## **Donald Redford**

## THE TJEKER

In recent studies on the Sea Peoples, a consensus seems to be emerging that the ethnonym known as the Si - k3 - r is to be identified with the  $\Sigma \iota \kappa \epsilon \lambda o \epsilon$  (Albright 1934: 65; Rainey 1982: 134; Edel 1984: 7; Görg 1985: 7–8; Singer 1988: 2000, to name but a few). There are, however, counter-arguments yet to be heard. First, to introduce Sicels in the  $12^{th}$  century BCE is to invoke an ethnic term which in fact was not to appear for six centuries. While this is not, of itself, a difficulty, and in spite of the Mycenaean remains on the island which show that it was within the penumbra of the Aegean (Boardman 1980: 189; Mountjoy 1993: 173), there is no evidence that Sicels were then in residence. The strongest tradition would bring them from Italy, not the east (Hellanicus FgrH I F 79b; Thucydides vi.25; Cornell [1995: 38]; Lehman [1979: 493–494] and Schachermeyer [1982: 39–40] favor the northern Adriatic as the place of origin). In the one region known to have been settled by Tjeker, viz. the coastal plain north of Philistia, there is nothing remotely "Sicel", if this term is taken in its classical connotation: all the foundation legends and cultural

connections point elsewhere.

While the above argument, ingenious though it may be, is undoubtedly spurious, a second objection must be considered. The standard spelling in the Egyptian transcription employing the group -r3- suggests an /r/ in the original word, not an /l/ (Hoch 1994: 509). Egyptian scribes from the earliest times faced a problem in rendering liquids in foreign tongues, often employing alif in the Old Kingdom for the lateral, "dark" /l/. In the imperial chancery of the New Kingdom, n + r came increasingly to be used to render an emphatic Semitic (or Egyptian dialectic) /I/ (Schneider 1992: 380; Hoch 1994: 407, 432). But from the 14th century to the end of the New Kingdom, scribal tradition faced a new challenge in rendering Aegean or Anatolian words from non-Semitic roots. One tradition suggests an attempt to reserve - ru - for a strong /l/ (cf. the transcriptions of Lukka and Shekelesh), but there are plenty of exceptions. In fact, the regular elision of r and l in word- or syllable-final position in Linear B (Hooker 1980: 49; Chadwick 1987: 26) suggests that the Egyptian scribes were faced with two weak sounds which they had difficulty in distinguishing. That being the case, the consistent spelling with - r3 - in the Medinet Habu texts (Gauthier 1929: VI, 69; Wenamun follows a different orthographic tradition) could as easily, and arguably more cogently, represent an original r than an l.

Finally, there is the rendering of the initial syllable by si. In Late Egyptian syllabic orthography, the scribal tradition employed the unvoiced palatal plosive /c' (< t': Vergote 1972: 99; Hoch 1994: 407), most often in the group si (Helck, 1971: 563-64), to render West

Note, however, that because of internal phonetic developments, /t '/ is frequently written for /t/ in Late Egyptian (Junge 1996: 35).

SCRIPTA MEDITERRANEA, Vol. XXVII–XXVIII, 2006–2007, 9–13

Semitic /s/ (Burchardt 1909–10: sec. 138, 142; Edel 1966: 82–3; Hoch 1994: 436; Loprieno 1995: 29). While this mechanism is well attested in Egyptian group writing (in fact, as late as the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE; see Edwards 1960: 3, n. 21; Grimal 1981: 60, n. 133), this is not the whole story. The Egyptian graphemes V 14 / G 47 (Gardiner 1957: 523, 473) share, along with I 10 (Gardiner 1957: 476), the task of rendering Semitic /d/ and occasionally /t/ and /d/ (Garr 1985: 27–28). It has been suggested that the sound conveyed by *samekh* was an affricative *ts* (Bromhard 1988: 123–25). However, it could as easily have been a frictionless continuant in which sibilance had been lessened, rather like the occasional pronunciation of intervocalic and word-final *s* in modern Greek. By the Iron Age, when *samekh* renders *s*/*š* in Egyptian,

this was no longer true (Bing 1985: 118, n. 54).

