Attention to the Peoples of the Sea tends to focus on the Philistines. Egyptian sources imply that these caused the collapse of empire in Canaan. More explicitly, they imply the overall onslaught precipitated the end of the Hittite empire and kingdoms, such as those of Ugarit and Alashiya, the kingdom at or near the site of Alassa ('Biblical Elisha'), which commanded the territory between the mountain copper mines and the coast, especially at the port of Kourion, in the center of southern Cyprus. It is also often suggested that Sea-People movements caused the change from the Late Bronze Age city-state palace-temple economy to the localized, almost autarkic, economies that predominated in the Iron I period.

The Sea Peoples fall into two groups. Ramesses III claims that the later group (see Table 1) dwelled on islands or coastlands. His Weshesh (w'-š'-š' ) are enigmatic. The Philistines (pw-r'-š'-š'-t ) settled the southern coastland of Canaan, giving their name to it (Philistia, Biblical Pleshet, Assyrian Palashtu, Greek Palestina) no later than the 11th century BCE (Exodus 15) on the Tjekker [₁'-k-k'-r' ] and Shekelesh [š'-k-rwš'-š' ], see below). The Denyen (d-n-y-n) are the Danuna or Danaoi, later associated with the plain of Argos; the latter term denotes Greeks in the Iron Age. The term also identified Cilician elements at Amarna. In a letter responding in part to the Pharaoh's request for intelligence on Canaan, Abimilki of Tyre relates that "the king of (the land) Danuna is dead" and proceeds to relate news of a fire at Ugarit, the accession of Etakkama at Qadesh, and an attack by Aziru on Biryawaza, presumably in the northern hinterland of Damascus (EA 151: 49-68); the order of the report runs from north to south, placing Danuna north of Ugarit. The term recurs for the same area in the 8th (probably reaching back into the 9th) and later centuries, denoting the population of the Plain of Adana, long ruled from Que in the west. Indeed, one possible origin for the name of Cyprus in neo-Assyrian texts, Iadnana, is "the isle of the Danuna". In any case, as the Danuna are Hittite vassals, Cilicia was their Late Bronze Age home.

The earlier group included the Sherden (š'-r'-d-n, š'-r'-d-n-n' ), who appear at Amarna (EA 81:16; 122:35; 123:15, širdanu), and thereafter

---

1 Note Weippert (1971: 12) on the forms of the name, and on the equation of Apollo of Alashiya with Phoenician Resheph 'lyšś. For the identification of Alashiya at Amarna with Cyprus, see now Goren et al. (2004: 48-75).

2 Dnn in the Karatepe inscription of Azitawadd, KAI 26 (probably from the mid-8th century). Danaoi appears in Iliad 1.42, among other passages. For an (improbable) identification of Tanaya in the annals of Thutmose III with the Argive plain, see Helck (1969: 73).
as mercenaries under Ramesses II. Under Merneptah, these and other voyagers menaced Egypt (see Table 1). Merneptah reports that the Sherden and Shekelesh joined Libyan elements along with the Teresh (\textit{tw-ry-s}', often identified with the Tiras of Genesis 10:2, near Tabal, Phrygia and Ionia, so, somewhere in the vicinity of Anatolia), Lukku (\textit{rw-kw}, Lycians) and Ekewesh (\textit{'k'-\textasciitilde{w}'-\textasciitilde{s}'}, \textit{'q'-\textasciitilde{y}'-\textasciitilde{w}'-\textasciitilde{s}'}, usually represented Ekwesh). He relates that the Shekelesh, the Ekewesh and perhaps other members of the group were “of the countries of the sea.” These same elements “had no foreskins.”

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ |l|l| }
\hline
\textbf{Merneptah} & \textbf{Ramesses III} \\
\hline
Sherden & Peleset \\
Shekelesh & Tjekker \\
Teresh & Weshesh \\
Lukku & Shekelesh \\
Ekewesh & Denyen \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Sea People Opponents of Merneptah and Ramesses III.}
\end{table}

The Wen Amun story of the 11th century BCE attests a Tjekker presence at Dor. The 11th-century Onomasticon of Amenope mentions the Sherden, Tjekker and Philistines in Canaan, in the 11th century; but between the “Philistine” towns and the mention of the Sea Peoples in question, three other entities are named, all presumably to the north of Philistia (Gardiner 1947: 47, 192). While archaeologists have attempted to locate Sherden colonies, the evidence does not sustain the inference. The other groups did not apparently colonize Canaan, though some may have done so in the south only to be conquered by Philistines in the 12th and 11th centuries.

