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Summary: King Taita and His “Palistin”: Philistine State or Neo-Hittite Kingdom?

The end of the Hittite Empire and the destruction and abandonment of Alalakh represents a cultural break between the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages in the ‘Amuq Valley. In the Iron I, a population with clear ties to the greater Aegean world, perhaps related to the Philistines of southern Canaan, established an agro-pastoral settlement at Tell Ta’ynat and the surrounding area. This occupation, marked by Field Phases 6–3 at Ta’ynat, was both materially and chronologically ephemeral, and should be viewed as a cultural outlier sandwiched between the Hittite-controlled LBA and later Iron I. This intrusive population lived alongside the indigenous inhabitants of the ‘Amuq, bequeathing to the region a toponym—Palistin—that would far outlast their own relevance and archaeological visibility. By the First Building Period at Tell Ta’ynat, which followed the Aegean-related phases, the site was home to a dynasty overseeing a typical Neo-Hittite state, with its toponym all that remained of the “Sea Peoples” presence that occupied it at the beginning of the Iron Age.
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Resumen: El rey Taita y su “Palistin”: ¿estado filisteo o reino neo-hitita?

El final del imperio hitita y la destrucción y abandono de Alalak representan una ruptura cultural entre la Edad del Bronce Tardío y la Edad del Hierro Temprano en el valle del ‘Amuq. En la Edad del Hierro I, una población con nexos claros con el mundo del Egeo, quizás relacionada con los filisteos del sur de Canaan, estableció un asentamiento agro-pastoral en Tell Ta’ynat y el área circundante. Esta ocupación, marcada por las fases 6–3 en Ta’ynat, fue material y cronológicamente efímera, y
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debería ser vista como una fase cultural atípica ubicada entre la etapa de la Edad del Bronce Tardío controlada por los hititas y más tarde la Edad del Hierro I. Esta población intrusa vivió junto a los habitantes nativos del 'Amuq, y legó a la región un topónimo—Palistin—que sobrevivió más allá de la relevancia y visibilidad arqueológica de este grupo. En el primer período de construcción en Tell Ta’yinat, que siguió a las fases relacionadas con el Egeo, el sitio albergó a una dinastía que dirigía un típico estado neo-hitita, y su topónimo fue lo único que quedó de la presencia de los “Pueblos del mar” que lo ocuparon a comienzos de la Edad del Hierro.

**Palabras clave:** Pueblos del mar – Neo-hitita – Palistin – Filisteos

**INTRODUCTION**

The collapse of the Late Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean left in its wake a geopolitical landscape that was far more complex and fragmented than that which preceded it. However, examinations of individual regions and polities in the Early Iron Age reflect measures of both continuity and change. This paper will address the 'Amuq Valley at this time, with particular focus on the kingdom of Palistin/Walistin and the person of King Taita. Was this polity a northern kingdom of Sea Peoples, and Taita a Philistine king? Or was it a Neo-Hittite state led by a king and dynasty who followed in the Hittite imperial tradition?

**NEO-HITTITES IN NORTHERN SYRIA**

The period in the northern Levant between the fall of the Hittite Empire at the end of the 13th century BC and the floruit of the Syro-Hittite states in the Iron II (ca. 900 BC) remains a “dark” age in many respects, though recent work in the region has helped shed an increasing measure of light on the matter. Based on present evidence, the vacuum left by Ḫatti’s fall appears to have led to a balkanization¹ of the region, as “rump states” led by rulers with direct connection to the prior regime jockeyed for position with new polities that were established in place of the old.² Both cultural continuity and change are visible in

¹Harrison 2009a: 187. One reason for the Neo-Hittite kingdoms’ success and stability following Hatti’s fall may be the independence they increasingly gained over the course of the 13th c. BC; Harrison 2009b: 172.
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the material record at this time, with the result being an emerging picture of a highly dynamic, multicultural period in the history of the region.³

