

### ANCIENT SEA POWERS OF THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

On page 408 of volume one of the Compendium is a list of Sea Powers called "Thal-assocracies" in Greek, from thalassos, the Greek word for "sea." This list presents the story of the sea powers of the eastern Mediterranean to about 480 B.C. which is the time of the struggle between Persia and Greece.

I have labelled this the "Eastern Mediterranean and Aegean Seas" but in reality, as you will see later, it is more than that: When studying Spanish history in volume two (pp. 124-126—Chapter VIII) you will see the story of the sea powers in terms of the western Mediterranean. The same powers appear in both lists but the dates will vary slightly depending on varying sources of history, and very probably also depending on circumstances. It is clear that in any particular year the transition from one power to the next may not have been complete. There may in fact have been more than one battle on the sea to lead to such a transition, one of the lists recording it from one point of view, the other from another point of view. For example, if the Phoenicians were a prominent power in the western Mediterranean as well as the east, their effect in the western Medit. may have lasted longer than, let's say, an eastern based power only which had no western areas of settlement except perhaps control of sea gates.

The reason this list is important is that it covers an extensive period of time. I will comment a little on the background of the list. This list is given to us by Eusebius from Diodorus of Sicily. It starts with the story of the Lydians or Maeonians after the recovery of western Asia Minor from the Greeks after the Greeks had controlled the Medit. at the time of that famous Trojan War which ended in 1181. The Greeks had been in control, then, prior to the time the list opens in 1149 (note p. 454 of vol. one). We are not told of any list of sea powers prior to this time. However, we know that for some time before this we have the story of Minos and Deucalion from Crete; then the Greeks rose to prominence on the sea. At even earlier times there obviously must have been Egyptian sea power in the days of the 12th Dynasty in order to have Egyptian colonies planted on Indian Ocean shores by Sesostris III the Great, 1779-1730, as told by Herodotus and possibly other ancient writers. But here we have the list after the defeat of the Greeks in 1149 in the Second Trojan War, and after the revival now of the eastern Mediterranean or Asiatic powers.

The MAEONIANs are certainly mentioned in the Biblical record in Judges 10:12 as Macnites (top of 408). They were allies of the Midianites and Amalekites. And if the Amalekites were centered in western Asia Minor in terms of the Heraclidae (see pages 401-406), an alliance in secular history including Maeonians or Macnites would have to involve the Biblical account at this very period! When you have these powers discussed in the Bible, when you have the same powers linked in Asia Minor, there is no doubt about which is which. And we definitely have a Biblical name for these people. This is one of the sub-divisions of the Lydians. This name "Maeonian" does not appear later; in history the term "Lydia" becomes more and more the prominent name. (But there are different names that have been applied to other peoples—Hellenes and Greeks, for instance, are the same people: The name "Greek" from a specific tribe, the name "Hellene" from a famous man and ancestor.)

The material here in this list is from the Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. XXVII, published in 1907. This was done at a time when it was not thought worthless to make a study of certain classical statements. By contrast, any history today would completely reject the idea that there were sea powers. No historian of the present would even entertain the concept as exemplified in this chart. This list of figures comes ultimately from Diodorus of Sicily (bottom of 407). It gives a remarkable picture of what was going on on the world scene during this long span of ancient history.

In the first place, to have the EGYPTIANs as a prominent power at this time is significant (768-725). We might note that it is of different significance than when I first wrote it for the first printing of the Compendium where we mistakenly had Ramesses the

Great placed in this period (768-725). We still have a Ramesses here, though not "the Great;" and this Ramesses is Piankhi of Egypt. But remember that at this time Piankhi found there were significant revolts in the Delta against his control; and that the Delta city of Tanis, for instance, was able to maintain itself. And one of the most famous kings in all of Grecian records of Egyptian history was Boechchoris (pp. 189-190), the son of Tefnakhte, of the city of Tanis. It is at this time that the Greeks have many traditions of Egyptians in the Mediterranean. This is the time of a later Hercules, if you remember the story of the time of the Third Trojan War preceded by the dynasties of Egypt at this time—XXIII and XIV. See the comment on page 410 and then go to the list on 193 for Dynasty XXIII and the explanatory paragraph on 194: "Osorthon, or Osorcho, was by the Egyptians called Heracles." In Greek history, Heracles lived three generations before the famous Trojan War. He was also the originator of the Olympic games. No historian has been able to reconcile these two facts" for the simple reason that the Olympic games are known but the dates assigned to Osorthon have not been traditionally accepted as they would have to be, and the Trojan War is assigned to 1181 (as its closing date) whereas we have another war that they have completely overlooked which ended in 677. So pages 193-194 give clear evidence that the Egyptians had already begun to be prominent on the sea in the days of Osorthon and that continued up until the time of the Milesians (725 B.C.). You bear this in mind and you see then a confirmation here, not only of this list, but of the Greek tradition—a confirmation, then also, of the significance of the Delta cities and why Tanis could maintain its independence (though it might have submitted to Piankhi as the overruler, nevertheless it maintained its independence and its kingly line—Dynasty XXIII of Tanis).

