

THE PHILISTINES AND THE "SEA PEOPLES" NOT THE SAME ENTITY

We have already indicated the opinion of Rowley and others¹ who believe that the mention of the Philistines in the Bible proves the Exodus occurred after the Philistines settled in the land. Since it is generally considered that they settled about the period of Raamses III,² we are accordingly obliged to date the Exodus about 1100 B. C. This dating condenses the whole period of the wandering in the desert, the conquest of Canaan the period of the judges as well as Saul's reign into a time-lapse of about 50–80 years³. Such an estimate is in complete contradiction with the biblical narrative. Some scholars try to settle this difficulty by stating that the Philistines settled in the land several generations after the Israelite conquest,⁴ and their mention in the patriarchal period is anachronistic. Those scholars who so vehemently reject the possibility of anachronism when dealing with Raamses, are prepared without hesitation to accept such a possibility with the name "Philistines".

The view which holds that the Philistines Settlement occurred at a late historical period is based on various factors. The Bible calls "Caphtor" the original Philistine homeland, and regards them as being of Egyptian descent: "And Mizrayim (=Egypt) begot Ludim, and Anamim, and Lehavim and Naftuhim, and Patrusim and Kasluhim (out of whom came Pelishtim) and Kaftorim" (Gen. 10: 13–14). Elsewhere Caphtor is mentioned as "Iy – Caphtor" (אֵי כַפְתּוֹר Jer. 47: 4). The word "Iy – אֵי" is understood to signify

1 Petrie, Palestine and Israel, p. 56.

Duncan, New Light on Hebrew Origins, p. 189.

Rowley, From Joseph To Joshua, p. 23.

2 Wright, Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries, BA. 1959, (3), p. 63.

Wainwright, Caphtor, Keftiu and Cappadocia, PEQ, 1931, p. 208.

Headlam, Sixty-sixth Annual General Meeting, The Bible As An Historical Source, PEQ.

1931, p. 130.

Renan, Histoire du Peuple D'israel, p. 114, note 2.

Albright, A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology, JPOS, 1920–1921, p. 56; – Syria, The Philistines and Phoenicia, CAH II, ch. 33, p. 24. (Albright notes that the wars of the "sea peoples" occurred at 1190 B. C.) Dotan, The Philistines And Their Material Culture, 1967, p. 5 (Hebrew)

3 The reign of king David is generally accepted as having begun c. 1040 B. C.

4 For example: Wainwright, Some Early Philistine History, VT. 1953, (9), p. 73.

Hall, On The Philistines (Annual Meeting), PEQ. 1923, pp. 126–127.

Aharoni, Eretz Israel Bitkufat Hamikra, p. 230 (Hebrew).

an island. and the Hebrew expression "Iy Caphtor" was therefore taken to be the island of Caphtor⁵. Hence reasons could be adduced for not linking Caphtor with Egypt, as the biblical text does, and the Philistines' land of origin was sought for among the islands But the verse in Gen. 10. states clearly that the Pelishtim came out of Kasluhim and not Kaftorim! In the books of Zephania and Ezekiel, the Philistines are referred to as "the nation of Kretim" (Heb: – goy kretim – "גוי כרתים") "Woe the inhabitants of the sea coast, the nation of Kretim, the word of the Lord is against you; O Kenaan, the land of Pelishtim"; (Ze. 2: 5); "Behold, I stretch out my hand upon the Pelishtim, and I will cut off the Keretim and destroy the remnant of the sea coast." (Ezek. 25: 16)⁶. It was thus inevitable that Caphtor would become identified with the island of Crete; and this is the accepted theory today.⁷ For support scholars cite the names "Chreti and Plethi" mentioned in the Bible as being David's bodyguards. These names are considered a corrupt form of "Chereti and Pelishti"⁸ (i. e. Philistine), and therefore are thought to

- 5 MacAlister, *The Philistines, Their History and Civilisation*, p. 5.
The different biblical translations all read the same. The Vulgate translates: *Reliquias Insulae Cappadociae*; the French translation: *ile de Caphtor*.
- 6 Onkelus, (Aramaic translation), translates *Goy Kretim*—The nation that must be destroyed (*dehayvin leishtezaa*), he derives the name from the Hebrew verb *karot* = cut; destroy.
- 7 Albright, *Syria, The Philistines etc.* CAH. vol. II, ch. 33, p. 29
– A Colony of Cretan Mercenaries on The Coast of The Negeb, *JPOS*. 1921, p. 188;
– A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology, *JPOS*, 1920–21, p. 57, note 2.
Berard, *Philistines et Préhellènes*, *RAr*, 1951, (37), p. 129.
Barnette, *The Sea Peoples*, CAH. Vol. II (68), Ch. 28, 1969, pp. 16; 18.
Cullican, *The First Merchant Venturers*, p. 29.
Gordon, *The Role of The Philistines*, *Antiquity*, 1956, p. 22.
– *Before The Bible*, Am Oved, 1966, p. 31 (Hebrew trans.).
Greenfield, *The interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 791. entry *Philistines*.
Lods, *Israel*, p. 81.
MacAlister, *The Philistines etc.*, pp. 13; 25.
Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de L'orient*, pp. 368; 699. (notes 2–3)
Prignaud, *Caphtorim et Keretim*, *RB*. 1964, p. 425.
Smith, *The Religion of The Semites*, p. 11.
Renan, *Histoire du Peuples d'Israel*, Tome II, pp. 29; 124.
Salama, *What has Become of The Philistines*, *PEQ*. 1925, p. 74.
Virolleaud, *Kaftor dans Les Poemes de Ras Shamra*, R. E. S. 1937. (3). pp. 137; 140.
Wright, *Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries*, *BA*. 1959, (3), p. 64.
Wainwright, *Caphtor – Cappadocia*, *VT*. 1956, p. 199.
Slouschz, *Motzaei Haivrim*, p. 44. (Heb.).
Mazar, *The Phoenicians on The Eastern Shore etc.* article in *Western Galilee and the coast of Galilee*, p. 6 (Heb.).
Dotan, *The Philistines etc.*, pp. 15; 24 (Heb.).
Aharoni, *Eretz Israel Bitkufat Hamikra*, p. 8. (Heb.).
Biblical Encyclopedia, 1962, entries "Caphtor" "Kereti" (Heb.).
- 8 Maspero, *ibid.* p. 368.

reinforce the "link" between Crete and the Philistines. MacAlister explains Plethi—"Philistines" as follows:⁹ "In other places the Chretites are alluded to as part of the bodyguard of the early Hebrew kings and are coupled invariably with the name – פלתי Pelethites. This is probably merely a modification of פלשתי (Heb: plishti–N. G.), the ordinary word of 'Philistine', the letter S being omitted in order to produce an assonance between the two names."¹⁰ And he continues: "In three passages –2 Samuel XX, 23; 2 Kings XI, 4, 19, the name of the royal bodyguard of Cheretites appears as כרי (Heb :cari–N. G.) Carians'. If this happened only once it might be purely accidental due to the dropping of a ת t –N. G.) by a copyist". (ibid p. 7). Moreover he notes that: "if this old explanation be not accepted, we should have to put the word 'Plethites' aside as hopelessly unintelligible" (ibid p. 6.)

Following this assumption that the original homeland of the Philistines was Crete, scholars tried to find supporting evidence for linking the Philistines with Greece. This was presumably to be found in certain Egyptian tombs in Thebes (the tombs of Senmut, architect of queen Hatshepsut, Rekhmara, vizier of Thutmose III, and of Menkheperuseneb, son of Rekhmara). In these tombs, wall paintings with inscriptions were found, in which the name Keft or Keftiu is mentioned, For some reason or other the name Keftiu is regarded as synonymous with Caphtor. This identity was assumed by Birch in 1858. Brugsch accepted this identification and assumed that Caphtor – Keftiu – Cretans are identical names.¹¹ In the wake of this assumption scholars tried to point out similarities and analogies in details such as the shape of objects, people, hair styles, ornaments, etc. found depicted in these wall paintings, as well as objects etc found in Crete,¹² Later they attempted to demonstrate

Albright, Syria, the Philistines etc. CAH. II, 33, p. 29. – A Colony of Cretan Mercenaries, JPOS, 1921, p. 189.

Prignaud, ibid. pp. 226; 228.

Barrois, Manuel D'archaeologie Biblique, 1953, p. 97.

Conder, The Syrian Stone Lore, p. 56 (notes)

Gordon, Ibid. p. 23. ; – Before The Bible, p. 31 (Hebrew trans.).

Wainwright, Ibid. p. 140.

Virolleaud, ibid. p. 140. ;

Renan, ibid. p. 29.

Lods, Israel, p. 421.

MacAlister, ibid. pp. 5–7; 61.

Biblical Encyclopedia, article "Kreti" (Hebrew).

9 MacAlister, ibid. p. 6.

10 According to MacAlister (note p. 6.) this explanation was advanced at first in 1729 by Lakemacher: Lakemacher, Observation Philologique, II p. 38. And in 1827 by Ewald,

Kritische Grammatik Der Hebraischen Sprache, p. 297.

11 See: Hall, The Peoples of The Sea, Recueil Champollion 1922, pp. 299; 301. – Keftiu, And The Peoples of The Sea, BSA, 1901–2, p. 163.