Some of the most significant changes include the appearance of new social groups and new toponyms, and, in some areas, an increased and altered interaction with Aegean-style material culture. These have, at times, been associated with the movement of “Sea Peoples” and other groups—perhaps raiders, perhaps migrants—who were part of an eastward movement of peoples at this time.⁴ The continuities, on the other hand, are the source from which our modern terms “Neo-” and “Syro-Hittite” are derived. These modern constructs do not denote ethnicity or a sense of common identity, but instead recognize certain physical characteristics in individual polities that existed in northern Syria and southeastern Anatolia between the beginning of the Iron Age on one end, and their eventual absorption into the Neo-Assyrian empire on the other (ca. 12th–8th c. BC).⁵ These common traits include, in varying combinations and quantities, dynastic succession from the Hittite empire, as seen especially at Karkemiš; cult revivals featuring iconography and architecture in the Hittite tradition (see below); re-use of Luwian or Hittite royal names; records written in the Luwian language using the Luwian hieroglyphic script, which had previously been utilized on Hittite public monuments; and geographic proximity to the region referred to as “Ḫatti” in Assyrian, Urartian, and Hebrew texts of the Iron Age.⁶

Long believed to have been most prominent among the Neo-Hittite “rump states” is Karkemiš, which was ruled by a dynasty of “Great Kings” now thought to have connected the Hittite empire to the Neo-Hittite first millennium.⁷ However, as will be discussed further below, many of the traits noted above—if not all—can also be seen in another polity about which our knowledge has begun to increase significantly in recent years. This territory is known variously as Palistin or Walistin, and was seemingly centered at Tell Taʿyinat (ancient Kunulua) in the ‘Amuq valley.⁸ The history of

⁵ Bryce 2012: 75; Ponchia 2011: 281.
⁸ Harrison 2009a: 209b.
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Palistin/Walistin’s Iron Age II successor, the kingdom of *Patina* (Assyrian *Unqi*), is known primarily from Assyrian textual sources.\(^9\) However, survey and excavation in the ‘Amuq plain (the plain of Antioch) and at Tell Ta’yinat has recently combined with epigraphic reassessment to increase our insight into its Iron I history and development.

**TAITA, HERO AND KING OF PALISTIN/WALISTIN**

Based on epigraphic evidence found over a wide geographic area, Palistin/Walistin has been reconstructed as a sprawling Iron Age kingdom extending from the ‘Amuq plain to Aleppo in the east and Hama in the south, perhaps with its capital at Tell Ta’yinat (Fig. 1).\(^{10}\) These dimensions encompass the former LBA kingdoms of Mukiš, Niya, and Nuhašše, which had been subordinate to Aleppo under the Hittite regime.\(^{11}\) By the Neo-Assyrian period, this prospective kingdom had been broken up once again, with Patina succeeding Palistin/Walistin (both chronologically and linguistically), and Arpad and Hamath occupying its former eastern and southern territory, respectively.

The earliest known ruler of Palistin/Walistin is *Taita*, whose eponymous relief at the Temple of the Storm God at Aleppo (ALEPPO 6) famously references him as “Hero and King of Palistin” (Fig. 2).\(^{12}\) The name *Taita* was previously encountered in Hieroglyphic Luwian on two other monuments, found at the sites of Meharde and Sheizar (ca. 25 km northwest of Hama). The former inscription (MEHARDE) is dedicated to Taita’s wife, Kupapiya “Queen of the Land,” while the latter (SHEIZAR) is a funerary monument in her honor.\(^{13}\) However, rather than being rendered *Palistin* as on ALEPPO 6, the toponym is rendered *Walistin* in both of these inscriptions. The same is true of an inscription discovered at Tell Ta’yinat (TAYINAT 1) and a pair of stelae found at Arsuz south of the Bay of Iskanderun (ARSUZ 1 and 2).\(^{14}\) The Ta’yinat and Arsuz inscriptions do not mention Taita at all; a fragment of TAYINAT 1 mentions a “Halparuntuša,” who may equate to king Qalparunda

---

\(^{10}\) Hawkins 2009; Steitler 2010 has used this geographic evidence and linguistic analysis to associate Taita with the biblical Toi, king of Hamath (2 Sam. 8:9–10, 1Chr. 18:9–10).  
\(^{11}\) Harrison 2010: 84; Ponchia 2011: 282.  
\(^{14}\) Hawkins 2010: 8; 2011: 51; Weeden 2013: 12.  
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of Unqi known from Assyrian records, while ARSUZ 1 and 2 are attributed to Šuppiluliuma son of Manana.