The “peoples of the sea”, or the Sea Peoples, were Anatolian,
Dodekanese and Cretan (see Singer 1988: 239–50). A. Killebrew (1998) has shown that Philistine pottery production mimics Anatolian and Cypriot techniques. Later biblical evidence associates the Philistines with Crete, possibly based on legends about Teuker’s connection with that island. But did the Sea Peoples cause Hatti’s collapse? Did Mycenaeans sack Troy, or were they identified later as its attackers? The king of Ugarit reports that “enemy” ships have ravaged his coastlands and asks that the king of Alashiya signal information about any further ships (cf. *Ugaritica* V: 87–88 [RS 20.238], and 85–86 [RSL 1]). However, the raiding vessels number only seven.

**The Medinet Habu Account**

Ramesses III encountered Philistines, Tjekker, Shekelesh, Denyen and Weshesh in the 1170s. He met them on his land and sea borders and settled the prisoners he took in Egyptian strongholds. Ramesses implies that they struck inland as far as Carchemish, where there is no trace of them (see especially Güterbock 1992: 53–55; also Hawkins 1988: 99–108).

No one stood before them. From Hatti, Qode (Cilicia), Carchemish (on the Euphrates), Arzawa (Lycia, in southwestern Turkey), Alashiya (on Cyprus) they were cut off. ... (ARE 4.64)

Again:

[They pitched] a camp in the land of Amurru (a Hittite vassal state in the northern Lebanon). They devastated its people and land. (ARE 3.580)

So, the invaders struck the Lebanese coast north of Byblos. Again, Ramesses’ Asiatic enemies were unable to withstand the onslaught. The action has the earmarks of vassals turning on the Hittites by striking at their periphery. Merneptah blamed the Hittites, in part, for the trouble.

Ramesses campaigns in Libya when the Philistines and Tjekker devastated Amurru. Amurru, he claims, appealed to him for aid (ARE 4.39, 44). The Philistines and Tjekker established themselves in Canaan. Is Amurru just the coast of Canaan here (see below)?

---

6 For the view that at least some of the Sea Peoples stemmed from central Europe, see Wachsman (2000: 122). As this conclusion is based on the appearance of some bird mastheads on the stern of some representations of Sea People vessels, however, it is not clear that it holds.

7 Alashiya was in a real or honorific position of seniority to Ugarit, and possibly enjoyed some sort of sovereignty over it.

8 For the foundation of Salamis on Cyprus, by Teuker, brother of Ajax, see Pausanias 2.29.4; 8.15.6; Apollodorus 3.10.8; 3.12.7. For Teukrians settling in the Troad, in northwestern Anatolia, with an eponymous king, Teuker, see Apollodorus 3.12.1, with an etiology of the name Dardanelles. The relation of the Dardanoi to the Trojan War is an interesting tease; compare with the Biblical name, Dedan.

9 Breasted, however, read Arwad for Arzawa. Kitchen (2002: 120) treats Hatti and Qode as a single compound term referring to Cilicia.
Ramesses, however, does not stipulate where he won the battle of year eight. He fortified his territory in Asia, and disposed naval forces in harbors, Asiatic or Egyptian, but he suggests the fight was over Asian harbors. On came the enemy, and then comes Ramesses's claim of victory:

As to those who reached my border, their seed is not (ARE 4.65–66).

Is this a claim that he repulsed an attack on the Delta? Literally, he claims only to have killed some of those whom he met.

Other reliefs leave no doubt that Ramesses did set out for Asia. In one text, he claims he entrapped the enemy into naval encounters on Egypt's border. Yet the enemy also arrives by ox-cart, in a full-scale population migration. This land battle might have taken place in the southernmost reaches of the Asian empire, and Ramesses can be claiming victory on the basis of having kept the enemy out of Egypt proper.

This reading assumes royal autobiography is constant in the ancient Near East (for the principles, see Halpern 2001: 107–226). Royal inscriptions walk a line between truth and risibility. If a text is truthful, then the negative side of the king's adventures lies exposed. If the text is untruthful, it is risible. Ancient thrones were not so immune from smoldering resentment as to permit extensive scoffing. So scribes paint the king's achievements as epic. No king credits allies with helping him. And the infliction of casualties is the equivalent of territorial gain. Too, one omits detail, such as the location of a battle when that would indicate a loss of territory, or domestic casualties. This is the Tiglath-Pileser principle. Any incursion is tantamount to the conquest of a territory: landing on Cyprus is taking the entire island; burning a shepherd's hut is the destruction of an entire town. Some scholars, for example, have mocked Hammurabi's claim that he destroyed Mari three times during his reign. But kings use terms meaning "to slaughter", when claiming that they fought, and this language should not be understood simplistically as a claim of victory.

Second, if the king does not take credit for an accomplishment, he cannot take credit. The principle of omission is central to understanding royal literature. Sherlock Holmes, in "The Adventure of the Silver Blaze," famously commended to a constable's attention "the curious incident of the dog in the night-time." The constable protested, "But the dog did nothing in the night-time." Holmes's reply: "That was the curious incident." There are many dogs in the night-time in the royal inscriptions of the ancient Near East.

