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Abstract

The approaches used in recent research regarding the ‘Sea Peoples’ of the late Bronze Age in the Eastern Mediterranean have been evaluated in this thesis. Different influences exist on all planes and effect all things in different ways. Researchers have the power of creating the history we know and all too often is the biased influence of the researcher forgotten and their words are taken as facts. Different researchers approach, the studies using different schools of thought such as e.g. ‘processualism’ and post-processualism. Some scholars firmly stay by one approach side, but the approaches should be viewed as complementing each other. Raising awareness of some of the major questions within the research, and scholars different ways of approaching them is a main point in this thesis. The different scholars’ approaches to research concerning the ‘Sea Peoples’ ethichity, their migration and impact brought up in the different texts have been analyzed. Concluding remarks focus on that the term ‘Sea Peoples’ is a creation of the modern day scholars and that researchers should refrain from using the term and focus on the different clans instead. A strong vote for interdisciplinary and complementary studies is presented regarding the future of this study and others.
Introduction

Terms like the ‘Sea Peoples’ have been used for various groups throughout documented history, from modern day piracy on the African coast to the times of ancient Egypt. From the Scandinavian Vikings to the Caribbean pirates, the words of peoples coming from the seas raiding and invading lands have been documented all over the world (Harper, 2014; Brink, Price, 2008; Lucie-Smith, 1978).

“The foreign countries made a conspiracy in their islands. All at once the lands were removed and scattered in the fray. No land could stand before their arms, from Khatte, Quode, Carchemish, Arzawa, and Alashiya on, being cut off at [one time]. A camp [was set up] in one place in Amor. They desolated its people, and its land was like that which had never come into being. They were coming forward toward Egypt, while flame was prepared before them. Their confederation was the Pelset, Tjekker, Shekelesh, Denye(n) and Weshesh, lands united. They laid their hands upon the lands as far as the circuit of the earth, their hearts confident and trusting: “Our plans will succeed!”” (Wilson 1969, referred to in Cline, O’Connor, 109)

The ‘Sea Peoples’ of the late Bronze Age Mediterranean is an umbrella term for the different clans that, during the Late Bronze Age, raided and invaded lands and cities in Egypt, the Aegean and the

Fig. 2.2. Alexikoua. 2013. Invasions, destructions and possible population movements during the collapse of the Bronze Age, ca. 1200. The picture above provides an overview of the area in question, as well as the proceedings of the collapse which were the invasions and migrations. The Egyptian New Kingdom, Hittite Empire and Mycenaean Greece are visible in different colors. It is only meant to present an image for understanding of both the collapse and the area during approx. 1200 BC. This map is only showing one side of the collapse, but I consider it to be a good overview to begin with.
Near East. They were the Sherden, Peleset, Tjekker, Denyen, Shekelesh, Ekwesh, Teresh, Karkisa, Lukka and the Weshesh. This gathering has been considered as an overriding factor to the Late Bronze Age Collapse of the great Mediterranean civilizations (D'amato, Salimbeti, 2015; Cline, 2015).

Some questions arises today: were these Peoples truly inflicting the cracks in the foundation of civilization or were they simply a foe, clever enough to ride the tide of an already imminent collapse? Is the ‘Sea Peoples’ a creation of the modern day or a fact of the past? The ‘Sea Peoples’ have been depicted as a strong influential force due to the impact scholars believe they had on the world they knew. Recently, scholars have started to ask questions regarding how much of this impact was truly the ‘Sea Peoples’ doing, and my question is how much the researchers themselves influenced the known collapse and our common knowledge and understanding about the ‘Sea Peoples’ (Freewlalt, 2014).
Aim and Problems

Aim

The aim of this dissertation concerns key issues within the study of the ‘Sea Peoples’, e.g. how researchers have influenced today’s picture of these past peoples. Different scholars’ research is to be analyzed and compared regarding their way of addressing the matter of the ‘Sea Peoples’. The mystery surrounding the ‘Sea Peoples’ has for years drawn researchers to investigate them, but this research needs its own evaluation. The evaluation needs to be focused on how the scholars’ have influenced the research, and to do so, it is necessary to evaluate what in its turn influenced the researchers. Mainly the focus falls on various researchers use of different schools of thought that is apparent in their work.

The ‘Sea Peoples’ ethnicity, culture and impact have been a major part of previous research and this is apparent in the literature. Even though the subject is hard to define there is still much research done. I will in this study, evaluate what approaches that influenced the researchers in some recent studies of the ‘Sea Peoples’. The Mediterranean lands may have been influenced by any of the clans belonging to the term ‘Sea Peoples’, but the ‘Sea Peoples’ have in their turn, as all the known past, been influenced by the writers of history.

Years of research on the matter have brought many and very diverse theories to light, regarding who these people really were and what consequences their presence had on the ancient Mediterranean lands. When studying such a difficult matter as the ‘Sea Peoples’ researchers can unintentionally influence the research to a point where science and fiction share the same narrative. This study concerns the influences that affect researchers and their studies of the ‘Sea Peoples’.

Researching the past can be considered as a method for us to understand ourselves, as scholars try to reconstruct the past peoples lifeways. It can be seen as contributions to a development of understanding of the human behavior (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006). This study on researchers who study the historical people from the sea of the eastern Mediterranean, seeks to do just that. It is an analysis of today’s researchers and how these in their turn affect the subject they’ve studied. This is a contribution to a better understanding of the influences on the ‘Sea Peoples’, through a study on the researchers line of thought.
Problems

The ‘Sea Peoples’ as a study contains many problems that originate from, e.g. the diversity of the peoples included in the term. It includes several different clans of seaborne raiders and invaders that travelled the Eastern Mediterranean Sea (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

The difficulty in determining the origin of these groups is another problem. Much of the early theories are based on linguistic research which many times are left without archeological evidence to back the theories up.

Regarding the chronology of the raids executed by the ‘Sea Peoples’, there are records from e.g. the Late Bronze Age Egypt (2000-1064) that can specify them through year of reign for different Pharaoh’s who encountered them. One might think that would solve any problems of chronology, but since there is no agreed upon ethnicity of these ‘Sea Peoples’, no one can truly specify when their migrations begun exactly. If a more precise date could be set for the migrations beginnings and attacks, it would be possible to calculate the distance travelled and through that evaluating the possible origins. Sadly, it is not possible to know the exact time of the departure, precisely because we don’t know their origins. It’s a bad circle where we chase our own tails, the origins of the different ‘Sea Peoples’ stays hidden in time.

Knowledge is constantly being reevaluated and replaced by new truths, but the appearance of new knowledge doesn’t make the past disappear. Different truths aren’t always accepted by all and regarding the studies of the ‘Sea Peoples’ there are many different theories, and some of them are preferred over others depending on the researcher. Their origin has been debated forth and back during many the years, but there still isn’t one singular agreed on truth amongst scholars. The problem of today would be the many different theories presented without enough new evidence found, or without new methods used to evaluate the material. The sources presenting a presence of ‘Sea Peoples’ are records that include a specific year of reign for different Pharaohs, which is fairly well datable today (Peczynski, 2009) (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

Another major problem is that there are no sources that derive from the actual ‘Sea Peoples’ themselves and their point of view. Overviewing this problem, it is possible to deduct that this stem from that at this point in the research it’s not possible to, for certain trace these different peoples’ back to any known lands. No sources have truly specified their homelands, the only true grounds for theories on the matter would be the records containing their names and short presentations of their kind. Still, all this information is gathered from foreigners who got a glimpse or a taste of their force (Peczynski, 2009).

Then there is the problem most researcher faces, of limiting their research to fit within the assigned parameters. This study has been limited by a focus on certain recent research concerning the ‘Sea
Peoples’, enough to create an overview of the subject. Bringing up all the research done during the years would be too big for the parameters of this thesis, and since my idea is to bring forth a line of thought that I believe necessary for further studies on the subject. As such, it should be viewed as an introduction to the influence of the “creators of history”. The creators of history include all the various researchers, historians, archaeologists and others who find, evaluate and document the past in different ways.

The knowledge today concerning the ‘Sea Peoples’ is uncertain and based on the various different conclusions that have been drawn from different researchers’ earlier work. The varied conclusions or theories can lead to confusion which is a problem, but a problem to be solved nonetheless.
Questions

To give the study structure and a clear aim, a few questions have been posed to guide the research, and enable a good platform for the evaluation as well as a continued discussion. These are questions that I’ve found necessary to the research of the ‘Sea Peoples’.

