

THE SEA PEOPLES AND THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE TROJAN WAR.

by Carlos J. Moreu

(Article published in *Mediterranean Archaeology* 16, 2003, pages 107-124)

ABSTRACT

The so-called Sea Peoples were involved in several conflicts at the end of the Bronze Age. The most important occurred during the time of Pharaoh Ramesses III, due to the crisis that took place in the eastern Mediterranean in about 1200 B.C. The inscription on the mortuary temple at Medinet Habu, reporting this event, is written in a very ambiguous style. This is why the text has usually misled the scholars of the crisis. In general, it is believed that a coalition of five Sea Peoples devastated Anatolia, Cyprus and Syria, and then finished their raid attacking Canaan and Egypt. However, further study of data proves that these five peoples, vassals of the Hittites, had their original settlement in some of the wasted lands of Anatolia and Syria. In fact, they had suffered great defeat in their own countries, having to migrate to the Egyptian borders and invade Palestine. Their enemies (or the true attackers in the north) were Mycenaean. These aggressors conquered some coastal lands, at the same time as the Mushki and the Kashka destroyed the Hittite empire. Troy was one of the Anatolian cities attacked by the Mycenaean Greeks, thus the legendary Trojan War has an evident historical background.

1. Introduction

The term "Sea Peoples" has been used by historians and archaeologists to designate a heterogeneous group of nations cited in various Egyptian records of the age of the Ramessid Pharaohs (19th and 20th Dynasties), which were firstly studied by E. de Rougé in the 19th century. However, a variety of names are used in the inscriptions, such as: "the countries of the sea", "countries which came from their isles in the midst of the sea", "warriors of the sea", "the Northerners in their isles"... [1] Some of these peoples are also mentioned in earlier documents from El-Amarna. [2]

Through the Egyptian sources, we know that the so-called Sea Peoples were involved in various crises, which affected not only Egypt but also other areas of the eastern Mediterranean. Since the age of Ramesses II, some of them joined the Libyan tribes to menace the western borders of the Nile. [3] But as is well known, the most serious conflicts took place during the reigns of Merneptah (second half of the 13th century B.C.), and Ramesses III (early 12th century B.C.). If we study the documentation in detail, we will notice that the Sea Peoples acted in each event for different reasons. Furthermore, there was not a common behavior for all the Sea Peoples involved, although several were able to make temporary coalitions. For example, in the case of the so-called Sherden, we find them confronting Ramesses II, but a few years later, they were part of the Egyptian army in the battle of Kadesh. [4] During the age of Pharaoh Merneptah, the Sherden joined a coalition between the Libyans and the Sea Peoples that attacked Egypt again. [5] And in the serious conflicts of the reign of Ramesses III, we find Sherden warriors fighting both on the

side of Sea Peoples and on the Egyptian side.[6] This consideration is important in order to understand the Egyptian inscriptions on the mortuary temple at Medinet Habu, which tell the great final crisis of the Sea Peoples.[7] The ambiguous writing style of those inscriptions, together with the mistaken idea that all the Sea Peoples had the same objectives, may mislead the scholars when studying the great disturbances in the eastern Mediterranean between the end of the 13th century B.C. and the beginning of the 12th century B.C. Although the main subject of this article is just the great crisis around 1200 B.C., it is also necessary to explain the previous events of the year 5 of Merneptah. Then it will be possible to compare this failed invasion of Egypt (regarding the different composition and objectives of the attacking coalition) with the invasion attempts during the reign of Ramesses III.

2. The Campaign of Pharaoh Merneptah

The Egyptian records relative to the invasion of Libyan and Mediterranean peoples in the age of Merneptah are: the Great Karnak Inscription, the Cairo Column, the Athribis Stela and the Hymn of Victory.[8] From these texts, it is deduced that a ruler of Libya called Meryey (son of Ded) had invaded the African land of Tehenu with the help of a five Sea-People league. It was constituted by the Ekwesh, Teresh, Lukka, Sherden and Shekelesh.[9] Later, and probably taking advantage of their numerous forces, the Libyans attacked northern Egypt together with their allies, approaching Memphis until they were vanquished by the Egyptian army.[10] All these peoples may have come from the Aegean coasts. The Teresh have been related with the "Tyrsenoi", an alternative Greek name of either the Lydians or the later Etruscans.[11] The Lukka are identifiable as Lycians.[12] The Sherden could have their homeland in the area of Sardis, in Lydia.[13] Also the Shekelesh have been located in western Anatolia[14] (they probably came from the Shekha River land). And referring to the Ekwesh, their identification as Achaians is frequent, due to the similarity of both terms.[15] The Egyptian texts specify, however, that they were circumcised,[16] which has inspired some doubts about their Hellenic origin.

In another text concerning this conflict, it is reported that Merneptah sent grain in ships for the survival of Hatti,[17] which leads one to think that the Hittites, settled in Anatolia, were also in a critical situation at that time. The pharaoh stated, referring to the Sea Peoples: "Their chief is like a dog, bringing to an end the Pedetishew, whom I caused to take grain in ships, to keep alive that land of Kheta". The term Pedetishew may refer to an Anatolian region called Pitassa by the Hittites, thus it seems that the cited area had been raided by the same coalition that later joined the Libyans. This interesting information makes it possible to link the attack on Egypt by the Sea Peoples with the problems suffered by the Hittites in western Anatolia during the reigns of Tudhaliya IV and Arnuwanda III. Most of those conflicts involved the "Ahhiyawa", [18] identified by a large number of authors as "Achaians" or Mycenaeans.[19] It is also known that Tudhaliya IV had seized the island of Cyprus (Alashiya), an important seaport on the trading routes of the eastern Mediterranean. Perhaps in this period, a coalition of peoples from western Anatolia, including Ahhiyawa and Arzawa, attacked the island.[20] The datation of the Hittite document relative to this alliance (the text of Madduwatta) is controversial. Although it seems to be written during the reign of Arnuwanda III, it has also been dated to the age of Arnuwanda I.[21]

Nevertheless, it is quite believable that the invasion attempt on Egypt repelled by Merneptah was produced by Libyans together with peoples from the Aegean-western Anatolian area (including Achaians), and in the same period, the Hittites had also confronted some rebel peoples from western Anatolia, joined by Mycenaeans. We can now study the events at the age of Ramesses III.

3. The Campaigns of Ramesses III

At the beginning of the 12th century B.C., the Egyptians had to combat a heterogeneous mass of people who tried to invade their country, as well as other lands usually controlled by them. Among the attackers, there were several Sea Peoples, but we can also find Libyans and Asiatics. The documentation relative to these events is contained in the wall inscriptions and reliefs of Medinet Habu (at the mortuary temple of Ramesses III), and in the Papyrus Harris.[22]

First of all, it is important to consider these invasion attempts as a final chapter in the great conflagration that affected almost the whole eastern Mediterranean. As is expressed in the great inscription on the second pylon at Medinet Habu, the devastation had been generalized in various areas of Anatolia (including the Hittite lands), in northern Syria and on the island of Cyprus.[23] There are several Hittite and Ugaritic documents, relative to this previous conflict, which make reference to a prolonged fight to take control of Cyprus.[24] But before returning to these matters, it is necessary to analyze the Egyptian records.

According to the information of Medinet Habu, Egypt had to suffer four wars against various peoples during the reign of Ramesses III. At the year 5, the Egyptian army combated in the First Libyan War against tribes coming from the west, which may have been supported by some contingent of the Sea Peoples. In year 8, the so-called Northern War took place, in which the Egyptians confronted a coalition of Sea Peoples in two battles. There was a naval battle at the Nile mouth, and a land battle at some Canaanite site to the northeast. The year 11 is the date of the Second Libyan War. And finally, the Egyptians made a campaign (or a series of campaigns) in the Levant,[25] against both Asiatic peoples and Sea Peoples who were settling on those lands.

The temple of Medinet Habu also provides important graphic information expressed in its magnificent wall reliefs. They show the Egyptians fighting against their enemies, and the numerous prisoners captured by Ramesses III. But the scenes, as a whole, represent individuals from different origin, as we can see Libyan, Syrian and Anatolian warriors. The latter look very similar to some allies of the Hittites shown in the reliefs of the battle of Kadesh, at Luxor temple,[26] and to several figures and statuettes found in Cyprus.[27] Furthermore, it is remarkable that some reliefs also represent Hittite prisoners.[28] Another piece of information recorded by one of the scenes, relative to the land battle of the Northern War, is that the involved Sea Peoples also moved overland, traveling on ox-carts with their women and children,[29] which proves that they were emigrating.