At this juncture, some might find it tempting to cite an entry in Thutmose III's great Syrian list of place names (*Urk.* IV, 788, no. 136; see Jirku 1937: 19, n. 3) as another attestation of the Tjeker, and one which militates in favor of a Near Eastern locale and derivation. However, while the spelling is similar (*T3-k3-rw* or *sì-ka-ru*), the argument suffers from an *embarras de richesse*, for the form appears not once, but no less than three times under slightly different spellings: t3-gr-rw (sì-g-r-ru: *Urk.* IV, 789, no. 161), iw t3-k-r3 (iyē - sì-k-ra/I: Urk. IV, 790, no. 197) and d3 t3-k3-r3 (zu sì-ku-ra/I: Urk. IV, 792, no. 271). The repetition makes it virtually certain that we are not dealing with a toponym, much less an ethnic term, but rather a generic noun for a land formation. Thutmose III's lists, and perhaps some of the lists of Ramesses II and III, are itineraries, in which landmarks such as springs (Thutmose III, nos. 5, 46, 86, 95, and 113), water courses (Thutmose III nos. 43, 90, 99, and 151), mountains or heights (Thutmose III, nos. 77, 85, and 272) are as necessary as settlement names (Redford 1982). T3-k3-r in the great Syrian list thus very probably has nothing to do with the *Tieker* of the Sea Peoples coalition, but is a common noun derived from the Semitic SKR/SGR, "to block up, dam (a canal or water course)" (Murtonen 1988: 300; CAD 15: 210ff), and probably should be translated "dam," or "dyke." Significantly, all four examples are to be found in contexts suggesting the presence of water: no. 136 is followed by T3-nr-t (Akk. Silittu), "branching off of a canal" (CAD 15: 263), no. 161 is preceded by \$3-wi-r3-n-t, (E)shawa-rnt, "far side of the Orontes" (CAD 4: 352), no. 197 (read "the island/bank of s'-) is followed by *Abattu*(m), the city at the crossing of the Euphrates between Emar and Tuttul (Heimpel 2003: 605), and no. 271 (read zu sekēri, "the spoil heap of the dam") is immediately followed by Carchemish.

There is no existing textual evidence, therefore, to seek the origins of the *Tjeker* in the Near East, and the likelihood remains that, in concert with most if not all of the members of the Sea Peoples coalition, they hailed from Western Anatolia or the Aegean. For terms in Hittite, Hurrian and Luwian, the  $\underline{t}3$ - group was used by Egyptian scribes to convey the affricative double sound t+s (written with z in cuneiform), not  $\underline{s}/s$  (see Albright 1934: 33, 64; Friedrich 1960: 32; Helck 1971: 280; Edel 1973: 63–64, 66–67; Laroche 1966: no. 1583; Held et al. 1987: 7–8; Ruijgh 1998: 664, 666). Since some Anatolian dialects

(e.g. Lydian) were "intolerant of double palatal clusters" (Kearns 1994: 55), and - ts - was rendered in Greek by /t/ (Kearns 1994: 44), we ought to look for an equivalent T (< ts) - k - r in our search for an eponym, ethnic group or region. Any connection between the Tjeker and the Sicels, therefore, appears to be unlikely, and the Sikalayu of Ugarit might more convincingly be equated with the Shekelesh.

The Pennsylvania State University

## Works Cited

Albright, W.F.

The Vocalization of Egyptian Syllabic Orthography. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Bing, J.D.

1985 Sissū/Issus, and Phoenicians in Cilicia. AJAH 10/2: 97–123.

Boardman, I.

1980 The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and trade. London: Thames and Hudson.

Bomhard, A.R.

The Reconstruction of the Protosemitic Consonant System. Pp. 113–40 in Focus: A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrman, ed. Y.L. Arbeitman. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub.

Burchardt, M.

1909–10 Die altkananäischen Fremdwörter und Eigennamen Ägyptens. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.

CAD 4 = Oppenheim, L.A., ed.

1958 \*\* The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, Volume 4. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

CAD 15 = Reiner, E., ed.