12 For Example: Wainwright, Caphtor– Cappadocia, p. 200.

Gordon, The Role of The Philistines, p. 24;

analogies between Mycenaean pottery and various types of vessels found in the land of Israel¹³. These so – called similarities were taken as conclusive proof that the Philistines originated from Crete, and in consequence their pottery was labelled 'Mycenaean' or 'Philistine'. On the other hand, in inscriptions and bas-reliefs found in a temple in Medinet-Habu (Egypt) dating from the period of Raamses III, there is mention of various peoples with whom the Egyptians were in a state of war such as¹⁴: P. R. S. T. (Przt); T. K. R (Tekeru, Tjeker, Takar, Zakara); D. N. N (Dananu, Danoi, Denyen, Danauna); M. S. S (Mashasha, Meshwesh); A. K. S (Akayusha, Ekwesh); V. S. S. (Weshasha, weshwesh, Uashasha, uashashe); R. K (Ruku, Ruka, Reka); M. S. (Masa), S. R. D. N (Sherdan, Shardan, Sirdan); T. R. S. (Teresh, Tursha,); Maona etc. Occasionally the word "island" or "sea" is attached to some of these names, e. g. "in their isles"¹⁵; "Sardan from the sea"; "Teresh of the sea"¹⁶. Some of these names occur also in Harris Papyrus which appears to represent a sort of a summary for the wars of Raamses III. The papyrus also includes citations as "I slew the Denyen in their isles"; "The Thekel (T– kr) and the Peleset (Pw–r'–s'–ty) were made ashes, the Sherden and the Weshesh (W–ss) of the sea they were made as those that exist not"¹⁷. These nations were dubbed by scholars "the sea peoples".

Champollion¹⁸ was the first to claim the name P. R. S. T. to be a transcription of the P. L. S. T. –Philistines. He maintained that the Egyptian script incorporates an interchange of the letters R and L, and he was followed in this by Osburn, Hincks, Brugsch, Lenormant and others¹⁹. With the

– Before The Bible, p. 94. (Heb. Trans.)

Evans, The Palace of Minos, Vol. II, 1928, pp. 559–654; 734–749

Hall, The Keftiu Fresco In The Tomb of Senmut, BSA, 1903–4, pp. 15 4–157.

– Keftiu and The Peoples of The Sea, BSA, 1901–1902, pp. 170–174

MacAlister, The Philistines, pp. 8–10.

13 Welch, The Influence of The Aegean Civilisation on South Palestine, PEQ. 1900, pp. 342 – 350. The same article appears also in BSA. 1899–1900.

Benson, A Problem In Orientalizing Cretan Birds Mycenaean Or Philistine Prototypes, JNES, 1961 (20), (2), pp. 73–84

14 It may be noted that the hieroglyphic writing is composed of consonants only and omits all vowels. Therefore, the exact pronunciation of Egyptian words and names is unknown and each scholar transcribes the names as suits him best, resulting in multiple pronunciations of the same name. I have cited here the names (consonants) only as they appear in Egyptian inscriptions and I have added in brackets, pronunciations of them as thought fit by individual scholars.

15 See: Breasted, Records, Vol. IV, p. 37. § 64.

16 Breasted, Records, Vol. IV, p. 75. § 129.

17 Breasted, Records, Vol. IV, p. 201. § 403.

18 See: Champollion, Dictionnaire Hieroglyphique, Grammaire, pp. 151; 180.

Hall, The Peoples of The Sea, Recueil Champollion, 1922, p. 297

19 Maspero, The Struggle of The Nations, Egypt, Syria and Assyria, 1910, p. 463, note 1.

MacAlister, The Philistines etc., p. 24

identification of Caphtor with Keftiu and the island of Crete on the one hand, and the mention of the names P. R. S. T., S. R. D. N etc., (some of which were depicted as "from the isles of the sea", "in their isles", "of the sea") on the other hand, the tendency of scholars was to link them with one another and to regard this linking as proof of the Cretan origin of the Philistines, even though the name P. R. S. T. is not once mentioned in connection with the word "sea" and the like.

Today it is generally accepted (in accordance with the theory of Maspero)²⁰ that we are dealing here with different nations which migrated from the region of Crete or Asia Minor, and tried to infiltrate into Egypt. Repulsed by the Egyptians, the Philistines (P. R. S. T.) settled in the coastal area of Canaan, while the Tyrsenes, Sardanes, and others migrated to Italy, Sardinia and other places. In 1747 Fourmont tried to prove that the name "Philistine" was an erroneous form of the Greek "Pelasgi". His theory was accepted by Chabas²¹, Hitzig and others who enlarged upon it. Maspero stated in this context: "The name 'Plishti' by itself suggests a foreign origin or long migrations and recalls that of the Pelasgi"²².

The equation Plishti–Pelasgi is based solely on a supposedly phonetic similarity.

The name T. K. R was also identified on the basis of the interchange of the letters R and L, i. e. T. K. L. . However, since the T here is a weak form of the letter, and can be pronounced as S, the name finally emerged as S. K. L., pronounced, Sakala and Zakala. By changing its pronunciation scholars have found a similarity with the Philistine city of Ziklag²³.

Lauth, Chabas and Lenormant identified the T. K. R – Zakala with the Teucrians, while Unger and Brugsch identified them with the Zigrita in Lybia. Later on Brugsch recanted, and adopted their identification with the Teucrians²⁴. Maspero identifies the Zakala with Siculo–Pelasgi, while Hall identifies them with the Cretans²⁵.

The multiplicity of these identifications derives from the fact that there is no mutual agreement concerning the morphology of interchanging

Hall, *The Peoples of The Sea*, Recueil Champollion, p. 299.
– Keftiu and The Peoples of The Sea, BSA. 1901–2, p. 182.

20 Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples De L'orient*, pp. 261; 314–317.

21 According to Maspero Chabas was the first to form this identity, Maspero, *The Struggle of the nations, Egypt, Syria And Assyria*, p. 463 note 1.

22 Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne Des Peuples de L'orient*, p. 368

23 This similarity is suggested by Brugsch; See: Hall, *The Peoples of The Sea*, Recueil Champollion, p. 301 ; Wainwright, *Some Early Philistine History*, VT. IX 1953, p. 78.

MacAlister, *ibid.* p. 89.

24 See: Maspero, *The Struggle of the Nations, Egypt etc.* p. 464, note 3. – *Revue Critique*, 1880, Vol. I, p. 110.

25 Hall, *Keftiu and The Peoples of The Sea*, BSA. 1901–2, p. 184.

consonants in the name T. K. R, S. K. R., S. K. L., etc. Albright²⁶ notes that: "The second (the Tjekker–N. G.) is perhaps to be identified with the Teucrians (or less probably with the Homeric Sikeloi, who occupied Sicily and gave their name to the island)" His attitude is: "Take hold of this, but do not withdraw thy hand from that either". If we are dealing with T. K. R. we have Teucroi but if S. K. L. is the name then we have the Siculians. Today there are scholars who already shy aside the name T. K. R. and refer only to Sikeli as if this was the original name.²⁷

In the same manner as the P. R. S. T. were identified as P. L. S. T., namely by the interchanging of R and L, so De Rougé identified the R. K (Ruku, Reka, Ruka, etc) as Luku (Leka, Luka) and equated them with the Lycians²⁸. The W. S. S. were identified by Chabas as Opici–Obsci = Oscanes (of ancient Roman History)²⁹. Brugsch believed them to be Caucasians, but later on revised his opinion and saw them as settlers from Asia Minor³⁰. According to Maspero they were inhabitants of Caria or Lycia³¹.

The D. N. N. (Danyun, Denyen, Danauna, etc.) were identified by De Rougé with the Danaans (of Greek history), by Chabas with the Deunians in Italy, and by Brugsch with the Libyans³².

The T. R. S. were identified by De Rougé and Champollion with the Etruscans. The M. S. (or Masa) were linked with the Mycenaean, etc.

The widely held view that the Philistines were originally from Crete, and that their settlement in Israel took place in the 11th century B. C., raises a number of questions which remain unanswered

A. No Greek element is to be found in biblical Philistine names, whether those of cities or personal names. Gaza, Gat, Ziklag, Yishbi, Fichol, Abimelech, Achuzat, Dagon, Achish and others are not derived from the Greek, but are Semitic names.³³ Scholars have already referred to this fact³⁴), including MacAlister³⁵ who regards Crete as the homeland of the Philistines. This fact

26 Albright, Syria, The Philistines and Phoenicia, CAH. Vol. II ch. 33, p. 25.

27 See for ex. Stern. E., When Canaanites Became Phoenician Sailors, B. A. R. vol. 19 no. 1. Jan/Feb. 1993, pp. 25, 26, 27.

28 See: Maspero, The Struggle of the Nations, Egypt etc. p. 359, and note 3 there.

29 Maspero, *ibid.* note 5, p. 464.

30 Brugsch, Egypt Under The Pharaohs. 1891, II, p. 124.

31 See: Maspero, *ibid.* p. 464, note 5.

32 Maspero, *ibid.*, p. 360, note 1.

33 MacAlister, Bonfante and others try to link certain names to the Greek language. For example, Bonfante, Who Were The Philistines, AJA. 1946, pp. 251–262.

34 See for example: Dotan, The Philistines etc. p. 22. (Hebrew). Conder, Notes By, PEP. 1896, p. 341; –The Canaanites, PEP, 1887, pp. 227–231.

Sayce, The early History of the Hebrews, 1899, 2nd edit. p. 294

Smith, G. A., The Historical Geography etc. p. 127.

35 MacAlister, The Philistines etc., pp. 13; 81.

has driven scholars to believe that the Philistines were Semites although the conjecture is that they came from the Greek islands³⁶, or at least, that they adapted themselves to the Semitic–Canaanite way of life and religion³⁷. Greenfield remarks in this connection that "All their gods known to us have a semitic name. The Philistines it may be surmised lost their language soon after coming to Palestine and spoke a Canaanite dialect which gradually gave way to Aramaic".³⁸

Winckler as cited by MacAlister³⁹ notes: "As immigrants they naturally adopted the civilisation of the land they seized and with it the cultus also".

B. Scholars try to point out the similarities between so called Philistine garments, hair styles, pottery, etc. and those of the Cretans. But how are we to explain their presumably total preservation of such characteristics on the one hand, and the total abandonment of their "Greek autochthonous" culture in nearly all other spheres such as language, religion, personal names, deity names, idol forms etc. on the other. In all spheres, excluding art, the dominant characteristics of the Philistines are Semitic, while in the Arts – so we are told – they are Greek. Is it possible to become so integrated into the local population, and in such a very short period of time?