With regard to the Libyan wars, there is a relief that shows five rows of captives. Most of them are Libyans, but there are also warriors with the appearance of the Sea Peoples. The annexed inscription states, referring to the pharaoh: "He hath carried captive the land of Temeh, Seped, and Meshwesh, who were robbers plundering Egypt".[30] This leads one to consider the relationship between the Libyans and the Sea Peoples. Studying the role of Libya in the Late Bronze Age, it seems that the African coast, from Cyrenaica to the Delta of the Nile, must have maintained trading contacts with other coastal nations of the Mediterranean.[31] This would explain that the Sea Peoples made alliance with the Libyans in certain circumstances. It is known that a part of the Sherden could have settled to the west of the Delta before 1300 B.C. After being defeated by Ramesses II in the year 2 of his reign, many of them were recruited by the Egyptian army. And referring to the Meshwesh, this Libyan tribe is mentioned by Egyptian sources from the beginning of the 14th century B.C. However, we can notice that a people settled in northwestern Anatolia, the Mysians, had a very similar name, and this suggests some kind of cultural links between Libya and Asia Minor.[32] The Papyrus Harris makes reference to other peoples among the Libyans, such as the Keykesh,[33] a name almost identical to that of the Caicus River, which is also located in Mysia. Therefore, it can be deduced that, at the end of the Bronze Age, people coming from western Anatolia must have settled on the shores of Libya. These foreigners were able to join the native peoples

on several occasions, in order to menace the more fertile lands of northern Egypt (we have already seen that something like this occurred in the year 5 of Merneptah). Referring to the Second Libyan War, the inscriptions at Medinet Habu tell that the Meshwesh had invaded the land of Tehenu, but this invasion ended in an alliance between both peoples.[\[34\]](#)

Now, the situation produced to the northeast of the Egyptian empire was undoubtedly more connected with the great crisis of the eastern Mediterranean (ca. 1200 B.C.).

4. The Northern War

In year 8 of Ramesses III, the Egyptians confronted a confederation of Sea Peoples that menaced Egypt from Palestine. This league was constituted by five peoples: Peleset, Thekel, Shekelesh, Denyen and Weshesh, according to the information from Medinet Habu. The Papyrus Harris names the same peoples with just one exception: instead of the Shekelesh, it includes the Sherden as members of the alliance. These peoples were vanquished in two battles; one was naval and the other occurred on land. It is known, however, that some of them managed to settle on the coastal area of Canaan, traditionally controlled by the Egyptians.

There is an inscription at Medinet Habu, close to the scene that represents the Sea Peoples traveling with their women and children, which states: "The countries which came from their isles in the midst of the sea, they advanced to Egypt, their hearts relying upon their arms."[\[35\]](#) Another inscription, more ambiguous, is written as follows: "The northern countries are unquiet in their limbs, even the Peleset, the Thekel, who devastate their land. Their soul came in the last extremity. They were warriors upon land, also in the sea. [...]"[\[36\]](#) When this text mentions the northern countries, it is referring to the neighboring lands of Phoenicia and Palestine. The Peleset, identified generally as Philistines, settled in Palestine at the beginning of the 12th century B.C., after conquering various cities.[\[37\]](#) Therefore, the inscription tells that Peleset and Thekel (warriors upon land and in the sea) devastated those countries.

But the most important and problematic text referring to the Northern War is the great inscription on the second pylon, which is the one that has given the Mediterranean crisis a historical nature. In fact, the ambiguity of its writing has usually misled the scholars when studying this crisis. According to the translation by Breasted,[\[38\]](#) the main paragraph of the text is as follows:

"The countries --, the [Northerners] in their isles were disturbed, taken away in the [fray] -- at one time. Not one stood before their hands, from Kheta, Kode, Carchemish, Arvad, Alasa, they were wasted. [The]y [set up] a camp in one place in Amor. They desolated his people and his land like that which is not. They came with fire prepared before them, forward to Egypt. Their main support was Peleset, Thekel, Shekelesh, Denyen and Weshesh. (These) lands were united, and they laid their hands upon the land as far as the circle of the Earth. Their hearts were confident, full of their plans."

The most common interpretation of the inscription is that a coalition of Sea Peoples devastated various regions of Anatolia, Cyprus and Syria, settled a camp in the land of Amurru (Syria), and then continued their destructive raid towards Egypt. The league was constituted by the five peoples mentioned in the paragraph.[\[39\]](#)

However, there is another way of reading the text, and after a further study of the available data, it will be revealed as the correct interpretation. It is based on differentiating those Northerners in their isles (mentioned at the beginning of the inscription as the attackers of the five cited lands) from the Sea Peoples who set up the camp in Amurru and advanced towards Egypt (the coalition of Peleset, Thekel, Shekelesh, Denyen and Weshesh). We have to remember that the wall reliefs show the latter as emigrant peoples, traveling with women and children, and not properly as an invader army in campaign. The reason for this fact is that they really came from the Anatolian regions, and perhaps the northern Syrian lands, previously

wasted by those called "Northerners" (whose identity is not specified). Therefore, the peoples who joined in a camp were not the victors of the conflict, but the defeated: a mass of refugees who later moved along the Phoenician-Palestine lands, searching for a territory to settle and causing new destruction in the regions where they encountered opposition. When the text states: "[The]y [set up] a camp in one place in Amor", we can see that the translator was uncertain of the part of the inscription in brackets. What is sure is "... a camp in one place in Amor". But, according to the text, the settlers in the camp could have perfectly been those whose lands were devastated, and not the invaders (the previous sentence exactly refers to the defeated: "they were wasted"). Thus, in a more precise style, the text would be written: "The latter set up a camp in one place in Amor". Finally, it is said that these peoples advanced towards Egypt with the "fire" (the Egyptian fleet?) prepared before them.

Now, the first question that can be asked is: Who were the true destroyers of the five mentioned lands?

If we identify these countries, the first that we find is Hatti (Kheta), whose empire was certainly in ruin at the beginning of the 12th century B.C.[40] The next is Kode, which can be identified as a region between Cilicia and northern Syria (both suffered destruction).[41] Carchemish was the important Syrian city attacked in the same period.[42] Referring to Arvad, this settlement was located on the Syrian coast, but there are other authors who have translated Arzawa (western Anatolia) instead of Arvad, which is more correct.[43] And finally we have Alasa, certainly the island of Cyprus, where the archaeology has revealed that various cities also suffered destruction in about 1200 B.C.[44] As has been previously remarked, several battles took place at that time in order to gain control of Cyprus, but the archaeological data are very clear in pointing out the identity of its final conquerors. They were the Mycenaean Greeks, who settled on the island from the age of the crisis until the Submycenaean period. Therefore, those called by the text of Medinet Habu: "the Northerners in their isles", are also a People of the Sea: the Achaians from the coasts and islands of the Aegean Sea.[45]

Nevertheless, in the corresponding paragraph of this work I shall detail my reconstruction of the crisis, as I do not believe that the Mycenaean were the only invaders of all those lands. Now I want to further argue my interpretation of the inscription at Medinet Habu. If we study the information from the temple referring to the last campaign of Ramesses III, called the "Syrian War" by Breasted,[46] which probably consisted of a series of campaigns for the reorganization of the Levantine borders, we find an inscription together with the scene of seven captive chiefs on their knees.[47] According to the inscription, four of them are chiefs of the Sea Peoples (Peleset, Thekel, Sherden and Teresh), two are Syrian (Amorite and perhaps "Shashu"), and the seventh is chief of Kheta (so he is a Hittite).[48] Therefore, we see that the Hittites, whose origin from one of the wasted countries in Anatolia is unquestionable, could also have spread over Syria and Canaan together with the Peleset and Thekel.[49] It is even possible that they battled together against the Egyptians. It is known that most coastal peoples of Anatolia, and those who lived in northern Syria were vassals and allies of the Hittites, and had already fought together with the king of Hatti at the battle of Kadesh.[50]

Thus, regarding its complete composition, this wave of immigrants and invaders that confronted the Egyptians must have been a consequence of the collapse of the Hittite empire, but not its cause.

