved on further west and ended on the island subsequently named after them, Sardinia; and so on, mutatis mutandis, for the three other ethnic groups identified both in the Sea Peoples context and suggested by Woudhuizen to be from the Central Mediterranean.

Meanwhile, this argument would not affect those of Woudhuizen’s Sea Peoples identifications that he proposes the come from the Aegean and further East: the ḫwšš, ḫrw, ḫwšt, ḫir and ḫinw. For them a South movement would remain possible; but then even in terms of Woudhuizen’s original proposal their movement would never have been ‘westbound’. However, the question of eastbound versus westbound scenario acquires another dimension if we look at North Africa, which is playing a role in my Pelasgian hypothesis as a region traversed by the Sea Peoples, and possible also the westbound, vectors of the Pelasgian cross-model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ethonym  (from top to bottom: from Maghreb to the Nile Delta)</th>
<th>if this ethonym had been rendered in Egyptian script and subsequently transcribed into Latin script, it would look more or less like</th>
<th>possible connection with an ethonym actually documented on Egyptian monuments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Atlantas (mod-</td>
<td>trnw</td>
<td>[šw][w]šw but very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ern Algeria, Tunisia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auses</td>
<td>wšw</td>
<td>[w]?šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Machiyes 1269</td>
<td>mšyw</td>
<td>[w]?šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anatantes</td>
<td>trnw</td>
<td>[šw][w]šw but very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(western boundary mod-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ern Libya)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lotophages</td>
<td>ḥḥpwy, ḥḥpwy</td>
<td>[šw][w]šw but very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guidamines</td>
<td>gšlw</td>
<td>dšlw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maces1270</td>
<td>mšlw</td>
<td>[w]?šš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Garamantes</td>
<td>grmtw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pyllxes</td>
<td>ḥššw</td>
<td>pr-wst but very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gamphalantas</td>
<td>gmptnw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1268 Transatlantic westbound diffusion in prehistory has formed a favourite hypothesis in Afrocentrism (e.g. van Sertima 1976) despite vicious dismissal from specialised Americanists (cf. Ortiz de Montellano 2000).

1269 Given the idea of Niger-Congo > Bantu as uninvited guest in the Bronze Age Mediterranean (Chapter 4), the element ma- could be interpreted as a plural prefix (as it is in many Bantu languages), not necessarily rendered in Old Egyptian.

1270 As previous note.
28.9.4. Were the Sea Peoples at some stage inhabitants of North Africa?

Following Herodotus (5th century BCE), Lhote (Lhote 1959 Dutch ed. p. 171) gives a list and a map of the peoples inhabiting modern Egypt, Libya, Tunisia and Algeria in classical Antiquity. Some of the peoples in this list qualify – as Lhote himself stresses – to be considered potential Sea Peoples listed in the New Kingdom Egyptian monuments. This becomes clear when we rewrite their names in a likely Egyptian phonetic rendering. The list of Table 28.6, below, is not proposed in earnest as an identification attempt of the Sea Peoples, but shows how widely we may have to cast our nets in order to identify the names in the Egyptian monumental inscriptions (for which Table 28.1 gives extensive information).

Thus it appears as if at least one Egyptian-attested Sea People’s ethnonym, [w?]ÅÆ, is found back, seven hundred years later, in the Maghreb; while a rather unconvinving case could be made for four others: pr-wst, [š?]rdn, rkw and dÁšnw. This finding confirms the argument – which is commonly held throughout the scholarly literature on the Sea Peoples – that Sea Peoples ethnicity must be situated in a broad supra-regional context encompassing the entire Eastern Mediterranean basin and its extensions into the Central, even the Western, Mediterranean. The central question, however, as to the direction of Sea People movement:

• from Western and Central Mediterranean (as well as Eastern Mediterranean) to Egypt, or
• from Egypt to the Western and Central Mediterranean (as well as Eastern Mediterranean)

cannot be decided on the basis of this exercise.

28.10. Eastbound or westbound scenario?

If we wish to stress the proposed statal push factor, these North African ethnonyms proved a further, limited indication for a westbound movement, involving the [w?]ÅÆ, and perhaps the three other groups indicated in Table 28.6, as well as the Gilgames. Such a westbound movement (of which Helck has been a major exponent) appears to have some further support, in the light of a fair number of converging considerations:

• the Phoenician colonisation of Africa Minor,
• Woudhuizen’s own interpretation of the Aeneas saga (from Troy to Central Italy),
• inveterate traditions on a Levantine origin of the Etruscans now supported by massive archaeological and linguistic evidence to which Woudhuizen himself has made major contributions,1273
• the extensive political, commercial and ethnic affinities between Etruscans and Africa Minor / Carthage, which would be best explained on the basis of a joint Levantine origin (which is certain for the Carthagin-

1271 Could this not be a Southern-shore cognate group of the Oscans?
1272 Note the surprising affinity with the name of the Mesopotamian hero / king Gilgamesh, which modern scholars (e.g. Albright 1956b) may often bring in connection with the toponym of Carcmean, on the Northern Euphrates – founded in the Neolithic, it ended up as the Northern Hittite capital, only to be destroyed in the context of the Sea Peoples’ Episode. Could the name of the town have clung to a contingent of the survivors, or of the destroyers, making it all the way to the Maghreb?

ians, and – as Woudhuizen himself demonstrates – highly probable for the Etruscans)

- the tradition of the eponymical Sardis expedition to Sardinia,¹²⁷⁴ and
- the widely held specialist’s consensus as to the predominantly westbound migrations of Afroasiatic and Indo-European speakers along the shores of the protohistorical Mediterranean,
- the possible identity of Cyprian Alasiya, and ;">wšš, Oscans
- the Bantu / Levantine / Egyptian connotations of the town name Roma, and of the Sinties-like Roma people, cf. Old Egyptian rmt ‘people, man’, proto-Bantu -dömÈ ‘man’;¹²⁷⁵ also the Roman cult of Jupiter Capitoline resembles the Egyptian cult of Amon-Ra’.

Under a westbound scenario, the empirical distribution of ethnonyms / toponyms, and of material culture, would be explained by regarding the Tuscans, Sicilians and Sardinians as Levantine immigrants in the Central Mediterranean, who brought these names with them to the West in the context of the aftermath of the Sea Peoples Episode, rather than taking these names with them to the East as under the eastbound scenario that Woudhuizen favours.

As we have seen, in the older scholarly literature Central Italy including Etruria has stood out as a region with very prominent ‘Pelasgian’ connotations. I interpret this as an indication that the Anatolian / Luwian side of the Etruscans ancestors were welcome in Etruria, with their language and other cultural traits, because of an underlying Pelasgian identity, which was consciously recognised at the level of the historical actors. Since in my model the Extended Pelasgian Realm by the Late Bronze Age extends from the fertile Sahara to East Asia, I am not convinced that we can cite the Etruscan case as an argument for either the westbound or the eastbound scenario. Given the underlying (albeit still highly hypothetical) ‘Pelasgian’ identity – supported by scores of cultural traits distributed and percolating all over the Pelasgian realm, in a context of protoglobalisation facilitated by effective chariot and maritime long-range transport – both scenarios could apply in the Etruscan case; but both in an Early to Middle Iron, rather than Late Bronze, time frame.

Yet an eastbound scenario can also find support, not only in the detailed argument Woudhuizen adduces (this volume), but also in, for instance,

- the exceptional, isolated genetic and linguistic situation of Sardinia,¹²⁷⁶ which is more compatible with the island being a source of trans-Mediterranean migration than being a destination from elsewhere in that region;
- the various indications – also in the contemporary Egyptian records – of a Libyan / North African component among the Sea Peoples. Such a component could well be accommodated as part of the aftermath under a westbound, i.e. as people originally East of Egypt using their chariot-based means of transportation to migrate to Africa Minor (and from there, in part, on to sub-Saharan Africa), after their defeat by the Egyptians. However, here an appeal to Occam’s Razor would make us prefer to look at the Libyan component as originally living West of Egypt, and as engaged in an eastbound aggressive movement against Egypt.

- This partial vindication of the eastbound scenario may also find some support in Karst’s (1931a) hypothesis of an earlier eastbound migration of maritime Basquoid peoples c. 2000 BCE. It is the descendants of these presumed Basquoid migrants, wherever situated in the Central to Eastern Mediterranean, that would seem to have made up an important part of the Sea Peoples attacking Egypt, anyway. Meanwhile Karst’s hypothesis on this point finds a measure of support in genetic and serological research. Thus (cf. Fig. 28.13) the Mediterranean distribution of the varieties of the hereditary blood condition named β-thalassaemia (which makes people anaemic but also grants greater immunity to malaria) unmistakably displays a gradient along an east-west axis;¹²⁷⁷ yet the abundant information on the Mediterranean distribution of RH Rhesus factors (cf. Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994) does not clearly show such a gradient, even though the Basques are well-known for their excessive frequencies of certain RH factors.

Although the peopling of the Maghreb with proto-

¹²⁷⁴ In this connection it is remarkable that Lilliu & Schubart 1967: 86 detect, in the Sardinian Bronze statuettes of this period, influence of Syrian examples from the 8th century BCE.
¹²⁷⁵ Guthrie number 697, Guthrie 1967-71 and n.d.
¹²⁷⁶ Scozzari et al. 2001; Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994; Hubschmid 1953 (highlighting especially Sino-Caucasian affinities, which suggest, not a massive invasion in the Late Bronze Age (as under a westbound Sea Peoples’ scenario) but rather survival of a Neolithic and Early Bronze linguistic situation that was once widespread in the Mediterranean, cf. this volume Chapter 4, and McCall & Fleming 1999).
¹²⁷⁷ Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1994: Fig. 2.14.7, after Cao et al. 1989.
Berber-speaking populations is usually estimated to have occurred well before the Late Bronze Age, Lhote seems convinced of the Sea Peoples’ contribution to this process. That a westbound movement in the Middle or Late Bronze Age makes some sense, is also corroborated by linguistic evidence: the name of the fire divinity Hephaestus, who mythologically, ritually and semantically is at home in West Asia, and from there selectively entered the Aegean (Lemnos, Athens, both with strong Pelasgian connotations), has its closest etymon in proto-Berber *hifauu, ‘fire’; this would suggest (in line with Starostin’s Afroasiatic Hypothesis, and with the Natufian Hypothesis for the Levantine origin of Afroasiatic) that proto-Berber was spoken in the Eastern Mediterranean before making its way west, to the Maghreb. McClay & Fleming (1999: 242) also see such a westbound movement, even by sea, but situate it in the Neolithic:

‘It has been proposed that the Neolithic reached the Maghreb by sea from the east Mediterranean in the same basic ‘stream’ that brought the Neolithic to Iberia. That is inherently more credible than a more difficult land route from Egypt to Cyrenaica, then across the northern Sahara to the Maghreb, at least for migrating farmers’.

However, in McCall & Fleming’s view this is a relatively recent addition to the population and culture of the Maghreb, whose overall characteristic is that of one of the very old areas of habitation of Anatomically Modern Humans, suggesting the Berbers to be even an aurochs-hunting phylum. Recent genetic research by Arnaiz-Villena et al. (2002; cf. 2000a) confirms the affinity between North African Berbers and modern Iberian populations including Basques, and in general affirms the stationary nature of most of the Mediterranean populations – but this does not seem to preclude intra-Mediterranean migrations.

However, the additional North African material adduced in this Section is not incompatible with an eastbound movement either. Woudhuizen takes it that the [wʔ]388 (whom he convincingly identifies with the Ausci of Northern Italy and Liguria) were indigenous to the latter regions and from there ‘took the boat’ to Egypt. Perhaps some of these alleged Ligurians did not go all the way east and ended up in the Maghreb.