C. Philistine names such as Dagon, Beit–Dagon, Ashkelon, Gaza, Gath and others are linked in the Bible and to some extent also in the Tell el–Amarna and Ras–Shamra tablets to a period prior to Raamses III, before the appearance of those called "Sea peoples"; therefore if the mention of the name Philistines in the Bible before the period of Raamses III is considered anachronistic, we must also accept anachronism in the mention of the names of Philistine cities. But the appearance of these names in the el–Amarna and Ras–Shamra tablets indicate their existence in a prior period. Hence according to the accepted version, the Philistines must have settled in already existing cities, e. g. Ashkelon, Gaza. etc. How is it that scholars, therefore, try to explain these names as derivations from Greek?⁴⁰

D. Archaeological findings considered as being Philistine were discovered in sites outside the region supposed to be Philistine, such as Tell Yehudieh in Egypt, Nebesha in the Nile delta, Aniba in Nubia, Sehab in Transjordan and others⁴¹.

36 For example: Robertson Smith, *The Religion of The Semites*, p. 11.

37 For example: Dotan, *ibid.*, p. 22. (Hebrew).

MacAlister, *ibid.*, p. 94.

Wright, *Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries*, BA. 1959, (3)p. 64

Barnette, c *The Sea Peoples*, CAH. (68), 1969, Vol. II, Ch. 28, p. 17.

38 Greenfield, *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 792 entry, Philistines.

39 MacAlister, *ibid.*, p. 94.

40 About the name Ashkelon see: MacAlister, *ibid.*, p. 72

Bonfante, *ibid.*, pp. 251–262.

41 See: Benson, *A Problem In Orientalizing Cretan Birds, Mycenaean Or Philistine Prototypes*, JNES. 1961, XX. (2), p. 77.

E. So-called "Philistine" findings were discovered at sites in strata which were ascribed to periods antedating that of Raamses III (c. 1170–1139 B. C.), though there were unsuccessful attempts to link them to this period.⁴²

In excavations at Tell el-Farah, Petrie discovered a cemetery containing "Philistine pottery" (cemetery 500). In one of the tombs (no. 552) he found an Egyptian scarab which bore the name of Raamses II (c. 1290–1224 B. C.) and therefore dated the tomb with its "Philistine" findings to the thirteenth century B. C.⁴³. (Albright nevertheless tried to push the date forward to the period of Raamses III).

Hall notes that Petrie discovered at Abydos "Aegean" pottery in tombs of the first dynasty which "still remain difficult to explain".⁴⁴

Anthropoid coffins inscribed with Egyptian hieroglyphs⁴⁵, found in a tomb at Lachish and ascribed to the Philistines, also point towards the 13th century B. C. . Speaking of the pottery found in them, Wright says: "Whether the pottery dates from the late 13th century (as I think probable) or from the early years of the twelfth, it still appears highly likely that the bodies in Lachish tomb 570 were Philistine. If so, they were newcomers in a Canaanite context using native pottery before their own particular variety was made in the country"⁴⁶.

F. Since the Philistines were supposed to have come from Crete, attempts were made to find a connection with various Greek names, and to link these in turn with names of the so-called "Sea Peoples" who were also considered to be Greek. Such interconnections resulted in many contradictions which were somehow completely overlooked.

1. The Greek peoples with whom the so-called "Sea Peoples" are linked came originally NOT FROM CRETE but from Asia Minor, Greece, Sardinia, Italy, Libya etc. What basis is there for the theory of a Cretan origin for the Philistines

2. The period of settlement of some of these Greek peoples does not correspond with that of the "Sea peoples". Herodotus (I, 94) states that⁴⁷: "In the days of Atys the son of Manes, there was great scarcity through the whole land of Lydia. For some time the Lydians bore the affliction patiently, but finding that it did not pass away. the king determined to divide the nation

Wright, *Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries*, BA. 1959, (3) p. 54.

42 For example see: Vincent, *Chronique*, RB. 1922, p. 102. (*Les Fouilles Anglaises D'ascalon*) Wright, *ibid.*, pp. 54–56; 58.

Barnette, *The Sea Peoples*, CAH. 1969, Vol. II, Ch. 28, p. 17.

43 See above note No. 39.

44 Hall, Keftiu and The Peoples of The Sea, BSA. 1901–2, p. 160. see there also note 1.

45 Wright refers to "Crude Egyptian hieroglyphs which make no clear sense and which were certainly not written by an Egyptian" (*ibid.*, p. 66)

46 Wright, *ibid.* p. 66.

47 Translation, Rawlinson . p. 37.

in half, and to make the two portions draw lots, the one to stay, the other to leave the land. He would continue the reign over those whose lot it should be to remain behind; the emigrants should have his son Tyrrenius for their leader. The lot was cast and they who have to emigrate went down to Smyrna, and built themselves ships, in which after they have put on board all needful stores, they sailed away in search of new homes and better sustenance.

After sailing past many countries they came to Umbria where they have built cities for themselves, and fixed their residence. Their former name of Lydians they laid aside, and called themselves after the name of the king's son, who led the colony Tyrrenians".

According to Herodotus the Tyrrenians moved to Umbria, and this emigration occurred about two generations before Raamses III. Maspero points out this discrepancy, but he discounts it and asserts that "Whatever Herodotus says, this migration was not accomplished at one single occasion and in one sole direction. It lasted for nearly two centuries"⁴⁸. On what basis is this belief founded? There is no allusion to it whatever in Maspero's words, and there is nothing in his statement which can resolve the discrepancy.

3. The Lycians who are equated with the Ruku (or Reka) were not known by the name of Lycians, but, as mentioned by Herodotus, were called Termilae⁴⁹. This contradiction has already been pointed out by Barnette.⁵⁰

4. The Shardanes, whose name is linked with Sardinia, could not have come from Sardinia, as already pointed out by Maspero.⁵¹

G. Another point to be more fully discussed later should be emphasized here, namely the dates of destroyed cities and the findings unearthed at their sites were studied, recorded and collated on the assumption that the Exodus took place during the Raamses – Merneptah period (c. 1200 B. C.). But with an Exodus as shown in the preceding chapter dated in c. 1446 B. C., the conquest of the land of Canaan would have taken place at c. 1406 B. C. Accordingly the dates of the destruction of cities and the findings from their sites which had been attributed to a later period will now have to be advanced at least 200 years, which means that the conjectured date of the settlement of the Philistines in the period of Raamses III will not accord with the dates of most "Philistine" findings.

Why are the Keftiu equated with Caphtor? MacAlister, considered one of the foremost scholars in this field of study, summarizes this question in his book⁵²: "The various lines of evidence which have been set forth in the preceding pages. indicate Crete or its neighbourhood as the probable land of

48 Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de L'orient*, p. 298.

49 Herodotus, VII; 92.

50 Barnette, *The Sea Peoples*, CAH. 1969, Vol. II, Ch. 28, p. 6.

51 Maspero, *Struggle of The Nations*, Egypt etc. p. 360, note 2.

52 MacAlister, *The Philistines etc.* pp. 25–26.

origin of this group of tribes⁵³; they may be recapitulated: 1) The Philistines, or a branch of them, are sometimes called Cheretites or Cretans. 2) They are said to come from Caphtor, a name more like Keftiu than anything else, which certainly denotes a place where the Cretan civilisation was dominant. 3) the hieratic school-tablet mentions Akasou as a keftian name: it is also Philistine (Achish)." and elsewhere (p. 27) he writes: "As for Carpathos which Homer calls Crapathos is it too bold to hear in this classical name an echo of the pre – Hellenic word whatever it may have been, which the Egyptians corrupted to Keftiu and the Hebrews to Caphtor..."

Another source of information upon which MacAlister bases his conclusions are the wall paintings in the tombs of Senmut, Rekhmara and Menkheperuseneb: "in these wall paintings we see processions of persons, with non-Semitic European – looking faces; attired simply in highly embroidered loin cloths folded round their singularly slender waists, and in high boots or gaiters; with hair dressed in a distinctly non – Semitic manner; bearing vessels and other objects of certain definite types. The Tomb of Sen-mut is much injured, but the Cretan ornaments there drawn are unmistakeable." (ibid p. 8).

In other words the identification of Keftiu with Caphtor is based solely on phonetic similarity and has no scientific basis. Hall regards the name Keftiu as Egyptian meaning "Those beyond" (Ha-Nebu), namely the land of the Keftiu lying "back of beyond". According to him, it was initially the name given to the dwellers of the Delta swamps, but in time applied to all northern countries, i. e. Asia Minor, Rhodes, Crete, etc.⁵⁴ On the other hand, from the wall paintings in the tombs of Rekhmara, Puamra and others he draws the conclusion that: "The facial type of the Keftians, splendidly exemplified in Rekhmara's tomb and also in the earlier tomb of Puamra IS NOT ONLY NON – SEMITIC BUT IS DEFINITELY EUROPEAN. PUAMRA'S MAN HAS A ROMAN NOSE AND LOOKS RATHER LIKE AN ITALIAN; THE SECOND MAN IN REKHMARA'S TOMB IS ABSOLUTELY ITALIAN IN TYPE, and has a remarkable strong heavy-jawed, almost 'nut-cracker' face, evidently a portrait: ...the rest are more or less conventionalised types approaching the ideal Egyptians; the utter dissociation from anything even remotely resembling a Semitic type." (ibid. p. 164 emphasis –N. G.).

Another important 'scientific fact' that Hall refers to it is: "...in the tombs of Puamra Senmut, Rekhmara and Menkheperusenb ...their costume is as definitely non Semitic." (ibid. p. 164). Having determined this, Hall finds "an identity of similarity" between fresco paintings discovered by Evans in Knossos and the wall paintings in the Theban tombs. This he advances as proof

⁵³ namely the so called "Sea Peoples".