1. How have different archaeological schools of thought influenced the way in which different researchers have approached the question of the ‘Sea Peoples’?
   - Ethnicity, where did these people come from?
   - Migration routes, where did they go?
   - Were they the reason for the late Bronze Age Collapse?

2. How are different archaeological schools of thought reflected in the works of selected researchers in the fields of Eastern Mediterranean archeology?
   - How have different schools of thought affected their approach to empirical material?
   - How have their approach to myths or facts been influenced?
Methodology

Source material

The material used for this study consists of recent research concerning the Sea Peoples of the late Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean. As a foundation for this, a base has been created out of literature concerning different archaeological schools of thought.

To complement the thesis, and also retrieve a closer understanding of the influences on the Sea Peoples and the various scholars studying them, I've visited the Austrian archaeological institute in Cairo, Egypt. This trip have provided me with a large amount of the literature used in this study, and a clearer view of the area which I've studied.

Methods

To begin the dissertation a visit was made to Egypt, one of the areas where much archaeology concerning the ‘Sea Peoples’ have been presented. The visit was not only made to provide an understanding, but also to take part of the Austrian archaeological institute’s library where many researchers’ works on the eastern Mediterranean is gathered. Furthermore, I was to join the excavation at Tell el-Dab’a, ancient Avaris, sadly the excavation was cancelled for this year on the order of the National Security.

Irene Forstner Müller who agreed to let me join their work and use their library, also arranged for different trips to excavations in the area around Cairo. And to bring insight into the minds of the researchers of today, the different “archaeology workshops” held in Cairo were attended.

To enable an overview of of the influences of today in the study of the ‘Sea Peoples’, recent research have been studied.

An investigation of the complete research history of the ‘Sea Peoples’ would be too large for this dissertation and therefore some samples from the latest years have been studied. In each study, with reference to earlier studies, every researcher makes their own re-evaluation of the material and then influence the material by their own thoughts on the matter. And to investigate this, an identification of the considered researchers approaches must be made.

**This study’s focus is the processual and post-processual school of thought, how have the researchers balanced the use of these?** This doesn’t mean that any other approaches found within the texts will be ignored, but the main focus will fall on these two approaches. This focus is placed because of the long running debate concerning which one of these should be used (Renfrew, Bahn, 1991). These two approaches have been chosen since they present a debate among scholars, concerning which one is the most effective approach or if they should be considered together (Trigger, 2006). Many times they incorporate other approaches like middle-ranged theory, ethnoarchaeology or experimental archaeology (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006).
Source criticism

Limiting myself to the recent research have both good and bad sides, it brings a clearer view of the current state of research and influence. Yet it leaves out the older research and therefor the explanations of how the research came to this point, have been excluded. This a less comprehensive study, and not very explanatory of how different views have influenced research in the past. But diving deeper into a smaller amount of research gives room for a more qualitative study, yet it suffers on the quantitative side. I consider influences of the researcher is always reflected within their work, no matter how hard they try to be objective. This is because a researcher must analyze their material to come to a conclusion, within the analysis a subjective influence affects the study.
Background

The ‘Sea Peoples’ have been researched by many, in connection with the Late Bronze Age Collapse in the Mediterranean. Mycenaean kingdoms, the Hittite Empire, the Assyrian Empire and the New Kingdom of Egypt were during the Bronze Age “the powers that be”, but they experienced the collapse at the end of the Era. This collapse have now and then been blamed upon the mysterious raiders and invaders documented in the records of the Pharaohs. The term ‘Sea Peoples’ were first coined by the French Egyptologist Emmanuel de Rougé, in 1855. Then in 1873, the theory of an accompanying migration was brought forward by Rougé’s successor, Gaston Maspero. This migration had no actual evidence in Egyptian inscriptions, but the theory’s support grew through the years, and with the publication of the stele of Lemnos (Drews, 1992).

There have been countless attempts to discover the ‘Sea Peoples’ true nature, but so far it may have been twisted by the interpretations of the material.

Moving on to the building blocks of this thesis and the approaches at hand, I will introduce some approaches that are used in today’s research.

And so a phenomenon that becomes more and more apparent today is the study of the use of different schools of thought within research. Scholars are analyzing their own or other researchers thought processes in order to figure out the best approach to certain subjects. Mark Q. Sutton and Robert M. Yohe II introduces a good ground for analysis when they describe the different theoretical horizons, used by scholars This is something they have in common with, e.g. Bruce G. Trigger and Matthew Johnsson. They all describe the processual and post-processual approaches, among other views and approaches that are in the light today. It is this kind of literature that feature the building blocks of my thesis.

Scholars tend to follow the science and use the different methods needed to explain certain questions. Not to mold the history after an already established idea, but to paint a picture by use of different research tools, such as the processual or post-processual approaches. The way they utilize these approaches will affect the results of their studies, which is a major point in this thesis (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006).

In the traditional cultural-historical approach before 1960, some of the information that artifacts could provide about the past was, in a way “overlooked”. The focus at the time was cataloguing, describing and also the creation of timelines and typologies. This left quite a few stones unturned, even if the approach may have been more precise than some of the later schools of thought. But the archaeologists just kept digging up new findings, without learning anything specifically new about the past (Johnson, 1999) (Trigger, 2006).
After this time the processual approach begun to grow forth mainly in the American archaeology, promising answers to questions unanswered by the earlier traditional cultural-historical approach. This new view made way for a new style of interpretation and raised foundational questions concerning the nature of archaeology that form the basis for several theoretical views today (Johnson, 1999). Processual archaeology should be viewed as an anthropological science and in history as a discipline (Alexandri et al. 1995). Scholars meant that this new approach enabled retrieval of a larger amount of information from the archaeological material (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006). The processual approach values explanations over descriptions, and the explanations should be made through incorporation of certain observations of the material passed into generalizations pertaining to social and natural process. Scholars who use this approach work with empirical proof, and rely statistically waterproof conclusions. Explanations should be achieved through explicit methodologies. This means that the previous interest in the laws of human behavior received an additional focus on formation processes of the archaeological record. Recurring patterns that allow inferences concerning the processes to be made from different material remains (Alexandri et al. 1995). The processual approach kept quite a narrow materialistic focus which led to that some scholars felt limited by the approach, they found difficulty in exploring different issues beyond the narrow materialistic focus (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006).

The post-processual approach originated in the United Kingdom and stems from this dissatisfaction with processual archaeology. It’s a part of the postmodernism and it landed on the frontlines of research in the 1980’s. This view rests upon a theory that all interpretations of the past are subjective since all archaeologists are somewhat biased. An example could be that every person have had different life experiences, and just because two people would be in the same spot at the same time in their life would not mean that they consider that place the same. They would view it through the knowledge based on their own personal experiences. Every human beings evaluation is built on their base knowledge that in its turn is based on their experiences. Every person is at the end subjective, it all boils down to how much is apparent in their work. Postprocessual archaeology is an approach where interpretations become narratives built on a belief that all the research done is subjective in one way or another (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006).

As such the processual and the post-processual archaeology are two different approaches that researchers use in their studies. A way of understanding a site and the implications of the archaeology from different sites. They aren’t two opposing camps, yet that is mostly how it has been viewed (Cherry, 2004). Blending the approaches could in the end turn out to be much more fruitful than siding with only one of the approaches. This is because the different approaches could complement each other and bring a more thorough explanation through their diversity.
As Eric Cline and David O’Connor stated in their combined work, the history of the ‘Sea Peoples’ have for some researchers become an epic tale, far more extravagant than it most likely was. They have been portrayed as bringers of chaos, the end of the Bronze age have been contributed to the ‘Sea Peoples’ success (Cline, O’Connor, 2003).

Bruce G. Trigger discuss the matter of the different archaeological schools of thought throughout history. Processualism and post-processualism, historical-processual archaeology and others. He writes about how some archaeologists have opposed the theoretical diversification of archaeology. The reason that they are against this is because the diversification could cause people to question the disciplines credibility. Researchers work to determine if and in what extent different approaches can complement each other, and also to build new more complete and functional approaches. The Processual and post-processual approaches has been argued to be complementary to each other and not rival theories (Trigger, 2006).