Personally, however, I prefer to see these Ausci whom we find on the Northern Mediterranean shore in the Iron Age (and who play a considerable part in Woudhuizen’s reconstruction), as the remnants of Pelasgian [wʔ]388 who, engaged in an eastbound movement from West Asia, passed by Egypt on their way to Africa Minor (whence some contingents of Sea Peoples, in their chariots, went on South, into the Sahara, West Africa, and ultimately Central, East and Southern Africa, spreading *Borean elements towards proto-Bantu in their trail) and Liguria. There are several indications of a south-north migration across the Mediterranean from Africa Minor in the Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age, the cult of Jupiter Capitolinus with
Egyptianising elements; the first mention of Africa in an Etruscan document dating from the late 7th century BCE (Woudhuizen 2005c); the genetic pattern of various RH* genes; and the occurrence of other Pelasgian traits in Northern Italy/Liguria such as head-hunting, the cult of the White cosmogonic god Janus / Basojaun, raiding, etc.\(^{1283}\)

Admittedly, however, some of these traits are continuous with North and South Italy (Tyrrhenians, Rome, Elymians and might have spread east, from Anatolia and the Aegean, in the Neolithic and Early to Middle Bronze Ages, regardless of the Sea Peoples Episode in the Late Bronze Age.

From the vantage point of the Pelasgian interpretation of the Sea Peoples, as presented in the preceding section, it is largely immaterial whether there was predominantly an eastbound scenario (as favoured by Woudhuizen), or mix of an eastbound and a westbound scenario (as I propose).

Groups that qualified for inclusion in the Pelasgian substrate community could be found from the Central Mediterranean (Africa Minor, modern Italy, Sardinia, Sicily) to the Aegean and the Levant, and even (in ways that Sea Peoples studies have rather underplayed so far) the Black Sea,\(^{1284}\) the Persian Gulf and Iran, towards the East, and the North Sea and Baltic, towards the North. The concrete evidence presently at our disposal hardly invites us to be more specific than that.

The idea of a gradual progression of the advance of the Sea Peoples along the northeastern shores of the Mediterranean, as developed by Woudhuizen (this volume, Part II), is also in considerable accordance with the way in which, in the Table of the Nations, the major inhabiting groups along that coast are enumerated (Javan [09], Elishah [10], Tarshish [11], Kittite [12], Dodanites [13], Tubal [14], Meshech [15], Tiraz [16]). However, the Lydians only appear as Lud [74], in the context of the descendants of Shem. The placement of the latter in the Table of the Nations, immediately preceding Aram who stands for Syria, leads one to wonder whether, in addition to \(\text{šrdn}\)\(^{1285}\) and \(\text{kn}\), also Lydians may have settled in Syro-Palestine immediately prior to the Sea Peoples’ attack on Egypt.

More in general, the methodological dilemmas of protohistory become apparent here. For on the one hand Woudhuizen’s ‘domino’ sequence of the progression of the Sea Peoples is only hypothetical: it constitutes only one particular possible reading of the scanty evidence. On the other hand, one can only try to corroborate that particular reading by reference to the Biblical Table of Nations if the reading of the latter were unproblematic. That is however far from the case, as Table 5.15 indicates. Many identifications are contested, and the sequence Javan [09], Elishah [10], Tarshish [11], Kittite [12], Dodanites [13], Tubal [14], Meshech [15], Tiraz [16], whose elements are uncertain in themselves, may be somewhat elucidated if one assumes that they too, in their turn, are to be conceived as part of a natural series that presents itself during a sea journey along the northern Mediterranean coast sailing from west to east or, even more likely (since Palestine and Babylonia, where the Table of Nations received its redaction, are East of the Mediterranean) from East to West.

Since the 1960s, a consensus has emerged in Sea Peoples studies to look to the northern shores of the Central and Eastern Mediterranean for the identification of the historic Sea Peoples, and Woudhuizen’s work is in that tradition. In Chapter 2 we have already encountered one major theoretical reason why such an approach should be regarded with suspicion: we have seen that any unique one-to-one identification of an ethnonym or toponym would be implausible.

Perhaps more positive (but equally uncertain) indication of the opposite, westbound, direction of movement for

\(^{1283}\) The Elymians also attach to this pattern, and bring out its distribution over both Liguria and Western Sicily (cf. Ziegler 1979).

\(^{1284}\) On a possible Black Sea connection among the Sea Peoples, cf. Hall 1929; Klochko 1990. There is also the remarkable similarity between Bronze Age hero stelae from the North Pontic region (Vassilkov 2007, with extensive references there) and those of Sardinia as discussed by Woudhuizen above; since the Sardinian ones are dated 1400-1000 BCE, they seem on the average younger than the Pontic ones, and thus constitute another indication of possible Pontic involvement in the Sea Peoples episode – hence for the East-West, rather than the West-East Sea Peoples scenario.

\(^{1285}\) Since the \(\text{s}\) in \(\text{šrdn}\) is conjectural, from \(\text{i}\)\(\text{n}\) it could be only one step to \(\text{lrn}\), which in turn might be equivalent to \(\text{Ldn}\). This argument is admittedly flimsy, because in other Egyptian documents the initial \(\text{s}\) is in fact attested. Anyway, if we would at all be justified to include Lud, that would make four constitutive ethnic groups among the Sea People that also have a place in the Table of Nations we discussed at such length in Chapter 6 – the other three being twrš / twryš / Tiraz, Tarshish; \(\text{dlnw}\) / Dodanites; and \(\text{Wjls}\) / Elīšah, Alasia i.e. Cyprus. Our painstaking discussion of Genesis 10 thus yields rather more concrete results for the study of the Sea Peoples, than merely an exercise in the methodology of Late Bronze / Early Iron Age Mediterranean ethnicitiy in general. If we are thus widening our scope, and in view of earlier misgivings about the common identification of \(\text{ikhwš}\) / Ekwesh as Achaeans, could we suggest that the \(\text{ikhwš}\) / Ekwesh could be identified as Ecaros people in other words Euscara, i.e. Basquoids?
the Sea Peoples may be found. Thus Karst (1931a: p. 468, n. 1) cites the names of Sea Peoples as recorded from Ancient Egyptian sources and transliterated according to the conventions of early Egyptology:

‘Turuša, Shakaruša, Shardana, Akayvaša, Takkara, Ruku-Luku, Purasati’

Insufficiently realising how arbitrary this vocalisation was, and how influenced by the philological conventions of the time (in which Indo-European, including Indo-Aryan, philology was dominant), Karst (1931a: 468 n. 1) cannot refrain from stressing the

‘striking correspondences with Eastern-Aryan or Indo-Aryan templates’

in these names. Admittedly, the correspondence between *tikr* / *Takkara* / *Tjeker* and Tocharian (Karst 1931a: 77) is somewhat tempting. This brings him to explore an, in my opinion somewhat plausible, parallelism between the Sea Peoples’ invasion and that of the Hyksos, several centuries earlier; and to postulate that, like in the Hyksos invasion, an Indo-Aryan dominant group coming in from the North East might also be a likely interpretation for the Sea Peoples. However, also this suggestion must be qualified in the light of the hypothetical five-tiered linguistico-ethnic model that Karst himself has proposed: even in the likely case that the leadership of some Sea Peoples groups was Indo-Aryan, or at least Indo-European speaking, these leaders’ followers would still, in terms of their original linguistic and ethnic provenance, display the wide range of variation typical of proto-globalisation in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean.

For the Aegean, various researchers (mainly non-mainstream ones, such as Bernal 1987-2006, 2001; also Karst 1931a: 581) have, quite plausibly, identified the Hyksos movement with that of Danaos i.e. the Danaos people of ancient legend, to be situated in the Middle Bronze Age, and not to be confused with their alleged descendants, the Danaoi of the Homeric Late Bronze Age. This might take care of the *dliniw* component of the Sea Peoples.

Moreover, the Uralic (including Sumerian?), Altaic, Dravidian, Bantu, perhaps even Austric, reminiscences inherent in the long list of cultural, linguistic and genetic traits associated with the Pelasgian realm, leads us to take very seriously the non-Mediterranean suggestions that are already contained in the evidence from Sea Peoples symbolism and their particular boat types. For the boat with high, symmetrical bow and stern has been attested both in Central European archaeology of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages, and in Mesopotamian iconography of the same periods, and thus seems compatible both with an eastbound (initially southbound) scenario from Central Europe, and with a westbound scenario from West Asia.

Woudhuizen sees his emphasis on a Central Mediterranean component (from modern Central Italy, Sardinia, and Sicily) in the Sea Peoples as an important aspect of his contribution to Sea Peoples studies. The distinctive feature of this approach is not that the Central Mediterranean is made part of in the Sea Peoples’ story – but that it is now made, by Woudhuizen, to feature at the beginning, as one of the places of origin. Woudhuizen here clearly takes position against the view (that has been defended in Sea Peoples studies for over a century now) according to which the Central Mediterranean only features in the aftermath, as one of the ultimate destinations of the Sea Peoples, after their confrontation with Egypt – and specifically as the ultimate destination of the *twrš*, *[?]*irn, and *škrš*, after their undisclosed but presumably Levantine origin, and after their campaign against Egypt.

We have identified as a major problem the question as to how the Sea Peoples, despite their provenance from distant places and their ethnic and cultural diversity (which is undeniable from their names, iconography and their insistence on distinct identities in the aftermath) yet managed to organise into an effective military force operating over considerable stretches of time and space. The solution I propose is fairly simple and far from original: the Sea Peoples could identify with one another as sharing in the

1286 C.f. Cheyne & Black 1899-1903; Frost 1913; Childre 1926; Eissler 1928.

1287 Karst (1931: 536) becomes even more controversial when he sees a link between the pre-Semitic Jebusite inhabitants of Jerusalem and the Hyksos – not surprisingly, because he situates the Hyksos in 1800 BCE, as was common in the first half of the twentieth century. Modern dating tends to be lower, e.g. Hein & Janosi 2004, who cite the dates of 1640 to 1530 BC. If we adopt the latter dating, then the Sea Peoples episode is at least some three centuries later, and clearly distinct, but it is quite possible that similar factors as caused the Hyksos movement, were among the principal factors of the Sea Peoples Episode, and to that extent caused a similar direction of movement.

1288 Sicily indeed occupies a pivotal position in the argument on westbound and / or eastbound migration of Sea Peoples. Recent work has sought to offer new interpretations of the Sekelesh / Sikil identity (Gilboa 2005; Vermeulen 2009). It is not as if only as a result of the Sea Peoples’ exploits Sicily entered the network of protohistoric relations: there is continuity between Sicilian and Iberian ceramics, and unique Mycenaean artefacts (golden earrings) found in Sicily, as well as the mythical account of Daedalus, Minos and king Cocalus of Sicily seem to suggests extensive contacts with the Aegean well before the Late Bronze Age (Bernabo Brea 1957).
somewhat amorphous and protean, yet widespread and conspicuous ethno-cultural Pelasgian heritage.

This proposal also seems to have implications for the scholarly consensus that the Sea Peoples’ Episode was an historical event well-defined in space and in time. My analysis in the present argument tends to a more diffuse reading of the Sea Peoples’ Episode: various populations that, in various parts of the hypothetical Pelasgian Realm, found themselves pressurised responded aggressively so as to preserve their cultural integrity, no doubt in combination with a desire of booty. Without wishing to play down the dramatic events affecting Ugarit, Ḫatti and the Nile Delta in the 13th-12th century, and in full awareness of the emblematic value the Sea Peoples’ Episode has assumed (for instance in defining a sub-discipline of Sea Peoples Studies, but also as a watershed between Bronze Age and Iron Age, between protohistory and history, a specialised province for Israeli archaeology, a decisive step in the emergence of so-called European culture which became globally dominant from Early Modern times, etc.), we must not forget that the likely factors of such pressurising have built up over many centuries, and made themselves be felt over a similar period: the growth of distinct states upon the otherwise primarily segmentary Pelasgian realm; the expansion of Indo-European (as the dominant phylum within the Eurasian / Nostratic macrophylum) and Afroasiatic languages and cultures at the expense of other culturally-embedded linguistic (macro-)phyla established in West Asia and the Mediterranean (such as Uralic, Sino-Caucasian, Khoisan, Nilo-Saharan and Niger-Congo); and (the factor explicitly developed by Woudhuizen and his authority Lehmann) the expansion of Urnfielders from Central Europe. In these respects, we must be careful lest the existence of a Sea Peoples industry brings us to view as a very concrete event, well-defined in space and time, what in fact may have been a prolonged and somewhat diffuse historical process, comparable with the centuries of encroachment from Northern Europe, West Asia and ultimately perhaps East Asia, which together with internal structural breakdown finally brought on the end of the Roman empire in 476 CE with the deposition of emperor Romulus Augustus by the Germanic chieftain Odoacer.