⁵⁴ See also; Hall, Keftiu and The Peoples of The Sea, BSA, Vol. VIII, 1901–2, pp. 159–163.

for the conjecture that the Keftiu came from Crete (*ibid.* p. 166). In fact, there is a certain difficulty with some Keftiu profiles which even according to Hall's criteria are 'Semitic' and with vases which are not of Mycenaean workmanship. Hall's explanation of this is: "Among the Mycenaean vases brought by the Keftians are also others which are not of Mycenaean workmanship. These are apparently Phoenician imitations of Egyptian work. Since in style they are more or less Egyptian, this fact compels us to believe that much of the commerce between the Keftian lands and Egypt filtered through Phoenician channels, and that the Keftian ambassadors quite possibly came via Phoenicia and in Phoenician ships...that this importation from Keftiu of Mycenaean objects and probably of Mycenaean ambassadors also by Phoenicians occasionally led to some confusion in the minds of the Egyptians is natural and the result is that occasionally we find Keftian tribute bearers represented as approximating to the Semitic type. No doubt the question may fairly be asked whether this is really a mistake and whether undetermined Semites from the far north (What place north is he referring to – is it Crete from which the Keftiu came according to him? – N. G.) were not sometimes included in the Keftian names as well as the Mycenaean." (*ibid.* pp. 174–175).

He goes on to say: "The people from Keftiu are always depicted as Mycenaean of the type of the Knossian cupbearers and the bull-catchers of the Vaphio cups. The representation of Keftians as Semites is unusual and only occurs when the subject is bearded: the influence of use and customs seem then to have inclined the artist's hand to approximate to the Semitic types. But when Mycenaean are correctly represented they are always described as Keftians and bear no other name; it seems then that when the Egyptian artist represented Keftians as Semites he was simply making a mistake." (*ibid.* p. 175).

In other words, when the paintings do not correspond with Hall's theory it is only because the Egyptian artist simply made a mistake. It is amazing how the Egyptian artist "made a mistake" only in drawing the Semitic types, whereas he drew the others with the utmost accuracy (so at least we are told by Hall and others). If the artist "was inclined to make mistakes" is it not probable that "he made mistakes" also in drawing the "Mycenaean" objects? Or is it not rather Hall who is at fault here for regarding each bearded type as Semitic, and vice-versa, for seeing in each unbearded type a non-Semite.

This approach of Hall is shown again when he deals with those called "Sea Peoples": The T. K. R, D. N. N., etc. for he writes: "The features of the Philistines and of many of the Shardina at Medinet-Habu (in the wall paintings – N. G.) are of classical straight-nosed Greek type, and the Tchakaray are as has already been remarked European. In fact all WITH OCCASIONAL EXCEPTIONS are definitely EUROPEAN IN APPEARANCE, some with

the moderately aquiline nose of the Italian, others with a decided snub. WE HAVE ONLY TO LOOK AT THEIR PORTRAIT TO SEE THAT THEY ALL COME FROM WEST OF TAURUS AND MANY NO DOUBT FROM EUROPE ITSELF". (ibid. p. 185). Elsewhere he remarks that "the European types, especially of the Shardina and the Teresh are conspicuous, whereas the Shekelesh seem Semites".⁵⁵

No doubt in the light of such "outweighing scientific facts": the "classical Greek and European face" and the "straight" or "moderately aquiline nose" – the sole conclusion to make is that we are dealing with Europeans. But Hall is not satisfied with these "facts", and so he tries to find other supporting evidence such as garments and the like: "Their costume points the same way. The Philistines, Tchakaray and Uashasha wear the distinctive feather headress which the Lycians wore in Salamis (Herodot. VII, 92)" (ibid. p. 185). He makes this explicit declaration merely on the basis of a vague phrase in Herodotus (VII, 92) which says that the Lycian sailors "wore an headress a hat encircled with plumes". This verse is sufficient for him to determine that there exists a similarity and resemblance between the two. According to Barnette there is no foundation for this surmise⁵⁶.

Evans, describing the wall paintings in the Theban tombs, also agrees that the form of the nose indicates the ethnic affinity of the painted figures. When one of the Keftiu is shown without "a classical Greek nose" he says: "The nose here is of a decidedly aquiline form, but this may have been partly taken over from the neighbouring Semitic profiles."⁵⁷ When Evans compares the garments drawn in the Theban wall paintings to those of Knossos, he discovers certain differences in the form of the garment, but he, like Hall, rejects this dissimilarity with the plea that the Egyptian artist made a mistake: "The Egyptian artist misled by Lybian arrangement with which no doubt he was better acquainted suggests that the whole was dependent on the front of the girdle." (ibid. p. 737).

Moreover his approach to comparable findings in the tomb of Rekhmara is similar. (ibid. p. 744). If Hall, Evans and their followers had troubled to examine more attentively ancient reliefs in overall, and the reliefs and paintings referred by them in particular without preconceived ideas, they could have discovered other "scientific evidence" such as "classical Greek" or "classical Italian" noses also featuring in the figures of exiled Jewish Semites depicted on Sargon's bas-reliefs. They also feature in other Semitic figures, especially in Egyptian reliefs, and appearance cannot be taken as "proof" that they are Greeks or Europeans. This so-called "scientific evidence" proves nothing, and rather should be regarded as the outcome of a certain

55 Hall, *The Peoples of The Sea*, recueil Champollion, pp. 314–315.

56 Barnette, *ibid.* p. 7.

57 Evans, *ibid.* p. 739.

education. The Egyptian paintings serve Hall and others as the basis for their theory of the reciprocal tendencies between the so-called "Sea Peoples" and Mycenaean culture. Yet these scholars somehow tend to disregard the common features evident between these "Sea Peoples" and their geographic locale. Evans⁵⁸ notes that some of the objects carried by the Keftiu "are well-known Egyptian fabrics" and that a certain sword "is also non-Cretan". But he fails to explain how it comes about that Keftiu people (i. e. would-be Cretans) carry Egyptian wares as presents to Egypt; and if some of these wares are not from Crete, is it not more likely that the other objects are not from Crete either? Evans alluding to the hair style of certain figures says: "The curls rising above the heads of several of these figures are very characteristic of the Minoan coiffure and the band of diadem is also found, though it is also a Semitic feature." (ibid. p. 741).

If we examine one of the reliefs (see drawing 1) we remark that the so-called "Sea Peoples" who are thought to be Philistines wear short girdles adorned with fringes and sometimes terminate in tassels. But exactly the same girdles are also worn by the Egyptians who fight them. The same style of dress is also found in the depictions of Canaanite settlers (see drawings 4, 5.), and on a stele of Baal (see drawing 5).

The oar-galleys of the so-called "Sea Peoples" closely resemble those of the Egyptians despite differences between them. The Egyptian vessels are more elaborate, with many oars and oarsmen as compared to the other vessels. However both the Egyptian vessels and the others have a central mast with a look-out post manned on top. From the top of the mast a pole curves downward to each end of the vessel. To this pole sail sheets are attached by ropes to the central mast. The place of the steersman is at the extreme end of the vessel. (see drawing 3).

Looking closely at drawing 3 considered to be of Philistines, we notice clearly that the figures depicted form a heterogeneous group, some with negroid features. In drawing 2., which depicts a land battle between the Egyptian army of Ramses III and the so-called "Sea Peoples", the figures at the rear are seen to drive carts harnessed to oxen (and horses), yet these "Sea Peoples" are supposed to have come from Crete. How, then, could they have brought along the carts, oxen and horses? Let us not forget that we are dealing with a war for which a large number of carts, oxen and horses are needed. How were these carts with heavy chests (as depicted in the painting), oxen and horses conveyed to Egypt?

Were they shipped on the sailing vessels directly by sea from Crete to Egypt? Could they have been landed directly on Egyptian soil? Or perhaps were they brought by sea first to Canaan where they organised into formations before

58 Evans, *ibid.*, p. 7

making their assault on the Egyptians? Was it at all possible to transport such a huge mass by sea vessels? Albright notes in this context: "The use of carts suggests a long overland journey but by no means proves it, since that may have been constructed after arrival in Palestine by sea" (Albright CAH. 1975, p. 508). If these "sea peoples" first came by sea to Canaan before going on to Egypt, how could they, in the short time available (as suggested apparently by the archaeological evidence) manage to get organised and trained to fight with carts? Or, perhaps, these "sea peoples" considered to be primarily sea warriors, had also superior skills in land fighting with carts? .

If they first came to Canaan (which must be assumed if we accept they made war with carts), what then becomes of the theory that they settled along the sea coast of Canaan after having being thrust out from Egypt by Raamses III. Is there the least shred of evidence that they made war and destroyed cities after arriving in Canaan and before they went to Egypt?

Furumark who made a searching study of the subject in a wide-ranging article⁵⁹, points to the contrasts and dissimilarities between the wall paintings in the tombs of Rekhmara, Senmut and Menkheperuseneb, and the depictions related to Cretan culture. Furumark claims that the wares, hairstyles, etc. depicted in these tombs are of Asiatic origin and are not Cretan. (ibid. pp. 231–232). Garstang⁶⁰, who shares this view, writes that the goddess Anuket "wears a feather hairdress identical with that later worn by the Philistines", and elsewhere⁶¹ he notes: "The Philistines were not like the Minoan Cretans nor Keftians either in dress or armor or facial type".