Now it is necessary to analyze three of the peoples who moved to Egypt: the Peleset, the Denyen and the Tjeker (called Thekel by Breasted). The temple reliefs represent all these peoples with a very similar appearance. They wear a short skirt, some of them also an armor or cuirass; they have round shields and the characteristic "Philistine" helmet crowned with feathers or, more probably, with leather straps.[51] This appearance leads one to believe that their origin was in the

geographic area of Anatolia-Cyprus, but it is not possible that they were Mycenaean or that they came from Greece, as has been suggested in the case of Denyen[52] and Peleset.[53] The panoply of the Achaian warriors is different, according to their representations in the fresco paintings of Pylos, and in the "Warriors' Vase" from Mycenae[54] (where they appear wearing helmets made of wild-boar tusks or bronze and adorned with long mane tufts).

5. The Peleset

There is a general agreement on the identification of Peleset as Philistines. This people settled in various cities of southern Canaan from the beginning of the 12th century B.C. The archaeological data show that some of those cities, after having been destroyed, were rebuilt and occupied by the Philistines. For example, in Ekron we find that the stratum VIII ended in total destruction, and the next level (stratum VII) is a much larger Philistine settlement.[55]

The material culture of the Philistines is clearly linked with the Aegean one,[56] but it also presents similarities with those of Cyprus, Anatolia and the Levant.[57] It is sure, however, that the Philistine pottery was locally made.[58] This fact is important, together with other data pointed out by T. Dothan and restudied by Barako, relative to the complete absence of Cypriot imports at the Philistine settlements during the 12th century B.C. Nor are there imported Aegean materials in Philistia at that time.[59]

If we also consider that the Philistines had a similar appearance to that of some Anatolians who fought in Kadesh, the first conclusion deduced from all these data is that the Philistines must have come from an Anatolian region near Cyprus, which explains the similarity of their material culture with that of the Cypriots, even after their migration to Palestine. If they produced pottery rather similar to the Mycenaean IIIC:1b style (although some traits are Levantine), it is partly because they had been living previously in the Cypriot-Mycenaean cultural koine of the 14th-13th centuries B.C., which was the origin of the diverse Mycenaean "pictorial" styles.[60] On the other hand, if this People of the Sea did not maintain maritime trading contacts with Cyprus and the Aegean-Anatolian world during the 12th century B.C., once settled in the south of Canaan, it can only be due to one cause. The reason is that the Philistines had left their homeland fleeing from devastation. As their original settlements must have been controlled by the enemies who dislodged them, like Cyprus, they could not establish cordial relations with those regions for a long period. Furthermore, the Hebrew word "peletim", which is clearly an evolution of "Pelishtim" (or Philistines), exactly means "refugees".

Therefore, the most logical place for the origin of the Philistines is an area of southern Anatolia called by the Greeks Pisidia, and by the Hittites Hapalla. Apart from the similarity of both toponyms with the term Peleset, this region was located to the west of Cilicia,[61] close to the island of Cyprus, and not far from the Aegean coast, thus its culture could not be very different from that of the cited neighboring lands.

Now, the Bible links ethnically the Philistines with the Kaphtorim[62] or Cretans. This relation must be older than the analyzed period, when the Cretans were not under the rule of the Mycenaeans, and they could have founded their own mercantile colonies on the coasts of Asia Minor. But the Bible also calls them "sons of Anak"[63], which may mean Anatolians.[64]

Another cultural trait that appears in the Philistine cities of Canaan is the use of a hearth room in their buildings, something similar to the Mycenaean megaron.[65] However, this fact cannot lead us to consider the Philistines as a branch of the Mycenaeans, because this architectonic style already appeared in Anatolia at the third millennium B.C. (specifically in Troy II).[66] Therefore, it is evident that the Philistines had their origin in southern Anatolia and, although they received important cultural influences from the Mycenaeans, they must have been one of the

vassal peoples of the Hittites who were involved in the conflicts of Anatolia and Cyprus in about 1200 B.C.

6. The Denyen

The Denyen have been identified as the Danuna, mentioned in the documentation from the 14th century B.C. found in El-Amarna. They were settled in Cilicia, and perhaps in part of Syria (to the north of the Orontes River).[67] Its name must be related to the toponym Adana, the capital of Cilicia that neighbors Tarsus. Those primitive inhabitants of Cilicia were called Luwians by the Hittites. An inscription from the eighth century B.C. found in Karatepe (Cilicia), which is written in Phoenician and Luwian, relates the city of Adana to a people called Danunim, who lived in that region.[68]

Now, there are authors who have equated the Denyen to the Mycenaean Greeks, due to the similarity of their name with the Homeric term "Danaoi", used in the *Iliad* as an alternative name for the Achaians.[69] This name really came from Greek tradition, as mythology tells that the hero called Danaus traveled with his people from Libya or northern Egypt, passing through Rhodes, in order to found a new kingdom at the Greek region of Argolid.[70] From these legends and from the possible relationship between the Danaans of Greece and the Danuna of Cilicia, there are scholars who have proposed the origin of Mycenaean civilization at the settlement in Greece of colonizers coming from the southeast of Anatolia[71] (thus it is probable that, among the ancestors of the Mycenaeans, there were some people of this ethnic group). Other authors suggest that some Mediterranean people related to the empire of Hyksos (which included Egypt and the Levant) could have dominated the Argolid with the use of battle chariots, giving origin to the legend of Danaus.[72] These ideas are interesting, but they can lead us away from our subject. It is most logical that the Denyen of the inscription at Medinet Habu were the Danunim from Cilicia. And if they were mentioned in El-Amarna letters almost two centuries before the crisis of the Sea Peoples, then they cannot be considered Achaians, as this people had no significant settlement in Cilicia before 1200 B.C. In fact, the Mycenaean presence at Tarsus is highly improbable until the date of the crisis.[73] It is important to remember that the Denyen warriors represented on the walls of Medinet Habu have not the same appearance as the Mycenaeans. Therefore, the idea that those Denyen were Achaian is erroneous.

It has been suggested that the Denyen could have also settled in Canaan after the crisis, and that some of them joined the Hebrews to constitute one of the twelve tribes of Israel (the tribe of Dan).[74]

But the most important conclusion for us is that the Denyen really came from Cilicia. Therefore they were vassals of the Hittites, as the latter considered Kizzuwatna (Cilicia as part of their empire).[75] But, as we have seen, the area between Syria and Cilicia is one of the lands that, according to the great inscription, were wasted during the crisis (the so-called Kode). The city of Tarsus was certainly attacked in that period.[76] This also proves that the most general interpretation of the Egyptian text is mistaken (that is, the idea that the five Sea Peoples who attacked Egypt were also the aggressors in Anatolia), as it is not plausible that the Denyen (at least a part of them) had devastated their own country to later migrate with women and children to Canaan.

7. The Tjeker

The name Tjeker has been linked with the "Teukroi", which is one of the terms used by Homer to denominate the Trojans.[77] Another name used in the *Iliad* is "Dardanoi", related to the toponym Dardanelles. This latter word is also used by the Egyptians, in the so-called Poem of Kadesh, to designate some allies of Hatti: the Derden,[78] who are also identifiable as Trojans (seeing that they are named in the text besides the land of "Mesa", or Mysia, that neighbored the Troad). It is known

that the Tjeker settled at the port of Dor, in northern Palestine, after the crisis. The story of an Egyptian traveler, called Wenamun, places them in this city in about 1100 B.C., reporting that they were pirates.[79] The site of Tel Dor has given materials of the 12th and 11th centuries B.C. that are somewhat different from those excavated at the Philistine settlements. Several pithoi have been found, but there is little Philistine pottery and the Myc IIIC:1b ceramic style is not common.[80] Although the archaeological data from Dor do not provide great evidence, they maintain, at least, the possibility that the Tjeker came from northwestern Anatolia.

The city of Troy, also called Ilios, was burned at the archaeological level VIIa, as a consequence of an armed conflict. This was the conclusion of Blegen, and after the more recent excavations directed by Korfmann, his opinion has not been refuted.[81] On the following stratum (Troy VIIb1), some Mycenaean pottery was found, together with the characteristic local wares.[82] The main part belongs to Myc IIIC style, but there are also a few shapes (Handmade Burnished Wares) that can be dated to the transitional period IIIB-IIIC.[83] Troy VIIb2 began at the end of the 12th century B.C., with several new buildings and the appearance of the so-called Knobbed Ware which is thought to be of Danubian or Thracian provenience.[84] According to a recent restudy of the Mycenaean pottery from Troy, the destruction of the level VIIa occurred in the last years of a transitional period IIIB-IIIC (just at the end of the 13th century B.C.).[85] Therefore, it is contemporary to the great crisis around 1200 B.C.[86]

During the new excavations in the Troad, one of the most important discoveries has been an epigraphic document, which is dated to about 1100 B.C. It is a seal with two names in hieroglyphic Luwian script.[87] As is known, the Luwian hieroglyphics were also usual in southeastern Anatolia.