28.11. Emerging themes and questions for further Sea Peoples research as suggested by the present study’s theoretical and methodological explorations

28.11.1. Summary and conclusions of this second opinion on Sea Peoples ethnicity

Let me summarise, in conclusion, some of the main findings and leading ideas of my contribution to the present study.

1. There was, nominally (i.e. in so far as an enduring system of names is concerned, supposed to stand in specific mutual relationships vis-à-vis other such names), an ethnic classification system encompassing the entire Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age.

2. This ethnic classification system had emerged, not just at the eve of the Sea Peoples Episode, but in the course of incessant communications throughout the Bronze Age, creating, towards the Late Bronze Age, conditions that may well be characterised as ‘proto-globalisation’.

3. We must try and move beyond the identification of individual ethnic components of the Sea Peoples: the point is not so much identifying the individual groups, but to appreciate the overall pattern of the emergence and subsequent history of a transregional ethnic space. If we give up the search for ethnic monoliths and one-to-one identifications, we will have come much closer to understanding the pattern of percolating, superimposed identities and proto-globalisation of the Bronze Age Mediterranean.

4. Moving beyond the identification of individual ethnic groups is all the more important, since I have advanced arguments to the effect that what mainstream scholarship has taken for granted as ethnic names of constituent Sea Peoples groups, may in some cases be mere nicknames, puns, political and propagandistic stereotypes, symbolic and cosmological mythical designations, of a far more general nature, and possibly referring to widely distributed conditions that in space and
time do not necessarily have to do with the Sea Peoples Episode at the end of the Mediterranean Bronze Age.

5. Much clarity can be brought in Mediterranean protohistory if we adopt the hypothesis (originally advanced by Karst, 1931a) of a four-tiered linguistico-ethnic system that, with all manner of local specificities, was established throughout the Mediterranean. If we take this as our point of departure, any identity that we can name for that region and period can no longer be considered a self-evident monolith, but may be regarded as internally heterogeneous

   a. according to language (with important substrates and subordinated layers continuing to function underneath the dominant Indo-European and / or Afroasiatic speaking layer, which is often that of a recent immigrant class, and numerically rather small);
   b. according to cultural affinities harking back to places of origin elsewhere in or near the Mediterranean; and
   c. according to cultural positions (the cosmogony of the Separation of Land and Water; a segmentary political system tending to amphiktyony; the dyadic rather than triadic cosmology).

The ethnonyms that percolate all across the Mediterranean in the course of centuries, are markers, not of monolithic identity and ethno-linguistic continuity of particular groups over time, but merely of the very complex process of onomastic manipulation and transformation I have outlined in Chapter 2, and amply illustrated in my discussion of the Biblical Table of Nations (Chapter 6). The overall structural setting is one of continuity, movement and exchange. To invest, within this setting, an enormous intellectual effort in the identification of specific ethnic groups, tying them to a specific language and culture, seems to somewhat miss the point, since onomastic manipulation, the hypothetical five-tiered system, and constant movement and re-alignment of ethnic segments render any ethnic group in the protohistorical Mediterranean *hybrid, multi-layered, elusive and protean*. The point is to capture this structure of the overall system in itself. Proteus, as the elusive and shape-shifting marine Greek god at home in the Isle of Pharos before Alexandria, and the presumable guardian of the hidden Helen while a stand-in dummy left her disreputable mark on legend and history, is indeed an apt emblem of the complexities and continuities of the protohistorical Mediterranean.

6. Thus identities and their interrelations do not spring forth, *tabula rasa*, at the eve of the Sea Peoples Episode, but had been developing for centuries by that time – as an important factor in the information flow, mobilisation process and actual politico-military organisation and support of the people participating in the Sea Peoples Episode.

7. Here, parallels and continuation of earlier migration streams in the Mediterranean space take on a new significance: *e.g.* the obvious parallel between the Sea Peoples Episode and the Hyksos migrations, several centuries earlier, suggest that in addition to the eastbound scenario now *en vogue* in Sea Peoples studies, a *complementary westbound scenario* should also be contemplated, while in general we should appreciate that the movement need not necessarily be seaborne and along a west-east axis (either way), but could, in principle, also have involved non-maritime groups from Central and Southern Europe, North Africa, and West Asia. We have identified, as ‘uninvited guests’, various such additional groups with some confidence, guided by reconstructions of the linguistic situation in the Bronze Age Mediterranean. These groups turned out not to be the uninvited guests they would be considered by dominant paradigms; on the contrary, they constituted important linguistic and cultural presences. Thus they contributed greatly not only to the specific *Sea Peoples’* cultural, cosmological, linguistic and politico-organisational resources; they also had brought Pelasgian traits to the socio-political systems (notably, Ancient Egypt) which the Sea Peoples were to confront. Among these ‘uninvited guests’, speakers of Proto-Uralic, Proto-Sino-Caucasian and even of Proto-Bantu have been highlighted, – the latter enabling us to pursue surprising Africanist perspectives onto the Sea Peoples.
8. While the last point reaches back into the Middle Bronze Age and remains limited to the Mediterranean region, part of my argument is based on the following conviction: if we wish to engage in protohistory and to include an emic, hermeneutical dimension to our work, reconstructing and understanding a little-known historical reality through the eyes and the processes of signification of the contemporary actors, we can only do so on the basis of explicit models concerning the worldview of these actors, and the historical dynamics that worldview underwent over time. In order to understand the Sea Peoples as engaging in navigation and the symbolism of white aquatic birds, in which mirror symmetry moreover plays a conspicuous role, I had to engage in arguments on recursion, the hypothetical succession of distinct cosmogonic models in the course of the Upper Palaeolithic, counting systems, transcendence, etc. These have helped to make our points about the Sea Peoples’ worldview with much more confidence and comparative power of persuasion. They also constitute, in their own right, contributions to the reconstruction of prehistoric and protohistoric thought, worldviews, and philosophy.

9. Yet with all stress on the protean and, presumably, multi-tiered nature of ethnicity in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean, we have identified, through the Pelasgian hypothesis, a broad substrate of genetic and cultural affinity, strong, extensive, ancient and elaborate enough to account for the strong ethnic identification between the various constituent groups – without which the Sea Peoples’ effective and concerted military exploits would have been impossible.

10. By focussing on the Pelasgian substrate and its dispersion, at the end of the Bronze Age, into all four directions across the three continents of the Old World, we may recognise the Sea Peoples Episode as mainly one particular, although possibly crucial, phase in the Pelasgian expansion, hence (considering the extreme transcontinental diffusion of the Pelasgian heritage at the end of the Bronze Age) in the establishment of the modern world. The Pelasgian Hypothesis thus helps us to solve the paradox posed by the global politics of knowledge in our time and age. In the face of the truly embarrassing modern history of European, subsequently North Atlantic, colonialism, imperialism, and hegemony, we would much prefer (with Bernal, other Afrocentrists, Oppenheimer, etc.) to lay exclusive emphasis on extra-European centres of initiative in the course of global cultural history. However, the geneticists’ repeated findings to the effect that the Mediterranean (with the exception of the Greeks!) has known a relatively stable population for half a dozen millennia or more, in combination with the evidence concerning the transcontinental spread of many Pelasgian traits from the Late Bronze Age on, persuades us not to throw away the baby with the bathwater. Straddling three continents and focussing on the Mediterranean (hence by no means an exclusively European, White, monotheistic, or Indo-European speaking reserve of nostalgic ideological purity), the Pelasgian realm may be recognised as one of the few crucial centres of Post-Palaeolithic human history, with an enormous impact on all three continents of the Old World, Asia, Africa and Europe – which by this shared impact also are condemned to much greater underlying unity than is commonly admitted.

11. In the process, I have also adduced an additional explanatory factor for such concerted military action as may remain as a historical core (after we have subtracted the mythical, cosmological, propagandistic, etc. artefacts of contemporary sources, as well as the artefacts of modern scholarship). While accepting Woudhuizen’s (and Kimmig’s) Urnfielder push factor, what little evidence we have concerning the Sea Peoples’ socio-political organisation, symbolism and worldview, does characterise them as relatively archaic groups from the wider Mediterranean / West Asian region, resenting the encroachment of the two of the most advanced states of the region, and confronting these states in a bid to retain or regain their economic, political and cultural independence.

We have realised that the entire episode of the mobilisation, exploits, and aftermath of the Sea Peoples constitutes a complex ethnic process, that cannot be simply
reduced to the identification of the nine constituent groups. The real puzzle lies in the identification of the ethnic identification and mobilisation factor, that (against the background of what we have established as the ethnic classification system encompassing the eastern Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age) may have been the backbone of effective Sea Peoples organisation. I believe to have identified that factor with the Pelasgian Hypothesis.

Woudhuizen’s interpretation of the story of Aeneas’ vicissitudes shows that in fact we do possess indications for the fact that fragments of the Sea Peoples continued to identify with one another after their famous exploits. For here we see, in the Aeneas saga, such elements as the mythical suggestion of a certain continuity, or at least the temporary accommodation of strangers being received, accommodated, considered eligible as marital partners, between people boasting Hellenic, Phoenician, Africa Minor and Latian identities. Even though this insight also fits other cases e.g. that of the Etruscans, it is in the first instance confusing, because we are accustomed to look at the Phoenician / Africa Minor complex as primarily Semitic, rigidly separated from the signature (emphatically declared to be Indo-European speaking) of Hellenic and Latian identities. However, already half a century ago Gordon stated the case for taking this distinction much more relative, admitting extensive parallels and interaction between the Greek and the Semitic world, both in the context of Syro-Palestine and of Crete.

In Chapter 2 I sketched a number of possible models of ethnicity. Clearly, the emphasis on cultural distinctive-ness among the constituent Sea Peoples both before and after the Sea Peoples’ episode is too strong than that we can have the African model of nominal ethnicity within an extensive and continuous cultural field (Model 1) – even though I identified scores of Pelasgian traits that together weave a fabric of familiarity and recognition, a continuous substrate culture rather similar to the pattern of ethnic fragmentation combined with extended cultural continuity, which we find in modern Africa. Rather, the initial, pre-mobilisation phase of the Sea Peoples would correspond with our specialisation model (Model 7) or (to the extent to which we allow for a certain imperial presence on the part of Egypt or Ḫatti, in these peripheral nautical communities) a very diffuse millet model (Model 4). During and immediately after the Sea Peoples’ episode, the ethnic models at play would be reminiscent of my immigrant and conquest models (Model 2 and 3), which gradually, as ethnic ten-sions became accommodated and incorporation in imperial systems increased, would have tended to early versions of the millet model that was to remain, for several millennia, the standard format of ethnicity in the eastern Mediterranean.

28.11.2. Envoy

This brings us to the end of my argument. I believe I have managed, in the above, to situate the Sea Peoples episode in a broad, in fact world-wide canvass, whilst appealing to what seems to be a more plausible and comparatively more widely attested explanation of their attacks on Egypt and Ḫatti: not only greed on the part of leaders and followers, but resentment of the encroachment of these states upon their moes of livelihood, resources, cultural identity, and indeed, freedom. I have identified the wide range of cultural traits from which the Sea Peoples could draw in their ethnic self-definition, and explained how this could give rise to the cultural variation and ethnic distinctiveness we detect among them. In terms of the two questions which we have set ourselves on the outset of the present section: (a) what is the nature of Sea Peoples ethnicity and (b) how could they be so well organised as to be militarily effective, I believe to have given consistent answers.

What remains to be done, however, is to vindicate the views in this Chapter 28 (and in the related Chapter 4) against specialist criticism especially from the linguistic side, and to offer a synthesis that reconciles, as much as possible, the apparently incompatible positions of Fred Woudhuizen and myself. These will be the topics of the next and final chapter, which fittingly has been co-authored by the two of us.