I completely agree with this line of thought, I’ve come to realize this through studying the different approaches. Neither one of the approaches are to be overlooked and they complement each other by different techniques of interpretation. One bringing the empirical grounds and the other bringing ways of analyzing not pertaining to the processual approach. In research, we repeatedly compare findings, research and views, this way we complement each others work. So in the end, we can gain more information and create a more complete view of the past, and in this case the study of ‘Sea Peoples’, if we use complementing schools of thought. Other approaches than the processual and the post-processual are also used today and should also be considered as complementary to the other.

Middle-Range Theory wants to link the material archaeological record with the past human behavior. One of its central elements is the argument that if there is a similarity in some parts, between two things, then there will also be similarities in other parts (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006). Then there is also ethnoarchaeology which is an approach where archaeological analysis of living people is done to gain insight into the past peoples lives.

The Hypothetic-Deductive Method or as it is also called the scientific method presents a method for analysis.

In experimental archaeology researchers create replicas of artifacts and features to reach a better understanding of the past cultural processes (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006). Use of this kind of though (cultural materialism) is common within the processual archaeology. It is a theoretical framework based on a belief that earthly existence comes with practical problems, that human social life becomes a response to. This approach focuses on investigating basic and practical research.
Genderarchaeology is something that has grown in the latest years, it have previously been mostly unheard of. This approach investigates another part of the until now male dominated researched past. Other genders have in many cases completely been ignored much because the science has long been dominated by the 'heterosexual, white male norm'. Then there is also the marxist archaeology that investigates social and political inequality. Cognitive archaeology seeks to study past peoples thoughts and beliefs through the analysis of different symbols, designs and styles. Evolutionary archaeology investigates the past through a perspective of the Darwinian evolution. World-systems theory is a multidisciplinary approach to the world history and social change, it emphasizes that world-system and not nation states as a strong unit of social analysis. Contemporary archaeology is something that incorporates the paradigms of history, science and humanism. Combined, they forms a synergistic approach to understanding the past and the investigations becomes a team effort where the researcher relies on the expertise of each other (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006) (Bentley et al. 2009). Interdisciplinary studies can give an even deeper insight into the research (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006).
Results

The texts analyzed have representations of different approaches within them, the following is an overview over the studied material and with it a conclusion regarding the schools of thought utilized in the texts. Beginning with Eric Cline, then moving on to Jason Freewalt, Frederik Christiaan Woudhuizen, Shell Peczynski and then last, but not least Raffaele D’amato and Andrea Salimbeti.

1177 B.C: The Year Civilisation Collapsed by Eric Cline

Eric Cline (1960) is an American author, historian and archaeologist and a professor in Classics and Anthropology in Washington DC. His research focus within this text rests on the actual collapse of the late Bronze Age, and he compares the rise and fall of empires. This is a subject that through the years have been investigated and presented, but his aim is to provide a new perspective to an old question. He considers that a globalized world-system, where multiple civilizations interacted and depended upon each other in certain areas, existed in the Bronze Age Mediterranean, a sort of brotherhood between the kings. Cline takes a magnifying glass and looks upon the past societies of the Bronze Age in the area of the Mediterranean Sea, then he makes a comparison to the globalized world of today. Visible within his research is ethnoarchaeology, that presents itself through his comparisons and generalization between societies today and those of the late Bronze Age.

By portraying his narrative quite dramatically, often quoting detective novels like those of Agatha Christie’s famous character Poirot “we need to use our little grey cells”. He also concludes that painting a picture of the past must begin with an open mind and employing “the scientific use of the imagination” as Arthur Conan Doyle’s character Sherlock Holmes once said, “we must balance probabilities and choose the most likely” (Cline, 2014, 17-18) (Cline, 2014, 162). The scientific use of the imagination could be classified as a post-processualistic approach, since they believe that the subjectivity of the analysis will be reflected in their work no matter how hard they try to be objective. Imagination is after all one of the major expressions of subjectivity in a human mind, and most probably not how a processualist would present their research. Throughout Cline’s text there is a constant mix of humor and imaginative, clever writing. He turns a book of ancient history into something exciting for anyone, not only archaeologists, but also any “Joe or Jane”. During his book presentation he shows off with an epic, overdramatic book trailer, painting pictures of the past to capture the audience (Cline, 2015).
He attempted to answer the question of “why a stable international system suddenly collapsed after flourishing for centuries”. And when this context is brought up, it can be expected that the ‘Sea Peoples’ either be mentioned or thoroughly discussed as a reason for the collapse (Cline, 2014). He begins with introducing these peoples possible origins as being Sicily, Sardinia, Italy, the Aegean, western Anatolia, Cyprus or the Eastern Mediterranean. He mentions earlier work regarding ‘collapse’ by e.g. Jared Diamond, Tainter, Liverani, Middleton, Butzer and Endfield (Cline, 2014).

Eric Cline finds other reasons for the Collapse than many others before him who often focused on the ‘Sea Peoples’ or drought. He implies that a “perfect storm” hit the Mediterranean in the Late Bronze Age. A “perfect storm”, in Clines terms, is a mixture of disasters that happen during a period of time. It wouldn’t have been one single trigger that unleashed the fall of the late Bronze Age, but many. It would have been a number of different stressors, what he discuss is a system collapse. “Earthquake storms” is something very modern to consider as a stressor since they have only recently been provable, but Cline goes even further with calling it a “perfect storm” considering various triggers. The ‘Sea People’ is one of the factors, but one among many that occurred not in a linear timeline, but overlapping and creating a difficult mess to rise out of. (Cline, 2015) (Diamond, 2011).

Through the study of his text a conclusion regarding his approach has been made and it all boils down to a processual approach with post-processual and ethnoarcaeological elements. His interdisciplinary approach have given him strong grounds to build a theory regarding the occurrences in the Late Bronze Age. Through this he has presented the theory of a “perfect storm” where the ‘Sea Peoples’ are but one of the overlapping factors to the Collapse.

**Collapse of Bronze Age Civilization in the Eastern Mediterranean: Conspiring Factors that led to the Dark Ages by Jason Freewalt**

Jason Freewalt (1974) is an American historian at the ‘American Military University’ in Washington St. He discusses the matter of the collapse and the role of the ‘Sea Peoples’. Beginning with raising awareness of the Collapse as an ongoing topic of scholarly debate. Some theories say that the violent collapse of the Bronze Age Civilizations had its source in a single key factor or another. There are after all many theories, perhaps it was earthquakes that triggered the fall or perhaps it was drought. Freewalt points out that surely it would have been possible for any one key factor to have created a chain reaction. (Freewalt, 2014)
He holds the modern and as of late quite popular view, the collapse was brought on by many factors that presented themselves around the same time. The collapse was so colossal and brought upon a great cultural transition. Freewalt's thought is that several conspiring factors, such as earthquakes, drought and volcanoes amongst other things led to large scale migrations. These migrating peoples would then have been desperate to find new homes and means of survival (Freewalt, 2014).

He views the Sherden and other ‘Sea People’ mercenaries employed by Ramses II during the attack on Kadesh 1274 BC, as a possible sign of desperation or possibly a civil war. This is because they were part of the people that Ramses earlier fought against, which implies that these people were loyal to their employer, not to each other.

He compares the migrations to the late-nineteenth century migration to the United States and the Mexican citizens who cross the border to the US with the migration of the late Bronze age Mediterranean world. He suggests that overpopulation, scarcity and lack of resources among other factors may also have been what caused people to migrate (Freewalt, 2014).

Regarding the approach he utilizes within his study, the conclusion have been post-processual with ethnoarchaeological elements. His approach have given him many theories to play with, but also a little too much space for speculation. Though the line is fine and he doesn’t drift that far in his speculation.

**The Ethnicity of the Sea Peoples by Christiaan Woudhuizen**

Frederik Christiaan Woudhuizen (1959). PhD, is a Dutch historian, through the Erasmus University in Rotterdam. He investigates the ethnicity of the ‘Sea Peoples’, beginning with identifying what ethnicity really is. Woudhuizen presents that he seeks more specifically to determine whether the ‘Sea Peoples’ were merely a bunch of pirates or if they were a set of coherent ethnic entities in pursuit of a better life. This is something he investigates through anthropological theories, and to execute this investigation, he must pursue the question of their origins. He uses an interdisciplinary method to detect proto-historical ethnic groups such as the ‘Sea Peoples’ and he states that this will make full use of the available archaeological, historical and linguistic data he investigates from Egyptian, Levantine, Anatolian, Aegean and central Mediterranean sources. He claims that some clans of the ‘Sea Peoples’ came from Anatolia and the Aegean and others came from the central Mediterranean region (Woudhuizen, 2006).