Now, as it is very plausible that the Tjeker were Trojan, at least some part of them sought refuge in Canaan after the destruction of the town. Their aggressors must have been the Mycenaeans, seeing that this people conquered Cyprus and other coastal regions in the same period. The great inscription of Ramesses III names the land of Arzawa among the wasted countries (according to most translators). Through the Hittite sources, Arzawa was an extensive area of western Anatolia, but perhaps Troy was not included in it. Nevertheless, the Egyptian knowledge of the Anatolian geography could be less accurate than that of the Hittites.

In order to conclude this analysis of the Sea Peoples involved in the war of Ramesses III, it is necessary to also make reference to the other peoples of the coalition: the Weshesh, the Shekelesh, and the Sherden cited on the Papyrus Harris. Referring to the former people, it is difficult to know if they are specifically represented on the Egyptian reliefs. There are scholars who have linked them with Caria, referring to the coastal city of "Iassos".[88] However, they could also have been western Syrians, because an Egyptian name for the Syrians is "Shashu", in some way similar to (We)shesh, and the coast of northern Syria was also plundered during the crisis (Ugarit and other sites). But, of course, the latter identification is only a hypothesis that has to be corroborated with new data.[89] Now, the Shekelesh have a similar appearance to that of the Teresh (probably Lydians),[90] thus I think that they had their origin on the River Shekha or Shekhariya, a Hittite name for the Hermus, among other rivers (the toponym is rather similar to the term Shekelesh or Shekeresh).[91] This region was located in Lydia (Arzawa), which is also a wasted land mentioned by the inscription. The Sherden could have come from the same geographic area (perhaps from Sardis). And it is plausible that some groups of Sherden and Shekelesh settled in Sardinia and Sicily, respectively, naming those islands.[92]

Thus, despite the fact that the Arzawan peoples had allied with the Mycenaeans at the time of Merneptah (ca. 1230 B.C.) in order to raid Cyprus and Egypt, we can suppose that some of them changed their party later and joined a Trojan or Hittite league.

8. The Great Crisis of 1200 B.C.

In view of all studied data, it is necessary to consider the serious conflicts of the Late Bronze Age as a great conflagration in the northeastern Mediterranean countries, which caused violent migrations towards Egypt and the nearby territories. Then it is possible to make a general reconstruction of the historical events.

The origin of the crisis must have occurred in about 1240 B.C., when the Hittites lost control of the copper mines located to the east of Anatolia. This area was finally dominated by the Assyrians during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, due to their victory at the boundaries of Hatti.[93] In order to face this situation, the reaction of the Hittite King Tudhaliya IV was double. On the one hand, he ensured the supply of copper seizing the island of Cyprus, rich in this metal. A later Hittite document, from the age of Shuppiluliuma II, makes reference to that conquest by Tudhaliya IV,[94] surely done with the help of his coastal vassals. And on the other hand, he set up a mercantile embargo against Assyria, which is well known due to the treaty agreed with the King Shaushgamuwa of Amurru. In the latter document, the Syrian ruler is also asked to block trade with the ships from Ahhiyawa.[95] The Ahhiyawa were Achaian, either all the Mycenaeans or only those from a region colonized by them on the coasts of southwestern Anatolia and the neighboring islands.[96] If Tudhaliya IV considered the Mycenaeans as enemies, it is deducible that he also prohibited other coastal peoples, vassals of his, to trade with the Achaians.

The embargo was effective from the domination of Cyprus by the Hittites, because this island articulated the sailing route to the east. It explains the temporary lack of pottery imported from Greece, which occurred in Cyprus and the neighboring coasts during the last decades of the 13th century B.C.[97] The good Myc IIIB:2 pottery was substituted by a poorer quality sequel, usually called "Rude Style".[98] According to Immerwahr, this is clearly an imitation ware locally made in the Levantine regions by artists who were not Mycenaean.[99] The new style was surely created in order to satisfy the eastern demand for Mycenaean pottery during the years of the embargo, since it appeared in the Levant and Cyprus in the second half of the 13th century B.C., just during the reign of Tudhaliya IV.[100]

Therefore, in the last decades of the 13th century B.C., the sailing routes became insecure, and the Mycenaean Greeks must have fallen into a period of decadence, as until then, they had based their rise on trade.[101] Furthermore, they probably had some difficulties to import copper, usually supplied by Cyprus. Internal wars began to take place in Greece, as a consequence of the general crisis of their system. Some palaces were fortified, but even so, several Mycenaean settlements suffered destruction,[102] which may be dated between 1240 B.C. and 1210 B.C. In fact, these problems led to a change of the genuine Mycenaean pottery, from IIIB style to IIIC.

Despite the conflicts, there were cities in Greece that continued to exist in the IIIC:1 period, such as Mycenae and Tiryns. The city of Pylos, however, was completely destroyed. Orchomenus and Gla remained uninhabited during the Myc IIIC, and there were smaller settlements also abandoned by their inhabitants, who migrated to other regions. After the transition to Myc IIIC:1, there was not significant destruction, and there may have been a more stabilized period until the final collapse of Mycenaean civilization in the second half of the 12th century B.C. [103]

At the same time (in the late 13th century B.C.), some Mycenaean contingents participated in great pirate expeditions, in response to the breakdown of their commercial network. I am referring to the first attempt to invade Cyprus, made by the "Ahhiyawa" in alliance with the Anatolian rebel called Madduwatta and the peoples of Arzawa, followed by the attack on Egypt at the time of Merneptah (ca. 1230 B.C.), probably produced by the same coalition, with the support of the Libyans. The controversial text of Madduwatta, concerning his aggressions against the Hittites, must have been written in the short reign of Arnuwanda III (son of Tudhaliya IV), because in this document the Hittite king states that Alashiya belongs to him. Furthermore, a person called Mukshush is named in the text, and we will see

that he could have lived at that time.[104] It seems that the Mycenaeans were trying to evade the embargo, as they might have settled at the Canaanite town of Tell Abu Hawam, where genuine Mycenaean pottery has been found.[105] However, the Hittites reconquered Cyprus very soon, probably at the beginning of the reign of Shuppiluliuma II, who was proud of having vanquished a fleet coming from Alashiya (not necessarily constituted by Cypriot ships) just before invading the island. He had also occupied the coastal land of Tarhuntassa, in southern Anatolia.[106]

But the decisive facts of the great crisis in the eastern Mediterranean occurred during the transition of centuries. At that time, the inhabitants of Greece could have temporarily solved their internal confrontations, and they launched into a campaign whose objective was to recover control over the main trading routes. One of the targets was Cyprus again, dominated by the Hittites and their vassals, but its seizing also required the conquest of the neighboring continental coasts. The other one was Troy or Ilios (Wilusha[107]), a city that could have fallen under some kind of Hittite subjection,[108] and which was the key to trading with the Black Sea. The well-known correspondence between the king of Ugarit and the ruler of Cyprus, both vassals of Hatti,[109] in which they fear the arrival of a hostile fleet, can only refer to the Achaians. They might have started the invasion of the island from the west, with a first settlement in Maa-Palaeokastro,[110] and then managed to conquer the island around 1200 B.C., since the pottery that appeared in the main cities (Enkomi, Kition, Sinda) after their destruction, is authentic Myc IIIC:1 ware, and the new buildings are of Mycenaean style.[111] In fact, the process called by Karageorghis "hellenization of the island" began just in this moment.[112] To ensure its control, the Achaians also attacked Tarsus (where they probably settled),[113] and Ugarit (which was not rebuilt after its destruction).[114] Therefore, they had to dominate the regions of Pisidia, Cilicia and northwestern Syria (inhabited by the Peleset, Denyen, and maybe Weshesh). They also besieged and finally burned down the city of Troy at its archaeological level VIIa, as was evoked by the Greek tradition, confronting the Tjeker and probably other Arzawan peoples (Shekelesh and Sherden). In order to achieve all those objectives, they must have mobilized a big army, although it is not probable that they acted alone.