---


1290 There have been suspect proposals (e.g. Karst 1931a) to link the various proposed Indo-European cognates of West Germanic frei, free, vrij (in Welsh, Church Slavonic, Old Indian, etc.) with the concept of Pelasgian – a word whose initial consonantal structure would appear to be similar (pVl~ļ = f/Vr~Γr~). In general (cf. de Vries 1958; de Vries & de Tollenaere 1983; van Veen & van der Sijs 1997) frei, free, vrij is considered to derive from ‘own, from one’s own family’, as distinct from slaves who tended to be captives from afar. However, as long as the semantics of the expression ‘Pelasgian’ and cognates in itself remains polysemic, and utterly puzzling (cf. van Binsbergen 2011b), the last word has not been said on this issue. The segmentary, a-cephalous implication of the Pelasgian cultural orientation combines splendidly with a notion of ‘freedom’.
PART IV. THE ETHNICITY OF THE SEA PEOPLES

TOWARDS A SYNTHESIS, AND IN ANTICIPATION OF CRITICISM

BY WIM VAN BINSBERGEN & FRED C. WOUDHUIZEN
CHAPTER 29. TOWARDS A SYNTHESIS, AND IN ANTICIPATION OF CRITICISM

29.1. Introduction

In our Preface we have warned the reader to expect two complementary, but paradigmatically very different approaches to ethnicity in Mediterranean protohistory, and when we compare Fred Woudhuizen’s Part II with Wim van Binsbergen’s alternative interpretation of the Sea Peoples’ ethnicity in the preceding Chapter 28, such a warning appears hardly exaggerated. Against Woudhuizen’s painstaking synthesis (mainly by a detailed analysis of linguistic and archaeological material) of an overall eastbound scenario largely sustained by shared Indo-European linguistic-cultural affinities, there is van Binsbergen’s combined eastbound and westbound scenario (mainly based on comparative ethnography with only a sprinkling of linguistic and archaeological material) in which the process of the Sea Peoples’ ethnic mobilisation is not sustained by shared Indo-European traits but by the mutual recognition of selective ‘Pelasgian’ traits circulating in the centre of the Old World since Neolithic times, in combination with the recognition of a shared history of peripheral encroachment by the states of Egypt – which suggests a Levantine, rather than Central Mediterranean, location for most of the constitutive Sea Peoples groups. This leaves unabated our joint endorsement of the theoretical and methodological perspectives on Mediterranean Bronze Age ethnicity set out in Chapters 2 and 3, and of the lessons to be drawn from their application to specific case studies (the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, and the Table of Nations of Genesis 10) in Chapters 5 and 6. However, our divergence specifically with regard to the interpretation of the Sea Peoples’ ethnicity appears to be so considerable that we cannot simply leave it to the reader to make up his mind and forge, out of these apparently opposed views, a synthesis of his own.

29.2. An hypothetical reader and his possible, dismissive criticism

A major stumbling block, then, and source of confusion in this connection, is undoubtedly what in Chapter 28 is introduced as the ‘extended Pelasgian hypothesis’. In order to clarify matters, let us play the devil’s advocate, and impersonate a highly critical reader reflecting on Chapter 28.

In the eyes of such a reader, would not the ‘Extended Pelasgian hypothesis’ boil down, by and large, to the assumption of a pre-Indo-European substrate in the Mediterranean, as well-known from the relevant literature? Is it not so that in Chapter 28 of this book, such a Pelasgian substrate provides for an overarching (although merely implied) ethnic identity for population groups along the margins of the Late Bronze Age empires? If such a rendering of Chapter 28 would be correct (but we will see that it is not), then it does not really matter whether groups among the Sea Peoples, like for example the Sherden / Shardana, originated from the central Mediterranean, Libya or the Levant: whatever their peregrinations, in Chapter 28’s view they would seem to submerge, in all three cases, in the assumed protean ‘ethnic soup’.

This is clearly a one-sided rendering of the views of Chapter 28 – where a Pelasgian cultural repertoire is identified (backed by demonstrable genetic convergence over the region where that repertoire is claimed to circulate), in such a way that a specific local group would adopt only a selection from this repertoire, and may or may not identify, and militarily collaborate, with other such groups on the basis of the mutual recognition of such a selection. Moreover, the emphasis, in Chapter 28, on culture cannot be equated with language – but we will come to that point later. The expression ‘ethnic soup’ suggests caricature, not detached critical debate. Moreover, our critical reader turns out to overlook the second leg of the argument in Chapter 28: the

1291 Below, indentured expanded text represents the criticism we attribute to our hypothetical reader.
hypothesis that the Sea Peoples’ military exploits were in part inspired by frustration over state encroachment among groups living in the periphery of the sphere of influence of the states of Ḫatti and Egypt; such groups could not just live anywhere in the ancient Mediterranean, and hardly in the central Mediterranean where these two states wielded little power by the Late Bronze Age, but mainly in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Aegean and the Black Sea. In other words, Chapter 28 does not deny the need nor the possibility to localise the respective provenances of the Sea Peoples, but merely argues for different specific localisations.

Yet even our critical reader’s hostile and caricaturing rendering would have to admit that Chapter 28 is correct in positing that the downfall of, for example, the Hittite empire during the period of the upheavals of the Sea Peoples, but merely argues for different specific localisations.

However, our critical reader might still doubt whether a shared ethnic identity functioned like an engine to these processes. For such a reader, it would therefore remain of imperative importance to determine the place of origin of the various groups of the Sea Peoples. Although the evidence on this topic is admittedly flimsy, would it not be reasonable to maintain that only after we have established the origin of these groups in a satisfactory way we can start to address the question of what is specific about their ethnicity? After all, our critical reader might object, there is a world of difference between say Bedouins, or Ḫapiru, in the Levant, on the one hand, and people from Sardinia on the other hand.

Still assuming that our critical reader equates the ‘extended Pelasgian hypothesis’ with the idea of a pan-Mediterranean Pelasgian linguistic substrate, he could easily dismiss the argument of Chapter 28.

For, provided our perspective is that of the intermediate time scale measured in decades or at most centuries, the whole concept of a pre-Indo-European substrate as a working tool for historical reconstruction could be argued to be crumbling as a result of recent research. Thus one of the main pillars of this concept is formed by the assumed non-Indo-European nature of the Etruscan language. In Fred Woudhuizen’s 2008 book on the topic, entitled Etruscan as a Colonial Luwian Language, he has argued at length that such an analysis is incorrect and that the Etruscan language is straightforwardly Indo-European, be it of an Anatolian type. Along this line of reasoning, and within such a relatively shallow time perspective, also the presumed non-Indo-European enclaves in the Aegean region consisting of ‘Tyrhenian’ and ‘Pelasgian’ population groups may seem to disappear like snow before the sun.

Another pillar of the concept of the pre-Indo-European Mediterranean substrate is formed by Ligurian. As already stipulated by Joshua Whatmough in his Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy (Whatmough 1933: 164), but also underlined by others, what we know about Ligurian is straightforwardly Indo-European again, be it this time of an ancient type which Fred Woudhuizen (2010a, 2010b) has recently argued to be most adequately labelled ‘proto-Celtic’. It ties in with the linguistic layer of Hans Krahe’s ‘Old European’ river names, and probably entails a thin but widespread group of very early Indo-European-speaking settlers originating from the North Pontic and / or North Caspian steppes that spread all over Europe, Anatolia, the Trans-Caucasus and the Levant from the start of the Early Bronze Age (c. 3100 BC) onwards. As there probably was a hiatus in the southern Balkans (mainland Greece and present-day

---

Bulgaria) between the Neolithic and the Early Bronze Age, these early Indo-European settlers in this particular region may have come to occupy uninhabited territory and had not necessarily contact with the previous Neolithic population. Only in the Cyclades and Crete such contacts are evident, on the empirical basis of the manifest continuity between the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age periods here.\(^{1293}\)

Such an argument, our highly critical reader might continue, would greatly limit the possible influence of a Neolithic pre-Indo-European substrate on the later Indo-European languages; that limitation applies particularly in the southern Balkans, but, given the early date of the incursion of Indo-European, the limitation may also be taken to apply elsewhere in Europe and the Near East. Therefore, our highly critical reader would have considerable difficulty with a statement like the following, in Chapter 28 (p. 320):

‘Moreover, as we have seen in Chapter 4, some of the Sea Peoples are likely to have spoken languages that were not Indo-European but that belonged to such macrophyla as Afroasiatic, Nigéro-Congo, Sino-Caucasian, or to other branches of Eurasian / Nostratic than Indo-European, notably Uralic, possibly also Dravidian and Altaic.’

29.3. Further clarification and vindication of Chapters 28 and 4

At first sight our hypothetical critical reader’s argument may appear convincing, and may be shared by quite a few of our actual readers. However, it turns out to be based on the kind of fundamental misunderstanding that the confrontation between disciplinary paradigms tends to generate. Every scholarly discipline at every phase of its historic development possesses a limited number of more or less implicit principles on the basis of which the collectivity of members of that discipline may assess the truth, or at least plausibility, of scientific statements within the scope of that discipline (cf. Kuhn 1970, 1977; Popper 1959). The study of ethnicity in Mediterranean protohistory, and specifically of the Sea Peoples, is inevitably an interdisciplinary undertaking. To such an endeavour scholars from different disciplinary backgrounds bring different methods and different paradigmatic frames of reference, on the basis of which they may read the relevant texts from another discipline through the eyes of their own discipline, explicitly imposing a paradigm that is alien to the text’s intentions, and that can easily lead to confusion. One of the main purposes of the present book is to bring about an encounter, before a readership of mainly ancient historians, of the empirical knowledge of Mediterranean ancient history, linguistic and...
archaeology on the one hand, and the theory and method of the social science of ethnicity, on the other hand. As a mode of thought the social sciences are barely a century old. Taking as their point of departure the logic of the social (as a supra-individual, institutional, often invisible and unintended, network of constraints and incentives on individual perceptions, utterances and actions), the social sciences have constituted a radical and often painful break with the individual-centred logic of the humanities including historiography – everything that made up Western scholarship for over two millennia. The specialised research fields of extinct languages, the associated historic communities, and the latter’s socio-political, economic and religious organisation over time, having emerged in the 19th century when the social sciences were non-existent or in their earliest infancy. As a result the sub-divisions of the humanities most relevant for the topic of the present book have initially developed their own, internal, common-sense approach to social processes, and have in more recent decades only sporadically and selectively partaken of the accumulated theories and methods which the specialised social sciences had accumulated in the meantime (cf. Weeks 1979; Trigger 1995; van Binsbergen & Wiggersmann 1999).

Nor is the possible paradigmatic encounter that lies at the basis of the present book, merely one of social sciences versus humanities. Within the humanities, and more specifically linguistics, it also revolves on the attempted accommodation between the more common historical approaches involving a limited perspective in space and time (decades, at most a few centuries; and regions scarcely exceeding a thousand kms across), on the one hand, and a long-range perspective on millennia and thousands of kms, on the other hand.

Finally, two more juxtapositions can be made:

- the familiar one (cf. Reid 1999: 6), in linguistics, between ‘joiners’ (who stress the communality of languages within, and even between, such phyla as Indo-European, Dravidian, Semitic, etc.; and even within, and between, such macrophyla as Eurasian / Nostratic, Afroasiatic, Niger-Congo, etc.): and ‘splitters’, who focus on what distinguishes languages, and concentrate on enhancing the specialist knowledge they have of one language, or a handful of manifestly closely related languages

- and the more problematic one, between those who take for granted the reality of an individual natural language as a self-evident edifice bound within its own lexicon, syntax and phonology, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the view – mainly associated with the philosopher Donald Davidson1294 – which sees such individual, bounded natural languages as retified intellectual constructs of us as researchers, obscuring a multi- and trans-linguistic reality that is much more fluid, complex, contradictory, unbounded, and elusive.

Our hypothetical critical reader, who is clearly a ‘splitter’ and given to the reification of individual languages, appears to have fallen victim to the usual confusion engendered by the encounter of paradigms. But, virtually, he renders us the service of forcing us to make our own positions clear, defending their plausibility, and demonstrating that in fact there is much more convergence between our respective approaches, as co-authors, than would appear at first sight after reading Chapter 28.