But to go back in the story—I will take a bit of time on this because I think it is important. The LYDIANS are in Asia Minor, the children of Lud (Gen. 10:22). As far as I know, they have never completely left this part of the world. I don't think there is any Biblical evidence that all of them have lived there or ever did settle there. Lud is associated with the Phoenicians; Lud is associated with Persia and Egypt, a Semitic family that is scattered—not necessarily Semitic-speaking, Shemitic by race—that scattered in various areas. Certainly from this area came peoples into Italy known as Tyranians or Etruscans, they must heavily by Lydians. Called also Maecnians—this is the term used in the Bible, not Lud. It represents that people of Asia Minor who recovered the power, the control, of trade and of the sea—that recovered it after the Greeks had taken over ~~seas~~ the sea routes following the First Trojan War ending in 1181 which they had won. This resulted in a Greek departure from sea control for centuries.

Herodotus tells us plainly that the first Greeks to visit the western Mediterranean or Spain are the Phocaeans (578-534). The first Greeks to visit the western Mediterranean were the Phocaeans! If this is true—and Herodotus said it was, and he lived barely a century after the record given here in the list so he should have known—then it is the same as saying that all people in this list of sea powers listed before the PHOCAEANS WERE NON-GREEK! In other words, Herodotus here is not talking about the ancient times of the Minoans and Greeks at the Trojan War, but in terms of more recent ancient times the first Greeks were not Lesbians, not Carians or Milesians—obviously Egyptians and Phoenicians were not Greek—not even Cyprians, Phrygians, Rhodians, Thracians or Pelasgians! Everyone of these, then, may be taken on the basis of Herodotus' sweeping and dramatic statement as non-Hellenic—non-Greek! This would come as a shock to many because Rhodes, and perhaps Cyprus, certainly Miletus, maybe not Caria, certainly Lesbians would be thought to be Greeks. But from a Greek point of view—Herodotus' view—they were not! Now, this will help to confirm a great deal of the story of who really was in these island areas in the period 1149-1057.

I want to say that this chapter should—this list—should be utilized as a guide for the chronological explanation of the archaeology of Troy. Read pages 464 to 475 carefully in this connection.

We have, then, a picture of non-Greeks. First, the children of Lud (already discussed). Then PELASGIANS or "Sea Peoples"—pelasgog coming from an idea of people of the sea. Who are these people? First of all notice their dates: They start in 1057, they end in 972. The year 972 is significant: It is the date of the death of Solomon and the beginning of the struggle between Israel and Judah that allowed for the complete separation of the two kingdoms and led to the demise of the control of the sea

by the people based on the Palestinian coast. The Biblical record demands that the Pelasgians be defined as a combination of Phoenicians and Israelites. The Phoenicians were already a sea power before David's time, continued as a sea power during his reign, and then Solomon was linked with them. There can be no doubt that this is the combination. The Pelasgians are not otherwise a separate people, and were always thought to be a variable people of perhaps more than one stock, there's no doubt about that. This is the story of the Phoenicians and of the Israelites during this period. It ends at 972 with the death of Solomon, the break-up of his empire, and now it passes to the Thracians.

Who were the THRACIANS? Anciently the Thracians were a significant people. Out of Thrace there moved a large number of people, as time went by, to Northwestern Europe. In fact, in 1040 B.C. there was a significant settlement that came from Thrace. Many of the earliest peoples who were in Scotland, as we will read in volume two, came from this area. The Thracians were originally some of the children of Tiras (Gen. 10:2). They also included, in the larger area of Thrace, settlers who descended from Meshech the son of Aram. I do not know whether the label "Thracian" here is limited to any one particular people, I think it is an area; it is what I would call an alliance of undoubtedly several peoples in what we call the Balkans today. What it means is that the mouth of the Danube and northern Greece became significant in terms of control of the sea. I would not exclude Israelites who had settled here having fled from Troy in the struggles with Greece in 1181 and also 1149.

From here the control of the sea passes to a small group of islands, the Rhodian Islands or the Isles of Rhodes, for a brief period of time (893-870). Confirmation of this kind of movement may be found in a recognition that often pottery from Rhodes was found in a particular period during the history of Troy and the stratigraphic sequences we have there (see top of p. 467). At this time, you see, it was possible for a nation to control the sea which had very little land—like Britain controlled all the seven seas, in fact, for awhile, though only a little island much smaller than India or China or Russia or Africa. If it has built a navy, a little island can control a vast portion of the world. That is what we have here in the case of the RHODIANS.