There were a people whom the Assyrian annals called Mushki and located, in later centuries, at the Cilician area of the Taurus and in the highest courses of the Rivers Tigris and Euphrates.[115] In addition, the bilingual inscription discovered in Karatepe (from the eighth century B.C.), recorded that person called Mukshush (in Luwian) and Mps (in Phoenician), who had founded the Cilician city of Beit Mopsu. This information is closely linked with the Greek tradition, which tells that the Lydian seer called Mopsus (probable eponym of the Mushki) joined Amphilochus, from Hellenic origin, immediately after the fall of Troy, and they led their people to the lands of Pisidia (or Pamphylia), Cilicia and Syria. Mopsus and Amphilochus founded, among many others, the city of Mopsuestia in Cilicia (called Beit Mopsu in the inscription).[116] From all these data, it is deduced that the Mushki accompanied the Mycenaeans in their invasion of southern Anatolia and northern Syria. Now, when the Assyrians mentioned the Mushki, especially in the annals of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., they usually referred to Phrygians. The Mushki might have been some people of Thracian origin, related to the Phrygians, who were already infiltrated in western Anatolia at the end of the 13th century B.C., and who must have joined the Achaians against the Hittites and their allies.[117]

The Hittite empire fell in the same period with the destruction of their main settlements, including Hattusha, the capital city. Upon its ruins, the Phrygians finally settled, although they did it some time after the destruction. Therefore, it is also probable that the attackers were the Kashka, traditional enemies of the Hittites settled to the southeast of Black Sea.[118] According to this, a Hittite army was probably defeated by Achaians and Mushki, enabling the Kashka and perhaps other people (the Phrygians or the Mushki) to invade the central lands of Anatolia.

Finally, all these invasions and destructions caused a considerable wave of refugees, which grouped in a camp in the region of Amurru (Syria). As has been

explained, the defeated Sea Peoples started their migration to the south. Some contingent might have sailed to the land of Libyans, encouraging them to confront Egypt, as long as the main part of the coalition conquered territories in Canaan. Finally, these immigrant invaders also attacked the Nile Delta, in order to weaken the Egyptian resistance to their settlement on lands controlled by the pharaoh. After the Second Libyan War, the Egyptians attacked (once or more times) the Sea Peoples who had infiltrated in the Levant, trying to restore the northern boundaries but being unable, however, to avoid their settlement in Palestine.

This chain of conflicts altered completely the development of the eastern Mediterranean countries, and caused the beginning of their transition from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age.

9. The Historical Background of the Trojan War

From all the narrated events, there is a more significant episode that has been the central theme of the Homeric *Iliad*, considered as the oldest work of European literature. I am referring to the legendary siege of Troy. Despite the discovery of its ruins by Schliemann, who was guided by Calvert,[\[119\]](#) and the archaeological research headed by Blegen, the historicity of this myth has been considered uncertain, following the critical position of Finley.[\[120\]](#) The contribution of Page, however, was to propose an approximate historical context for the Trojan conflict.[\[121\]](#)

The great inscription on the second pylon at Medinet Habu, correctly interpreted, is a document that proves that the Greek legend is based on historical reality. If those called by the text "Northerners in their isles" are the Achaians or Mycenaeans, and it is said that they attacked Cyprus (as undoubtedly occurred) and various regions in Asia Minor (including western Anatolia); if in addition, Troy was taken and destroyed in the same period, and the name of one of the defeated peoples mentioned in the inscription is practically identical to that of the Teucrians (or Trojans), the historical basis of the Trojan War should be beyond all question.

However, this evidence does not mean that the whole story has to be authentic. Of course, there can be a considerable part of fiction in it (for example, it is not probable that the conflict was caused by the abduction of a queen called Helen, who appears to be a poetic symbol of the Hellenic nation). But certainly, the famous legend helped the ancient Greeks to record the great conflagration produced in Anatolia at the end of the Bronze Age.

It is also important to remark that the basic event was considered historical by the classic authors. Perhaps the most interesting source is the work of the Egyptian historian Manetho, titled *Aegyptiaca*, where it is written that the fall of Troy occurred during the last reign of the 19th Dynasty.[\[122\]](#) And that was in the last decade of the 13th century B.C., according to the Egyptian chronology of the *CAH* 's third edition. As we have seen, the archaeological and contextual datation of the end of Troy VIIa is noticeably similar.

Therefore, the mythical Greek tradition can be used as an auxiliary source for the knowledge of the past, although it tells the events in a different style from that used by a modern historian. In fact, the parallels between the crisis of 1200 B.C. and the events narrated by the Greek legends are numerous. First of all, the classic authors told that one generation before the siege of Troy (some 25 years), there were several wars in Greece, such as the first invasion of the Peloponnesus led by the sons of Heracles, which was finally repelled.[\[123\]](#) We have already seen that, in the late 13th century B.C., most Mycenaean cities suffered destruction. With regard to the expedition against Troy, this event is presented as a great conflict in which numerous Greek forces took part, also plundering other cities of Asia Minor. The enemies were not only the Trojans, but also an alliance of coastal peoples from Anatolia (so they were Sea Peoples). After the sack of the town, some Greek heroes such as the King Agapenor of Arcadia, Demophon the Athenian or Teucer, the brother

of Ajax, settled in Cyprus (the island that was occupied by the Mycenaeans).^[124] And referring to the story of the seers Mopsus and Amphilochus, already cited, there is another interesting detail. A Lydian legend tells that the goddess Derceto or Atergata, worshipped by the Philistines and Syrians, was punished by Moxus (or Mopsus), who threw her into a lake of Ashkelon.^[125] Thus the Mushki, allied with the Achaians, dislodged the Philistines from their homeland forcing them to migrate to Palestine.

Other myths tell that two or three generations after the Trojan War, the Heraclids returned in another successful invasion of the Peloponnesus^[126] and it is true, at least, that in the second half of the 12th century B.C., the main Mycenaean cities of Greece were finally destroyed or abandoned.^[127] Nevertheless, the conquests reached by the Achaians, at the decadence of their civilization, enabled a considerable number of Hellenic immigrants to settle, from the Late Mycenaean period, on the coasts of Asia Minor.^[128]

10. The Philistine Pottery

In this last paragraph, I have to make some considerations about the so-called Philistine pottery. As is well known, this special style was a hybrid between some shapes related to the Myc IIIC:1b Close Style (though their quality is not so high) and other Levantine traits (such as the clay and the matt paint).^[129] The typical bird motif must have been an evolution of some pictorial shapes born at the Mycenaean-Levantine or Mycenaean-Cypriot koine of the 14th and 13th centuries B.C.^[130] On the other hand, the Myc IIIC:1b style also used pictorial decorations, based on the same primitive patterns.

If we remark that the Philistine pottery is a style derived from the Mycenaean pottery, and produced by people who were not Mycenaean, I think that it can be perfectly considered, at least in its origin, an imitation ware comparable with the Rude Style, although it becomes a different style later. I believe that the key to its appearance can be found at the settlement of Ashdod. As has been suggested by M. Dothan,^[131] this city could have been conquered by the first wave of Sea Peoples, which attacked Egypt in the age of Merneptah and included the Ekwesh, allied with the Sherden and Shekelesh. Therefore, it is not strange that, after the destruction of the stratum XIV, there was a first phase called XIIIb with genuine Mycenaean pottery. The following level XIIIa shows the arrival of the Philistines, in a new invasion wave also joined by the Shekelesh and maybe the Sherden. Some Myc IIIC ware was found on it (possibly belonging to the Sea Peoples previously settled), besides the specific Philistine pottery. Finally, the stratum XII is a city clearly enlarged by the Philistines. I think that those similarities, between the Philistine ware and the Myc IIIC:1b pottery, could have derived from the imitation of the Mycenaean shapes found by the Philistines in Ashdod (and maybe at other sites of Palestine). Probably the Myc IIIC style was already appreciated in the eastern markets at that time. The later lack of contacts, between the Philistines and the new Cypriot-Mycenaean koine of the 12th century B.C., made the pottery of this banished people evolve apart from its models.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLEN, SUSAN H. 1995. "Finding the Walls of Troy: Frank Calvert, Excavator." *AJA* 99: 379-407.

ASTOUR, MICHAEL C. 1967. *Hellenosemitica: An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece*. Leiden: Brill.