Frederik Christiaan Woudhuizen argues that the main reason for the upheavals of the ‘Sea Peoples’ were the migration of the bearers of the central European Urnfield culture towards the Italian peninsula approx. 1200 BC. He continues his text considering Homero as an important literary source to be used when reconstructing the early history of Greece and the Aegean since six of the
nine titles of the different clans of the ‘Sea People’ is present in the works Lliad and Odyssey. Then he goes on to present a historical setting where he makes a brief overview of the central historical developments in the Near East (Woudhuizen, 2006). After this point he moves on to presenting an outline with the literature on the ‘Sea Peoples’ that have the greatest importance, according to him. In this section he discusses both the identification of the different groups and the cause for them to appear on the historical scene, but he only does this to determine if the ‘Sea Peoples’ coalition consisted of some individual “cohesive ethnê”. Then he moves on to describe contemporary sources concerning the ‘Sea Peoples’ upheaval, which is the records of Egyptian, Cypro-Minoan and Ugaritic (Woudhuizen, 2006).

Woudhuizen finish his thesis with lining up which people that came from where, e.g. he considers the Lukka to be from the Xanthos valley even though he can’t back his research up with any distinct material culture since there actually isn’t any archaeological data from that area today.

He bases the hypothesis on that the different clans are referred to by the same ethonym in different sources proving that the way of writing the name isn’t a whim of one single writer (Woudhuizen, 2006).

His approach have been concluded, through analysis as post-processual and even if his empirical material and research is large, he is not afraid to make descriptions and narratives. This have resulted in his theories sometimes lacking of archaeological backing and at times they become quite speculative.

**The Sea Peoples and their Migration by Shell Peczynski**

Shell Peczynski is a historian who received her PhD through her thesis at Rutgers University in New Brunswick (NJ), in America. It is this thesis that have been analyzed and is presented within this study. She have investigated the ‘Sea Peoples’ and their migration, beginning poetically describing the ‘Sea Peoples’ mystery and rare sources for evidence. Through epigraphical evidence she finds signs of a population fleeing. Epigraphical evidence means proof provided through studies of inscriptions, the science is about identifying the graphemes, clarifying, classifying and drawing conclusions about the writing and the writers. She then defines the transition from the use of bronze being replaced by the use of iron implements. Peczynski claims that piracy was an acceptable, prevalent and feasible way to live, if resources for such ventures were present (Peczynski, 2009).
She begins her paper with presenting physical proof of that the ‘Sea Peoples’ actually even existed and that it wasn’t something that can be summed up as a myth. She uses epigraphical records of both textual and pictorial sort from Egypt, the Hittite kingdom and from Ugarit. And she talks about a big issue in the study of the ‘Sea Peoples’ which is the fact that there has not been any records found belonging to the ‘Sea Peoples’ themselves and their perspective. And then she moves on to reviewing scholars who have studied the ‘Sea Peoples’, then she continues to explore who the different tribes were and where they are thought to have come from. Then she dives into the archaeology and the archaeological remains to find the migration routes of these peoples. In the end she finishes by giving a hypothetical route by land that she believes that the ‘Sea Peoples’ took. There she also discusses what obstacles they might have faced. In the end she chose to focus on the land route that these peoples took, not the sea route (Peczynski, 2009).

She finishes by going into why they migrated and investigate the epigraphical evidence of drought and famine. She also explores the hypothesis of an ‘earthquake storm’ which Eric Cline brought up in his work, which is a today provable event of multiple earthquakes happening over a period of time in a specific area. An earthquake is the result of tension in a fault line, and if one doesn’t release all the tension more will occur along the same line and in an earthquake storm countless earthquakes can occur over years and decades. This happened in the Bronze Age Mediterranean, causing turmoil and chaos.

Analysis of her study has shown that a post-processual approach have been applied, yet it contains many processual elements. She tends to speculate quite a bit, yet she mostly leans on evidence and does not venture far without it. Her descriptions of the Sea People and their behavior tends to go deeper than what should be possible. Her post-processualism have affected her interpretation of the Peoples, whose reasons and appearance, she writes about, with large words and little back up.

*Mediterranean c. 1400 BC-1000 BC by Raffaele D’Amato and Andrea Salimbeti*

Raffaele D’amato (1962) is an Italian PhD and specializes in ancient Western civilization and together with Andrea Salimbeti (1962) who lives in America, they tell the story of the ‘Sea Peoples’. They describe who they were, how they looked, what they wore and what they did. Beginning with describing the ‘Sea Peoples’ as a loose confederation of clans. After this they’ve created a chronology which gives a good view over the mentions of the ‘Sea People’ in the written records. The authors then go in on detail with the research on the historical background and sources. Mentioning the earliest representation of one of these clans of the ‘Sea Peoples’ in the Egyptian hieroglyphics and the ‘Byblos obelisk’, and the next mention which is the ‘Amarna letters’. They go
through the archaeological, historical and pictorial material that mention the 'Sea People' and list them one after the other. Then they move on to the identification of the groups, comparing evidence from different sites (D'amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

And they also describe the different clans as much as possible, their origin and story. Other than this they also look at the matter of their clothing (D'amato, Salimbeti, 2015). Piracy is discussed and explained as not something new and solely connected to the ‘Sea Peoples’, but actually something quite usual. After this they thoroughly describe the clothing and equipment of the different peoples (D'amato, Salimbeti, 2015). They even consider their military organization, then they focus on the invasion attempts and attacks.

Their approach have within this study been classified as processual with elements of post-processualism. Drawing conclusions out of representations and keeping them as objectively as possible. They present hypothesis through comparison of representations of ships and armors in paintings and literature from the Aegean, and the representations of the ‘Sea Peoples’. This complementary approach have made it possible for them to consider difficult material, such as making comparisons between the few images of the Sea Peoples and representations of similarities in other areas of the Mediterranean. The method for analysis can be concluded as the hypo-deductive method, it is easy to read without major dramatic narratives.
Discussion

I consider subjectivity as an ever present fact that exists on all planes, and is more or less visible in all interpretations, but they are an important part of understanding the past. An objective interpretation is nothing I consider possible for the human mind, but I do believe it should be sought out to its possible extent. The researchers should always remark their own subjectivity within the research, and as far as possible to analyze and correct themselves. We should embrace most approaches, the processual, the post-processual, gender archaeology and many others. Methods that complement each other will bring our understanding of the past closer to the truth. Scholars are as all beings affected by the world around them, their environment’s influence on them takes its expression in their creations.

The study of the ‘Sea Peoples’ is widespread, and definitely an intriguing piece of mystery for scholars to tangle with. This has both light and dark sides to it, the positive is that more investigation of the subject means that it is more likely to reach an actual answer to questions posed. The negative is that scholars struggle to become the one who lands the final word, and might in the end have achieved an epic tale based closer to subjectivity than objectivity. The researchers analyzed in this paper have all been fascinated by the ‘Sea Peoples’ mysterious world. They follow and include different styles of interpretations, for example processualism and post-processualism. These are the ones this study is focused on, but there are other interpretations today, such as the gender or cognitive view (Sutton, Yohe II, 2006). The reason that these aren’t the center of attention is because these ways of interpretation are not obviously evident in these texts.

I posed a couple of questions earlier to guide this study, and this is where I discuss them closer with through the texts perspectives.

How have different archaeological schools of thought influenced the way in which the different researchers have approached the question of the ‘Sea Peoples’?

I would classify Eric Clines work as being complementary, interdisciplinary with his perspective, when he tries to understand the mystery of the ‘Sea Peoples’. He provides a narrative synthesis that integrates both archaeological and literary evidence, in that way it becomes an interdisciplinary study, he aims at studying the dusk of an age through fresh interpretations (Cline, 2015). Cline describes the study as being pseudoscientific, which means that there is insufficient knowledge to draw firm conclusions regarding the questions posed concerning the ‘Sea Peoples’. This is definitely true since the only real material remains of them are thought to be the Aegean-styled pottery (Cline, 2014) (Cline, 2015).
Cline is not afraid to analyze and interpret his material like a post-processualist, but he always finishes his interpretations by, showing the processualistic firm materialistic focus. He means that there is insufficient evidence for actual conclusions, stating that there is only one remain from the actual ‘Sea Peoples’, this would be the Aegean-styled pottery. Other than that there are only textual and pictorial sources from outsiders, which he doesn’t consider enough. His materialistic focus with generalizations and complementary approach restricts his actions and conclusions regarding the ‘Sea Peoples’. In the end his approach is processualistic, even if it contains post-processual elements. This mixture is hard to avoid for any researcher even if they claim to only promote one of these approaches, and it shouldn’t be avoided.