So, Ramesses claims to have defended and even extended Egypt's borders. What does this mean? Ramesses claims that he killed Denyen, Tjekker and Philistines. He adds, "The Sherden and the Weshesh of the sea were made as those that are not, captured together, brought captive to Egypt...I settled them in fortresses..." (ARE 4.405). Since Ramesses had Sherden mercenaries in his army, who are depicted

---

10 See generally ARE 4.72–75; for the ambush in Egyptian territory, ARE 4.77. Against a naval battle in the Delta, see Singer (1985: 109–22, especially 109 n. 1).
as his troops in the Libyan campaign of Year Five, he could claim to have them in custody. He may have taken Weshesh captive in Year 5 or in Year 8, but he took no captives from among the Tjekker and Philistines.

By Year 5, Ramesses reports that Philistines and Tjekker were devastating “northern lands,” probably southern Canaan. Those lands (Amurru?) implored him for aid (ARE 4.44–45). The Year 8 campaign, against Canaan, is his response to the aggression. And yet, except in reliefs, he takes no prisoners from the groups that seized the southern coast (ARE 4.82–83, with Denyen and Philistines respectively). Ramesses lost the coast: Dor to the Tjekker, and Gaza, Ashkelon and Ashdod to the Philistines (with Denyen integrated among them?), as confirmed by the absence of 20th Dynasty artifacts from coastal contexts.

In Year 8, Ramesses impaled Philistines “in their towns,” so in Canaan (ARE 4.71). In Year 11, he implies that he reached Qadesh (on the problem of dating this foray, see O’Connor 2000: 88). More likely, he faced opponents coming from Syria, who were on campaign, elsewhere, to the south. He takes one Tjekker (calling him a chieftain), a Sherden, a Teresh and a Philistine, and a Bedouin (or pastoralist) (ARE 4.129). The list reflects the earlier influx of Tjekker, Philistines and Sherden.

So the Sea Peoples were ensconced by Year 11, and probably earlier. Possibly, Ramesses’s Sea-People camp in “Amurru” refers to the arrival of the Philistines and Tjekker (for the contrarian view, see Finkelstein and Silberman 2001, with bibliography). In the north, Hatti survived only at Carchemish. Mesopotamia entered a prolonged recession. People with Mycenaean pottery took over western Anatolia, Cilicia and northern Syria. Emir, Qadesh and Qatna fell at the same time (see Caubet 1992: 129; 2003: 17–22; for evidence of crop shortage, see Singer 2000: 24–25).

The Dynamics of Collapse and Socioeconomic Transformation

The economic collapse is more complex. Drought contributed to impoverishment in Iron IA. It is attested in Mesopotamia and Egypt: artisans struck in Year 29 of Ramesses III; depression also bedeviled the 20th Dynasty, with the Nile silting in the 11th–10th centuries. Stiebing cites climate change (Stiebing 1989: 167–87), but Egypt’s water depends on Ugandan rainfall, and the activities of Ramesses II reflect unprecedented plenty. So, inflation in 20th-Dynasty grain

---

11 For a superb introduction to the historiography of the Medinet Habu inscriptions and reliefs, followed here, see Redford (2000: 1–20).

12 See Neumann and Parpola (1987: 161–82), for evidence of warming, salinization and reduced Tigris-Euphrates stream flow, from about 1200 to about 900 BCE.

13 I embraced a similar suggestion in The Emergence of Israel in Canaan (1983: 96–98, 100–1), largely based on the work of Carpenter (1966: 59ff), Stiebing (1980: 7–21), and especially Bryson et al. (1974: 46–50). However, the evidence for drought stems from a time later than the end of the Late Bronze Age.
prices more likely indicates economic distortion caused by political upheaval than by climate.

Climate change, on a minor scale, appears to have followed the collapse, despite R. Carpenter’s explanation for the fall of Mycenaean in the 1960s (1966; see further evidence in Kuniholm 1990: 645–55). Nor did invaders, such as the Mushku (Biblical Meshek, later Phrygians), propel populations into migration. Troy VIIb did trade with those quarters. The absence of a trade vortex at Hattusas, mediating the exchange especially of people, may have had a knock-on effect. A theory of Rube-Goldberg population movements, each invasion propelling the next, is implausible; invaders in the Near East assimilate to rather than replace populations. If the Mushku did invade, their assimilation was rapid, as there is less evidence for a northern colonization than there is for a Mycenaean colonization of the Tyrrenian basin.