BARAKO, TRISTAN J. 2000. "The Philistine Settlement as Mercantile Phenomenon?." *AJA* 104: 513-530.

BARNETT, ROBERT D. 1975. "The Sea Peoples." In *CAH*, Vol.2, pt.2, 359-378. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- BAURAIN, CLAUDE.** 1984. *Chypre et la Méditerranée Orientale au Bronze Récent: Synthèse historique.* Études Chypriotes 6. Paris: École française d'Athènes.
- BERNAL, MARTIN.** 1987. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization.* 3 vols. London: Free Association Books.
- BITTEL, KURT.** 1970. *Hattusha, the Capital of the Hittites.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- BLEGEN, CARL W.** 1963. *Troy and the Trojans.* London: Thames and Hudson.
- BOARDMAN, JOHN.** 1964. *The Greeks Overseas.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- BREASTED, JAMES H.** 1988. Reprint. *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest.* 5 vols. London: Histories and Mysteries of Man. Original edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906.
- BRYCE, TREVOR R.** 1992. "Lukka Revisited." *JNES* 51: 121-130.
- . 1998. *The Kingdom of the Hittites.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- CATLING, HECTOR W.** 1975. "Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age." In *CAH*, Vol.2, pt.2, 188-216. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CLINE, ERIC H.** 1991. "A Possible Hittite Embargo Against the Mycenaeans." *Historia* 40: 1-9.
- DOTHAN, MOSHE.** 1971. *Ashdod.* Vols. 2-3. *The Second and Third Seasons of Excavations 1963, 1965, Soundings in 1967.* *Atiqot* 9-10, English Series. Jerusalem: Department of Antiquities.
- DOTHAN, TRUDE.** 1982. *The Philistines and Their Material Culture.* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- . 1998. "Initial Philistine Settlement: From Migration to Coexistence." In *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition, Thirteen to Early Tenth Centuries BCE*, edited by S. Gitin, A. Mazar, and E. Stern, 148-161. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- DREWS, ROBERT.** 1988. *The Coming of the Greeks: Indo-European Conquests in the Aegean and the Near-East.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- EASTON, DONALD F.** 1985. "Has the Trojan War Been Found?." *Antiquity* 59: 188-195.
- EDGERTON, WILLIAM F. – JOHN A. WILSON.** 1936. *Historical Records of Ramesses III: The Texts of Medinet Habu.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- FAULKNER, RAYMOND.** 1975. "Egypt: From the Inception of the Nineteenth Dynasty to the Death of Ramesses III." In *CAH*, Vol.2, pt.2, 217-251. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FINLEY, MOSES I.** 1977. *The World of Odysseus.* Rev. ed. New York: Viking Press.
- FINLEY, MOSES I. – JOHN L. CASKEY – GEOFFREY S. KIRK – DENYS L. PAGE.** 1964. "The Trojan War." *JHS* 84: 1-20.
- FORRER, EMIL.** 1932. "Ahhijawa (Ahhijawa)." In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie: Unter Mitwirkung Zahlreicher Fachgelehrter*, Vol. 1, edited by E. Ebeling, and B. Meissner, 53-57. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- FRENCH, ELIZABETH.** 1975. "A Reassessment of the Mycenaean Pottery at Tarsus." *AS* 25: 53-75.

- FURUMARK, ARNE.** 1972. Reprint. *Mycenaean Pottery II: Chronology*. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen. Original edition titled *The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery*, Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen, 1941.
- GOEDICKE, HANS.** 1975. *The Report of Wenamun*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- GRAVES, ROBERT.** 1990. *The Greek Myths*. 2 Vols. Rev. ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- GUNNEWEG, JAN – TRUDE DOTHAN – ISADOR PERLMAN – SEYMOUR GITIN.** 1986. "On the Origins of Pottery from Tel Mique-Ekron." *BASOR* 264: 17-27.
- GURNEY, OLIVER R.** 1975. Reprint. *The Hittites*. London: Allen Lane. Original edition, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1952.
- GÜTERBOCK, HANS G.** 1967. "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered." *JNES* 26: 73-81.
- . 1983. "The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 1. The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered." *AJA* 87: 133-138.
- HAMMOND, NICHOLAS G. L.** 1972. *A History of Macedonia, Vol. 1: Historical Geography and Prehistory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HAWKINS, J. DAVID.** 1998. "Tarkasnawa King of Mira: 'Tarkondemos', Bogazköy Sealings and Karabel." *AS* 48: 1-31.
- HAWKINS, J. DAVID – DONALD F. EASTON.** 1996. "A Hieroglyphic Seal from Troia." *Studia Troica* 6: 111-118.
- HILLER, STEFAN.** 1991. "Two Trojan Wars? On the Destructions of Troy VIIh and VIIa." *Studia Troica* 1: 145-154.
- IMMERWAHR, SARA A.** 1956. "The Protome Painter and Some Contemporaries." *AJA* 60: 137-141.
- KARAGEORGHIS, VASSOS.** 1965. *Nouveaux documents pour l'étude du bronze récent à Chypre*. Études Chypristes 3. Paris: École française d'Athènes.
- . 1990. *Les anciens Chypristes. Entre Orient et Occident*. Paris: Editions Errance.
- KITCHEN, KENNETH A.** 1983. *Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical*, Vol. 5. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell.
- KORFMANN, MANFRED.** 1996. "Troia – Ausgrabungen 1995." *StTroica* 6: 1-64.
- . 1998. "Troia – Ausgrabungen 1997." *Studia Troica* 8: 1-70.
- MÉGALOMATIS, COSIMO.** 1996. "Les Peuples de la Mer et la fin du monde mycénien: Essai de synthèse historique." In *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia: Roma-Napoli, 14-20 ottobre 1991*, Vol. 2, edited by E. De Miro, L. Godart, and A. Sacconi, 805-814. Roma: Grupo Editoriale Internazionale.
- MELLAART, JAMES B.** 1982. "The Political Geography of Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age – Who Lived Where?." *Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft* 19: 372-377.
- MELLINK, MACHTELD J.** 1983. "The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 2. Archaeological Comments on Ahhiyawa-Achaians in Western Anatolia." *AJA* 87: 138-141.
- . 1986. "Postscript." In *Troy and the Trojan War*, edited by M. J. Mellink, 93-

101. Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College.

MOUNTJOY, PENELOPE A. 1998. "The East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaeans and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa." *AS* 48: 33-67.

———. 1999. "Troia VII Reconsidered." *Studia Troica* 9: 295-346.

MUNN-RANKIN, JOAN M. 1975. "Assyrian Military Power 1300-1200 BC." In *CAH*, Vol.2, pt.2, 274-306. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NELSON, HAROLD H. – UVO HÖLSCHER. 1929. *Medinet Habu 1924-28*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1931. *Medinet Habu Reports*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

NIEMEIER, WOLF-DIETRICH. 1999. "Mycenaeans and Hittites in War in Western Asia Minor." In *Polemos: Le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'Âge du Bronze*, edited by R. Laffineur, 141-155. Aegaeum 19. Liège and Austin.

NOËL, FRANCOIS J. M. 1991. Reprint. *Diccionario de Mitología Universal*. 2 vols. Rev. and translated to Spanish by F. LL. Cardona. Barcelona: Edicomunicación. Original edition titled *Abrégé de la Mythologie Universelle ou Dictionnaire de la Fable*, Paris: Le Normant, 1805.

O'CONNOR, DAVID. 2000. "The Sea Peoples and the Egyptian Sources." In *The Sea Peoples and their World: A Reassessment*, edited by E. D. Oren, 85-102. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

PAGE, DENYS L. 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

PRITCHARD, JAMES B. 1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SANDARS, NANCY K. 1978. *The Sea Peoples: Warriors of the Ancient Mediterranean 1250-1150 BC*. London: Thames and Hudson.

SHERRATT, SUSAN. 1998. "'Sea Peoples' and the Economic Structure of the Late Second Millennium in the Eastern Mediterranean." In *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition, Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries BCE*, edited by S. Gitin, A. Mazar, and E. Stern, 292-313. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

STAGER, LAWRENCE. 1993. "Ashkelon." In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. 1, edited by E. Stern, 103-112. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

STARKE, FRANK. 1997. "Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend." *Studia Troica* 7: 447-487.