The ‘Sea Peoples’ are today seen as a restless gathering drifting along the waves and leaving ripples of chaos in their wake. Cline points out that the ‘Sea Peoples’, as mentioned in ancient Egyptian texts, set up camps in Syria before proceeding down the coast of Canaan to the Nile Delta in Egypt. The sources of today have created a more complete view of them. He explains how these peoples came by land and sea, dressed in different garments and carrying different weapons. They also attacked in different waves, over a considerable amount of time (Cline, 2014).

Cline proceeds to claiming to objectively consider the available evidence supporting or failing each of the hypothetical possibilities concerning the causes of the collapse (Cline, 2014). This is according to me a very good method for analysis, but I consider the post-processual approach to demand self-reflection and not claiming objectivity. Yet it is possible and worthwhile for a post-processualist to attempt to study the material as objectively as possible. Cline doesn’t show much proof of any self reflection in this part of the text.

His use of ethnoarchaeology is apparent where he compares today’s society of the western world to the one during the Bronze Age in the eastern Mediterranean. And also how we today are facing the same problems as they were then. Regarding the ‘Sea Peoples’ he brings up a quick thought, that was brought forth during a lecture that he held on his book, that ISIS today could be the modern version of the ‘Sea Peoples’. He presents it like a joke, but the point is that there are measurable similarities between the occurrences of the late Bronze Age Mediterranean and the same area today (Cline, 2014) (Cline, 2015). He measures the now against the past by comparing appearances of earthquakes, rebellions, climate change, famines, draughts and factors like the ‘Sea Peoples’.

In the end he discusses the ‘Sea Peoples’ ethnicity and investigates their influence on the collapse. Clines interpretation turns the ‘Sea Peoples’ into one factor that worked in a larger process of different triggers. Many researchers before have viewed them as the major reason, or even as the single reason to the late Bronze Age Collapse. He mentions how civilizations have survived...
droughts, disease and earthquakes among other things, when they come as a single, separate disaster. A “perfect storm” is something much harder to survive, and almost all great civilizations in the area of the Eastern Mediterranean fell. The survival of Egypt could be called an overstatement, when really it was but a mere shadow of its former self. (Cline, 2014)

Eric Cline comments on Jared Diamonds work and consider the similar thoughts upon collapse. He concludes that collapse is a recurring, traceable event. Empires rise and fall unavoidably, but for the vigilant eye there are signs to be interpreted regarding the risk of collapse. Cline interprets the cause to effect as not being as easy as events happening in a straight line. Actually, he considers all these things to work together in somewhat of an organized chaos. He opposes the thought of scholar’s publications suggesting a linear progression of the Late Bronze Age Collapse. He describes the unaccuracy of the theory that drought caused famine which led to the ‘Sea Peoples’ migration and attacks that in their turn caused the collapse, he believes that it could not have been that simple (Cline, 2015).

“Drought ➔ Famine ➔ Movement of the Sea Peoples ➔ Havoc and Cutting of Trade Routes ➔ Collapse” (Cline, 2015)

Cline means that nothing is ever as linear as this, but researchers keep presenting this perspective. After he discussed this he presents his view of the collapse where everything was messier. He suggests that all these were factors, but there were no first singular stressor that set of the fall of the age, but rather multiple stressors that become a system collapse (Cline, 2015). He believes that researchers would benefit from using complementary approaches, to the study of the ‘Sea Peoples’, since the subject is so elusive (Cline, 2014).

Jason Freewalt work have been concluded as post-processualistic with elements of ethnoarchaeology. When he discusses the matter of why the Sherden mercenaries fought against and for the Egyptian army. He considers this as them not being loyal to each other, but loyal to their employer, which he presents as a possible sign of either desperation or civil war. This shows what kind of effect the term ‘Sea Peoples’ has on research. The conclusion that these peoples or the Sherden saw themselves as a coherent unit, is based on mere assumptions since actual evidence of this doesn’t exist in any form. The possible grounds are that outsiders have titled them under a name, which as far as we know did not mean that they shared a mutual feeling of solidarity. Which is a stretched line of thought and so his theories fall short at times. This can be seen as a result of his lack of major processualistic elements within his research.
He describes the ‘Sea Peoples’ to have been more like the Scandinavian Vikings which is easier to be familiar with. After all, they roamed the seas during another time closer to the now, from the late 700 AD to approx. 1100 AD. While the ‘Sea People’ of the late Bronze Age Mediterranean wreaked havoc some 2000 years prior (Freewalt, 2014).

“They poured off their boats to plunder and destroy the great cities, and did not play by the rules of chariot warfare” (Freewalt, 2014, 10).

There is of course a difference here, from what researchers many times conclude, the ‘Sea Peoples’ of the Mediterranean were a people migrating which cannot be said about the Vikings as a whole.

Jason Freewalt describes the ‘Sea Peoples’ worn attire as an actual fact, yet all we have for this assumption is a couple of illustrations and some textual records, but no actual archaeological sources for this (Freewalt, 2014). I consider archaeological material evidence to be more certain than pictorial or textual evidence. If this attire were actually found on the body of a person classified as one of the ‘Sea Peoples’ or if there was any actual material remains, that would be something to truly base the statements upon. Any self-reflection within Freewalt’s text is absent, but the grounds for his theories and his methods could be classified as post-processualistic.

Frederik Christiaan Woudhuizen study seems very post-processualistic, and as such his study have in some areas good grounds, but in others he seems to consider questionable conclusions. He describes the ‘Sea Peoples’ as to have single-handedly brought down the Hittite Empire and wounding Egypt greatly. He also explains that they were the main reason for the turning point in history, which was the Late Bronze Age Collapse. Describing something like this without any source critic shows his own biased evaluation of the evidence presented, and other possible reasons for the fall of the Hittite Empire and Egypt isn’t mentioned. One could claim that this is not necessary for his research because it specifically concerns the ethnicity of the ‘Sea Peoples’. Yet he talks about the collapse, but doesn’t clarify it particularly well, but he does explain the shift of economic and political center of gravity towards Greece, Africa Minor and Italy. His influence provides an overview that gives the term ‘Sea Peoples’ a very dramatic touch.

Shell Pecynski used the post-processual approach in her study, but many elements of the processual approach were included. This can be concluded through looking at her way of writing, without special self-reflection, still trying to be as objective as possible, but instead forgetting the subjectivity of her human mind. She tries to write in an objective way, but her subjectivity is clear in many areas. She begins her research by presenting empirical evidence that the different clans of the
‘Sea People’ even existed and weren’t a myth. This is in a way unnecessary for her study, but she must have wanted to be very thorough. She uses much previous research and base her study upon that which is just what anyone must to regarding the ‘Sea Peoples’, but this means that her information gathered from earlier work is even further away from the ground source, and upon this she builds her own theories which also influence the material.

Beginning with her own interpretation, her understanding changes over time due to influences and impressions this way she is influenced and working on the study, her mind influence the way she writes and present certain things. This way her material is subjective, but she strives towards objectivity, which I personally approve of since I believe that one must strive away from subjectivity but always remember that it is still part of any creation. To reach the clearest view of the past possible, we must use complementary methods, still we will never see the same world as they did.

That will not stop us from trying to understand and view that world, and the only way could be by using different approaches that together can paint a picture of the past. We can contemplate, but we must always remember who painted the picture. This is the way I view the steering-wheels of time, and it is what makes me foremost a post-processualist, but also a little bit of everything, some part processualist, and some part genderarchaeologist, which I in the end believe we all are. We blend different schools of thought and in our own minds weigh their worth, some things within the different approaches seem better than others and sometimes the same goes for another approach.