Our critical reader concentrates almost totally on linguistics, so let us dwell on that topic a bit longer. His points about the Indo-European nature of the attested, relatively late forms of Etruscan and Ligurian are well-taken (cf. Urbanova & Blažek 2008: 178-181). When these languages continue to be classified as non-Indo-European in the recent literature, it is often in generalising statements from the hands of non-linguists relying on the older linguistic literature.1295

---


1295 One of the first to make the claim that Ligurian river names are to be interpreted in a Dravidian framework, was H. Clarke (1883, cf. 1872). The claim, although completely discarded by linguistic specialists since the 1950s CE, was even repeated in more recent years in contexts where genetic or Indological expertise had to cover up linguistic science fiction (Daniélou 1987: 8; Arnaiz-Villena & Alonso-García 2000: 214). A specimen from the latter publication, where Biblical names are given fantastic Basque (B.) etymologies (ibidem):

- ‘Abraham (Abran = B. Aba-aran = father-valley: The father of the valley) was born in Ur (B. water) (Sumer, B. Su-mer = Fire-land, Land of fire) which was close to the Euphrates river mouth (Persian Gulf). He was going to arrive to Canaan with Sarai (B. Sar-ai = Old-relatives) and Lot (B. Lot = Companion), i.e.: with the older relatives and other companions (of this pilgrimage). Ararat (B. Ara = Land; Arat = There, the land which is there) was the place where Noah’s Ark finally stopped. Bala (B. Balbe = Death; Ate = Door, death’s Door) was the ancient religion of Canaan. Even New Testament words like ‘‘Apocalypse’’ reveal their real meaning when analyzed by using Basque language: Apo = the End; Kali = Death; Tsi = Burning, ‘‘The End in burning death’’. Other Biblical names belonging to ancient ‘‘Usko-Mediterranean’’ languages will be published by us in the fu-
Yet their ultimately being Indo-European may not be the whole story. Apart from the paradigmatic confusion of tongues, our critical reader’s apparent misunderstanding and dismissal appears to spring from another, related, perspectival difference.

This second perspectival difference addresses the different time scales which one may bring to the problem of Sea Peoples ethnicity. As we acknowledge in our joint Preface, this difference also informs our collaboration as co-authors of the present book. Where Fred Woudhuizen looks at decades or at most centuries, Wim van Binsbergen looks at millennia. Well, in a long-range perspective of millennia, it is undeniable that Indo-European was a newcomer in the Early Bronze Age Mediterranean: as an offshoot of the Eurasian / Nostratic phylum, either engendered truly locally (cf. Alinei 2003), or (as our critical reader prefers) as an introduction from West Asia. The Mediterranean has been demonstrably inhabited by Anatomically Modern Humans for tens of thousands of years, and has been recognised as one of the main centres of cultural and linguistic renewal in global cultural history. The relative newcomer status of Indo-European, combined with the current consensus that articulate language emerged many tens of thousands of years BP and is the most characteristic attribute of Anatomically Modern Humans, means that prior languages must have existed in the Mediterranean before the expansion of Indo-European started, from the Early Bronze Age onward. We can only identify these prior languages to the extent to which they have left traces in the linguistic material collected in Western Eurasia in historical times. We must therefore reckon with the probability that an unknown number of now extinct languages of unknown classification were among the Bronze Age languages of our region. In many respects we find ourselves here at ‘the edge of knowability’ (Renfrew 2000). Still, the identifiable languages spoken in Bronze Age Mediterranean would have, in part, belonged to the Eurasian / Nostratic macrophylum, too (e.g. proto-Uralic), in part to other macrophylla (e.g. proto-Sino-Caucasian, proto-Afroasiatic, proto-Niger-Congo, etc.). The complexity of that situation, and its relevance to even the Late Bronze Age, are illustrated by Chapter 4 of the present book.

The relevant section of Chapter 4 was guided by Karst’s hypothesis of the implicitly multi-tiered linguistico-ethnic nature of communities throughout the Bronze Age Mediterranean. This is emphatically no more than a hypothesis. As an hypothesis it is appealing because it is a surprisingly effective explanation for the fact, haunting all scholarly studies of the Bronze Age and classical Mediterranean, that apparently the same linguistico-ethnic name can be found to be applied to communities that appear to greatly differ in modes of production, culture, socio-political organisation, and religion. In terms of his tiered hypothetical model, Karst’s claim is that underneath the late, duly attested Etruscans and Ligurians of the Indo-European speaking type, various substrate layers lurk of pre-Indo-European types; for this claim he adduces ample evidence that, however, is not always convincing and that anyway reflects the now obsolete state of linguistics c. 1930 CE. Yet it is not as if the tiered model is entirely without empirical grounds. The protein attributions of the name ‘Pelasgian’ are a case in point, discussed at length by Karst but, more importantly, by numerous other authors in a voluminous literature discussed in van Binsbergen 2011b. In addition, Chapter 4 has adduced (admittedly fragmentary) evidence concerning proto-Niger-Congo and proto-Uralic presences in the Bronze Age Mediterranean, and hinted at further presences (e.g. the possibility of attaching Austric etymologies to Ancient Egyptian theonyms, cf. Table 28.4, above).

From the late 18th century CE on, Indo-European studies have developed into a splendid field of scholarship, that has exercised great influence on linguistics as a whole. In the same period, the expansion of the Indo-European phylum all over the world has greatly progressed – keeping pace with the colonial expansion (with its attending ethnocentrism, often even racialism) of European nations. As a result, today the greater part of the world (with the exception only of Central, East and South East Asia, and North Africa) has acceded to an Indo-European language official status at the national level. Specialists in Indo-European studies are in great majority native speakers of an Indo-European language. Where Indo-European languages meet with non-European ones (e.g. Basque, Chechen, Turkish) within the same formal political territory, often indentitary politics ensue that make the definition, demarcation and representation of Indo-European far from a merely scholarly affair, but a hot political issue. The nature, history, and place of origin of specific Indo-European languages (Vedic, Indo-Aryan) are currently also the subject of heated controversy about the region of origin of the Vedic scrip-
ters as constitutive of Hinduism – a field to which the prominent Sanskritist Michael Witzel\textsuperscript{1296} has made authoritative and decisive contributions in recent years – albeit that such contributions were extremely unwelcome to Hindu fundamentalists, who clamour for the recognition of India as the natural origin of the Vedic scriptures. Along with Christian roots and ‘Caucasian’ somatics, Indo-European is one of the implicit building blocks of emergent, frail, and (\textit{e.g.} around the admission of Turkey as a member state) contested European identity within the European Union (established only recently, with the Maastricht Treaty of 1993).

Against this background, we have no alternative but to admit that Indo-European is contested space, and that claims as to the Indo-European nature of particular language phenomena in ancient history may potentially have hegemonic and Eurocentric implications. In the study of the Bronze Age Mediterranean and the Ancient Near East, it has been the merit of Martin Bernal’s \textit{Black Athena} project to put awareness of such implications centrally on the scholarly agenda – whatever the factual, methodological and ideological shortcomings that Bernal himself has been guilty of. Nonetheless, we must be very careful on this point, lest we ourselves fall into the ideological trap out of which Bernal has never been able to free himself: there is a world of difference between (a) identifying, as a methodological problem, a possible ideological danger (notably, claiming Indo-European status for a particular language situation on the grounds of the claimant’s own Indo-European chauvinism as an Indo-European speaker); and (b) accusing a particular opponent of having fallen victim to danger (a), simply because his or her results do not agree with our own theoretical preferences, even though the latter may be just as ideological as those of our opponent.

Going back to Karst’s hypothetical, tiered linguistico-ethnic model of the Mediterranean Bronze Age, seems permitted in the light of the increasing consensus in the recent literature (see \textit{e.g.} McCall & Fleming 1999\textsuperscript{1297}) that many more languages than Indo-European were circulating in the region, and that even by the Late Bronze Age the dominance of Indo-European was far from total. And how could it have been, given the fact, for instance, that ever since the Early Bronze Age, and probably long before, Afroasiatic (with Berber, Egyptian, Semitic, perhaps also traces of Cushitic) has not been away from the Southern and Eastern shores of the Mediterranean and some of the islands. Perhaps there is a risk in presenting, as in Part II of this book, an analysis in which the Isle of Sardinia takes pride of place as a proposed Sea Peoples place of origin, whilst at the same time insisting on a shared Indo-European linguistic identity supposedly uniting the Sea Peoples. For if we would do that, we would ignore all evidence (some of which is to be found in Chapter 28; also cf. Piazza \textit{et al.} 1988: 174\textsuperscript{1298}) as to the exceptional genetic and linguistic makeup of Sardinia. That exceptional makeup is best interpreted, with McCall & Fleming, as a remnant population with ‘macro-Caucasian’\textsuperscript{1299} notations in the linguistic field.

In this connection, the classificatory status of the ancient Ligurian language is another bone of contention, and not only for our hypothetical critical reader: was it Indo-

\textsuperscript{1296} In the process, Witzel (1999a, 1999b, 2002) also convincingly identified non-Indo-European substrates in the Indo-European of West and South Asia. This makes it all the more conceivable that the current trend to dismiss such a substrate in the context of the Indo-European of \textit{Europe} may have an ideological element to it – which might be suggested to be Eurocentrism and the ongoing construction of Europeanness, c. 2000 CE; although we should also not underestimate the possible impact of a more recent and parochial concern, notably the institutional defence of Indo-European studies against rival (sub-)disciplines and university departments.

\textsuperscript{1297} True joiners as opposed to splitters, McCall and Fleming display, admittedly, the typical joiners’ tendency towards sweeping generalisations on the ground of somewhat incomplete or somewhat obsolete data, or without much, or any, reference to concrete linguistic examples. Thus they base their claim for the Semitic nature of the language of Minoan Linear A on Cyrus Gordon’s seminal writings of the mid-20th century, which are largely obsolete now (\textit{e.g.} he read \textit{yu-ne} instead of “\textit{WAINU} / \textit{wa}, for ‘wine’"). Such peccadillos, endemic to the long-range genre in linguistic scholarship, may be unforgivable to the splitter. The latter, in his desire to stay with the local and up-to-date facts (which he has at his fingertips), may perceive (\textit{cf. Matthew 7:5}) the mote or splinter in the joiner’s eye, but not the beam of myopia in his own eye, preventing him from seeing the wider, long-range picture in space and time, and from developing the social-scientific and historical imagination needed to make sense of the language phenomena on the ground.

\textsuperscript{1298} Piazza \textit{et al.} 1998 argue that, statistically in other words typologically, both Basques and Ligurians ought to occupy a much more easterly position on the European map than where they are found in historical times – which is in agreement with the linguistic and genetic assumption of a Caucasus association of Basque, but also implies convergence between Basques and Ligurians.

\textsuperscript{1299} \textit{i.e.}, pertaining to the \textit{Sino-Caucasian} macrophylum, comprising North Caucasian, Sino-Tibetan, Yeniseian, Basque, and Burushaski – with probably an extension of Yeniseian in the New World in the form of the Na-Dene languages such as Tlingit, Athabaskan (\textit{e.g.} Dogrib, Eel River, Navaho, Apache) and perhaps Haida. In view of the proposed genetic origin of West Iberian mtDNA Type H from West Asia in the Upper Palaeolithic (Forster 2004), the most likely specific branch of ‘macro-Caucasian’ to apply to Bronze Age Sardinia would be a variety of Basquoid, possibly also North Caucasian.
the Ligurians is the custom of the couvade, cf. Dawson 1929.

1300 Cf. Clarke 1883 and d’Arbois de Jubainville 1889: 26 f., where extensive critical reviews are reviewed.

1301 D’Arbois de Jubainville 1889: I, ii, § 6 goes into some detail concerning the link between Ligurians and swans, and stresses that, in the perception of the Ancients, not the mute swan is meant but the voiced variety, Cygnus cygnus. Modern Liguria is (Fig. 28.9, above) in the extreme north-western periphery of the wintering area of this species (its brooding area is in the extreme north of Eurasia, practically beyond the Ancients’ perception); but the wintering area extends deeply into West Asia, which ancient reports occasionally mention as the Ligurians’ origin.

1302 Ions 1980: 147. Another West Asian trait found among the Ligurians is the custom of the couvade, cf. Dawson 1929.

The significance of this passage lies in the fact that it is these very suffixes that have been the main reason to attribute non-Indo-European status to Ligurian. Only few passages in d’Arbois de Jubainville 1889 indicate hesitation as to the Indo-European nature of the Ligurian language, e.g., on p. 26 (italics added): ‘Les Ligures, ou mieux Liguses, dont une fraction importante a porté le nom de Sikèles ou Sicules, semblent avoir appartenu à la race indo-européenne sans qu’on puisse toutefois rétablir par les méthodes de la linguistique.’