STERN, EPHRAIM. 1998. "The Relations Between the Sea Peoples and the Phoenicians in the Twelfth and Eleventh Centuries BCE." In *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition, Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries BCE*, edited by S. Gitin, A. Mazar, and E. Stern, 345-360. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

STROBEL, AUGUST. 1976. *Der Spätbronzezeitliche Seevölkersturm*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

STUBBINGS, FRANK H. 1973. "The Rise of Mycenaean Civilization." In *CAH*, Vol.2, pt.1, 627-658. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1975. "The Recession of Mycenaean Civilization." In *CAH*, Vol.2, pt.2, 338-

358. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VERMEULE, EMILY. 1964. *Greece in the Bronze Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WAINWRIGHT, GERALD A. 1961. "Some Sea-Peoples." *JEA* 47: 71-90.

———. 1962. "The Meshwesh." *JEA* 48: 89-99.

WOLFF, SAMUEL R. 1998. "Archaeology in Israel." *AJA* 102: 757-807.

WOOLLEY, LEONARD – ROBERT D. BARNETT. 1978. *Carchemish: Report on the Excavations at Jerablus on behalf of the British Museum*, Vol. 3: *The Excavations in the Inner Town by Sir Leonard Woolley and the Hittite Inscriptions by R.D. Barnett*. Rev. ed. London: British Museum Publications.

YADIN, YIGAEEL. 1965. "And Dan, Why Did He Remain in the Ships?." *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1: 19-23.

YON, MARGUERITE. 1992. "The End of the Kingdom of Ugarit." In *The Crisis Years: The Twelfth Century B.C., From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, edited by W.A. Ward and M.S. Joukowsky, 111-121. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing

Abbreviations

AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AS	Anatolian Studies
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy. Leipzig and Berlin.
KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköy. Berlin.
RS	Tablets from Ras Shamra.

[1] Breasted 1988, 3:§§298-351, §491, §§569-617; 4:§§35-135, §§397-412.

[2] Strobel 1976, 177.

[3] Breasted 1988, 3:§491; Wainwright 1962, 93.

[4] Faulkner 1975, 226; Sandars 1978, 50; Wainwright 1962, 93.

[5] Breasted 1988, 3:§579.

[6] Breasted 1988, 4:§§403-404; Sandars 1978, 158.

[7] Breasted 1988, 4:§§35-135.

[8] Breasted 1988, 3:§569.

[9] Breasted 1988, 3:§579.

[10] Faulkner 1975, 232-233.

[11] Barnett 1975, 367; Sandars 1978, 157; Strobel 1976, 182-190; Wainwright 1961, 89.

[12] Wainwright 1961, 72; Vermeule 1964, 271; Bryce 1992, 129-130; Hawkins 1998, 1.

[13] Strobel 1976, 190-201.

[14] Wainwright 1961, 84, 90.

[15] Sandars 1978, 107, 157; Vermeule 1964, 272; Wainwright 1961, 73.

[16] Breasted 1988, 3:§588.

[17] Breasted 1988, 3:§580.

[18] Barnett 1975, 363; Gurney 1975, 38; Güterbock 1983, 136-138.

[19] Forrer 1932, 53; Vermeule 1964, 272; Güterbock 1983, 138; Mellink 1983, 141; Hawkins 1998, 30-31; Niemeier 1999, 141-155. See also Mountjoy 1998, who has located the settlements of the Ahhiyawa mentioned by the Hittite sources in an area of southwestern Anatolia and the eastern Aegean, establishing definitely their close relationship with the Mycenaeans.

[20] Güterbock 1967. The land of Arzawa included Lydia and Caria, according to Mellaart 1982.

[21] See the reference to the Madduwatta text (KUB XIV 1 + KBo XIX 38) in Güterbock 1983, 133-136, and some commentary in Güterbock 1967, 80. The high datation is accepted by Hawkins 1998, 25, and Bryce 1998, 140-147, 414-415. But according to this document, the actions of Madduwatta, a rebel Arzawan ruler, involved the Hittite land of Pitassa (see Barnett 1975, 363), which is cited in the inscription of Merneptah.

[22] Breasted 1988, 4:§§35-135, §§397-412.

[23] Breasted 1988, 4:§64; Pritchard 1969, 262.

[24] Güterbock (1967) explains the correct translation of the Hittite text KBo XII 38. The letters RS L.1 and RS 20.238, from Ras Shamra, are translated in Sandars 1978, 142-143.

[25] Breasted 1988, 4:§§35-135.

[26] Sandars 1978, 35, fig. 13.

[27] Sandars 1978, 160, figs. 112, 132, 200.

[28] Nelson and Hölscher 1931, fig. 21.

[29] Sandars 1978, 124, fig. 77.

[30] Breasted 1988, 4:§52.

[31] Sandars 1978, 114-115.

[32] Wainwright 1962, 93-94, 99.

[33] Breasted 1988, 4:§405.

[34] Breasted 1988, 4:§85.

[35] Breasted 1988, 4:§77.

[36] Breasted 1988, 4:§44.

[37] Dothan 1982, 295-296; 1998, 151-152.

[38] Breasted 1988, 4:§64. See a copy of the original hieroglyphic inscription in Kitchen 1983, 37-43.

[39] Faulkner 1975, 242; Stubbings 1975, 340; Baurain 1984, 258-388; Mégalomatis 1996, 813-814; O'Connor 2000, 95. The historical reconstructions made by all these

authors are based on the most frequent interpretation of the Egyptian record.

[40] Bittel 1970, 131-133.

[41] Barnett 1975, 370.

[42] Woolley and Barnett 1978, 224.

[43] Pritchard 1969, 262; Edgerton and Wilson 1936, 53, 106-109.

[44] Catling 1975, 209; Karageorghis 1965, 293.

[45] **Nelson and Hölscher (1929, 3-4) considered the crisis as the end of a chain of migrations, which started, a long time ago, with an invasion wave from the Balkans, and continued with the Achaian conquest of Crete.** Thereafter, invaders from Europe fell into Anatolia forcing some elements of the older populations to leave their homes. And finally, both newcomers and vanquished reached the shores of Africa. Referring to the year 8 of Ramesses III, they clearly think that the invaders of Palestine were dislodged from southern Anatolia by the European newcomers. Pritchard (1969, 262-263) explains, with less precision, the same general idea. See also Sandars 1978, 197-202. In her conclusions, the latter author expresses her difficulties to make a clear reconstruction of the crisis. But she suggests, as a possibility, that the invaders of the Egyptian borders moved from Anatolia, Cyprus and northern Syria, because they were harassed by other Sea Peoples, some of them setting off from Aegean ports.

[46] Breasted 1988, 4:§§115-116.

[47] Sandars 1978, fig. 68.

[48] Breasted 1988, 4:§129.

[49] Gurney (1975, 39) wrote: "the Hittites with other peoples fled into Syria in a great invasion which, in conjunction with the Peoples of the Sea, menaced Egypt."

[50] Sandars 1978, 35.

[51] Dothan 1982, 5, figs 1-3; Sandars 1978, 131; Wainwright 1961, 74.

[52] Catling 1975, 242; Mégalomatis 1996, 811; Stubbings 1975, 340. These three authors identify the Denyen of the inscription as Danaans or Danaoi, referring clearly to Mycenaean Greeks, not to the Anatolian people settled in Adana.

[53] Mégalomatis (1996, 813) considers that the Philistines were Pelasgian, coming from the Greek Mainland.

[54] Sandars 1978, fig. 119.

[55] Dothan 1998, 151-152. See also Stager 1993, 103-112.

[56] Dothan 1982, 96; Furumark 1972, 118-120.

[57] Barnett 1975, 373-374; Dothan 1982, 160-172, 292; Sandars 1978, 166.

[58] Gunneweg et al. (1986, 17-27) proved the local origin of the Philistine pottery basing on NAA (neutron activation analysis).

[59] Barako 2000, 515-516; Dothan 1982, 289.

[60] With regard to these styles of Mycenaean pottery (Pictorial and Levantine), see Karageorghis 1965, 201-229.

[61] Wainwright (1961, 77-80) argued that the Philistines had their original settlement at the Calycadnus River in western Cilicia, but this is also the boundary between Cilicia and Pisidia. See the location of Hapalla (to the east of Arzawa) in Mellaart 1982.

[62] *Gen.* 10, 14.

[63] *Jer.* 47, 5.