Raffaele D’amato and Andrea Salimbeti seem to go about the study with a processual approach and continuous use of the hypo-deductive method. Their approach to the ‘Sea Peoples’ have guided the formation of the text lining up the different peoples and then presenting theories drawn from the material. They present different hypothesis’s that they then weigh forth and back, until they finds the most probable answer. Post-processualistic elements can be noticed here and there through the research, and so in a minor sense it becomes a complementary study (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

There is the question of ethnicity, where did these people come from who were they?

Eric Cline concludes that we know little about these people and their origins other than what is provided through the Egyptian records. He explains the possibilities of them originating from Sicily, Sardinia and Italy or perhaps the Aegean or he western Anatolia, even Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean. He lists the Egyptian sources that name the ‘Sea Peoples’ separate groups, the Pelset, Tjekker, Shekelesh, Shirdana, Lukka, Danua, Teresh, Eqwesh and Weshesh. The number of clans in the gathering differs from each invasion attempt. Analyzing ancient images he
suggests that the ‘Sea Peoples’ were comprised of diverse groups of different geographies and
cultures (Cline, 2011).
This is based on the differing attire that the depicted ‘Sea Peoples’ wear in the images investigated.
A processualistic viewpoint is apparent through this part of the text. He uses typological studies
and makes a generalization of the people within the clans through the portrayal of their different
attire and an assumption that the creators of the image gave them different appearance and attire
to show that they belonged to different clans. The typological method developed by Oscar
Montelius was a redefining of the chronological approach to research, but it was the Swedish
archaeologist Hans Hildebrand who created systematic classifications of prehistoric artifacts. This
was the beginning of a more carefully defined classification system using comparison and
generalization worked in favor of the creation of a clearer picture of the past (Trigger, 2006).

Eric Cline also suggests that the motivation for their migration could have been an example of the
push and pull theory. He considers the different clans as difficult to detect within the archaeological
record, but he stresses that different researchers have tried their best through linguistic studies and
looking at remains such as pottery (Cline, 2014). Through the studies of different types of pottery, it
is possible to find a type specific to the investigated people and if there is a distribution of these it is
also possible to, among other things, consider their migration routes (Aegean-styled pottery)
(Trigger, 2006).

Eric Cline re-tell the former conclusions about the different origins of the different clans, and he
describes conflicting theories regarding the Shekelesh and Shardanas origins. Some say that they
came from Sicily and Sardinia based partly on linguistic studies, others suggest that they came from
the Eastern Mediterranean and then fled to Sicily and Sardinia after their defeat by the Egyptian
army’s hand. The later theory is supported by his words regarding the Shardana that was known to
have fought for and against the Egyptians for a long time before the ‘Sea Peoples’ gathering. These
are theories based on archaeological material, images and scriptures. Clines reminds the reader that
there are many theories concerning these different questions, but in the end there are no real facts
behind the answers given to their origins or motivation, two questions that would complement each
other. What is usually considered as a more accurate would be the way they looked, because of the
images and names on the walls of Ramses III’s mortuary temple at Medinet Habu (Cline, 2014).
This too can be considered as subjective since we can’t possibly know what the artists who painted
these pictures were influenced by themselves. Pictographic representations might not represent
reality, but we can’t tell if they did since we don’t have any material evidence supporting this, like a
mummy with all the attires represented within the representations.
There is an overbearing question of to what extent scholars have exaggerated the ‘Sea Peoples’, not only their impact but also their existence. Not denying the existence of the peoples included, but the existence of ‘Sea Peoples’ as a term which is a creation of today (Cline, 2014). In this point it is possible to see some post-processualistic elements present since he needed to self-reflect regarding the term ‘Sea Peoples’.

Frederik Christiaan Woudhuizens concludes his research by listing the different peoples and their origins and their later refuges. The Lukka he considers to have originated from the Xanthos valley, but this cannot be proven with archaeology since there is a lack of such data concerning this subject. He bases much of his research on epigraphy and linguistic studies. He considers the Ekwesh and Denyen as alternative indications for Greeks in the Late Bronze Age. Woudhuizen also bring up literary traditions regarding the Philistines origin of originating from Crete and/or Lydia.

Shell Peczynski mentions the different ethnic groups of the Sea People names like most others and also any record of them, but doesn’t dwell on the question of their origin. As later mentioned in her conclusion“I have not tried to argue who the Sea People were in some essentialist sense or have become”, what she does present is theories from other scholars such as F. C. Woudhuizen whom I also discuss in this study (Peczynski, 2009, 102). Since she doesn’t consider the question in her work, but she creates an overview of the present day theories. The most popular theories today is according to Peczynski that the Sea Peoples origins were in Asia Minor, the Aegean, the Balkans and Cyprus. It seems likely that they would live near a coast and that the border region of both western and southwest Anatolia, the Dodecanese and Rhodes would be their home (Peczynski, 2009).

Raffaele D’amato and Andrea Salimbeti explain that the Egyptians probably knew the ‘Sea Peoples’ homelands and suggests that such sources have been lost in time, but remarks that many scholars have tried to determine the answer to this question. These attempts have been based on textual and iconographic evidence as well as studying the ‘Sea Peoples’ material culture, which they explain has been identified in Cyprus and the Levant. The material culture comes down to the locally made Achaean-style pottery and because of this material scholars have argued that many of the clans included in this term came from the Aegean (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

And the question of migration routes, where did they go?

Cline describes how we tend to imagine them as a restless group moving from one site to another sweeping down kingdoms as they go. He tells the story of how they travelled by both land and sea,
even thought their nickname is the 'Sea Peoples' (Cline, 2014). This is one of the reasons to why I believe that researchers should drop that moniker and just go by their names as they are read in the ancient records. Cline discusses that the 'Sea Peoples' travelled by both land and sea at the same time and because of this he draws the conclusion that the most likely route they would follow would be close to the coastline (Cline, 2014).

He brings up Egyptian sources that describe the Sea Peoples as, at one point having set up camp in Syria before proceeding to attack Egypt (Cline, 2014). Each 'Sea People' had their own motivation and reason for migrating according to Clines theories, and his interpretations of Ramses’s inscriptions.

Jason Freewalt discuss the causes of the 'Sea Peoples' migrations, he concludes that something cataclysmic must have happened and the term he uses is “creating a billiard ball scenario”. This would mean that one factor unleash a series of catastrophes. The event he focuses on would be environmental factors, what’s interesting is that he believes that many factors worked together towards the collapse but he believes that one unleashed another. He also uses ethnoarchaeology, for example, he compares the happenings of the Late Bronze Age to the Europeans who migrated to the United States in the late- nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the end he doesn’t discuss the 'Sea Peoples' routes of migration in any major sense.

Shell Peczynski explains that migrations were recorded for a time of over fifty years in the Mediterranean Sea, from around the late twelfth century BC. Then she continues with bringing up Hewitt and explaining that he believed that the 'Sea Peoples' started as united allied villages that grew into the larger confederations that travelled the Mediterranean. Also, she mentions Leahy, who describes that there is broad consensus that the 'Sea Peoples’ would come mainly from the Aegean and Anatolia. Leahy means that archaeological discoveries suggest that upheavals in the Mycenaean world is increasingly seen as a reason for the 'Sea Peoples' abandonment of their native lands. Peczynski suggest that the ‘Sea Peoples’ were in search for ore deposits as well as a better life (Peczynski, 2009).

Shell Peczynski means that the ‘Sea People’ consisted of not only warriors, it was more like a population migrating. Then she explains that there was a power struggle in the eastern Mediterranean especially concerning metals. The Hittite kingdom was crushed and trade routes fell into disarray. And according to Shell the ‘Sea People’ confederation is thought to have been the reason for the kingdom’s downfall. Shell exclaims that the reason for the ‘Sea Peoples’ to leave their homelands with all the risks that come with it must be investigated thoroughly. She explains that
Egypt was in a weakened state and because of this the ‘Sea Peoples’ were a threat to their power (Peczynski, 2009).

Shell Peczynski discuss the migration routes of the ‘Sea Peoples’ based on pottery and archaeology, and she points to how the Philistines, most commonly seen as the Pelset, introduced the “krater” pottery to the Levant. Whilst working in Egypt I received a bigger perspective and insight on how much can be understood through pottery, when I was catagolizing and learning about it from Vera. There are so many kinds of differences of pottery such as the clay, the ornaments, the shape and size.