Furumark in reference to other Theban tombs such as that of Kenamoun (Amenhotep II, notes that in one of the paintings a figure of a prisoner said to be a Keftiu wears an Asiatic beard and short hair-cut (in contrast to the general depiction). In regard of another Keftiu represented on a dais in the tomb of Ineni (Amenhotep III) Furumark says: "It has been argued that these applications of the name Keftiu are erroneous (Davies – N. G.). This may very well be the case, since such labels can in some instances be shown to be inexact and since, as we have seen, both the pictures and the texts were created in a manner that inspires no great confidence in their value as historical documents. But it is an error of method to reject this evidence only for the reason that the men described as chiefs of Keftiu are not Cretans. For this would be to presume the very thing that one wants to prove, viz. that Keftiu is Crete."⁶² Furumark continues – "Unfortunately this discussion (on Aegean elements in Egyptian tombs – N. G.) has been marred by much

59 Furumark, *The Settlement at Ialysos and Aegean History* c. 1550–1400 B. C., OA. VI, 1950, pp. 150–271.

60 Garstang, *A Criticism on Albright*, in PEQ. 1932, p. 227.

61 Garstang, *Joshua – Judges*, p. 311.

62 Furumark, *ibid.* p. 240.

prejudice and by a certain lack of precision. Most writers on the subject have been possessed by the preconceived notion that Keftiu is identical with Crete and when dealing with the pictorial representations they have allowed this idea to confuse the issue" (ibid. 223). And elsewhere: "there is nothing whatever in the Egyptian records referring to the Philistines (P. R. S. T.) that associates them with Crete and (sic.) the same is true of the archaeological material assignable to them that has been found in Palestine" (ibid. p. 242).

It is worth citing here part of his general views about the Keftiu–Cretan relationship:

"The conviction that Keftiu means Crete would not have been so strong and persistent –and might, indeed, never have originated at all had it been based only on the Egyptian evidence now reviewed. The real reason for this equation (though this does not always seem to be clear to those who believe in it) is the assumption that the land of Kaphtor mentioned in the Bible is identical to Crete and that Kaphtor is the same thing as Keftiu. It is because of this that most writers on the subject have gone to such pains to make the Egyptian material fit into their theory.

Now already the linguistic equation Keftiu – Kaphtor presents serious difficulties and requires somewhat elaborate theories to become fairly acceptable. But granting that it is correct, what reason is there for identifying Kaphtor with Crete? In the Old Testament Kaphtor is mentioned as the original homeland of the Philistines (Amos 9: 7 Jer. 47: 4; Gen. 10: 14 ; 1Chr. 1: 12) In these passages there is nothing that suggests an identification with Crete (if we do not regard as a hint in that direction the expression שַׂרִיִּת כַּפְתּוֹר In Jeremiah 47: 4)⁶³. And in reality this theory is based exclusively on the fact that in other connexion 'Cherethites' are mentioned together with 'Pelethites' or with Philistines⁶⁴. The term 'Cherethites' and 'Pelethites' occurs seven times in the Old Testament and is traditionally considered to signify the life guard of David. According to a current view Pelethi should be explained as derived from 'Pelisti' either as a 'Volkstümlich Verstümmelung' or as a modification in order to obtain an assonance with 'Krethi'. The first of these explanations is unacceptable, since it is phonetically impossible, and since no parallels to such a transformation exist, and the second is extremely far-fetched and dubious. There is indeed, no plausible reason at all for associating 'Pelethi' with 'Pelisti'. This time honoured equation is based exclusively on a similarity of sound and the same is true of the alleged identity of Kerethi with Cretans" (ibid., p. 241–243).

63 The text in brackets appears as a note in the original text. The Hebrew reads=Sheerit Iy Kaphtor =The remnant of the country of Caphtor. (A. V.)

64 It will be pointed out that in the Bible the Cherethites are never mentioned with Philistines but only with Pelethites.

Furumark is not alone in this view. In an article on Philistine ceramics⁶⁵ Saussey analyses among other topics, the different stages in the consolidation of the view that these ceramics are of Mycenaean manufacture⁶⁶: "How is it – one asks – that the apogee of the Palestinian ceramics production is due to a population which is often imagined to have left few traces and voluntarily represented as a horde of warriors settled in a conquered land, which does not constitute a high presumption in favour of its intellectual and artistic superiority. Unless mistaken it is Tiersch who made an explicit determination (in 1908) of this term (i. e. of Mycenaean ceramics – N. G.) after he examined two sets of pottery of Mycenaean inspiration and considered one of them to be a genuine imported Mycenaean production, and concluded 'such a local category cannot be other than Philistine' . Watzinger and MacAlister accepted this view and so did Mackenzie who excavated in Ashkelon; and spoke about pseudo-Philistine ceramics...Dussaud⁶⁷ pointed out that most of the alleged pieces (of Mycenaean ceramics – N. G.) manifestly date back to beyond the date of the settlement of the Philistines in Palestine.⁶⁸ That is indeed what the discoverers themselves had to acknowledge from the nature of the excavation stratifications. MacAlister at first dated them to 1400 B. C. and when later he says that it was not obligatory to date them so far back, he does not furnish any reason for this retraction. We are justified to reject it, considering that the first impression acquired at the site of excavation is formulated without preconceived ideas, whereas the negation was produced under the influence of a theory to be validated". (ibid. p. 182). He continues by saying: "In the regions where they retained full autonomy the 'Philistine' ceramics is in full decadence less than two centuries after it was introduced by them. How are we to explain this fact, if the Philistines were really so gifted with original esthetic ingenuity so necessary for the creation and implantation of a certain form of Art, humble as it may be?" (ibid. pp. 183–4).

Elsewhere he remarks: "The decorations lead us to analogous conclusions. On the one hand, we are dealing with local elements, or at least very ancient ones, like the Bichromia in red and black which is considered today specifically Asiatic, or naturalistic decorative elements such as plants, stags, fish, birds (which have no connection with the Philistines)⁶⁹. On the other hand certain motifs, such as snail-shapes, spiral designs centered around a Maltese cross, and the geometric patterns in general confirm the presence of Mycenaean and Cretan influence". (ibid., p. 184).

Saussey concludes: "The ceramics which we call 'Philistine' are not

65 Saussey, *La Céramique Philistine*, SY. V, 1924, pp. 169–185.

66 ibid. pp. 169–172.

67 Dussaud, *Observations Sur La Céramique Du II Millenaire avant Notre Ère*, SY. ix 1928, p. 145.

68 namely, as believed, about 1100 B. C.

69 The brackets in the original text.

Philistinian at all. but a further stage in the general developement of local pottery which has come under the influences of Mediterranean pottery. (Cretan, Mycenaean, Cycladic etc.)...These ceramics should not be attributed to the Philistines in any way whatsoever." (ibid. p. 185).

Furumark⁷⁰ claims that: "Both the spiral and the rosette are indeed old Asiatic motives and the attempts to derive them from Aegean sources must be regarded as ill founded" (ibid. p. 207).

Heurtly⁷¹ also objects to naming this pottery "Philistine" and regards this label as "unfortunate" (ibid. p. 109). He disagrees with the inference that the Philistines brought this pottery with them, and also asserts "nor can we deduce from it where the Philistines came from" (ibid. p. 108).

Berard, too, disagrees with identifying the Keftiu as Cretans, and remarks,⁷² citing Glotz, that the many findings of weights in Crete, based on the Chaldeo-Phoenician system, indicate that their use was widespread in Crete, and he asks how these weights were imposed upon the Cretans (ibid. II, p. 79). He notes also that a basin and a ewer were discovered in a sarcophagus in Byblos and were classified as Mycenaean, because the decoration on the basin was the same spiral network as in Mycenaean decoration. But the ewer that accompanies the basin is of quite a special form, such that at first Poittier acknowledged it was Levantine rather than Aegean. He maintained that this vessel had no name in Greek. However, he classified the ewer also as being of Mycenaean production, asserting that both vessels form one inseparable entity, and that if the basin is identified as Mycenaean production, so also must be the ewer. Dussaud in 1910 asserted that the Phoenicians were influenced by the Greeks, but in 1925 (SY. p. 195) he went back on this, and wrote that these vessels from Byblos were closely related to the ceramics in the first Babylonian dynasty and that the ewer found in our Phoenician tomb is a sample of these Babylonian ceramics (ibid. II. p. 181). Hence Berard inquires: "If the conclusion has been reached that the ewer is of Gible manufacture, will not the basin found with it – the inseparable entity – be also Gible? And if this basin with spiral decoration is Phoenician, is it from Egypt directly or is it from Phoenicia by stages that the Cretans and Mycenaeans received this decorating motif, or on the contrary, the spiral motif passed from Crete via Phoenicia to Egypt? But if such variability is to be expected in the relations between Crete and Egypt, what are we to think about most of archaeological determinations?" (ibid. Vol. II, p. 188). Elsewhere⁷³ Berard writes: "Let us observe the paintings in the Theban tombs, the gifts brought by the Keftians and their tributaries. If all these contributions are of Cretan

70 Furumark, *ibid.*, p. 207.

71 Heurtly, "Philistine" and Mycenaean Pottery, *QDAP*. V. pp. 99–110.

72 Berard, V. *Les Phéniciens Et L'odyssée*

73 Berard, V. *ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 312–314.

origin, how are we to explain the presence among them of salmon figures in gold and copper, metals that have never been produced in Crete, neither in the classical era nor in the modern one? Moreover, how are we to explain these elephant tusks – an animal that never existed in Crete, whether wild or domesticated? How especially are we to explain the fact that the other tributaries in the adjacent paintings bring the same tribute to the Pharaoh? – The archaeologists have in effect neglected to tell us that in the tomb of Khamait, for example, the wares which are supposed to be Aegean are in the hands or on the shoulders of envoys from Lotanu⁷⁴ and in those of Syrian tributaries, and that the garments, features, profile and their beards have nothing Minoan about them...Are we to conclude that these Syrians received from Crete the ivory vessels, the copper and the elephant tusks they brought to the Pharaoh? Or on the contrary, to adopt the old opinion of Helbig, that the Mycenaean objects and art are of Phoenician origin?"