However, two migrations clearly did occur: the first to Cilicia, Cyprus and the Syrian coast by people whose pottery is of a Mycenaean cast (Singer 2000: 27), and the second the settlement of Philistia and Dor, devastating “the northern lands” along the coast of Canaan. The Israelites and other “Hebrews” (Ammon, Moab, Midian) also appeared in the 13th–12th centuries. In house forms and ceramics, a new culture appears. Settlement of the hills is also new: Late Bronze settlements between Jerusalem and the Jezreel Valley numbered about 25; Iron I settlements rose to about ten times that number. A similar phenomenon occurred in Transjordan. But all of this was probably secondary.

The fall of Hatti included states along the littoral and likely involved western Anatolians and Cycladic elements revolting against a former overlord. If, as is possible, Hatti activated vassals to launch assaults on Egyptian interests, the same vassals may have recoiled against Hatti herself, perhaps after she attempted to rein them in, in quest of Egyptian grain shipments. All one can know is that the “Sea Peoples” turned on Cyprus, and probably Ugarit, and, on both sides, Troy, and that what had been a fight against Egypt became a disaster for Hatti. Crop shortfall alone did not bring on the revolt. Still, trade went into decline in the 13th century. One scholar (Betancourt 1976: 40–47) has hypothesized depression in the Aegean basin (LH IIIB), theorizing that it resulted from overpopulation.

In the 13th century, Assyria interposed itself between Hatti and Babylon. From the time of Shalmaneser I (1273–1244), Hatti could

14 On the Mushku (Muscovites?), usually identified as Phrygians based on the mention of a king, Meta (Midas), in the late 7th century BCE, of Mushku in Anatolia, see SAA 1.1:3. The same name appears in the annals of Tiglath-Pileser I, in the late 12th or early 11th century BCE (RIMAP 1 A.0.87 1.i.62–ii.35; 2:18–20; 4:18–19; 10:21–23). Whether the peoples are identical is a question, but see Small (1990: 3–25) for a compelling argument to long-term Phrygian presence in Cappadocia.

15 It seems less likely that the elite pottery reflects trade alone.

16 Merneptah, late in the 13th century, reports that he eradicated Israel: “its seed is not”. Thus, the Israelites were a people, or political entity, in the hills at that time. This is coeval with the appearance of the Philistines in the coastal plain.
exact no tribute east of the Euphrates. Tukulti-Ninurta I compounded
the difficulty. Hatti was increasingly dependent on its western
vassals, and Assyria attempted to by-pass Hatti, at Ugarit certainly
and probably in the Cyclades as well. Restiveness regarding Hatti
registers in Ugarit's last decades (Singer 2000: 22).

Assyrian expansion meant the withdrawal of capital from the
imperial economy. The local manufacture of goods increased at the end
of the Late Bronze (see especially Muhly 1992: 10–26, and particularly
13–15; also Rutter 1992: 62–70, on ivories, decorated weaponry and
stone-cutting in the Aegean; and Kling 2000: 287), and markets closed,
as did sources of copper and timber. As local manufacture replaced
imports with imitations, economic dislocation ensued. Populations
formerly dependent on exports, or on the transportation of goods,
will have been impelled to measures of desperation. Most vulnerable
of all were the ports.

Local politics were also involved. Almost everywhere that one
finds Aegean-connected populations after 1200, there was trade in the
preceding period (LH IIIB; e.g., for Ashkelon, see Bergoffen 1988: 161–
68; note also Barako 2000: 513–30). Thus, Aegean traders were involved
with elites involved in local politics. The analogy is to the British
in India, where elites enlisted Europeans against local competitors.
In the Near East, the Sea Peoples raided or traded with coastal
communities going as far back as the 15th century (Wachsmann 2000:
103–5, including the argument to league with local populations).
Coastal communities called on the traders to intervene in the politics of
towns who were redefining their internal relations, and their relations
particularly with the Hittite empire. It was in the traders' economic
interest to reduce imperial demands.

The Iron I decline in trade was severe. Writing of early Hallstatt in
central Europe, for example, Peter Wells remarks, "It is surprising that
more actual imports from the Mycenaean world have not been reported
in the Balkans and farther north and west" (1992: 37–38). A culture of
appropriation succeeded one of exchange. Comparative advantage ceased
to operate at an international level. Imitation Mycenaean
pottery characterizes such regions as Cyprus (see Karageorghis 2000:
256), northern Lebanon (see Caubet 1992: 123–31), Israel, Sicily,
Sardinia and the Gulf of Taranto.

Italy and the Tyrrhenian Sea, for example, developed olive
cultivation on an industrial scale, obviating the need for imports.
The fast wheel led almost exclusively to the local manufacture of
Mycenean-type pottery, supplanting imports. In Italy and Sardinia,
smiths schooled elsewhere manufactured bronzes using the lost
wax method to imitate eastern Mediterranean forms. Faience was

17 Assyrian deprivations probably also explain the rampant inflation in grain

18 Karageorghis remarks that Mycenaean IIC:1b pottery virtually supplants the
local ceramic traditions, but contrast with Kling (2000: 287). Note also the manufac-

19 The development begins with LH IIIB; see generally Vagnetti (2000: 312–13).
manufactured on the Adriatic (Holloway 1992: 40-45).