Suddenly, evidenced in the archaeology of Troy (top of 467), after the Rhodian period, at Troy we have a remarkable situation of a very barbarian type of culture that seems to have come from the inland—a culture that implies people who were mountaineers and hunters. Now the PHRYGIANS are from the inland. People have wondered, How was it possible, then, for an inland people, the Phrygians of Asia Minor, ever to be a sea power? Well, the answer should be simple: They built ships! They won some victories on the sea—didn't last too long. But there are land powers that sometimes gain temporary control of the sea. The Phrygians may be, again, a combination of more than one people. These are terms that are applied to districts, and we will find sometimes in history that there may be more than one people living in a given area. I would not exclude the fact that these can include Armenians, but it probably represents individuals of other origins as well—some of the sons of Mash the son of Aram (Gen. 10:23), who are from Aram just like Armenians, settled in this area. There were also others who were in here of the sons of Gomer. It represents a district in western Asia Minor, a very large district that came to be prominent. From the note at the bottom of page 366 in the chapter on the Hittites we would conclude that the Phrygians in western Asia Minor were prominent, the Arameans, Mitanni and the Hittite realm were very weak. So thus we may say with assurance that this item in the sea power list is a non-Hittite, or a non-Armenian area—that's what it would seem to be. I would also point out this: All of the peoples who came out of Asia Minor later and went into Europe whom we know as Franks—the German Franks and the French Franks—ultimately came from Phrygia. In fact all of the ancient writers said that the Greek word phryge is the Latin word "Frank"—men who are free. I would draw the conclusion here, now that I see the parallel picture for the Hittite area, that we are dealing with a remnant of that population which no longer gained prominence in western Asia Minor. After the original defeat in the Trojan War many of these people still remained behind in Asia Minor where Israelites had in fact settled in the Aegean. We know that Germans had come out of Europe (Mesopotamia?) and settled in this area, went to war against Troy first but later became their allies when they couldn't settle the problem, and then both of them warred against the Greeks.

So, in review, we have Lydians; we have Phoenicians and Israelites under the title "Pelasgians"; we may well have Israelites and/or others under the "Thracians" who were

from the Balkans where the people that went into Denmark came from, and also those who anciently went into Scotland. And in fact, all later peoples, even including the Frank and others, came through the region of greater Thrace and the Danube before going to Europe when they journeyed into the area of Gaul and Celtica. The Rhodians are not Greeks though the islands are Greek-speaking today; the Rhodians give every evidence of having ultimately colonized Portugal....The Phrygians would very likely include people who we would know as Franks.

The CYPRIANS were anciently settled by Kittim—but not the Greeks remember, that was Elishah (Gen. 10:4). Cyprus may also include Phoenician colonies. It's an island. No matter who was on Cyprus they were still labelled Cyprians. We must repeat that we are dealing with geographic areas with possibly more than one stock of people in any given area. The more we go through this the more I am impressed with the fact that modern nation-states, as we think of them, are combinations of peoples. Even the British Isles are made up of Cornishmen, Welsh, Englishmen, Scotsman—not to mention the Irish whom some would prefer not to mention! This is the kind of combination, you see, that makes up an island.

After the Cyprians came the PHOENICIANS. Certainly these would be Canaanite Sidonians. But again, on the other hand, there were evidences that the Phoenicians were made up sometimes of people who came from the Red Sea and were Edomites. There is no reason why they may not have been that. But basically we would regard them as Sidonians.

Then the Egyptians. Now the EGYPTIANS here represent one of several possible subdivisions. Remember, if Phoenician means Sidon then you're excluding all other Canaanites but Egyptian could include any number of sons of Mizraim, you see? So that you are here dealing with a geographic territory. The Egyptians become prominent on the sea.