1304 An idea that a few decades later, and in an ethnic reformulation, comes back with Karst (cf. the subtitle of Karst 1930: ‘Les Ligures comme substratum ethnique dans l’Europe illyrienne et ouralo-hyperboréenne’).
‘Following a climate phase marked by low human population densities across the region, any one group that acquired both the general cultural traits that caused it to spread rapidly out of a refugium and the technology to enable it to do so would have experienced rapid exponential population growth in an environment relatively free of competition from other hunter-gatherer groups. Such a group, spreading out northward and westward and possibly eastward as well, would have made a disproportionate contribution to the genetic and linguistic legacy of Europe and parts of the Near East. Other groups even a few centuries slower in expanding in size and range in response to the climate change would have been numerically dominated by the earlier colonists as they left their refugial homelands, given the likely exponential growth rates of these populations. Even at the relatively low densities that hunter-gatherer populations would have been capable of achieving, competition or at least interaction between groups would eventually have become more frequent, and the less numerous (non-Indo-European-speaking) groups would have been much more likely to lose their cultural and linguistic identity among a larger wave of Indo-European-speakers. This scenario may explain the existence of the Basque language group, which may have been a ‘potential’ European dominant that narrowly failed to expand before the Indo-European-speakers became abundant in central and eastern Europe, southeastern Europe, and possibly also most other parts of Europe. The extinct Etruscan, Ligurian, and Iberian language groups may be regarded as further examples of the same. As the hypothetical Indo-European wave spread out in each direction, it can be expected to have gathered up the genetic and linguistic legacies of scattered smaller populations it encountered along its way as each of these began a slightly later spread out of southern European refugia. This process of gathering up may explain some of the current east-west and north-south genetic gradients which now exist in Europe and some of the differences between the present-day branches of the Indo-European family of languages.

It is thus possible that much of the initial (mid-Holocene) range of the Indo-European languages across central and northern Europe, the Balkans, and the Near East was achieved by the rapid spread of a sparse hunter-gatherer wave out of either southern Europe, the Levant, Anatolia, or western Asia, preceding the farming wave.’ (Adams & Otte 1999: 73 f.; italics added)

Also another archaeologist, Robb (1993) admits that the status of Ligurian as Indo-European is undecided.1305

The point is not only whether archaeologists in their treatment of linguistic material risk to miss the latest advances in linguistics proper, or whether specialist Indo-Europeanists are free to stretch their conception of Indo-European ad libitum so as to accommodate unwelcome controversial cases like, apparently, Ligurian. The point is also that from the entrenched viewpoint of Indo-European studies (which, as argued above, is institutionally and even politically highly empowered), or from that of any monophylum academic speciality, we are not necessarily sufficiently equipped to appreciate the historical depth and geographical width of the distribution of hydronyms and other toponyms, whose extreme antiquity and resistance to change has already been noted by linguistics and historians long ago (also cf. Chapter 2).

In hydronyms and toponyms, as in basic vocabulary in general, what can only be accommodated in a monophylum conception at the cost of ad hoc expansion of the definition of that phylum (thus recourse to expressions such as ‘exceptionally ‘ancient forms’, etc.), is often in fact so ancient that it predates the formation of that one phylum at the disintegration of the parent macrophylum – and therefore could not with justification be classified as belonging to that one phylum only. Many Indo-Europeanists appear to be adverse to long-range linguistics and to the idea of macrophyla that could be considered as parents under which ‘their own’ Indo-European phylum would have to be subsumed, and the unmistakable peccadilloes attending long-range approaches (probably also in Chapters 4 and 28 of the present book) hand them the justification for not probing into long-range linguistics any further. If they did, they would realise that Ligurian hydronyms, as so many others from the Western Eurasian realm, need not be understood at the level of a hopelessly expanded conception of Indo-European, because such hydronyms may be so old that they may have transparent Eurasiatic / Nostratic and even *Borean etymologies, dating from before the Indo-European branch of Eurasiatic / Nostratic split off from the parent body.1306 Table 29.1 presents the lexicon of surface

1305 Extensively on Ligurian also cf. Karst 1931a (passim), and 1930, with Faye’s 1931 critical review – hypercritical, in fact, vindictively dwelling at length on the fact that, contrary to the reviewer, the Lotharingian Karst cannot qualify as a native speaker of French …
water in *Borean and its constituent macrophyla. Students of European hydronyms will recognise that many of the familiar names can be subsumed under the Eurasiatic / Nostratic listings in this table (e.g. the cluster Don, Donau, Dniepr under Eurasiatic / Nostratic *dVnV < *Borean TdVnVo, ‘to melt, flow’ – forms that are distributed throughout the Eurasiatic / Nostratic realm (of which Indo-European is only a branch), and that are moreover (see Table 29.2) so close to their Afroasiatic and even Niger-Congo / Bantu counterparts:

*dVn- and *-tόni- / -tόny- / -dūmbē / -dōŋgā,

respectively, that it becomes less convincing, and almost chauvinistic, to insist on the purely Indo-European nature of such forms.

Particularly for Celtic, especially the insular variant, there has been a long tradition (at least going back to Rhŷs 1890 and Morris-Jones 1899) of debate, among historical linguists, about the many traits this language subphylum, although classified as Indo-European within the Eurasiatic / Nostratic macrophylum, appears to share with other macrophyla, particularly the Afroasiatic one. In the

...from Dakar to Kenya, with the exception of the Khoisan speaking area, whereas none of these contexts are primarily informed by a cynegetic (= hunting) mode of production in historical times. The archaeology of modes of production, in fact, allows us to suggest a tentative periodisation frame for such myths (van Binsbergen 2006a) as, typologically at least, pre-Neolithic (for until the Neolithic invention of food production through animal husbandry and agriculture, hunting was, with gathering, the universally dominant mode of production of all humankind). Van Binsbergen 2008 argues how myths reminiscent of the Celtic context may be recognised in South Central Africa – in addition with several others with general Indo-European (cattle theft) and Graeco-Roman as well as Uralic and Altai reminiscences (building a temple from skulls); the cross-model (Chapter 28) explains such cases as disseminations of an essentially pre-Indo-European, Pelasgian package (much of which, however, may have been subsequently adopted by, inter alii, Indo-European speakers).


Vennemann 2002 offers a list of over 60 such features. A major contribution to this discussion was made by the icon of Indo-European historical linguistics, Julius Pokorny (1927-30). We are indebted to George Broderyck (n.d.) on this point. Also cf. Adams 1975; Gensler 1993; Jongeling 2000; Schrijver 2000, 2005; McConne 2005; Isaac 2007. The evidence is simply too extensive to be dismissed offhand by reference to a recent, anti-substrate consensus among Indo-Europeanists. Incidentally, also a recent discussion of a Sino-Caucasian / Basque substratum in Western European toponyms (Vennemann 2007) suggest that we light of all these considerations, our critical reader may be somewhat less inclined to dismiss the claim that the Sea Peoples may have been, in part, non-Indo-European-speaking, and to admit that this claim has an empirical underpinning by much more than a mere Parade-Beispiel. In addition to these considerations reflecting a voluminous literature, there is, less main-stream, Chapter 4’s innovative claim of traces of Niger-Congo / Bantu in the Bronze Age Levant. However, also on this point the, admittedly limited, evidence – but we are in the domain of protohistory here, where data are by definition scanty anyway – is decently presented; it ties in with the rest of the Pelasgian Hypothesis, and with Starostin’s *Borean Hypothesis.

Our critical reader’s position may be further characterised in the following terms: he chooses to concentrate on Indo-European; and tends to see an historical linguistic situation as monolithic, informed by the total, contiguous dominance of one language or language group – whereas according to the multi-layered model adopted in Chapters 4 and 28, the local presence is taken for granted of a plurality of macrophyla and hence the likelihood of substrates (as local attestations of earlier language regimes), particularly in the proto-globalising situation of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean. According to the latter conception, for instance, Etruscan and Ligurian may have ended up (invariably it is the late forms that are attested) as largely or even entirely Indo-European, yet at one time existed side by side with pre-Indo-European (Sino-Caucasian? Afroasiatic?) language forms – which subsequently may be totally replaced by Indo-European (the situation that has been convincingly argued for Etruscan and Ligurian as attested in historical times), or may live on inside Indo-European as a substrate. The attested end result of both models would be indistinguishable, but, arguably, in a long-range perspective of regional language replacement and change over several millennia, the more dynamic, though hypothetical, multi-tiered model appears to deserve at least the benefit of doubt.

(continued p. 409)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Roman</th>
<th>II. Roman meaning</th>
<th>III. Formative</th>
<th>IV. Afroasiatic</th>
<th>V. Semitic-Egyptian</th>
<th>VI. Greek</th>
<th>VII. Aramaic languages</th>
<th>VIII. African languages</th>
<th>IX. References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVLVS₂</td>
<td>weak, post</td>
<td>*gdm IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CVBVS₂  | weak, post | *gdm IV | | | | | | |}

### Notes:
- The table provides a comparison of Roman, Afroasiatic, Semitic-Egyptian, Greek, Aramaic, and African language forms and references.
- The Roman forms (I. Roman) are compared with their respective meanings and classificatory notes from various linguistic and historical traditions.
- The Afroasiatic (IV. Afroasiatic) and Semitic-Egyptian (V. Semitic-Egyptian) columns provide insights into the linguistic and historical contexts of these languages.
- Greek (VI. Greek) and Aramaic (VII. Aramaic languages) columns also offer valuable comparisons for understanding the linguistic interrelations.
- The African languages (VIII. African languages) offer a glimpse into the linguistic diversity and evolution of these languages.
- The references (IX. References) provide scholarly sources for further study and exploration.

### References:
- The references cited in the table include books, articles, and other scholarly resources that are crucial for understanding the complex linguistic and historical relationships presented in the table.
- These references are essential for researchers and students interested in the comparative study of these languages and their historical development.
- The references are compiled from a variety of disciplines, including linguistics, history, and anthropology, providing a comprehensive overview of the subject matter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Synthesis and Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PART IV</td>
<td>Wim Van Binsbergen &amp; Fred Woudhuizen</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>Chapter 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VAN BINSBERGEN & WOUDHUIZEN, ETHNICITY IN MEDITERRANEAN PROTOHISTORY

V = unspecified vowel)

Table 29.1. The lexicon of surface water in *Borean and its constituent macrophyla
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Eurasiatıı / Nostratic: "dVnV", ‘to melt, flow’, the following reflexes are proposed to derive in the various constituent phyla:

Indo-European: "dhen-" / *d[e]n(w)-, ‘to flow’

Tukarian: A tsn-ntär, pp. tsnino ‘flow’, B tseñe ‘river, stream, courant’, tsarnino ‘flowing’ (PT "tsärn") (Adams n.d.: 741, 744); Old Indian: dhadhánti ‘to cause to run or move quickly’, dhánvati ‘id., to move or run’, dhánvati ‘to run or flow’; dhánutar- ‘running, moving quickly’; Latin: fons, fontis m. ‘Quelle’


Kartvelian: *dn-

Proto-Kartvelian: *dr- ‘to drown, to melt’

Georgian: dr-

Megrel: dr-, dən- ‘to disappear, to lose’

Svan: r-

Laz: nət-, (n)dut- 'to disappear, to lose' 


Dravidian: *tund-? ‘, ‘to pour, spill’

Proto-North Dravidian: *tund-; Kurukh: tundnā ‘to be poured out, spill, pour into’; Malto: tundne ‘to spill, shed, throw out as water’; Additional forms: also KUR[ak] tundnā ‘to be poured out, be spilt’, M[a]LT[oo] t ä ndre ‘to be spilt, be shed’. Number in Burrow & Emmenau 1970: 3321

Comments: Cf. Aleut *drjın- ‘drink’?


Still our critical reader may not be satisfied:

As far as linguistics is concerned, the argument in defense of the substrate theory should not focus on roots with a common origin in Nostratic or *Borean, or whatever common ancestor, which, even if correct, is entirely gratuitous. Rather, one should focus on words and linguistic elements which are language-specific for the later representatives of these assumed overarching predecessors. Thus, in order to prove the presence of speakers of Niger-Congo, Sino-Caucasian, Uralic, Dravidian or Altaic in the Mediterranean region, one needs to present words and linguistic elements which bear testimony of linguistic developments like sound changes or morphological features that are typical for Niger-Congo, etc., or that are otherwise language specific. Note in this connection that, irrespective of the controversy between splitters and joiners, by definition there are no speakers of any given language before this language had split off from a common ancestor, because at that time they still spoke the ancestral language.