The multiplication of local elites accelerated the multiplication of production centres, which at a local level superseded trading partners as suppliers. Raw materials were being processed locally, rather than shipped to traditional crafts centres. Crafts traveled more than goods. Technologies such as metallurgy traveled rather than the finished products themselves, partly as a result of colonization, and partly as a result of the pent-up demand created by the accumulation of wealth through trade (see especially the prescient treatment of Burkert 1992). The rise of protectionism also responded to demography: in the Levant, at least, the number of hinterland sites was 75 to 90 percent lower than in the Middle Bronze or the Iron Ages. On the coast and inland valleys, there was also a contraction, complemented by increasing Egyptian control (see generally, Gonen 1984: 61-73).

As crafts and technologies spread, the elite economies became more homogeneous. The small markets, increasingly centralized, confined exchange. When the Assyrian crisis struck the Hittites, the imperial economy was more vulnerable than it had been a century earlier. Indeed, the market for luxury imports dried up in the early 12th century. As the peripheries grew increasingly autarkic, producing cheaper local imitations of elite imports, depression ensued.

Small settlements in zones occupied by the Sea Peoples, such as parts of Cyprus or the Philistine coast, and especially in Greece, dwindled for half a century. Foundations of new settlements tended to be large urban centers. In Italy, for example, one sees already in the 13th century the beginnings of an urbanization that would characterize later Sea Peoples zones, probably reflecting the prevalence of protectionism that occurred there (see Vagnetti 2000: 308, with a Sicilian forerunner at Thapsos, 311).

**The Rise of Ethnic Identities**

Related to these dynamic socioeconomic processes was the dawn, or perhaps rediscovery, of ethnic identity in an imperial vacuum. In Canaan, one suddenly had not just towns and 'Apiru, but Philistines, Canaanites of various sorts (the term Canaanite is never ethnic except in the Bible), Israelites, Moabites and Aramaeans, prompting a rise in xenophobia. Israelite texts from and about this era register this tension. Later in the sources, but not necessarily in historical development, we

---

20 In Moab, between the wadis Mujib and Hasa, for example, surveys have located 52 Middle Bronze sites, but only 13 in the Late Bronze; see Miller (1989: 11). For early Late Bronze occupation, see Redford (1982: 115–20).

21 In the central hill country of what would become Israel, surveys have located only 25 settlements, whereas those of the Middle Bronze and the Iron Age number in the hundreds; see Finkelstein (1998: 120–31).

22 Note the chapter by Weitzmann in the first final report on the current Beth Shemesh excavations (Bunimovitz and Lederman forthcoming). See also Judges 5; Exodus 15; the Exodus myth generally, and the narratives and notices in 1 Samuel 9–2 Samuel 8 about Saul's and David's relations with various foreign groups; also 2 Kings 11: 15–16.
hear also of Midianites, Ammonites, Tjekker and Sherden, and new groups such as the Phoenicians (surely from Egyptian "Fenkhu", a term applied to the Lebanon). Early biblical materials, such as J (9th or early 8th century), mention a number of communities whose existence is unattested before the Iron II.

This context explains the birth of national territoriality in the region.23 New also was the emergence of territorial high gods. The state adoption of an emblematic regional god (Qaus in Edom, Kemosh in Moab, Milcom in Ammon or Yahweh in Israel) reinforced borders, at least in the ideology of the central elites. These areas were already somewhat populated in the Late Bronze. Thus, in Edom, the first references to Seir, a name for the region, come from the inscriptions of Ramesses II, while Seti II refers to it as Edom. Ramesses II also refers to the land of Moab as such. Our earliest reference to Israel’s high god comes in a mention of the Shasu (pastoralists) to YHWH, in Edom, under Amenhotep III and Ramesses II (for references, see Ahituv 1984).24

Concomitantly, it is foremost in the Iron I that we have evidence of warfare against populations rather than against armies. Late Bronze Age warfare in the west mainly involved the capture (and often ransom) of populations. Kings treated populations as assets for increasing production and taxation. In the east, however, Assyria stands out. Against the Hurrians, Assyrian kings commonly blinded captives, until the region’s annexation was an immediate prospect. Similar conditions came to affect warfare in southern Canaan in the Iron Age.25

Still, when the Late Bronze world order (with its emphasis on imperial territory) vanished, its echoes did not.26 They reverberated

23 The concept of the territorial state as an Iron Age innovation in the area was first articulated by Buccellati, in his Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria (1967).