1984 *The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary,* Volume 15. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

Chadwick, J.

1987 Linear B and Related Scripts. London: British Museum Publications.

Cornell, T.I.

The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000 – 264 B.C.). London & New York: Routledge.

Edel, E.

1966 Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III. Bonn: Hanstein.

1973 Hethitische Personennamen in hieroglyphischen Umschrift. Pp. 59–70 in *FS Otten*, eds. E. Neu and C. Rüster Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

1984 Die Sikeloi in den ägyptischen Seevolkertexten und in Keilschrifturkunden. *BN* 23: 7–8.

Edwards, I.E.S., ed.

1960 Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Fourth Series, Oracular Amuletic Decrees of the Late New Kingdom. London: Trustees of the British Museum.

Friedrich, J.

1960 Hethitisches Elementarbuch, Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Gardiner, A., Sir Egyptian Grammar: Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs. 1957 3rd Edition, Revised. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Garr, W.R. 1985 Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine 1000–586 B.C.E. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Gauthier, H. 1929 Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques. Cairo: Société Royale de Géographique d'Égypte. Grimal, N. 1981 La Stèle triomphale de Pi('ankhy) au Musée du Caire, IE 48862 et 47086-47089. Études sur la propagande royale égyptienne, 1. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale. Görg, M. 1985 Dor, die Teukrer und die Girgasiter. BN 28: 7-14. Heimpel, W. 2003 Letters to the King of Mari. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. Helck, W. 1971 Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zur Vorderasien im 3. Und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. Held, W.H., et al. 1987 Beginning Hittite. Columbus: Slavica Publishers. Hoch, J. 1994 Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Hooker, J.T. 1980 Linear B: An Introduction. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. Jirku, A. 1937 Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und syrischer Ortsnamen, in Umschrift und mit historisch-archäologischem Kommentar herausgegeben. Klio 38: 1-62. Junge, F. 1996 Einfuhrung in die Grammatik des Neuägyptischen. Weisbaden: Harrassowitz. Kearns, J.M. 1994 The Lydian Consonant System. Kadmos 33: 38-59. Laroche, E. 1966 Les noms des Hittites, Paris: Klincksieck, Lehmann, G. 1979 Die Sikalaju - ein neues Zeugniss zu den 'Seevolker' - Heerfahrten im späten 13. Jahrh. v. Chr. ŬF 11: 481-94. Loprieno, A. 1995 Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge

Murtonen, A. 1988

Hebrew in its West Semitic Setting: A Comparative Survey of Non-Masoretic Hebrew Dialects and Traditions. Part One. A Comparative Lexicon. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Rainey, A.F.

1982 Toponym

Toponymic Problems. TA 9: 130–36.

Redford, D.B.

1982 A Bronze Age Itinerary in Transjordan (nos. 89–101 of Thutmose

III's List of Asiatic Toponyms). ISSEA 12: 55–74.

Ruijgh, C.J.

1998 Sur la date de la création de l'alphabet grec. *Mnemosyne* 51(6):

658-687.

Schachermeyr, F.

1982 Die Levante im Zeitalter der Wanderungen vom 13. Bis zum 11.

Jahhundert v. Chr. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der

Wissenschaften.

Schneider, T.

1992 Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches.

Freibourg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck

& Ruprecht.

Singer, I.

1988 The Origin of the Sea Peoples and their Settlement on the Coast

of Canaan. Pp. 239–250 in Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean (c. 1500–1000 B.C.): Proceedings from the International Symposium held at the University of Haifa from the 28th of April to the 2nd of May, 1985, eds. M. Heltzer and E. Lipiński. Leuven:

Uitgeverij Peeters.

2000 New Evidence on the End of the Hittite Empire. Pp. 21–33

in *The Sea Peoples and their World: A Reassessment*, ed., E. Oren. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of

Pennsylvania.

Urk IV = Sethe, K.

1927–30 *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche

Buchhandlung.

Vergote, J.

1972 La phonetique de l'Egyptien ancient. Pp. 91–106 in *Textes* 

et langages de l'Egypte pharaonique I. Cairo: Institut français

d'archéologie orientale du Caire.