As already noted, the biblical expression "Iy Caphtor" (אי כפתור) was understood as being the island of Crete. The word Iy (אי) was, and still is taken, to mean an island. But was this also its meaning in the past? In the biblical context the word Iy (אי) in its plural form occurs in verses like: "Jehovah reigneth let the earth rejoice. Let the multitude of ISLES be glad" (Ps. 97: 1) ; "Glorify ye Jehovah...in the ISLES. of the sea"(Is. 24: 15); "and men shall worship him...even⁷⁵ all the ISLES. of the nations" (Ze. 2: 11); "Keep silence before me O ISLANDS..." (Is. 41: 1); "...till he have set justice in the earth and the ISLES shall wait for his law" (Is. 42: 4); "Sing unto Jehovah a new song and his praise from the end of the earth; ye that go down to the sea, the ISLES. and the inhabitants thereof " (Is. 42: 10); "Let them give glory unto the Lord and declare his praise in the ISLANDS" (Is. 42: 12); "To the ISLANDS he will repay recompense" (Is. 59: 18); "the ISLES. have seen and fear" (Is. 41: 5). According to the accepted interpretation of Iy – אי as island, we must understand the above phrases to mean: only the islands will wait for the Lord's law; only the islands of the world will praise the Lord God of Israel; only the islands will receive recompense, etc. Is this the real meaning of these verses? And what about all the lands apart from the islands? It is evident that the accepted interpretation of the word Iy – אי In these verses is unacceptable, or perhaps "Iy" does not mean an island. One's scepticism as to the correctness of this interpretation increases in light of verses in which cities such as Sidon, Ashdod, and countries like Egypt, Israel, Greece, are also called "Iy": "Be still ye inhabitants of the isle, thou whom the merchants of Sidon, that pass over the sea, have replenished." (Is. 23: 2 A. V. The Gideon Bible reads: "inhabitants of this coast-land": The Hebrew

⁷⁴ Lotanu—being the name given by the Egyptians to part of the land of Israel

⁷⁵ The Hebrew text reads "all the isles"(without the word "even"). כל איים. "הגויים".

verse reads: "Domu yoshvei Iy sokher Sidon דְמוּ יֹשְבֵי אֵי סוּחַר צִידוֹן" which literally translated is "Be still the inhabitants of the 'Iy 'of Sidon"; "And the inhabitants of this coast–land (in Hebrew it reads Iy – "אֵי") shall say" (Is. 20: 6 A. V.). (In this verse the reference of Iy –"island" is to the land of Israel): "And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations to Tarshish, Pul and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan; to the isles afar off". (Is. 66: 19) The Hebrew verse reads: "...To Tubal and Javan (Greece–N. G.) the far off 'Iyiim ('islands')". In Jer. 25: 22 we read: "and the KINGS of the ISLES which are BEYOND the sea". (A. V.) (in the Hebrew text "Iy" is in the singular while Kings is in the plural i. e.: and the KINGS of the ISLAND which IS BEYOND the sea –see also the Gideon Bible). If Iy is to be understood as island, why does the text not refer to the island within the sea? Why "beyond the sea"? For beyond the sea lies the land again. Moreover, the Hebrew verse refers to kings in the plural whereas Iy is in the singular (so also translated in the gideons' bible). How are we to explain this unless the text refers to land and not island? The fact that the word "Iy" means "land" is proved by the phrase in Is. 42: 15: וְשַׁמְתִּי נְהָרוֹת וְאֶגְמִים אוֹבִישׁ "לֵאמֹר וְאֶגְמִים אוֹבִישׁ". (Vesamti neharot leiyim veagamim ovish). This was translated: "and I will make the rivers islands and I will dry up the pools". (A. V.) The Vulgate also translates "insulae"(islands). The Jerusalem bible: "turn rivers to pools and dry up lakes". However, we have here a linguistic parallelism and the end of the verse provides the clue to the meaning of its beginning, namely "I will dry up the pools" gives us to understand that the beginning of the verse: "and I will make the rivers islands means, I will make the rivers dry–land and not islands. We find the same parallelism in the verse: "that saith to the deep, be dry and I will dry up the rivers" (Jes. 44: 27). Hartom and Cassuto⁷⁶ also interpret "land" and not "islands", and we find the same in the French translation⁷⁷ "Je changerai les fleuves en terre ferme. Et je mettrai les etangs a sec". i. e. "I will change the rivers into dry–land".

I believe that the word "Iy" is simply what the Greeks called "Ge" (Yñ – pronounced in Greek Iy – yee), namely – land, Earth. According to Greek mythology this was the name of the Phoenician earth goddess⁷⁸. Most probably the letter א (Aleph) in the word "אֵי" (Iy) was transcribed into Greek as "G". A similar transcription may be presumed also for the Greek word "genos" which signifies the name of a Phoenician deity, namely the god of race⁷⁹. This name corresponds to the biblical name Enosh – אֲנוֹשׁ (Gen. 4: 26 in Hebrew spelled also with the letter Aleph) which also signifies the human

76 Hartom– Cassuto, Yavneh ed. 1960, Israel (Hebrew Bible).

77 French translation by Louis Segond, Paris, 1962,

78 Contenau, La Civilisation Phénicienne, p. 86.

79 Contenau, ibid. p. 86.

Rawlinson, Phoenicia, p. 339.

race. Moreover, it is known that certain personal names written in Hebrew with the letter Ayin (ע) were transcribed in Greek by the letter gamma ε. g. Aza –Gaza, Amora –Gomorra, Daue –Daguel, Athniel – Gothniel. The fact that the Hebrew letters A (Aleph –א) and A' (Ayin ע –) frequently interchange was already discussed earlier.

We may summarize by saying that the word "Iy" – יא in the Bible is invariably understood to mean "land", and not island, therefore "Iy Caphtor" simply means the land of Caphtor and nothing else. There is no basis whatever for the conjecture that Caphtor is an island, and hence there is no obstacle for connecting it with Egypt, as indeed we find in the Bible. Since, as stated, there is no reason whatever for considering Caphtor an island, the main argument for equating the island of Crete with Caphtor is completely invalidated,

As noted earlier, the mention of "Kerethites and Pelethites" in the Bible is taken as proof of their identification with Cretans, But as pointed out, it seems that the connection between Kerethi–Cretans and the island of Crete is solely one of assonance. From a rational point of view the fact that the "kerethi and pelethi" are mentioned together points to two different groups, as evidenced by the conjunctive letter waw (ו=and). If we grant that Pelethi means "plishti" (Philistines), then Kerethites and Philistines should not be equated since they are two distinct groups. If the Kerethites are presumed to be Cretans, then they too ought not be equated with Philistines. Yet, assuming the Philistines are the Kerethites, the question arises as to the need for this duplication and repetition in the same sentence.

Who are the Kerethites and Pelethites? We hear of the Kerethites and Pelethites for the first time in King David's army: "And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was over the Cherethites and over the Pelethites" (2 Sam. 20: 23). The Hebrew text reads: "And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was over the KARI (כרי) and over the Pelethi". In other verses we read the Kerethi instead of the Kari: "and Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was over the Chrethites and the Pelethites" (2Sam. 8: 18)⁸⁰. According to Josephus⁸¹: "To Benaiah son of Joados he (i. e. king David – N. G.) entrusted the command of the bodyguards, while his elder sons were in attendance on him and guarded his person".

From this passage it was understood that the Chrethites and Pelethites served as King David's bodyguard, and as already pointed out that they were considered "Cretans and Philistines".

In 2 Sam. 15: 18–19 we read about David who escapes from his son Absalom: "And all his servants passed on beside him; and all the Cherethites and all the Pelethites, and all the Gittites, six hundred men that came after

⁸⁰ See also 1 Kn. 1: 38.

⁸¹ Josephus, Ant. VII, 110, Trans. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Libr.

him from Gath passed on before the king. Then said the king to Ittai the Gittite, wherefore goest thou also with us? return, and abide with the king; for thou art a foreigner and also an exile." It is plain from the verse "and all the Gittites, six hundred men that came...from Gath" that this number refers specifically to the Gittites and does not refer to the Cheretites and Pelethites, the supposed king's guards. The fact that the king addressed Ittai as a foreigner leads one to infer that the Cherethites and the Pelethites are not considered foreigners by him.

The fact, that the Cherethites and Pelethites are not to be considered foreigners is also indicated elsewhere, in a list of appointments by David (2Sam. 8: 17–18), we read:

”וצדוק בן־אחישוב ואחיהלך בן אביתר כהנים ושריה סופר ובניהו בן־יהוידע והכרתי”
 “and Zadok the son of Ahitub and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar – priests (Hebrew: kohanim) AND Seraiah – scribe, AND Benayahu the son of Jehoiadah AND Chreti AND Plethi AND the sons of David were priests (Hebrew: kohanim)”⁸². The conjunctive letter waw (= and) between the different names in the last phrase: "and Benaiah...and the Chreti, and the Pelethi, and David's sons..." indicates that the end of the phrase "were kohanim" (i. e. "were priests") applies to all the preceding names, that is to say, Benaiah, the Chreti, the Plethi, and the sons of David all were priests. As to Benaiah being a priest, this cannot be derived only from the above verse, but also is clearly stated in 1Chr. 27: 5–6; "The third captain of the host for the third month was Benaiah, the son of Jehoiadah the priest, chief...this is that Benaiah who was the mighty man of the thirty". This is also stated by Josephus (Ant. VII, 315); "The fifth was Banaïos of priestly descent". Thus the final words "were priests" (kohanim) in the above verse quite obviously apply to Benaiah, as well as to the Chreti and the Pelethi and the sons of David.

As mentioned, Benaiah was set "over the Cari⁸³ and Pelethi" (2Sam. 20: 23). Of the Cari during Athaliah's reign we read: "And in the seventh year Jehoiadah sent and fetched the captains over hundreds of the Carites and of the guard (The Hebrew text reads ratzim רצים i. e. runners =couriers, not guards). and brought them to him into the house of Jehovah; and he made a covenant with them" (2Kn. 11: 4). This same episode is depicted with slight variations in the book of Chronicles (2 Chr. 23: 1): "And in the seventh year Jehoiadah strengthened himself and took the captains of hundreds, Azaria

82 This passage is wrongly translated in the A. V. "and Zadok the son of Ahitub and Abimelech the son of Abiathar, were the priests; and Seraia was the scribe; and Benaiah the son of Jehoiadah was over both the Cherethites and the Pelethites; and David's sons were chief rulers. (alternative translation, "chief ministers". The Koren Bible translates thus: "and Benayahu the son of Yehoyada and the Kereti and the Peleti, and sons of David were ministers of state".