24 The names are spelled s3-r-i (-r3) (at Amara West), d-w-3 (in Pap. Anastasi VI.51–61), m-w-3 (at Amara West) and y-h-w3 (at Soleb). Seir and Yahweh are each referred to as a “land of the Shasu”, which is to say, of transhumant pastoralists. Edom also is associated with herders, who were admitted to Egypt in search of pasturage.

25 See 1 Samuel 11:2 (4QSam') relating that Nahash the Ammonite had blinded the rest of Israel in Transjordan, a tradition also reflected in Josephus (cf. Cross 1983: 148–58); 1 Samuel 15; 17:54; and 18:25–27. Although these texts may be late in origin, they do emblematize the era, as do the more reliable 1 Samuel 30:17; 31:4–5, 9–10; 2 Samuel 8:2; 1 Kings 11:15–16; KAI 181 (Mesha), and the concept of the Holy War.

26 The Late Bronze Age in Canaan came to an end with a resounding, if prolonged, collapse of the Egyptian and Hittite empires. However, the ideals and events of that era remained programmatic in local thought for centuries thereafter. Egypt’s empire in Canaan was vital for the spread of the Exodus story as the central narrative of Israelite state religion, even if Israel did not commemorate that imperial presence. The borders of the Egyptian empire much later became the idealized boundaries of the Israelite state, as imagined in Judah (see Na’aman 1989: 29–44; and on a related note, 1986: 463–88). Moreover, the monument building of the pharaohs, especially of the 19th Dynasty, furnished the backdrop for the story of the Exodus (cf. Halpern 1993: 89*–96*). At a more popular level, there was
through the centuries, including in the Egyptianization of Phoenician and Israelite art, to shape the identification of Israelites and Judahites, Greeks and Italians, and probably Philistines, with peoples of distant "ancestry". They also formed the basis for the reinvention of these cultures centuries after they had expired.

The Shekelesh, as noted, are to be identified with the Sikils, reputedly migrants to Sicily, and the Tjekker correspond to the Greek Teukroi. Shuppiluliuma II of Hatti even writes a Ugaritic prefect to send a captive from "the land of the city of the Shikalayyu, who dwell in ships" (cf. Judges 5:17, "Dan, let him not dwell in ships"), for debriefing (Malbran-Labat 1991: 38, No.12 [RS 34.129]). These are the Shekelesh. So the Sikils were in the ambit of Hatti, or just beyond its borders. Only later could they have colonized Sicily (see particularly Holloway 1992: 40–44).

The Sikils are no isolated case. The Sherden lent their name to Sardinia, and possibly Sardis. The Teresh are identified, more speculatively, with the Etruscans (or Tyrsenoi, [*Trsenna] in Etruria). They also lent their name to the Tyrrhenian Sea. But a Hittite text names the Taruisha as vassals in western Anatolia; if so, they lent a tradition in the southern Levant of collecting Egyptian scarabs, many of them produced later. The three most popular royal scarabs: Thutmosis III, Ramesses II, and a figure from the Iron Age, Shishak (Shoshenq). Even if the biblical materials preserve no recollection of Egyptian empire in Canaan, people in Canaan, not least in Philistia, certainly did, and Shoshenq's stela at Megiddo was, for a time at least, a stark reminder, as were the monuments, and no doubt the diplomatic claims of kings both in Luxor and in the Delta.

27 The correspondence of Egyptian ι to non-Egyptian /i/ is more common in this period than its correspondence to /s/. Conversely, Egyptian š corresponds to Canaanite and Greek s. Semitic */št/ almost always corresponds to Greek /σ/; and, Tjekker has a doubled -kk-, which would have been resolved before the -r- of Teukroi, whereas Shikila does not. Note that Shikila has a vowel between the -k- and the liquid, as in "Sikil".

28 A town, ṣqal (= Shiqila) is attested in KTU 1.91:25; 4.355:17; 365:32; 661:6; 684:6; 693:36; 770:15; 784:17, at one time inside the territory of or at least on good terms with Ugarit. Though it is improbable, this could conceivably be the reference in the letter mentioned above. See Raban (1987: 118–26) for the claim that it was Sikils who brought thin ashlar header construction to the Phoenician cultural realm.

29 Note also the absence of the LH IIIC ceramic that seems to have characterized these peoples in 13th–12th-century Sicily (see below).

30 They would have been neighbors of the Danuna. The Sherden (irtmm) appear in conjunction with the maruyamu (presumably, charioteers) at Ugarit (KTU 4.163:9; 4.173:4; 4.174:7; 4.179:5), and have been understood to be mercenaries (see Loretz 1995: 125–36). However, it is equally possible that they represent a specialized military agency, possibly identified with a particular geographic source. Compare the treatments cited above. For the connection with Sardis, see Tubb (2000: 189).