[64] Graves (1990, 1:292) compiled a Greek tradition on a Minoan colonization in western Anatolia, land originally occupied by a people called Anactorians, who were ruled by "the giant" Anax.

- [65] Barako 2000, 523; Dothan 1998, 156-157.
- [66] Blegen 1963, 64-66.
- [67] Sandars 1978, 161-162.
- [68] Barnett 1975, 365; Gurney 1975, 42-43; Sandars 1978, 162.
- [69] See the note 52 in this work.
- [70] See a compilation of the myth in Graves 1990, 1:200-203.
- [71] Astour 1967, 1-80.
- [72] Bernal 1987, 2:20-98; Stubbings 1973, 633-638.
- [73] Mellink 1983, 141. With regard to the Mycenaean pottery at Tarsus, see French 1975, 53-73.
- [74] Yadin 1965, 19-23.
- [75] Gurney 1975, 43.
- [76] Sandars 1978, 155.
- [77] Wainwright 1961, 76; Strobel 1976, 48-54; Sandars 1978, 158, 170, 201; Mégalomatis 1996, 811.
- [78] Sandars 1978, 36; Breasted 1988, 3:§306.
- [79] Goedicke 1975.
- [80] Barako 2000, 524. See the archaeological data of Tel Dor in Stern 1998, 346-349, and Wolff 1998, 777-779 ("Tel Dor" section by E. Stern et al.)
- [81] Blegen 1963, 161-162; Korfmann 1996, 30-64, and 1998, 35-70.
- [82] Blegen 1963, 165, 171.
- [83] Mountjoy 1998, 53.
- [84] Blegen 1963, 167-171.
- [85] Mountjoy 1998, 46, table I. See also Mountjoy 1999, 297-321, especially 300-301 and table 1.
- [86] Stubbings 1975, 350; Vermeule 1964, 270, 277-278.
- [87] **Hawkins and Easton 1996, 111-118.**
- [88] **Barnett 1975, 377; Strobel 1976, 208.**
- [89] **There is a wall relief at Medinet Habu, relative to the last campaigns of Ramesses III, which shows a Syrian captive wearing the usual skirt of the Sea Peoples (see Sandars 1978, fig. 93), and I have wondered if it could represent a Weshesh warrior, as it is not possible to identify him as a member of any other People of the Sea.**
- [90] **Barnett 1975, 367; Wainwright 1961, 84. Both authors make reference to the head-clothes used by the Sea Peoples, shown in Nelson and Hölscher 1931, fig. 4.**
- [91] **See the Seha River Land in Mountjoy 1998, fig. 7. See also Hawkins 1998, 23-24, fig. 11.**
- [92] **Barnett 1975, 368-369; Strobel 1976, 190-201.**
- [93] **Munn-Rankin 1975, 285.**
- [94] **The text KBo XII 38 is translated in Güterbock 1967, 73-81.**
- [95] **Güterbock 1983, 136. This author comments the text KUB XXIII 1. See also Cline 1991, 1-9, and Stubbings 1975, 340.**
- [96] **Ahhiyawa must have been the Hittite word that meant Achaians in general. Thus, depending on the context of each document, the Hittites can refer to the Greek**

Mainland (i.e. the great kingdom of Ahhiyawa), the Mycenaean colonies in Anatolia, or even both lands.

[97] Cline 1991, 1-9; Mellink 1983, 140-141; Stubbings 1975, 338-341.

[98] Karageorghis 1965, 231, 234-257; Sandars 1978, 153.

[99] Immerwahr 1956, 140. The existence of imitation wares has been also argued by Sherratt 1998, 294-296.

[100] The chronology of the reign of Tudhaliya IV might have been 1265-1235 B.C. (if we consider that the year 8 of Ramesses III was 1190 B.C.). Karageorghis (1965, 257) thinks that the Rude Style appeared in the decade 1250-1240 B.C.

[101] Stubbings 1975, 338; Vermeule 1964, 271.

[102] Stubbings 1975, 350-353; Vermeule 1964, 323-325.

[103] Vermeule 1964, 270, 301-302, 323-325.

[104] Barnett 1975, 363-364; Gurney 1975, 38, 52; Güterbock 1967, 80.

[105] Stubbings 1975, 338-339. I have the hypothesis that the Mycenaeans who attacked Egypt in the year 5 of Merneptah (the Ekwesh), were circumcised because they might have lived some kind of brotherhood with Canaanite people in the Levant, just before sailing to Libya.

[106] Güterbock 1967, 80; Bryce 1998, 364-366.

[107] The Hittite name Wilusha has been equated with Troy and the Troad by Starke (1997, 447-487). See also Hawkins 1998, 23, fig. 11, and Niemeier 1999, 143.

[108] The Hittite King Muwatalli II concluded a treaty with Alakshandu, ruler of Wilusha (see Bryce 1998, 246-248), and during the time of Tudhaliya IV, the Trojan kingdom appears to be a vassal of the Hittites, as this monarch sent some documents in order to restore a deposed king called Walmu to his throne of Wilusha (see the Milawata letter, KUB XIX 55 + KUB XLVIII 90, in Bryce 1998, 341-342).

[109] The letters from Ras Shamra are translated in Sandars 1978, 142-143.

[110] Karageorghis 1990, 103.

[111] Barnett 1975, 370; Dothan 1982, 292; Vermeule 1964, 302.

[112] Karageorghis 1990, 103-107.

[113] Sandars (1978, 155) believes that most of those aggressors came from Rhodes and Kos, and Vermeule (1964, 302) clearly identifies them as Mycenaeans. The Myc IIIC pottery found at Tarsus is explained by French (1975, 53-75).

[114] With regard to the end of Ugarit, see Yon 1992, 111-121. The destroyers of Ras Shamra must have been the same people that conquered Cyprus, according to the Ugaritic sources. The city was not rebuilt, but at the nearby royal residence of Ras Ibn Hani, a group of settlers with Myc III:C1b pottery reoccupied the site. This pottery has clear stylistic affinities to the Mycenaean wares of Greece and Cyprus (see Barako 2000, 521-522, reading also his footnote 65).

[115] Bittel 1970, 133-136.

[116] Barnett 1975, 363-366; Sandars 1978, 162; Stubbings 1975, 355.

[117] I think that Madduwatta lived in the age of the last kings of Hatti. As the text of Madduwatta makes reference to Mukshush, a chief who participated in his raids (see Barnett 1975, 363), it is possible that Madduwatta had ruled, among other nations, the people whom the Assyrians later called Mushki (that is, the followers of Mopsus-Mukshush). However, it is remarkable that another mythical hero named Mopsus was a king of the Thracians, according to Diodorus Siculus (see Graves 1990, 2:129).

[118] Bittel 1970, 134-139. The successors of the Hittites in central Anatolia have

been studied by Bryce 1998, 386-389, basing on several documents written after the fall of Hattusha.

[119] Allen 1995, 379-380.

[120] Finley 1977, 180-217 (See the appendix II of his book). See also Finley et al. 1964, 1-20.

[121] Page 1959; Finley et al. 1964. For other approaches to the "Trojan question", see also Easton 1985, 188-195; Mellink 1986, 97-101; Hiller 1991, 145-154; Bryce 1998, 392-404.

[122] See the paragraph relative to the 19th Dynasty in the Epitome of this classical work. The reign of the Pharaoh called "Thuoris" can be equated with the age of Siptah or, more accurately, with the rule of his step-mother, the Queen Twosret.

[123] See a compilation of this myth in Graves 1990, 2:207-208.

[124] See a compilation of the epical Trojan War in Graves 1990, 2:268-354.

[125] Noël (1991, 1:181, 2:913) compiled in his dictionary of myths (Atergata and Mopso.6) this legend originally narrated by the Lydian historian Xanthus. See also Graves 1990, 1:302.

[126] See a compilation in Graves 1990, 2:209-210.

[127] Some archaeological signs of a plausible invasion from the northwest of Greece have been studied by Hammond (1972, 405-407). However, a debate over the Dorian invasion still remains at present. See also Drews 1988, 203-225.

[128] Boardman 1964, 39-56.

[129] Dothan 1982, 96; Furumark 1972, 118-121; Sandars 1978, 166-167.

[130] Furumark 1972, 119; Karageorghis 1965, 203-224.

[131] (Dothan 1971) is cited by Sandars (1978, 170-171), who summarizes the archaeological data studied by the excavator in Ashdod. See also Dothan 1982, 295.