The reliefs mentioning Taita and/or Palistin/Walistin have been dated to various times within the Iron Age I. Hawkins initially offered an 11th–10th c. BC date based on historical and epigraphic analysis. However, further analysis, along with the consideration of a possible $p > w$ sound shift over time (possibly suggesting an initial fricative $f$, as may be expected if this toponym is to be related to the Philistines/Philistia of the southern Levant), subsequently led him to suggest that we are in fact seeing epigraphic evidence for two kings named Taita. In this scenario, Taita I was king of Palistin, while Taita II (+ $n$), perhaps removed by as little as a generation, was king of Walistin. The dates proposed are 11th c. for ALEPPO 6 (Taita I), 10th c. for MEHARDE and SHEIZAR (Taita II [+ $n$]), 10th–9th c. for ARSUZ 1–2 (Šuppiluliuma), and 9th c. for TELL TAYINAT 1 (Halparuntiya). Thus, the $^{14}$C date of the Aleppo temple’s reconstruction, ca. the 11th c. BC, meshes with Hawkins’s suggested date of Taita I, as opposed to the possible later Taita(s) of the Hama, Arsuz, and Ta’yinat inscriptions. Sass, on the other hand, has argued for only one Taita, whom he dates to the late 10th c.

The use of Hittite royal names (specifically, Šuppiluliuma and Labarna) by some kings of Palistin/Walistin and Patina has been seen as evidence that this “rump state” was founded by a direct descendant of the Hittite royal line, as seen at Karkemiš. Also in favor of a connection with the preceding imperial Hittite period is the “cult revival” that King Taita seems to have led at ‘Ain Dārā and at Aleppo, where he rebuilt the Temple of the Storm God following a destruction by fire.

While the Aleppo temple itself is not the subject of this study, it is the sole

---

17 Singer 2012: 463.
20 Sass 2010a; 2010b.
21 For Labarna (= Lubarna of Hattina), see e.g. the Annals and Standard Inscription of Aššurnasirpal; Luckenbill 1926: 165–177.
currently-known source of the toponym Palistin and of that term’s association with Taita; as such, a brief background on the structure is pertinent to this discussion. A major cult center beginning in the middle of the third millennium, the Late Bronze Age iteration of this temple bore multicultural elements, including those emblematic of Hittite, Syrian, and Mesopotamian cultures. Following destruction by fire during the LBA, the temple was rebuilt with layout altered to accommodate a standard Hittite “bent axis” scheme. With this shift, the Storm God’s image was relocated to the eastern wall, where it was both distant from the entrance and out of the direct line of sight of those entering. After being destroyed by fire once again at the end of the LBA, it was again rebuilt, once again on a straight axis and with some elements of its older architecture incorrectly re-integrated. The Palistin relief was added to the temple during this reconstruction, on the eastern wall beside the image of the Storm God. While the relief follows Luwian and Aramaean style in its proportions, the king is attired according to Hittite tradition, wearing garments that are specifically allowable when in the presence of divinity.