These are very pertinent remarks indeed, which it would be difficult to dismiss. However, the crux of the Pelasgian Hypothesis employed in Chapter 28 is not linguistic, but lies in comparative ethnography, and is further supported by the genetic evidence that is adduced and discussed at some length. Therefore our critical reader’s sweeping substitution of my Pelasgian Hypothesis with the idea of a pre-Indo-European substrate in the Mediterranean, is largely beside the point – regardless even of whether we consider the idea of such substrates as valid, or as illusory wishful thinking.

Our critical readers’ tacit substitution of the comparative ethnographic by a linguistic argument has severely distorting effects – for having made this substitution, he can now concentrate on the claimed absence of such a substrate in the attested, late forms, and thus dismiss – on grounds that, as we have seen, are questionable, but more impor-
tantly, that are largely irrelevant – the entire re-
interpretation of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples offered in
Chapter 28 as a further development of Fred Woudhuizen’s
painstaking and detailed analysis in Part II.

In view of the rich and extremely contradictory use of
the term ‘Pelasgian’ from Herodotus to van Windekens and
after (part of that terrain has been covered in my mono-
graph on the Pelasgian Hypothesis, van Binsbergen 2011b)
it was obviously inviting confusion when the term ‘Pelag-
gian’ was chosen to denote the hypothesis of a cultural
substrate, which (as is demonstrated in Chapter 28) to a
considerable extent can also be supported by data from the
field of population genetics. We know that demic diffusion
(tracks spread by an entire population on the move) is not
the only way for languages to supplant each other and to
expand geographically; we also know that linguistic pro-
cesses may to a considerable extent be independent from the
transmission and transformation of other aspects of culture
and of socio-political organisation. For the demonstrable
(cf. Table 28.4) cultural substrate informing much of
Bronze Age West Asia and the Eastern and Central Medi-
terranean, the name ‘Pelasgian’ is as good (although
slightly more confusing) as any other. The claim of Chapter
28 is that such a cultural substrate is diffusely identifiable
(from the selective distribution of combinations of a repertoire
of some 80 traits) throughout West Asia, the Mediterranean,
and (as the cross-model suggests, Fig. 28.16, and as
Table 28.4 argues) even much further afield, with ramifica-
tions in West and North Europe, and across the Eurasian
Steppe into East, South and South East Asia, and even in
sub-Saharan Africa. Chapter 28 is not in the least claiming
that people throughout this vast area were all consciously
and invariably identifying as Pelagian; but it does suggest

(1) that occasionally the recognition of this common
package of cultural traits may have led to ethnic
identification, including the kind of cooperation
suggested by the Sea Peoples exploits;

(2) that when Ancient writers speak of ‘Pelasgian’,
they often demonstrably seek to capture the same
evasive and shifting package of cultural traits that
is also identified by the Pelasgian Hypothesis.

Our critical reader cannot simply dismiss such mas-
sive distributive cultural evidence with the argument that
the idea of a pre-Indo-European linguistic substrate has
been out of fashion among linguistic authors. None of the
80 Pelagian traits proposed are linguistic. The signifi-
cance of the Pelagian Hypothesis for the present book’s
argument lies somewhere else. We know (or can surmise
with some plausibility) very few cultural traits for the Sea
Peoples – which is what makes their ethnic identifications
so difficult. A few traits we can make out for at least some
of the constituent Sea Peoples: e.g. male genital mutilation,
segmentary organisation with leaders as primi inter pares,
symbolic orientation (via bird representations on boats) to
the sea – also as the centre of a very ancient and obsolete
cosmogony. Well, these Sea Peoples traits turn out to fit
surprisingly well into the Pelagian package, and are selec-
tively shared throughout the Pelagian realm. They are dis-

tinctive and may invite (but that is different from: dictate)
mutual recognition of ethnic proximity, as one of the build-

ing bricks of the (otherwise unexplained) Sea peoples ef-

effective military organisation despite their manifest
heterogeneity. Such an approach may claim to be an origi-
nal contribution to Sea Peoples studies, and one that cannot
simply be dismissed on linguistic grounds.

Then again, Chapter 28 has opened up another addi-
tional perspective on Sea Peoples identity, seeing them as
relatively disowned and pressurised groups, not from thou-
sands of kilometres removed (Italy, Sardinia) from the Sea
Peoples’ scene of action in the Levant, but from the very
peripheries of the centralised states they threaten, Hatti and
Egypt. It is argued that their cultural package is relatively
ancient and (from the perspective of these states and their
specific cultural projects) obsolescent, and this makes it all
the more plausible that elements of that package served as
points of mutual ethnic recognition and mobilisation.

29.4. Indications of non-Indo-
European substrates in both
Etruscan and Ligurian

Our argument in this chapter so far has attempted to vindi-
cate the views presented in Chapters 28 and 4 of this book,
and to demonstrate that the matter of a non-Indo-European
substrate in Etruscan and / or Ligurian is less central to our
argument as would appear to be the case from a purely lin-
guistic point of view. However, before offering a synthesis
between the apparently divergent positions of Fred Woud-
huizen and Wim van Binsbergen, and to reinforce the long-
range perspective that has informed much of our book, let
us first reconsider the question of such substrates.

29.4.1. One indication of a non-Indo-
European substrate in Etruscan

We have at least one indication for the presence of a non-
Indo-European substrate in the oldest forms of Etruscan—so old that they may only survive in place names. However, our example concerns probably the most famous Etruscan word in history. It is clear that close relations existed between the Etruscans and Carthage, and probably other parts of North Africa. Woudhuizen claims that the oldest mention of the name ‘Africa’ (i.e. Africa Minor, in other words modern Tunisia) is to be found in a 7th century BCE Etruscan text. On the spur of this connection one might propose to look for an Afroasiatic (Phoenician < Semitic; Berber; or Egyptian) substrate in Etruscan.

Note that in Appendix II, Chapter 24, above, at least four West Semitic words are identified in the Etruscan lexicon. One of these is a toponym, and we know that cults can easily penetrate a language area without any historic substrate being involved; the other three, however, (with the semantics ‘month of the dances’—calendrical notions tend to be very conservative—‘beautifull’, and ‘power’) suggest a basic vocabulary conceivably compatible with the idea of an Afroasiatic substrate in Etruscan.

However, the case is less clear-cut for the mountain name Berigiema, which Whatmough proposed should be translated as ‘snow-bearing mountain’. Admittedly, -giema could be explained by reference to Proto-Indo-European: *

\[\text{gēm-}\] ‘snow, frost, winter\';[1312] reflexes rather close to the Ligurian form can be found in Hittite (giṃ(a)- ‘winter’; Tischler n.d.: 571); Old Greek (khēmma n., khēmōn, -n. m.) and proto-Baltic ("šēm-ā f., "šēm-ia- c.").

However, even if we wish to retain Whatmough’s proposed translation in terms of ‘snow’, (which introduces a circular element, for that translation is predicated on the

1309 Note that in Appendix II, Chapter 24, above, at least four West Semitic words are identified in the Etruscan lexicon. One of these is a toponym, and we know that cults can easily penetrate a language area without any historic substrate being involved; the other three, however, (with the semantics ‘month of the dances’—calendrical notions tend to be very conservative—‘beautiful’, and ‘power’) suggest a basic vocabulary conceivably compatible with the idea of an Afroasiatic substrate in Etruscan.


ences there; van Binsbergen 2008b, 2010c).

etymological fit with proto-Indo-European *ǵʰyem-,
*ǵʰyem-), other Eurasian languages besides Indo-
European appear to offer alternatives, particularly from
Uralic, as set out in Table 29.3.

Also for some other Ligurian words listed by What-
mough it seems advisable to look beyond the confines of
Indo-European to arrive at a satisfactory etymology.

In the name Stoniceli Whatmough identifies the root
q-e, which he sees as cognate with Latin inquilinus (‘ten-
ant’), colo (‘to plow, to inhabit’), and – by a suggestion
from Conway
\[1313\] – Greek πό λος (with a basic meaning
‘round’, ‘to turn’, ‘to revolve’, this word relates to the
world axis, the vault of heaven, plowing, the head; Liddell
et al. 1897, s.v. πό λος). As Table 29.4 indicates, the web
of cognate relationships of this root is very complex, and
encompasses most of the Old World – not surprisingly, for
the conceptualisation of the vault of heaven, its equation
with the human head, the articulation of the diurnal revolu-
tion of the heavens around the celestial axis, and the cos-
mogony of the separation of heaven and earth (hence headhunt-
ing?), were major steps in the development of the,
remarkably widespread and uniform, world-view of Ana-
tomically Modern Humans from the Upper Palaeolithic
period onward (cf. Rappenglueck 1999 and extensive refer-
cences there; van Binsbergen 2008b, 2010c).

Without denying the possible fit of Indo-European to
[Stoni]-e, some of the other phyla do at least as well espe-
cially Uralic. This makes the insistence of an Indo-
European etymology at least over-confident, and also se-
mantically leaves a much wider range of possible interpre-
tations besides ‘inhabited’.

Our final example is that of the Ligurian river name
Porcobera (cf. later reflections on this river name in Krahe
1959; Goggi 1967; Danka & Witzczak 1990; Arenas-
Esteban & de Bernardo Stempel 2005). Gray 1928 does not
dontright reject Whatmough’s reading but reminds us that
in modern times the bed of the river in question has been
dry and devoid of fish. Devoto 1961 supports the tradi-
tional reading of the first segment as ‘bearing’ (also cf.
above, ‘snow-bearing mountain’), but is unconvinced by
the identification of the second segment as ‘perch, river
fish’. Whatmough sees the second segment of this name as
cognate with Greek πό λος, Irish Ṡand Latin porcus
‘perch, a river fish’. Although we might be alarmed by the
fact that precisely the Celtic listing deviates far from the
Ligurian one, this approach has the appearance of a
straightforward and convincing etymology, endorsed as
follows (Table 29.5) by the Tower of Babel database.\[1314\]

Yet such a proposed etymology does not do the cause
of Indo-European much good. If the form in question is
mainly attested in Greek and Latin, and the Germanic
forms are probably first millennium CE borrowings from
Latin, Table 29.5’s claim of a fully-fledged Indo-European
root in its own right may be exaggerated. In fact, the
Pokorny reference brings out that what we have here is not
so much a fish name, but the designation of a surface tex-
ture. Trout, perch and salmon are spotted / speckled or
striped (the two patterns are often interchangeable in ety-
ologies), but so are numerous other animals (including
wild pig – another and more common referent of Latin por-
cus –, leopard, and hawk), which therefore, as Pokorny
clearly perceived (while he graciously adopts What-
mough’s Porcobera etymology), may be subsumed under
the same root or cognate roots listed in Table 29.6.

Part of the background of such emphasis on surface
texture is that hunters / fishermen have the widespread ten-
dency to use evasive circumscriptions for their animal
quarry, mention of whose true name is taboo and invites
failure (cf. Portengen 1915). The point is, however, that
such a designation for a variegated, granulated surface tex-
ture is by no means confined to Indo-European, but en-
compasses most macrophylla, and therefore must be
considered to be older than the emergence of Indo-
European as a distinct phylum.