83 The Hebrew verse reads Cari (כרי) erroneously translated as Cherethites

the son of Jeroham, and Ishmael the son of Jehohanan and Azariah the son of Obed, and Maaseiah the son of Adaiah, and Elishaphat the son of Zichri, into covenant with him". It is therefore evident that in this second passage as compared to the first, there are listed specific Hebrew names instead of Carites and Ratzim (=Couriers). From this we may conclude that those called Carites were simply Hebrews⁸⁴. (however, the Carites and Ratzim are also called Cherethites and Pelethites, and moreover scholars have even tried to link the Cherethites =Carites to Carians in Greece⁸⁵. The fact that the Cherethi – Cari come out as Hebrew ethnics is consistent with the fact that the Cherethi and Pelethi and the sons of David were priests.⁸⁶

We may now conclude as Furumark does that the similarity between Chereti and Crete is based on assonance alone. It is quite probable that the name Pelethi refers to people from the house of Peleth son of Jonathan from the sons of Jerahmeel of the tribe of Judah (1Chr. 2; 33). i. e. the Pelethites were people from David's own tribe. If we look carefully at the mighty people who surrounded David (1Chr. 11: 10 ff) we realise that most of them are his kinfolk or members of his tribe. Joab, Abishai and Asahel are the sons of Zeruah – David's sister (1Chr. 2: 16). Jonathan his uncle was his counsellor (1Chr. 27: 32), Eleazar his cousin the Ahohite (1Chr. 11: 12), Elhanan his cousin⁸⁷ of Beth Lehem (1Chr. 11: 26). In the book of Samuel (2Sam. 21: 19) his name appears as "Elhanan the son of Jaare – Oregim the

84 Segal in commentary on 2sam 8.18 states that Gershonides (Levi ben gershon = Ralbag), and Kimhi David (=Radak) explain that kreti and pleti were israelite families.

85 MacAlister, The Philistines etc. p. 7.
Gordon, The Role of The Philistines, Antiquity, XXX, 1956, p. 23 note 5.
Maspero, Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de L'orient, p. 368.
Renan, Histoire du Peuple D'israel, tome II, p. 30.

86 My friend S. Regulant drew my attention to the verse in Is. 16: 1. "שלחו כֶּרֶ" "משל-ארץ" Shilhu car moshel eretz" translated "send ye the lamb to the ruler of the land". "car" is translated – lamb. But in the Hebrew text car כר is vocalised by pathah = פתח (a short a'), therefore it points to being a gemmate verb; whereas "to the cari2 (לכרי) ("–kn 11: 4) is written with a qamatz (long a) a fact that strengthens the assumption of it being a gemmate verb (a consonant strengthened by a Dagesh before a guttural consonant R) i. e. the verb is כרר = Krr (karar=carar). In Arabic the verb karar is linked with runing "kurur el ayam" = in the long run. Hence the cari will be explained "the runners"= courriers, and indeed in 2 Kn. 11: 4, the cari are mentioned dovetailed with runners (in the Hebrew text = לְכָרִי וְלָרָצִים of the Cari and the runners), hence the verse in Is. 16: 1, must be explained "Send a courier..."and not a lamb. It is noteworthy too that in Latin languages the word for running is phonetically identical to the Semitic stem "karar"; Latin –Currere, Italian – correre; Spanish and Portugese – correr, French – courir.

87 The Hebrew text reads "Ben Dodo" which literally means son of his uncle = cousin. But it was translated as son of Dodo. The same applies to Elhanan of Beth Lehem who we learn elsewhere was the son of Jaare – Oregim (and not the son of Dodo).

Beth–Lehemite" (this verifies that Ben Dodo must be understood as "his cousin"). Benaiah son of Jehoiadah of Kabzeel (1Chr. 11: 22), Ira the Ithrite, Gareb the Ithrite (1Chr. 11: 40), Mahari the Netophatite, Heled the son of Bannah the Netophatite (1 Chr. 11: 30). Kabzeel is one of the cities of the tribe of Judah (Jo. 15: 21). The family of the Ithri (יתרי) is related to the families of Kiriath–Yearim in the tribe of Judah, whereas Jether (יתר) the Ishmaelite is the father of Amasa son of Abigail – David's sister (1 Chr. 2: 17; 53). The Netophatites are one of the families of Beth – Lehem (1Chr. 2: 54) etc., moreover we have already mentioned the passages in Josephus relating that David's sons served as his bodyguards. It is obvious then that David's retinue consisted mainly of members of his family or tribe, that is their make up was a tribal one, as is the custom still prevalent among Beduin tribes today. It is highly unreasonable to assume that within such a tribal formation an outside group made up of foreigners who were completely alien to the native environment would be introduced. So it is evident that we are definitely not dealing here not with foreigners, but with Hebrews – most probably from the house of the Jerahmeelites of Judah's tribe.

It is noteworthy that Phytian–Adams regards the Greek name "Aiguptos" (Egypt) as a combination of Ai = Iy and Kept which name he identifies with the biblical Iy–Caphtor. Kept or Kebt he identifies with the nomus (region) of Kept or Kopt. Basing himself on Herodotus who stated that the Greeks applied the name Aegyptos exclusively to the region of the Delta, he concludes that Iy–Caphtor was in fact the name of the Delta region⁸⁸.

Since Philistine origins are generally accepted as being Cretan, and connected with the so-called "sea peoples", scholars have tried to link the names of these people with Greek names. As shown, the Philistines cannot be equated with Cretans and therefore it becomes necessary to reconsider our approach to the so-called "sea peoples".

Below some comments on the subject:

A. – Various scholars try to elucidate the names of the "sea peoples" by analogy with Greek names, stressing mainly assonantal i. e. phonetic similarities. Yet in the process they create a completely distorted picture, though in their search for names with similar sounds they take in a large range of geographical regions – Libya, Asia Minor (Cilicia etc.), Rome, Sardinia, the Aegean islands, Sicily, etc; they yet utterly fail to answer the implied question: How is one to explain that a variety of different peoples from totally different geographical regions assembled together for the one purpose of migrating to the same geographical region? How could this migration of different peoples from such disparate geographical regions be successfully coordinated? Be it remembered that we are dealing here not with the 20th

88 Phytian – Adams, Aiguptos – A Derivation and Some Suggestions, JPOS. 1922, pp. 94–100.

century, with its abundant resources of modern transport, but with an era in which the distance between Crete and Greece or Sardinia was enormous by prevailing standards, as shown, inter alia, by the descriptions of voyages in the Iliad and Odyssey.

B. – In Papyrus Harris⁸⁹ we read: "I slew the Denyen (D'ynywn') in their isles". Assuming the D. N. N. represent the Danayans, how are we to explain the conquest of their "isles", seeing that Raamses III never reached the Greek islands? However if the text is assumed to refer to their "new" settlements in Canaan, then the expression of "isles" has nothing to do with Greece but rather with the shores of Canaan.

Similarly we read⁹⁰: "I made for thee numerous lands in the new isles in the southern and northern districts". Again, if "isles" is taken to refer to the region of Greece, this implies that Raamses III conquered the isles of Greece, which we know is not the case. But if on the other hand the text does not refer to the Greek islands, then the word "isles" obviously should not be linked to Greece, as has been done by most scholars .

In the inscriptions on relief sculptures Raamses boasts that "the Peleset (Pw'r'st) are hung up in their towns"⁹¹, which is to say that the P. R. S. T. were attacked in their towns. What becomes then of the theory that the P. R. S. T. supposedly Philistines, came to Egypt after they migrated from the isles of Greece before they settled in towns? .

C. – As noted earlier, the T. K. R were identified as T. K. L. Since the T is weak and pronounced like S or Z the T. K. L. became Sakal – Zakal, and from Zakal it was changed to Zakala. Scholars have seen in this name a resemblance to Siculians – Sicilians, and also to the Philistine city of Ziklag. Since the Philistines were considered Cretans, here was yet another proof of the "Myceanisation" of the Philistines and the "sea peoples". There are some scholars today who refer to Sikeli as if this was the original name written in Wen Amon's letter and Raamses III' inscriptions⁹². A number of scholars believe that the T. K. R. are identical with Teucrians. T. K. R. is found in Egyptian inscriptions also as an element in the name Tkr–Baal⁹³. T. K. R. is equated by scholars with T. K. L. – S. K. L–Sakal–Sikel etc. as mentioned above, while "T. kr– Baal " is transcribed BY ALL SCHOLARS as Zakar–Baal⁹⁴

89 Breasted, Records, Vol. IV, . § 403, p. 201.

90 Breasted, Records, Vol. IV, § 265, p. 146.

91 Breasted, Records, Vol. IV. § 69, p. 41.

92 Stern E., When Canaanites Became Phoenician Sailors. B. A. R. 1993. vol. 19 no. 1, pp. 25; 26, 27.

93 breasted, Records, Vol. IV. § 567, p. 279; §. 574, p. 281

94 For example: Breasted, Records, Vol. IV, §. 567, p. 279.

MacAlister, The Philistines etc. pp. 30 – 38.

Pritchard, ANE. Princeton, paperback reprint, 1973, Vol. I. p. 17.

Mazar, The Philistines and... The Kingdoms of Israel and Tyre. 1966, p. 2–3 (Hebr.).

and not Sakal-Baal. Why the change? There is no reason for this change, for we are dealing with EXACTLY THE SAME NAME.

D. – In the name Takar-Baal the element "Baal" is undoubtedly Semitic. How can this element be linked to people who are thought to be Sicilians-Sicilians? We should remember that these names refer to the period when they are supposed to have entered the region, which implies that the name Tkr-Baal was evidently an original and not an adopted name, for it is hardly likely that they adopted it in the short time available.