The available evidence therefore suggests that both Taita and his line fit with seemingly perfect comfort into the Neo-Hittite tradition, contra Sass’s characterization of Taita as “probably of Sea Peoples’ or outright Philistine stock.” In fact, if not for the toponymic association with Palistin or Philistia and the short-lived presence of Aegean-style material culture in the Iron I ‘Amuq (see below), it would be difficult to find any basis for associating Taita with the Aegean in general or the Philistines in particular, let alone for ascribing to him a “Philistine” identity. Legitimation of rule via cultural appropriation is certainly not rare, including in the Neo-Hittite sphere; as countless examples general and specific demonstrate, from the adoption of the names of former Great Kings of Hatti to Hamiyatas the Aramaean king of Til Barsip-Masuvari depicting himself with the Storm God, the power of tradition and appearances played no small part in governing the public-facing

26 As Kohlmeyer notes, this causes the king’s gaze to be focused slightly above, rather than on, the Storm God; Kohlmeyer 2011: 261.
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actions of rulers and officials. In the case of Taita, both the incorporation of the Storm God into his public image and the use of the Luwian language and script are acts of legitimation that are both appropriate and expected for a Neo-Hittite king.

A “Philistine” Kingdom?

How, then, are Taita and his line to be reconciled with the influx of Aegean-style material culture and the appearance of the toponym Palistin in the Iron I?

Ta’yinat and Alalakh are the two largest mounded sites in the ‘Amuq plain (Fig. 1). Less than one kilometer apart, they seem to have alternated as centers of habitation in the Bronze and Iron Ages: following a destruction late in the Early Bronze IVB, Ta’yinat was abandoned and Alalakh inhabited through the Middle Bronze Age and into the LB II, at which point settlement there ceased and, in the 12th c. BC, Ta’yinat was reoccupied. Harrison suggests that Ta’yinat’s resettlement was “either co-terminus with, or immediately following, the destruction or abandonment of” Alalakh, while Janeway sees a gap between Alalakh’s abandonment ca. 1200 BC and the reoccupation of Ta’yinat late in the 12th c.31 The short-distance shifts from Tell Ta’yinat to Tell Atchana and back again had the functional result of keeping the capital (and largest settlement) of the ‘Amuq in largely the same location through the Bronze and Iron Ages.34

However, there seems to be more at play in the last of these shifts than a simple case of “mound-hopping” by a jumpy indigenous population, as the material culture of the first Iron Age settlement at Ta’yinat betrays clear markers of an intrusive population. This difference is clearly seen in architectural changes, as well as in the comparative presence, volume, and use of the Aegean-style pottery between Alalakh in the LB II and Ta’yinat in the Iron I. Alalakh was a major importer of Mycenaean ceramics, the bulk of which seem to have been part of the typical Aegean drinking set. The site is second only to Ugarit in the quantity of Mycenaean amphoroid kraters recovered.

32 Harrison 2010: 84.
33 Janeway 2014: 312.
34 Casana 2007: 203.
35 Yener 2010: 1.
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while the high number of vertical globular flasks also found there—the most anywhere in the Eastern Mediterranean—may have contained concentrated wine.\textsuperscript{36} Additionally, the quantity of Cypriot pottery found there is among the most voluminous anywhere outside Cyprus itself, thus further demonstrating the involvement of this key site in the Eastern Mediterranean trade network of this period.\textsuperscript{37} The role of the main site in the ‘Amuq as a gateway for imports continued in the Iron II, as well, with Ta’yinat serving as a hub of exchange between Cyprus, the Aegean, and the Levant.\textsuperscript{38} Interestingly, the latest of the Mycenaean imports date to the LH IIIA2, thus leaving an apparent gap in importation prior to Alalakh’s late 13\textsuperscript{th} c. abandonment.\textsuperscript{39} It is possible that the cessation of Mycenaean imports to Alalakh at the beginning of LH IIIB is connected to Hittite domination of the region and to political tension between Hatti and Ahhiyawa, evidence for which may be seen in several Hittite documents.\textsuperscript{40}