31 Although the later indigenous term for Etruscans, Rasenna, is sometimes adduced against the identification, it may well be an apocopated form of Tyrsenoi < Tarwisha < Tursha. That is, Tyrsenoi > *Trsenna > Rasenna. I am grateful to my colleague, Philip Baldi, for his advice in this connection.
their name to Tarshish, and possibly the Taurus mountain range (trwš > tówrs). Etruscan shares the dialect of a stela from Lemnos, near Troy (from Kaminios; see Rix 1995: 119–38; de Simone 1996). Troy, too, may be cognate with Teresh; its eponym is Tros. Tradition has it that the Trojans migrated to Italy. Teuker migrated from Crete to Phrygia, where he married Aeneas’s kin (Strabo 13.1.48; Servius on Aeneid 3.108; Tzetzes on Lykophrón 1302), and Tjekker (Teukrian) colonization registers in the 11th century.

These peoples settled the west no later than the eighth century, and there are corresponding shifts. The Etruscans, for example, abandon cremation for burial in tombs, usually situated on heights enjoying impressive vistas. The tombs incorporate depictions of banquets, influenced by the marzeah, the Levantine funerary society, and by Egyptian tomb traditions. And the Nora tablet, dated to ca. 800 BCE, mentions the Sherden in Sardinia, and also attests a “Tarsus” (probably reflecting Teresh) in the region (see Cross 1986: 117–30). However, Sardinia’s earlier name was Ichnussa, and the alleged Libyan origin of its eponym, Sardos (see Pausanias 10.17.1–2), may echo the Sherden presence in Africa at the time of Merneptah.

The concentration of all these peoples is in or very near Asia Minor. The Lukku (Lycians) appear at Kadesh as Hittite vassals, from Anatolia’s southwestern coast (see the superb study by Poetto 1993: 75–84). The Weshesh are traced to Asia Minor, Crete or Libya. The Ekwesh can be identified with the Achaeans, a Homeric term for Greeks comparable to Denyen/Danaans, and with the Ahhiyawa

32 Or Tarsus, which would make them neighbors of the Danuna as well. For continuity in Tarsus from the Late Bronze to the Iron Age, at least in the cult of the god, Šanda, later equated with Marduk, Nergal and Herakles, see Dalley (1999: 73–80). The equation with a “storm god” (Marduk) suggests an analogy to the lunar god of the Sherden (Bennett and Keel 1998, above n.4), reinforced by Anatolian iconographic evidence (cf. Ornan 2001: 1–26).

33 On Aeneas, born by Aphrodite to Anchises, grandson of Tros, see Hyginus, Fabula 115; Iliad 13.460ff; 20.181ff; Hesiod, Theogony 1007. For Aeneas’s trip with the Palladium to Italy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.68ff; Ovid, Fasti 6.434. On Trojans founding towns on the Adriatic and in northern Italy, including Padua, see Pausanias 10.27.2; Livy 1.1.

34 The text speaks of an expulsion from Tarshish: btršš wngṛš hʾ bšrdn šlm hʾ šlm šbʾ nktìn bn šbn nqd lpmʾ: “In Tarshish/Tarsus, he/it was expelled; in Sardinia, he/it had well-being. There is well-being for the host of Milkyaton, son of Sheben, official of Pygmalion.” Whether the reference here to Tarshish/Tarsus is related to the Sardinian river (Thorsus), or to Etruria, is unclear.

35 The west did trade with Mycenaean Greece and Cyprus. Still, 12th-century sub-Mycenaean pottery is absent from Sicily, for example, and there is no tradition of stone architecture, as in Greece and Turkey, in Etruria. See generally, Vagnetti (2000: 305–26).

36 Note Ugaritica V 89:20–24, which indicates that the troops of Ugarit were in Hittite home territory, and the fleet in Lukka (Lycia). Since the point of the passage is that neither had yet returned home, it is safe to assume that Lycia, like Hatti, was friendly territory, and that the two branches of the service were doing their duty to the overlord power. Certainly, Lycia is not the source of “the enemy” raiders to which the letter refers.
in the 14th and 13th centuries BCE, on or just off the Turkish coast; the Hittite court treated them as equals. Kings of the Philistine cities of Gath and Ekron bear the same name in the tenth and seventh centuries respectively (Achish [Hebrew and Philistine 'k-y-s], Assyrian Ikausu, Greek Achaios; see Gitin et al. 1997). Their names indicate that inland Philistines identified with the Ekewesh. However, the Ekewesh were circumcised (above), whereas early Israelite texts refer to the Philistines as "uncircumcised", although in no text about a period after the 10th century. Circumcision was also alien to Greece. So how did "Achaean" become, in Homeric epic, a generalized term for early Greeks?