E. – The name T. K. R is also found in the letter of Wen-Amon (dated first half of the 11th century B. C.): "I reached Dor, a town of the Tjekker".⁹⁵. Here we have clear evidence that the city of Dor belonged to the T. K. R. Since the T is weak and is pronounced like S (as most scholars maintain) one might read S. K. R. As seen in earlier chapters, the date of the Israelite conquest of Canaan precedes the date of the letter of Wen-Amon. Who, one may ask, were the inhabitants of the city of Dor? .

In Joshua 17: 11 we read: "And Manasseh had in Issachar and in Asher Beth-Shean and its towns, and Ibleam and its towns, and the inhabitants of Dor and its towns...". It is obvious that the city of Dor was in the inheritance of Issachar, but was the property of Manasseh. The Simeonite tribe was of the same status (Jos. 19: 1–10): "their inheritance was in the midst of the inheritance of the children of Judah, and they had for their inheritance Beer-sheba or Sheba, and Molada..." etc. But all the names of the towns of the Simeonite tribe within the inheritance of the tribe of Judah appear also in exact detail in the inheritance of the tribe of Judah itself (see Jos. 15: 20–37). Thus although these towns were given to the Simeonites, they were grouped under the inheritance of Judah. It must therefore be supposed that the same also applied with regard to the city of Dor, which is listed under the name of Issachar.

As seen earlier the city of Dor is called in Wen – Amon's letter a city of the T. K. R (S. K. R.); moreover the phonetic resemblance between Skr and Issachar is inescapable the more especially as both are supposed to have owned the same town. Actually I believe the two names are identical with one another⁹⁶.

Pernigotti, *Phoenicians and Egyptians* p. 526 in *The Phoenicians*, edit. Bompiani 1988.

Bondi Sandro Filippo, *The course of History* p. 39 in *The Phoenicians*, Bompiani 1988.

Lemaire, *Divinités Egyptiennes etc.* pp. 89–90, STU. PH. 1986.

Sabatino Moscati, *The world of the Phoenicians* p. 10. weidenfeld & nicolson 1968.

95 Breasted, *Records*, Vol. IV, §. 565, p. 278; ANE. *ibid.* Vol. I, p. 17.

96 As known the name Issachar according to the Bible, derives from "Yesh – Sachar" namely there is a hire (reward) (Gen. 30: 18). Sachar is the main composite of the name.

F. – In the name D. N. N. (Danayun etc.) De Rougé recognises an affinity with the Greek mythological hero Danaos, and this leads him to identify them with the Danaeans. But according to Greek mythology Danaos came from Egypt to Greece and not vice versa; so this name could not have been foreign to the region of Egypt.

G. – The name D. N. N. is present also in the Tel el Amarna tablets which means they were in the region already in the 14th century B. C. Also Hall points out that in the el Amarna period they were already settled on the coast of Canaan⁹⁷. This however contradicts the inference, based upon the Egyptian inscriptions, which equates them with the

Danaeans. Hall tries to overcome this contradiction by stating that the D. N. N. who are mentioned in the el Amarna tablets are Danaeans who settled in Canaan during the el Amarna period, whereas the Danaeans mentioned in the Egyptian inscriptions represent a new wave of Danaeans⁹⁸. However he discounts the fact that about 300 years separate the el Amarna period from that of Raamses III⁹⁹.

H. – The name "Iy" (understood as isle), linked to the D. N. N., should be seen as referring to their places in Canaan and not Greece; hence the D. N. N. cannot be Danaeans. The name D. N. N. is found also in the form D. N. (Danu), as was pointed out already by Maspero and others¹⁰⁰. It is therefore more plausible to regard them as sons of the tribe of Dan who settled on the sea shore in Canaan on the 14th century B. C.

I. – The R. K (Ruku, or Reka etc.) were identified as Luku (Luka Leka etc.) and equated with Lycians. However, the Ruku are also mentioned in the el Amarna tablets¹⁰¹, (circa three hundred years prior to the Raamses III period). According to Herodotus¹⁰², the Lycians were called Termili, only in later years came to be known as Lycians.

J. – The Ekwesh (this name also is vocalised by different scholars in different ways—Akawasha, Akayusha, Akayaousha etc.) were identified by De Rougé as Achaeans. Yet the surprising fact is that in the Egyptian inscriptions they are depicted as circumcised people, a custom that was not practiced by the Greek peoples. Barnette¹⁰³ notes this circumstance, and expresses his incomprehension. Astour (according to Barnette) sees in these particular

97 Hall, Keftiu and The Peoples of The Sea, BSA. 1901–2, p. 1

98 Hall, *ibid.* p. 183.

99 This solution reminds us the one employed to explain the Exodus.

100 Maspero, *The Struggle of The Nations; Egypt, Syria and Assyria*, 1910, p. 462, note 1.

101 See: Hall, *ibid.* p. 182.

Hall, *The Peoples of The Sea*, Rec. Champollion, 1922, p. 304.

102 Herodotus, VII, 92. See also Barnette, *The Sea Peoples*, CAH. Vol. II, Ch. 28, 1966, p. 6.

103 Barnette, *ibid.*, p. 11.

depictions evidence of the Semitic character of the Mycenaean culture,¹⁰⁴ while on the other hand most scholars discount it.

K. . The "Tahanu"¹⁰⁵ are mentioned several times together with the T. K. R Breasted saw them as Libyans¹⁰⁶. About these Tahanu we read: "The land of the Meshwesh is desolated at one time the Libyans (Tahanu) and the Seped are destroyed, their seed is not"¹⁰⁷. and of the Mashasha it is said that Raamses III destroys "the names of the Asiatic lands...repelling the nine bows taking captives the Meshwesh"¹⁰⁸. Evidently the Tahanu and the Mashasha are to be linked to the Asiatic lands. As to the link between the Mashasha, Tahanu, and the nine bows we learn from several inscriptions.¹⁰⁹ In the Merneptah Stele which refers to a war in Canaan we read: "No one raises his head among the Nine Bows, Desolation is for Tehenu, Hatti is pacified, plundered is Canaan " etc. When the Tahanu are mentioned it is in connection with the Canaanite region. This connection negates the identification of the Tahanu with Libyans and links them with Canaan. Breasted already noted the strange coincidence in the time of the wars (with the Libyans and in Amurru) and it is hardly feasible that two wars took place simultaneously, one with the "Libyans" and one in the Amorite region.¹¹⁰

Seeing that the T. K. R are often mentioned together with the Tahanu, and in the light of our identification of the T. K. R. with the tribe of Issachar, perhaps some hint of the Tahanu may be gleaned from the Bible.

In Numbers (26: 35–37) one reads: "These are the sons of Ephraim after their families: of Shutelah, the family of the Shutelahites; of Becher, the family of the Becherites; of TAHAN, the family of the TAHANITES " (emphasis— N. G.). In Chr. 7: 21 we read about the clan of Zabad in the tribe of Ephraim. The names of these two Ephraimite clans, Tahan and Zabad are phonetically identical with the names Tahanu and Sephed¹¹¹ in the Egyptian inscriptions. In the Merneptah Stele (See above p. 57) which depicts a victory over the Tahanu, there is a mention of the city of Gezer, which is known to have been an Ephraimite city.¹¹²

Together with the Mashasha we also meet with the name Khepher: "Mashasha son of Khepher"¹¹³ or "Khepher came to salam, he laid down

104 Barnette, *ibid.*, p. 11, note 6. Astour, *Helleno Semitica*, Leiden, 1965

105 Breasted, *Records*, Vol. IV, §. 78, p. 46.

106 For example see: Breasted, *Records*, Vol. IV, . § 35, pp. 83; 85.

107 Breasted, *Records*, Vol. IV §. 91, p. 55.

108 Breasted, *Records*, Vol. IV. § 103, p. 60.

109 For example see: Breasted, *Records*, Vol. IV, §37, p. 20; §38, p. 21; §49, p. 27; § 52, p. 29

110 Breasted *Records*, Vol. IV. § 133, pp. 78–79.

111 Concerning the interchange of the letters P and B and the letters S and Z, I believe discussion is superfluous, since this is a well known fact.

112 See: Jos. 16: 3; Jos. 21: 21; Ju. 1: 29.

113 Breasted, *Records*, Vol. IV, §. 90, p. 53.

his arms together with his soldiers"¹¹⁴ Khepher is mentioned in the Bible as the name of clan of the Manasseh tribe "and of Khepher, the family of the Khepherite"¹¹⁵. Perhaps the name Mashasha is merely a corrupt form of the name Manasseh.

The tribe of Zebulun includes a clan by the name of Sered: "of Sered, the family of Sardi"¹¹⁶.

Other names with a phonetic resemblance to those in the Egyptian inscriptions are "Tiria" a family in the tribe of Judah of the sons of Caleb (1Chr. 4: 16) = Tyr'yw'. Masa and Tema of the Ismaelite tribes: = M. S. ; Masa, (Records Vol. III. 306, p. 136; Temeh (Vol. IV. 91, p. 54; 50. p. 28). Perez –of the Perezite family in the tribe of Judah; the families of Mushi and Ishvi in the tribe of Asher; Recha (1Chr. 4: 12)and Lecha (1Chr. 4: 21) of the sons of Shela son of Judah (names phonetically identical to R. K–Reka Leka etc.).

Apart from the phonetic resemblance, there is no certainty that some of these names are identical to those of the Egyptian inscriptions. They are mentioned here solely to point out that within the regional area a sufficient number of names can be found of identical phonetic value to those in the Egyptian inscriptions, so making it unnecessary to search among the Greek islands and in Europe for like sounding names. Leaving aside the many contradictions involved in such identifications, these can only be made plausible by a series of distortions and unpleasing modifications of the original Egyptian names.¹¹⁷

114 Breasted, Records, Vol. IV § 97. p. 57.

115 Nu. 26: 32

116 Nu. 26: 26.

117 One may mention in this context the commandment given to the Israelites: "that they make them fringes in the borders of their garments throughout their generations, and that they put upon the fringes of the borders a riband of blue" (Nu. 15: 38). Compare this to the tassels and the hems in the clothing of the so called "sea people"