None of these characteristics is in evidence at Tell Ta’yinat in the Early Iron Age (Field Phases 6 through 3; Swift’s Phase N), which presents a starkly different picture not only from the preceding Late Bronze Age in the ‘Amuq, but from the succeeding Iron Ib/Iron II periods as well. Unlike Late Bronze Alalakh, no monumental architecture (administrative or religious) exists in this period.\textsuperscript{41} Rather, the architectural remains found to date are primarily silos, pits, and small houses built atop Ta’yinat’s final Early Bronze Age level, representative of a “rudimentary village settlement” with agro-pastoral focus.\textsuperscript{42} This phenomenon of population dispersal into smaller agrarian settlements is seen across the ‘Amuq in the Iron Age.\textsuperscript{43}

Painted pottery suddenly becomes a significant part of the ceramic assemblage at this time, making up perhaps up to 90\% of the Phase N assemblage—a stark contrast to the preceding and succeeding periods.\textsuperscript{44} The copious Aegean-style ceramics appearing at this time are not imported, but locally made, and their repertoire and spread (from three sites in the LB II

\textsuperscript{36} Koehl 2005: 419; 2010: 83.
\textsuperscript{37} Kozal 2010: 71.
\textsuperscript{39} Özgünel 1996; Koehl 2005; 2010: 82.
\textsuperscript{41} Yener and Yazıcıoğlu 2010: 29.
\textsuperscript{44} Janeway 2006–7: 128, 136.
to nearly thirty in the Iron I)\textsuperscript{45} are different from the preceding levels in the ‘Amuq (Fig. 3).

In contrast to the viticulture-centered repertoire of Mycenaean ceramics at Alalakh, Ta’yinat displays a wider variety of forms and far less standardization of size and detail.\textsuperscript{46} The Aegean-style pottery is accompanied by other intrusive domestic elements, among the most prominent of which are the unperforated, cylindrical loomweights seen around the Eastern Mediterranean beginning in this period, often (though not always) in connection with locally-manufactured Aegean-style ceramics.\textsuperscript{47} While these are frequently referred to as “Aegean-type loomweights” in the literature—most of which focuses on their connection to the presence of “Sea Peoples”—it is rarely noted, but important to mention, that this type of loomweight is not just new to the Levant in the 12\textsuperscript{th} c. BC, but that it is largely unknown in the Aegean prior to this time, as well.\textsuperscript{48} The earliest Aegean instance of “spool” weights seems to be Late Minoan (LM) IIIA2 or IIIB on Crete,\textsuperscript{49} but this is not followed until LH IIIC Early at Lefkandi\textsuperscript{50} and Tiryns,\textsuperscript{51} when hundreds of these objects suddenly appear. Beyond this, such loomweights are only known from the LH IIIC Middle and beyond, thus making their appearance in the Aegean generally, and on the Greek mainland in particular, cotemporal with (or perhaps even later than) their appearance in the Levant.\textsuperscript{52}

In keeping with the regionalism seen in the Iron I, Ta’yinat in Phase N displays the typical Northern Levantine affinity for painted closed forms.\textsuperscript{53} However, the overall repertoire is diverse, including deep and shallow angular