**Ethnic Archaiization**

Exactly what caused the ethnonyms of peoples from the Late Bronze Age or start of the Iron Age to reappear in the 8th and 7th centuries? The Israelites were rediscovering their roots in the form of Mosaic reformation, and a rejection of traditional funerary customs, including the desecration of tombs (cf. Halpern 1996; 2003). The Greeks were discovering their roots in the form of Homeric epic, and in the case of the Ionian philosophers (excluding Heracleitus), were rejecting traditional ideas of the afterlife. Beginning in the 8th century, kings began taking on the names of dynasty founders: Jeroboam II in Israel, Hiram II in Tyre, and Sargon II in Assyria. Even the term "omen of Sargon" in Assyrian texts of the 7th century suggests a concern with archaizing. The reappearance of the names of other peoples, such as Teukroi, Danuna, Sardinians, Sicilians and Etruscans, must be taken in light of this archaizing tendency (note also the recurrence of the name Shiqila; Tadmor 1994: 66, 2).

This sort of archaizing differs from that found in Egypt (to Old Kingdom models) in the 26th Dynasty, in that it subverts and indeed rejects models between the idealized past (which is, in large measure, of course invented) and the corrupt present. In that respect, it resembles the Protestant rejection of Catholic iconography and other symbolism, particularly the denial of a more or less bodily afterlife (in Jeremiah, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Xenophanes, Ezekiel, Heracleitus and Deutero-Isaiah; cf. Tadmor 1994; Halpern forthcoming), combined as it is with the idea that the stars and sun circulate to the underside of the earth, and effects a revolutionary impact on all traditional culture. In Judah, the revolution was incorporated into state policy under Josiah (640–609). In Greece, it remained confined to the elite, such that Socrates (whose ideas about astronomy are lampooned in Aristophanes' Clouds) could be executed for what amounted to apostasy (killing off the gods, rather than the God), although it is likely that his political sympathies, with Sparta and against democracy, had something to do with his death sentence (almost all the pre-Socratics were wealthy, and many wound up as advisors to tyrants, in effect, as Quislings).

---

37 Specifically, in the treaty of Tudhaliya IV with Shaushgamuwa of Amurru, along with Egypt, Babylon, and Ashur (KUB XXIII 1.iv.1–3). Contrast this with the earlier list of Muwattalis: Egypt, Babylon, Mitanni and Ashur.
The Codification of National Mythologies

At the same time, and in a similar vein, the 8th-7th centuries witnessed the codification of cultures and the systematization of mythologies. This was true in Greece, with the Homeric epic creating a national myth that reached back into the Late Bronze Age, and Hesiod attempting, against the Ionian judgment underlying Hecateus' rejection of the "ridiculous" or Archilochus' rejection of traditional values, to reconcile and assemble into a single theological and narrative matrix otherwise temporally or spatially local repertoires of Greek myth. It was also the case in Judah, where P was composed as an alternative to the earlier JE (a product of the late 8th century) and the Deuteronomistic History codified Israel's and Judah's history in the land, while both P and D preserve legal codifications whose origins are projected back to Moses. In Phoenicia, as well, where our evidence is thinner, Sakkunyaton, probably in the 7th century, produced a systematized mythology. And in Assyria, starting in the 8th century and continuing in the 7th, scholars in various locations undertook systematic observation of the night sky, assembled comprehensive collections of omens, and canonized literary classics, including the final form of the Babylonian Creation Epic, which effectively wed theogony to cosmogony in a manner attested in Hesiod, but not in the West Semitic cultural realm.

At this new dawn of international trade, both the codification and the rejection of traditional culture were mediated by expanding literacy, with its tendency to homogenize the quirks and idiosyncrasies of local practice. But the logical antecedent for elites to appeal to—and it is, after all, elites, and mostly the ruling elites, who determined the ethnic identification projected by the states involved, whether in Greece or Tuscany or in Ionia or Phoenicia—was the most recent period in which an international elite culture had been developed and shared, irrespective of local variation in tradition. The previous age of empire, and of international exchange, was that of the Late Bronze era. Now, competing and collaborating elites invoked it as they engaged in exchange again that would survive through the Roman era, despite occasional interruptions and a succession of empires and trade zones. They did so initially, of course, when elites could organize as tyrannies or oligarchies.

The process of reformation thus involved the rejection of state Iron Age forerunners of the polities of this late era. In a sense, the rediscovery of antecedents recapitulated the racinating processes that went on at the end of the Late Bronze Age, which also made it an appropriate period in which to search for origins. The 8th and 7th centuries saw; after all, the birth of new ethnic identities, based on archaizing, in response to the height of exchange that took place in this period; an influx of foreign goods, clothing, art, literature and customs, opening the elite cultural canon immeasurably. Reformations, that is, follow renaissances, in an attempt to define local identities in the presence of intense exchange. Out of this particular reformation grew

38 I took this term from Mark Munn, in conversation, March 2006.
western culture, based primarily on the rejection of tradition and the embrace of identities from the past.

*The Pennsylvania State University*
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