When you go deep into the smallest of details you might find things you never expected. At a workshop I attended in Cairo, Egypt a woman called Daniela Rosenow, presented a detailed study of Egyptian glass of the first millennium AD, which proved early large scale connections, her lecture gave me an even deeper understanding of how much information we as archaeologists can squeeze out of a small sherd of glass or a tiny lump of clay (Rosenow, 2013).

I believe strongly that the smallest of details within the archaeological material can prove incredibly useful for finding an answer to any question. At one of the workshops in Cairo, where Rosenow explained how she could figure out very detailed things from studying glass shards, finding out trade routes, favourised ware in different areas demand and distribution. I don’t let it blind me and I keep a critical mindset to the influence an archaeologist have on the material through their interpretation of the material (Rosenow, 2015).

Shell Peczynski describes that before any systematic archaeological excavations had taken place in Palestine in the early 20th century, the researchers were most commonly agreed on a few factors regarding the ‘Sea Peoples’. For instance, many agreed that the ‘Sea Peoples’ had left their homelands somewhere around the Aegean, then they laid waste to large parts of the eastern Mediterranean before their downfall by the hand of Ramesses III. Then they were garrisoned as prisoners of war or mercenaries in Canaan, and there they grew until they were able to extricate themselves from the authority of the Egyptian rulers. Finally, they could establish themselves on the coastal plain in the south of Canaan (Peczynski, 2009). Peczynski describes the ‘Sea Peoples’ to have departed from Asia Minor and then onwards to Syria, the Levant, and Egypt. When Ugarit was weakened it was hit by a tidal wave, earthquake and the resulting secondary fires, after all this the ‘Sea Peoples’ saw their chance and invaded.

Raffaele D’amato and Andrea Salimbeti describe how citadels crumbled in Greece and shores of Islands in the Aegean became areas of confrontations. Example of that is the citadels Tiryns in Argolis and Enkomi in Cyprus, where the ‘Sea Peoples’ made a base for occasional confederacies.
They conclude that the further the disintegration went, the larger became the ‘Sea Peoples’ gatherings and their attacks begun to extend towards Egypt (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

They continue by looking through the reliefs and inscriptions at Medinet Habu, Egypt. This tells them that the defeated leaders were forced to seek refuge in Western Asia. They bring up that researchers have debated about the matter of the ‘Sea Peoples’ importance in the Mediterranean world, but D’amato and Salimbeti consider that the ‘Sea Peoples’ movement throughout that world definitely was one of the absolute most significant movements of that time (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015). D’amato and Salimbeti describe that in the Egyptian texts, which they use in their research, these people are called ‘Northerners’. They discuss the different clans importance and deeds, for instance, they conclude that the Sherden had been well known in the Mediterranean for their piracy and skilled mercenaries during at least two centuries (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015). Then they also deduct that Tiryns in Argolis and Enkomi in Cyprus had become bases for the ‘Sea Peoples’, not specifying specifically which ones. These were places ravaged during confrontations while the Late Bronze Age citadels crumbled and may have been a provoking factor for the Achaean princes to take to piracy and migration. This led to a confrontation with the Hittites in Asia Minor and so on with other Anatolian populations. They even consider that this could have been one cause among others, for the Trojan War (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

D’amato and Salimbeti introduce the ‘Sea Peoples’ history in a summary of their progression throughout the Mediterranean. As the disintegration of states progressed, the numbers of the confederation of ‘Sea Peoples’ grew. They describe the ‘Sea Peoples’ to have travelled from the Aegean by the coast towards Egypt, since the area was a very wealthy place that could feed many hungry mouths and souls. They continue explaining that some allied themselves with Egypt’s traditional enemies such as the Libyans, and they wished to settle in the Nile Delta (D’amato, Salimbeti, 2015).

The first wave of attack on Egypt took place in 1207 BC, but was beaten down by Pharaoh Merneptah, and during the reign of Ramesses III there was another attack, this time on a larger scale. First attack had only consisted of Seaborne raids on coastal regions, this time the attack came from both land and Sea. The Pharaoh managed to beat the invaders off, and according to the Egyptian records, they won completely overpowering the enemy. There on out the ‘Sea Peoples’ settled as guardians of Egypt’s eastern frontiers. The Philistines e.g., settled on the Palestinian coast, but Egypt’s power was drained and fell into a less fruitful age. The settlers went on to create their own kingdoms and claiming the Palestinian coastal plain as theirs. D’amato and Salimbeti then
explains it has been suggested that some of the survivors from the defeat may have gone further west. This is based on the theory that the name 'Sardinia' resembles the name of one group of the 'Sea Peoples'.

**Were the ‘Sea Peoples’ the reason for the late Bronze Age collapse?**

Eric Cline presents his research on what the 'Sea Peoples' had for kind of place in the events at the end of the Bronze Age. He concludes that there is definitely a possibility that the 'Sea Peoples' were responsible for parts of the destruction, but he presents something much more likely which is a gathering of events or factors, natural and human. The causes could have been the climate change, draught and earthquake storms and human factors such as internal conflict and system collapse. All these together would have created a perfect storm, enough for the turn of an Age (Cline, 2014).

Building on research done by archaeoseismologists (The study of ancient occurrences of earthquakes through indicators found in the archaeological record (Sintubin, Manuel, et al. 2012. Unesco.int) he concludes that Greece, the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean was struck by an event of cataclysmic size a so called earthquake storm, ongoing from around 1225 BC to sometime around 1175 BC. He believes that one factor would not be enough to bring down entire flourishing societies (Cline, 2014).

Cline uses ethnoarchaeology that evolved within both processual and postprocessual archaeology, by comparing the events of the ancient Eastern Mediterranean with the United States during the 1930’s where large scale migrations occurred due to a drought in Oklahoma, Texas and California. This all depends on the “push and pull” theory, bad conditions in the homeland and better in another would cause migration to occur (Cline, 2014).

Eric Cline doesn’t consider the 'Sea Peoples' as the cause for the collapse, he mentions that their influence might have been exaggerated. Perhaps they were the cause for the disruption of the trade routes, but nothing is certain (Pseudoscientific theory, as previously mentioned).

Jason Freewalt agree upon that there were many factors, but he describes the stressors as a direct line of cause to effect, like the one Eric Cline disapproved of. He means that environmental factors could have caused mass migrations which in its turn led to conflict and invasions, and military factors allowed invaders to bring down the greatest civilizations and the fall of an age. He directly continues with a thought of some who actually benefitted from this collapse. He then explains how traditionally the ‘Sea Peoples’ have been blamed for the difficulties in sea trade, a theory he seems to share (Freewalt, 2014).
He mentions the dependant brother to brother system, that were set up between Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Levant and Anatolia. The interdependence between the kingdoms existed through alliances and gifts from one to another to strengthen their friendship. He remarks that this could have failed and lead to a destabilization of the diplomatic brotherhood and in the long run become a factor in the collapse. As the collapse progressed the sea trade ceased, traditionally this has been believed to have been the 'Sea Peoples' fault. The Philistines have been included in different scholar's research as the Pelset, but Freewalt mentions them as a benefactor of the decline of the Mediterraneans traditional powers and not as a clan of the 'Sea Peoples' (Freewalt, 2014).

Shell Pecynski conclude that today we have a science called archaeoseismology, and with geological findings can prove that earthquake storms could possibly have been the reason for the late Bronze Age Collapse (Pecynski, 2009).

Eric Cline presents this theory as well, but he considers it in a perspective where they are but one of many releasing factors (Cline, 2015). Peczynski bring these different disasters up as well, but present them in a line where one thing happened after another while Cline consider them to overlap here and there making the conditions of continued prosperity unfavorable (Pecynski, 2009).

The 'Sea Peoples' role in the late Bronze Age collapse is to scholars today something widely agreed, but not the most important or singular part. Many agree on that the "earthquake storm" was the biggest part responsible for the destruction of that age, Eric Cline believes this "storm" was a factor yes, but not alone as a trigger (Cline, 2014).

How are different archaeological schools of thought reflected in the works of selected researchers in the fields of eastern Mediterranean archaeology?