\textsuperscript{45} Janeway 2014: 296.
\textsuperscript{46} Janeway 2014: 296–297.
\textsuperscript{48} Ben-Shlomo 2011: 198-201; Rahmstorf 2003, 2005.
\textsuperscript{49} At Chania, a single weight was found in a LM IIIA2 context and four in LM IIIB2, though none are presently known from the LM IIIB1 period; Bruun-Lundgren 2011: 382. 58 spools were found in a LM IIIB context at Sissi, while four have reportedly been found in LM IIIA2-B1 contexts at Malia; Gaignerot-Driessen 2013: 73.
\textsuperscript{50} Evely 2006: 296–297.
\textsuperscript{51} Rahmstorf 2003.
\textsuperscript{52} Rahmstorf 2003: 406; but cf. Ben-Shlomo 2011: 200. For sites with spoolweights on LM IIIC Crete, see Gaignerot-Driessen 2013: 73, with references. Cf. also Cecchini 2000: 216–217, with references, who notes that there may be evidence for their use during the LBA at Alishar Höyük, Tarsus, and Tille Höyük in Anatolia, thus providing a potential alternate source of these “Aegean-style” objects.
\textsuperscript{53} Janeway 2013: 102.
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bowls, kraters, amphoras and jugs, spouted (“feeding”) bottles, pilgrim flasks, goblets, and even a small number of Aegean-style cooking pots (though, as at Tarsus, local cooking traditions continued alongside the introduction of Aegean-style implements). The Aegean-style cooking pots in particular are exceedingly rare at Ta’yinat, making up less than 5 percent of diagnostic rim sherds, all of which appear in the later phases of Iron I occupation (FP 5 and 6). According to Janeway, these are best dated from the later half of the Late Helladic (LH) IIIC to the Submycenaean periods (ca. 11th c. BC). Decoration includes pictorial scenes, the most remarkable of which shows a warrior in the feather-hatted or “hedgehog-helmeted” tradition that is best known from the representations of “Sea Peoples” at Medinet Habu. These figures, which appear in Eastern Mediterranean art beginning in the 13th–12th c. transition, can be found on painted pottery from Bademgediği Tepe (ancient Puranda) and Kos in the East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface (Transitional LH IIIB2-IIIC Early and LH IIIC Early, respectively) to several sites on the Greek mainland (the bulk of which date to LH IIIC Middle). However, this is only the second time such a sherd has been found within a purported “Sea Peoples” settlement. The only comparandum comes from the Philistine heartland on the southern coastal plain of Canaan, where it appears on a krater from Ashkelon (Fig. 4).

While impressive for its overwhelming proportion of painted pottery, this basic farming settlement seems an unlikely candidate for the seat of the “Hero and King” of an expansive Iron Age kingdom—particularly when viewed in light of the succeeding (Phase O) level at the site. Superimposed over these phases are monumental structures associated with the First Building Period (BP1) at Ta’yinat, which represents another clear break in the site’s material culture and re-engineering of its architecture and layout beginning ca. 1100

55 Janeway 2013: 284, 287.
56 Janeway 2013: 297.
57 Janeway 2013: pl. 9.15.
58 Mountjoy 2011: 484.
59 Find-sites include Amarynthos, Iolkos, Lefkandi, Mycenae, Pyrgos Livanaton (Homeric Kynos), and Tyrins; Crouwel 1991: fig. 7b; Tsountas 1896: pls. 1-2; Vermeule and Karageorghis 1982: pls. XI. 28, 42–43, 45–47, 51, 56–57, 64, 64.1. The Kos, Pyrgos Livanaton, and Bademgediği Tepe examples are particularly noteworthy for their nautical nature, with the latter two featuring naval battles between “hedgehog-helmed” warriors; Emanuel 2014; 2015; Mountjoy 2011.
60 Stager and Mountjoy 2007.
The main structures of this period are Building XIII, a *bit hilani*, and Building XIV, a massive (600m²) building that partially overlays XIII. These buildings seem to have been part of a larger complex oriented around a paved courtyard, and the monumental basalt column bases, carved orthostats, and monumental Hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions associated with this complex are typical of an important Neo-Hittite city. The cultural break represented by the stratum associated with BP1 is also demonstrated by a ceramic shift, as Red Slipped Burnished Ware (RSBW) eclipses the locally made wares of the preceding period, and the painted pottery (so visible in the earliest Iron Age phases) disappears from the repertoire.

**DISCUSSION**

The situation in the Eastern Mediterranean *ca.* 1200 BC is now understood to be far more complex than the few lines of prose offered by Ramesses III (“*No land could stand before their arms, from Hatti, Kode, Carcemish, Arzawa, and Alashiya on...*”), which were long thought to accurately describe the events of these “Crisis Years” and the role of the “Sea Peoples” in them. It is now increasingly understood that the breakdown of the Late Bronze Age system fragmented the Cilician and Levantine coasts, resulting in individual polities and territories that interacted with each other and with newcomers to the region on an individual basis. In place of total destruction and upheaval, some regions and polities, such as Phoenicia, seem to have continued largely as before, albeit with a veneer of bureaucracy having been removed, resulting in increased self-determination that could be actualized via growth in international contacts. Cyprus was similarly prosperous in the 12th and 11th centuries BC (the establishment and rapid abandonment of “refuge sites” like Maa-Paleokastro notwithstanding), experiencing economic growth, serving as an expanding hub of trade, and correspondingly reorganizing its settlements to the form they would maintain throughout the Iron Age.