Then come the MILESIANS. You'd think they were Greeks but Herodotus said the Phocaeians were the first! The Milesians were themselves a people on the coast of Asia Minor. All of this coastal region was settled by Ionians. These Ionians certainly seem to have been a people who came from the region of Athens, one of the two peoples who were there but were driven out; and I suspect, since the Athenians were originally from Egypt and were a combination of two people, that one of the two was Israelite (p. 390). I don't think the other was Egyptian though. I think it was Greek—that there were anciently Greeks who had settled that part of the Mediterranean to start with (you know, just small colonies). The city of Miletus settled Miletus on the north shore of the Black Sea. And this is the reason we call all the Scots or Scythians, who came out of Scythia, "Milesians." All Scottish people who didn't come from some other area, but who came from Scythia, went to the Mediterranean, went to Spain and to Egypt, finally went to Ireland—we have Irish history telling all that story—all these people are called Milesian Scots because they came from the port of Miletus which they had settled. If they came from the port of Miletus they obviously were also the same people who had control of the sea here in our list. This period (725-707) is significant in ancient times. I think what we have here is a picture of the Milesians in control of the sea representing colonies of Israelites on the northern shores of the Black Sea and on the coast of western Asia Minor. It is very possible that the reason the Assyrians made an effort to destroy the House of Israel in 721-718 was to break the control of the sea which the House of Israel had temporarily regained at this period in the late 700's B.C. I do not mean from Palestine, but elsewhere where the Israelite colonies were. Just as today, the sea power is not focused on the British Isles but from the United States. Or, if you want to look at it another way, the sea power in the Pacific is settled at Okinawa! You know, some historian might make the idea unclear by pointing out that Okinawa is the center of all of the sea power in the western Pacific. That is a point to bear in mind. Israelites being scattered may have held control of the sea and the Assyrians attempted to break it! I think this is probably true. The Assyrians finally got control of Cyprus; they finally got control of Carthage also in the days of Sargon the Great (735-700—page 303, bottom). And you will notice that Sargon was still alive in 707 when the Milesian sea power is broken.

Now we have the CARIANS. The Carians are a people from southwestern Asia Minor. They may well have been at this time allies of the Assyrians. Who the Carians were is not definite—well, it's again a geographic district. There may have been more than

two kinds of Carians—the original Carians and those who came later. The name would seem to include certain Phoenician Cushites. Now that may sound strange but there was one branch of Cushites that settled in this region from Dedan (Gen. 10:7) that were known as Phoenicians by certain Greek writers, that later settled the western Mediterranean on the shores of Africa, that were in this very region where the name "Car" was utilized. But I am sure it includes also a branch of the Lydians. There is a tradition that there were three brothers—Mese (spealing?), Car and Lud—this is the tradition of western Asia Minor as reported by Herodotus. I would presume that those were three sons, or in some way descendants, of Lud who divided up the region. I would suspect that is the case. Anyway, we're back to one of the branches in the area of Lydia. Western Asia Minor was extremely prominent then—many islands, and one of the most fruitful lands in ancient times.

Then we have the island of Lesbos from which we get the word "Lesbians." A very famous island frequented by some significant women. Remember our word "Lesbian" comes anciently from the custom of women at Lesbos. This island was settled by what we call Amazons. Again, historians might regard this as fabulous. But whether or not it is could be determined by the fact that they have archaeologically already uncovered in the Caucasus (Asia Minor and southern Russia) a number of tombs attributed to the Amazons where the king's body is that of a woman!! She has her sword by her side! In other words, there were women whose morality had come to this perverted state in that day. And they were made up primarily of two peoples as far as I have any record—Gothic from Gether the son of Aram (Gen. 10:23), and one branch of one of the German tribes. And it appears that it is a Germanic-speaking area that we are dealing with in that day, but Gothic is the primary emphasis. This particular people got into the habit where the men would fight on their own, and the women would fight on their own—and so women were warriors as well as men! The idea that they had only one breast and that the other breast was cut off in infancy is not true. It probably was because there was only the strap on one side that made one prominent and the other was not, due to the leather garment that was put on for fighting, this is probably the case. The Greeks thought that the word "Amazon" sounded like "one breast" and so they had this tradition that all the little girls had one breast seared off when they were babies. I don't think that's the case at all. In fact the Germanic tradition that gives much more about it shows that it goes back to an old, old Gothic or Germanic word which even we remember in the modern word of madchen meaning a young girl who was not a married woman. And the old word was mazon—hence the "Amazon." This was then reapplied by the Portuguese to certain warriors on the upper reaches in Brazil of the Great Amazon River where they found women fighting, and hence Amazons are there too—but they are a totally different people. The story of this is very clear, we know what we are dealing with.

The island of LESBOS was, in all tradition, founded by Amazons. And the Gothic history of Sweden, the Germanic history of Germany, tells us the inter-relationship of this people and how they had settled in much of Asia Minor. This island of Lesbos lost its control in 578, which had been shared in part by the Carians in tradition—they were right next to each other really.

Then we have the first Greeks coming into prominence, the PHOCAEANS, and then the list reflects Greeks to its conclusion: Sarigans; the Lacedemonians only 2 years when the Spartans, an inland city, had control; finally the Naxians, Eritreans, and Aeginetans.

Then you have the Persians attempting to get control of the sea, were not able to maintain it. The Greeks have it thereafter till the Romans wrested it from the world; and at this point we are no longer concerned with the sea powers.

[This list is regarded by Dr. Hoeh as the most important in the Compendium for its value in confirming his entire reconstruction of ancient history!]