In Chapter 6 we have already introduced the important
semantic theme of speckledness / granulation can be ob-
served formany animal species and all the phyla and
macrophylla, often with striking lexical convergence as if
we have to do with a very ancient and very persistent phe-
nomenon. In Chapter 6 we have already touched upon this
theme in our discussion of the bright / smooth / even versus
dark / speckled semantics that we argued to underlie the
semantics of the names of Japheth and Ham, not as histori-
cal ancestors but as cosmological concepts, and in Table 19
of the same chapter it came back in relation with Nimrod
(also cf. van Binsbergen 2003d, 2004, 2009: 24 f.). There
we had occasion to point out that one of the principal mani-
festations of granulation in ancient modes of thought has
been the leopard or panther (Panthera pardus). Its habitat
extended all over Africa, the Near East, South, South
East

(continued p. 414)

\[1314\] Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Indo-European ety-

mology’.
### Table 29.3. Alternative Eurasiatic / Nostratic etymologies for Ligurian 'round'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/Phylum</th>
<th>Etymology</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eurasiatic: *kUmV 'sand, thin snow'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altaic:</td>
<td>*kumo 'sand, dust'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkic:</td>
<td>*kum; Mongolian: *kumak' Tungus-Manchu: *kume; Comments: Poppe 68. A Western isogloss, Mongol[ian] cannot be explained as a Turk[ic] loanword, despite Doerfer 1963-67: III, 508-9, Scherbak 1997, 143 (conversely, late Turkic forms like Oyr[at], Kaz[akh] qum[a]a, etc. are evidently &lt; Mongol[ian]).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uralic:</td>
<td>*kumV 'thin snow', No. 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kartvelian:</td>
<td>*ku 'to roll, turn'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megret:</td>
<td>*ku 'to roll, turn'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dravidian:</td>
<td>*ku-vum 'to roll, turn'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altaic:</td>
<td>*kulo 'to roll, turn'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uralic:</td>
<td>*kulka (l.) 'to move, walk'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish:</td>
<td>*kulke- 'gehen, wandern, fahren, sich bewegen'; Saam (Lapp): go'gâ-lg- (N) 'run (of water), float, leak'; kâ-rkâ- (L) 'fließen, rinnen, strömen; sich herumtreiben, vaga-bundieren', kokki- (T), kokke- (Kld. Not.) 'fließen'; Mordovian: kol'ge- (E M) 'triefen, rinnen, sicken'; Komi (Zyrian): külâ- (s), kïl'v- (P) 'stromabwärts treiben (intr.)', külâ- (S), kïl'v- (P) 'mit dem Strom fahren od. schwimmen', kïl'v- (PO) 'auf dem Wasser fließen'; Khanty (Ostyak): kâyl- (V), ko'kol- (DN), kçuqan- (Kaz.) 'spreiten, laufen'; Hungarian: halad-, dial. hallad-'fortschreiten, vorwärtskommen, (allung[ari]sch) sich hinziehen, sich verschieben', halaszt- 'verschieben, verzögern, (allung[ari]sch) anweisen, verweisen'; Nenets (Yurak): kûlû- (O) 'von der Strömung getrieben schwimmen', ? kû (0), kûw (Nj.) 'vom Wasser an das Ufer getriebener Baum'; Selkup: kuremba- (Ta.) 'schwimmen', quj- (Ta.) 'tragen der Strom'; qujà- (Ty.) 'schaukeln, schwimmen'; Kamass: kâl-, xål- 'gehen, wandern' ?; Sammalaisht's version: (FU) 'kulkì'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kartvelian:</td>
<td>*kolver- 'round; scone'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian:</td>
<td>kver-, kvel'swer-a; Megret: kwar-; kwarkwali-a 'round'; Laz:.rar- (7) korka-l a 'frizzle; sheep excrements'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukchee-Kamchatsian: *kavla- 'dance; fly ii; reel ii; swim; whirl'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukchee-Koryaksian: *keLp-; Proto-Iteleman: *kiL-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Illich-Svitych 1965 345-6 (&lt; 332 under 'bodar'), Illich-Svitych 1971-84: 1, 326-7; Dolgopolsky n.d. 1054 *kâl'v 'round, to turn, turn around'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afroasiatic:</td>
<td>*kulâ- (vey); due to an inconsistency in the Tower of Babel database, no reflexes are listed under this, yet explicitly presented, proto-Afroasiatic form, however, the following equivalents are listed, however without being presented as reflexes of Borean *kâl's 'round'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Afro-Asiatic (1):</td>
<td>*gâl'v- 'be round, go around'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semitic:</td>
<td>*gâl'-V- 'go around' 1, 'roll 2', 'round object' 3; Berber: *gâl'V- 'be round'; Western Chaditic: *gul- 'ball'; Central Chaditic: *gâl- 'round'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Afro-Asiatic (2):</td>
<td>*ka/rikar = 545 'circle, ring'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semitic:</td>
<td>*kâkar- 'round bread, disk' 1, *kâkar- 'circula'; East Chaditic: *kâkâr- 'arm-ring'; Notes: Reduplication of *kur- (2398),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Afro-Asiatic (3):</td>
<td>*kur- (be) round</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semitic:</td>
<td>*kur-'ball', Central Chadic: *kwarkvar- 'round' 1, 'around 2', 'encircle 3'; Central Chadic: *kwar-(kware) 'round'; East Chadic: *kar-'rotate, Notes: CF. Dahalo kîr-oo-d 'make in a ball'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Afro-Asiatic (4):</td>
<td>*kVl- 'move'; Berber: *kVl- 'go, march' (Starostin &amp; Starostin 1998-2008 attribute this to a Borean root *kVl'A, 'fat', but it seems more convincing to a consider this another reflex of the Borean root highlighted here, *kVlVl- 'round')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian:</td>
<td>mt, n 'road' &lt;m-kn &lt;*m-kVl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**References:** Illich-Svitych 1965 / 1967: 362; Dolgopolsky n.d.: 1066a *KumV 'sand' (part. alt. + Ur. + ??Chad.).

---

**Notes:**

- **Table 29.3.** Alternative Eurasiatic / Nostratic etymologies for Ligurian *Berigiena* (© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008)
Proto-Afro-Asiatic *(S)*: "KV(\(\text{V}\)) - round object"

Semitic: 'kikār-' encirclement' ; Central Chadic: 'kar- ' arm ring' ; East Chadic: 'ka\(\text{V}\)R- ' arm bracelet' ; Notes: Scarce data.

Sino-Caucasian: "\(\text{gaw} \) (\(\text{G}w\)) - round object; skull"

North Caucasian: "\(\text{gwi} \) (\(\text{Gwi}\)) - round object; skull"

Proto-Avaro-Andian: "\(\text{g}r\) Vng' V- ; Proto-Tsezian: "\(\text{g}i\) i g\(\text{ti}\) L- ('-o)' ; Proto-Lak: \(\text{k}\)\(\text{R}\); Proto-Lezghian: "\(\text{k}\)\(\text{U}\)\(\text{R}\); Notes: An expressive root with some uncertainty about the medial resonant. It must be distinguished from 'g/i g\(\text{aw}\) V - round' q.v.

Yeniseian: "\(\text{k}\)\(\text{q}\) (\(\text{G}\)\(\text{Q}\)) - head"

Kat: \(\text{kn} \) j\(\text{a}\) ; Arin: k\(\text{ka}\) ; Pumpokol: k\(\text{ol}\)

Comments and references: Different in Starostin 1989: 56.

References: Illich-Svitych 1965/1967: 345-6 (+ 332 under 'b\(\text{ro}\)d\(\text{it} \)'); Illich-Svitych 1971-84: 1, 326; Bengtson & Ruhlen 1994: 23

*kol* (= NS) (Although Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008 do not make the connection, there is much to be said for extending the web of cognate relationships of *KV\(\text{V}\)\(\text{R}\)\(\text{U} \)k to proto-Bantu *-k\(\text{udung}- 6.3,' making round and smooth by rubbing' ).

Table 29.4. Global etymologies possibly informing Ligurian *Stoni*celi (© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Long-range etymology’)

Table 29.5 Proposed narrow Indo-European etymology of Ligurian *porco-* (© Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Indo-European etymology’)

Table 29.6. Pokorny (1959-69; © Starostin & Starostin 1998-2008, ‘Pokorny’s dictionary’): Ligurian *porco-* is probably a name, not for an animal species but for a surface texture

and East Asia until well into historical times. In an extensive study of leopard symbolism in the Ancient Near East (going back to the Neolithic of Çatal Hüyük, Anatolia; Mellaart 1966, 1967) and Ancient Egypt (Stürck 1980), Kammerzell (1994) called attention to two interchangeable roots, *prd* and *prg*, which he demonstrates to inform
leopard terminology throughout this region since Neolithic times, in a way that straddles or transcends the habitual distinction between Indo-European and Afroasiatic. Similar affinities are studied in Ray (1992). Unaware of the significance of the number four in the general context of finities are studied in Ray (1992). Unaware of the rain, stars, impurity, and feminine gender subordination, the centrally determining semantic factor – often evocative of rain, stars, impurity, and feminine gender subordination. While Kammerzell already demonstrates the range of the emerging, recursive post-Palaeolithic modes of thought (as discussed in Chapter 6 above), Kammerzell lays too much emphasis on number-four symbolism that happens to surface in the Egyptian case (treating the leopard, with its four-pronged claws, as a ‘four’ animal, inviting earth symbolism, etc.); so he underplays the granulation / speckled element as the centrally determining semantic factor – often evocative of rain, stars, impurity, and feminine gender subordination.

As the views of Chapter 28, we are sufficiently equipped to take a relative view of the differences between Part III and Chapter 28 – differences that at first glance may appear to drive us as co-authors apart. Let us conclude our book with an explicit balance sheet, that states not so much our several points of disagreement and the many general points of uncertainty characteristic of protohistory, but especially points of convergence, by which we hope to make a meaningful contribution to Sea Peoples studies.

For this purpose, the following diagrams summarily set out the models of Sea Peoples provenance and mobilisation as advanced in the arguments of Part II (Fred Woudhuizen), and Chapter 28 (Wim van Binsbergen).

From these diagrams it is manifest that the agreement between our respective approaches is much greater than our differences. For the Eastern Mediterranean, our respective approaches yield the same positive result. For the Central Mediterranean areas as Sea Peoples provenances proposed by Woudhuizen, no support is offered by (a) van Binsbergen’s stress on peripheral revolt against encroaching statehood, however (b) since these Central Mediterranean regions fall within the proposed Pelasgian Realm, his Pelasgian hypothesis does make it conceivable that these areas were secondarily drawn into the Sea Peoples mobilisa-

---

tion process on the basis of mutually recognised cultural traits from among the Pelasgian package – thus potentially salvaging Woudhuizen’s eastbound scenario.

If we could decide that such a compromise offers the best interpretational options, further reflection and re-analysis of empirical data would still be required in order to determine the actual format for such a Westerly involvement in the Sea Peoples episode. Claiming, at the *emic* level, ‘Pelasgian’ connotations (whatever that may mean) for Central and Northern Italy, and part of the Levant, is hardly controversial – such claims were frequently made by classical authors and were repeated by students of the Pelasgian question in modern times. Anyway, imposing the analytical framework set out in Table 28.5, on the *etic* level the ‘Pelasgian’ element in these Westerly locations can easily be demonstrated – not only for mainland Italy but also for Sicily, Sardinia and Africa Minor.

If thus a wider, no longer necessarily West Semitic speaking, context is found in which the later Phoenician-Carthagian links may be subsumed, the dilemma of the eastbound versus the westbound scenario is reduced to choosing between the following alternatives:

1. Pelasgian affinities between the Levant and the Central Mediterranean *pre-dating* the Sea Peoples episode, created, in a manner familiar from ethnic processes all over the world, a ‘reception structure’ that allowed Levantines recognisable by a selection of Pelasgian traits, to find refuge in the Central Mediterranean after the episode (this is the solution advocated in Chapter 28, but also found in sections of Part II notably those on Aeneas).
2. Pelasgian affinities between the Levant and the Central Mediterranean pre-dating the Sea Peoples episode, created, in a manner familiar from ethnic processes all over the world, a ‘reception structure’ that allowed Central Mediterraneans recognisable by a selection of Pelasgian traits, to strike alliances with Levantines at the eve of the episode, and to resettle in the Levant after the episode (this is the solution advocated in most of Part II).

3. Pelasgian traits ended up in the Central Mediterranean only in the aftermath of the Sea Peoples episode – a radical alternative that has so far not been advocated in the present book, and that moreover seems to underestimate the extent to which the Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age displayed the characteristics of proto-globalisation.

However, if greater weight would be given to (a) than to (b), then the eastbound scenario would become less convincing given the great distance separating these areas from Ḫatti and Egypt, making it more likely that Sicily, Sardinia and Etruria acquired, through their names, association with the Sea Peoples episode in the latter’s aftermath, as a result of a westbound scenario. Either way, van Binsbergen’s proposed Black Sea and North African Sea Peoples provenances remain unaccounted for by Woudhuizen’s approach, and thus continue to constitute invitations for further research into the validity of the synthesis contained in the present diagram.

With this synthesis we feel we have made the most of our respective contributions, and can confidently entrust our book to the reader, as an invitation to further develop the fascinating topic of the ethnicity of the Sea Peoples and of the protohistorical Mediterranean in general, in a manner inspired by but ultimately transcending our own views.
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