---

63 *MH I* pl. 46 col. 16; Wilson 1974: 262.
In others areas, there were new cultures and new populations to be interacted with, and a complex process of identity and cultural negotiation to be engaged in. However, while population shifts can be seen in the material record—including the movement of groups bearing elements of Aegean, Cypriot, and Anatolian-style material cultures—it is unlikely that any “string of Sea Peoples polities [sprang] up in the Iron Age I along much of the Levantine and Asia Minor coasts” following the end of the Late Bronze Age. Instead, though newcomers are visible in the material record at some sites (but hardly all), the engagement with material influences and the negotiation of status and identity that took place across this massive area in this period were incredibly diverse in nature. Some areas seem to have gained access to new elements of foreign material culture, either via trade or the movement of peoples. Others coexisted with newcomers, some of whom bore with them Aegean-style material culture which has been variously connected to the Greek mainland, the Interface, and/or Cyprus. An example of this is Kazanli Höyük, where, in the late 13th or early 12th c. BC, there appears locally-manufactured pottery which is in the Aegean style, but whose closest stylistic correlates are found on Cyprus and in the East Aegean. At Tell Afis in Syria, on the other hand, where indigenous occupation is clearly continuous into the Iron I despite a 12th c. destruction (albeit with a more agro-pastoral focus and temporarily debased architecture and organization), Aegean-style table wares and cylindrical loomweights appear alongside indigenous cooking and storage methods. This perhaps suggests communication, if not cohabitation, with elements of an intrusive population. Still others, as seen at Kinet Höyük and Kilise Tepe, incorporated newcomers who displayed different orientations altogether, while the appearance at this time of the Cypriot “cooking pot à la stéatite,” or band-handled cooking pot, on the Syrian coast and its spread in the later Iron I to the ‘Amuq Valley demonstrates further interaction with foreign material culture in the region.

At the other end of the spectrum, some of these Aegean-affiliated groups appear to have settled in relatively large numbers and created new polities, such as those on the southern coastal plain of Canaan that came to make up

---

67 Sass 2010b: 171.
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Philistia. Even within and across these, though, significant variance can be seen in the nature of both the intrusive material culture and the relationships with the indigenous population.72 Part of this is certainly due to the “mixed multitude” nature of what have been frequently referred to as the “Sea Peoples” as reflected in the material culture of sites in Cilicia, the ‘Amuq, and Philistia (and perhaps in areas of the coastal Levant between them), as well as the increasingly-recognized complexity of their migration.73 Singer has convincingly argued that the ethnikon used in reference to these people (and the derived toponym that, while known primarily from later written sources,74 survives to this day) is a self-referential term that the Egyptian chroniclers and later biblical writers learned directly from them.75 The appearance of Palistin as a geopolitical entity containing similar material culture supports this conclusion, and the Phase N period at this site should likely be seen as home to an intrusive population with Aegean-style material culture, who gave their name to the land before quickly assimilating into the indigenous population with whom they had coexisted since their arrival. In fact, the association of Palistin with the Peleset of Medinet Habu has led one scholar to suggest that Ramesses III’s land battle against the Sea Peoples and defeat of “the land of the Peleset” (t3 Plst) actually records a campaign against Philistines (or, more correctly in light of ALEPPO 6, Palistinians) in this northern territory.76

Thus, opposite southern Canaan, where the toponym Palestine has endured for millennia, the evidence points to another ethnically-derived toponym that should be seen as a remnant not only of an Aegean and/or “Sea Peoples” influence, but perhaps of the same group known from the coastal plain. In light of this, another such case bears mentioning. The Cilician territory called Hiyawa (Assyrian Que) appears in one of two parallel Luwian-Phoenician


Aside from the biblical text, the earliest known reference to Philistia by name comes from a Third Intermediate Period inscription on a Middle Kingdom statue base, which references a “Padeset” who is “emissary of Canaan of the Philistines”; Singer 1994: 330.