Eric Cline builds his research on a lot of old material, but also as up to date as possible, even cramming in the latest research he could find at the last minute (Cline, 2015). He discusses different theories and views throughout the research history, personally his approach seems to balance theories. There is not nearly enough anything close to gender archaeology shown within the study, but concerning processual and post-processual archaeology, he nicely balances them by certainly trying to stay as objective as possible yet knowing his limitations which is shown in the way he write. He uses the post-processual approach very effectively and the hypodeductive analysis in is studies of the 'Sea People'. Cline applies his own thoughts on the matter, but doesn’t completely shut out other theories of thoughts, he merely presents another theory. And this may be very post-prosessionalistic, but he has also used some elements that can be considered as
processualistic approach. He analyzes empirical research as much as possible, but sometimes forgets the source-critic.

Eric Cline rests well upon the records of ancient Egypt, but concludes that today nobody can truly say where they came from today. He writes about what collapsed as well as how it collapsed, being very passionate about the subject. The collapse itself, he describes as of a scale that the world didn’t see again until the Roman Empire and it might just outshine the collapse of the Roman Empire. He makes clear that he is aware of earlier works on collapse, like Jared Diamond’s book “Collapse: how societies choose to fail or succeed” is a clear example. He claims that the difference in his study is that he discusses multiple societies that collapsed at the same time while earlier research only consider one society at one time (Cline, 2015).

Shell Peczynski presents an amazing amount of detailed accounts of ‘Sea People’ activity, no new evidence but her work definitely have worth, especially as an overview of the sources of ‘Sea Peoples’ activity. Peczynski describe events of the Bronze Age Mediterranean in a way that make previous theories sound like facts, it may be her way to limit her research, if so then she succeeded, but at a cost of her self-reflection. It is also easy to question such remarkable statements as the ones she made on page 4, where she wrote of the ‘Sea Peoples’ intentions and wishes, which is impossible for researchers to state as facts when there isn’t any sources from the clans own perspectives, not to mention the different reasons for each individual. In this statement no reference is made either, but on page 11 she presents a text that tells from an Egyptian perspective that their reason was to search for food sources. It seems she takes word for word and not considering the possible huge amount of different influences between her and the person who wrote it. This is where the lack of a realization of her own subjectivity can be found, even a lack of objectivity is shown in the same place.

**Concluding remarks**

The term ‘Sea Peoples’ is a modern term that wasn’t used in the ancient sources that we study today. What the sources say is that some of these peoples’ came from the ‘Isles in the Sea’, or just from the Sea (Cline, 2014). With this as a basis researchers have come to create a picture of an epic grouping of rampaging folk’s called ‘Sea Peoples’. This is a problem that today’s research is faced with, the overall common presentation of the ‘Sea Peoples’ is that they would be peoples living as Vikings. Researchers conclude that they were much more than skillful plunderers, and to lose the concept of a name ‘Sea Peoples’ is a very difficult but, I believe worthy task. With this title they will immediately be included in the commonly known ‘Sea Peoples’, such as pirates and Vikings, but is
that term truly correct? Could we really equate them to pirates, or should they be termed as the correlation of societies lost in the ancient times, and on the move to find a new home. Shouldn't focus fall on the mysterious lack of evidence for such a major gathering, and the locating of their records?

I believe that as far as we have come with the research of the ‘Sea Peoples’ today, we should refrain from that term since it can give a misleading impression. The problem of today is as Eric Cline states that the study is pseudoscientific and we don’t have enough of material or evidence for these peoples to make any firm conclusions, but this doesn’t mean we should stop trying.

Each of these researchers have in their own amount, influenced the research they’ve worked with. Through their different approaches they’ve affected the research more, or less than the others. Considering the processual and the post-processual approaches, one can consider there to be a higher probability for those who utilize the processual approach to influence the material less, since their theories are based upon empirical proof. Yet the belief that archaeological interpretations could reach completely objective conclusions, through the scientific method, creates a disbelief in a influence of minor properties. The scientific method, also called the hypothetico-deductive method, is as it sounds a hypothetical model. It is based upon observations that are proposed, and tested through the deduction of consequences from certain models.

Within interpretations of the past, we do not work with facts, we conclude the most probable conclusion out of the facts presented. Let’s say that the Aegean-style of pottery influenced the pottery of the Philistines, and on this we base our research on the spread of this kind of pottery. This would mean that we take the conclusion of another scholar as an actual “fact”, even thought this in its turn is an interpretation. I do trust scholars and researchers, but to a certain point and that is exactly how I consider that research should be handled. One should listen and learn, but also be critical to the words of another, just as well as you should be skeptical to your own conclusions. Some scholars would probably then consider my thoughts to creat an impossibility of realizing the truths of the past, which is correct of them. It is impossible for us to conclude the real, actual, complete truth. What we can do is find the most probable interpretations and from there create a belief for us to trust in today. I believe science, research and understanding are in a steady flux, but it is important for us to find the probabilities and conclusions possible for today. This is because we build tomorrow upon the thought and interpretation of today.

To go truly far one could say that to us the actual facts would be that a finding that we interpret as pottery of the Philistines that have been influenced by the Aegean-style, consists of a certain percentage of different clays. That is the real conclusions to be made, the percentage of clay, but
drawing conclusions from this will more or less include with the human factor. This is where my line of thought blends the processualistic and post-processualistic views. Methods of the processualistic approach together with the post-processualistic methods, and most of all, the self-critical addition complement each other, and build a sturdier ground to base theories upon. Sadly, even today there are scholars who won’t utilize these tools to their fullest potential, and I believe that this is something we must, if we want to move forward with the research, especially concerning the study of the “Sea Peoples”.

Regarding the question “are the ‘Sea Peoples’ a creation of the modern day or a fact of the past?” Concluding that the ‘Sea Peoples’ were a fact of the past would at the end of this thesis make me a hypocrite, since I’ve explained that facts of the past is nothing but the creation of our minds. There is an overwhelming distance between now and then. The actual term ‘Sea Peoples’ isn’t used in the actual records of the past, it is the interpretations of scholars that have brought this term to life.
Conclusion

Finally the thesis concludes that what research have proven about the ‘Sea Peoples’ origins, effect and settlement are all based on a variety of different schools of thought. Together, these schools spin the history of these peoples into a web of different ideas and theories. Much is still to be learned about these peoples, for instance, there is as of yet no evidence of these ‘Sea Peoples’ own records. Researchers have lately started studying pottery and connecting it with possible groups, but so far nothing is set in stone. The ‘Sea Peoples’ is a popular study today and many scholars strive to find the most probable explanations to the mysteries of these peoples. Yet they keep eluding the sharp eyes of the researchers who try to make the view of them clear. Their origins are still under question, there is no evidence from their side and there are no singularly accepted answer to their later settlements, or the influences they had on the late Bronze Age Collapse.

Researchers influence their work as much as they are influenced themselves by theories, other researchers and choice of approach. Scholars strive to be objective, but there is probable cause to believe that being completely objective is an impossibility for humans. We may strive to be or believe we are, but fully and completely objective is impossible because humans are all influenced by cultures, ideas, society and so on from the time of their birth. To achieve as good of an understanding of the past ‘Sea Peoples’ of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean Sea, interdisciplinary studies should be applied. This way a larger amount of research can be covered, compared and then evaluated.

The ‘Sea Peoples’ have indeed been affected by the scholars studying the subject just like any creation the creator uses their own personal twist on the work. Regarding the ‘Sea Peoples’ the title itself is a creation of the researchers investigating these peoples, but there are certainly more ways the history of the ‘Sea Peoples’ has been influenced by the researchers.

The ‘Sea Peoples’ as a subject maybe shouldn’t exist in the sense that it is today. Isn’t the point for us to investigate the collaboration of different clans, that together became one of the causes for the late Bronze Age Collapse. Leave the mythbound name of the mysterious ‘Sea Peoples’ behind, could prove to open new doors for future thought in research. Research that doesn’t limit the scholars, but maybe enable new perspectives on the subject.

Scholars biggest question today might be regarding what influence the ‘Sea Peoples’ had on the Late Bronze Age Collapse and in the end one can consider like Eric Cline, that they were but one of the factors of the collapse. It is also possible to consider them simply as a symptom of the Collapse, a gathering of foe’s clever and skilled enough to ride the tide of the ongoing storm.
Each of the investigated scholars’ research would profit from using more interdisciplinary methods. Trying to stay as objective as possible, but at the same time deducing the behavioral pattern of the past peoples. Utilizing what ethnoarchaeology could provide for insight into the way of life and through a gender approach expanding both material and research. Processual and post-processualism among others, should be accepted as complementary approaches and together they should be used to create a believable past based on the material at hand.
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