Singer 2013.

Kahn 2011; MH I pls. 32–34; RITA V 57.

It is likely that Ahhiyawa > Hiyawa > Qawa > Que; Oreshko 2013: 28. For further references and analysis of Ahhiyawa, see, inter alia, Beckman, Bryce and Cline 2012; Finkelberg 1988; Niemeier 1998.
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bilingual inscriptions, ÇİNEKÖY and KARATEPE, in which the dedicator assigns himself to the House of Mopsos, the legendary Greek seer, founder of cities, and traveler from Cilicia to Ashkelon. The toponym Hiyawa seems to have been transferred some time after the Hittite empire’s recession beyond Cilicia, perhaps as an ethnikon brought by Greek-speakers who bore with them elements of Aegean material and linguistic culture. After a short period, the toponymic form of this ethnikon and the cultural memory of Mopsos became all that remained of the once-intrusive population that brought it to the southern coast of Asia Minor, though it was enduring enough that Herodotus centuries later noted that Cilicians were referred to as Hyp-Achaioi ("Sub-Achaeans").

A similar situation seems to be present in the ‘Amuq, where the new toponym of Palistin/Walistin was derived from an ephemeral Aegean-related population that arrived after the close of the LBA and occupied the area in cooperation with an indigenous population of unknown size. This brief period, marked by Field Phases 3 through 6 at Tell Taʿyinat, was followed at the end of the Iron I by a return of Syro-Hittite material culture which is seen in particular in art, architecture, language, and script, as well as in other cultural elements like the names of some Palistinian/Walistinian and Pattinite kings.

**Conclusion**

Not long ago, Pruss argued against a “Sea Peoples” presence among the intrusive Iron I population of the ‘Amuq on the grounds that “gibt es keinen einzigenden historischen Hinweis auf eine solche Situation, kein einziges entsprechendes Toponym” (“there is no single historical reference to such a situation, not a single corresponding toponym”). However, as we have seen, quite the opposite seems to be true of the kingdom of Palistin/Walistin and its successor Patina (as well as of the Cilician territory of Hiyawa/Que). By the First Building Period, it seems that Tell Taʿyinat was home to a dynasty overseeing a typical Neo-Hittite state, and a toponym was all that remained of the “Sea

---


80 Herodotus Hist. 7.91; cf. Singer 2013: 323–324. 
81 Pruss 2002: 172.
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Peoples” presence that briefly occupied it at the beginning of the Iron Age.
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Figures

Fig. 1.
Map of the northern Levant showing key sites mentioned in the text. **Inset:** Relative locations of Tell Ta'yyinat and Tell Atchana.

Fig. 2.
Inscription ALEPPO 6, showing Taita “Hero and King of Palistin,” from the Temple of the Storm God at Aleppo (Hawkins 2011: 42 fig. 5).
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Fig. 3.
Myc. IIIC bell-shaped bowls from field phases 6-3, Tell Ta‘yinat (after Harrison 2009a: 182).

Fig. 4.
“Feather-hatted” or “hedgehog-helmed” figures from the Aegean, Egypt, and the Levant: a. pictorial krater body sherd, Tell Ta‘yinat (after Janeway 2013: pl. 9.15); b. shipborne warrior on a pictorial krater body sherd, Pyrgos Livanaton (after Mountjoy 2011: 485 fig. 2); c. pictorial Philistine bichrome krater, Ashkelon (Stager and Mountjoy 2007: 53 fig. 4); d. Sea Peoples warrior, Medinet Habu (after MH I, pl. 34).