

***KOINE (SO-CALLED  
ANCIENT GREEK)  
DERIVED FROM ANCIENT  
EGYPTIAN***



**By Dr. Risto Ivanovski**

**Translated from Macedonian to English and edited by Risto Stefov**

**KOINE (SO-CALLED ANCIENT GREEK)  
DERIVED FROM ANCIENT EGYPTIAN**

Published by:

***Risto Stefov***



**Publications**  
Toronto, Canada

Copyright © 2025 by Risto Ivanovski & Risto Stefov

[rstefov@hotmail.com](mailto:rstefov@hotmail.com)

e-book edition

\*\*\*

December 10, 2025

\*\*\*

Koine (so-called Ancient Greek) originated from Ancient Egyptian / by  
Risto Ivanovski. - Bitola.

a) Origin of the Macedonian Koine language (so-called Ancient Greek).

## Table of Contents

QUARTER.....	5
MIGRATION FROM THE LEVANT TO THE NORTH.....	9
LEVANTE CIVILIZATIONS .....	16
CIVILIZATIONS OF THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN .....	40
HEIRS OF THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN.....	134
HUMANITY’S RACES .....	194
LANGUAGES OF THE RACES .....	203
THE SUMERIANS AND EGYPTIANS WERE WHITE, AND THE ACADIANS WERE BLACK .....	209
BI-RACIAL LANGUAGES OF WHITES AND BLACKS .....	223
BIRACIALITY AND BIRACIAL LANGUAGES .....	233
BLACK ATHENA.....	244
BABYLON=BABYL=BAB IL-IL VRNE/THUNDER; BABA PLANINA, BABUNA .....	261
EMERGENCE OF THE ALPHABET .....	266
WORDS (LETTERS) .....	274
SLAVS ACCORDING TO THE WORD - THE WORD OF GOD...	281
THE SAME PEOPLE LIVED IN THE BALKANS AND IN ASIA MINOR .....	287
THE ANCIENT EUROPEAN LANGUAGE AND THE ETRURIAN SCRIPT .....	291
THE SO-CALLED HOMERIC LANGUAGE WAS SLAVONIC = SO- CALLED SLAVIC .....	305
BARBARIAN=PELASGIAN=SO-CALLED SLAVIC LANGUAGE .....	314
KOINE DID NOT EXIST DURING THE TIME OF ALEXANDER OF MACEDONIA .....	331
KOINE (SO-CALLED ANCIENT GREEK) HELLENIC LANGUAGE FROM ALEXANDRIA .....	349
KOINE WAS THE ALEXANDRIAN LANGUAGE - IN ATHENS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE WAS IONIAN .....	354
THE ROMANS LIKE THE HELLENS AND THE MACEDONIANS WERE ALL PELASGIANS .....	381

THE COPTIC LANGUAGE WAS PELASGIAN = SO-CALLED  
SLAVIC LANGUAGE..... 392  
THE CHURCH LANGUAGE, A HERITAGE OF KOINE ..... 396  
LITERATURE..... 401

## QUARTER

“Quaternary glaciation. According to Larousse <sup>1</sup> during the Quaternary period glaciers spread south several times from the north of Europe and from the Alpine mountain ranges. During their maximum extent the northern glaciers covered all of Ireland and reached the London Basin, the mouth of the Rhine, the foothills of the Middle German Mountains, the Kiev Basin (north 50° N. lat.) and the middle Don; they also covered northern Siberia, not crossing the 60° parallel line in the south. Several glaciers of enormous dimensions from the high Alpine mountain ranges moved westwards to Lyon, northwards to the Bavarian sector of the Danube, southwards to the middle reaches of the Durance and the southern shores of the present-day Italian lakes at the foot of the Alps. Other mountain ranges also had local glaciers, but they did not move far due to their insufficient height (Vosges) or amount of precipitation received (that was the case with the high Asian mountains).

The glaciers smoothed and deepened the valleys (‘Mountain eyes’, i.e. ‘Alpine eyes’ - small alpine lakes, then fjords in Norway) and the shields or tables (lake basins in Finland), making them completely barren, and by their mechanical action the glaciers carried away the loose bottom and exposed the rocks underneath. The moraines, composed of sand, gravel and clay – were barren and poor. They contained only large quantities of peat, which became marshland (northern Germany) after the retreat of the glaciers. However, the glaciers were of indirect benefit by creating fractures, i.e. sections of the slopes with waterfalls, which represent a significant hydroelectric potential (Scandinavia) and by the loess, deposited in front of the glaciated zones of land and composed of fine dust, blown by winds from the alluvial accumulations of silt on the glaciers streams.

---

<sup>1</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967- za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 55.

The melting glaciers eventually caused sea levels to rise and thus created the present-day appearance and basic characteristics of the sea coast. This process created the Calais Moreus, submerged the former valleys and created the rias (Brittany in France, Galicia in Spain) and the archipelago in the Adriatic Sea (along the Dalmatian coast).

The sedimentary basins of the flat coast, the dune cordons (i.e. sand dunes) surrounding the marshy coastal land, intersected by several estuaries or (slightly hilly) rare deltas, were replaced by steep high coastal sections (cliffs) of solid rocks. Only the Baltic Sea was significantly reduced because the rise of the ice-free zones was more significant than the rise in sea level.

Climatic characteristics. Due to its geographical position in terms of latitude between 35° and 80° north latitude (from Crete to Novaya Zemlya), Europe was associated with three major climatic zones: subtropical, temperate and arctic (polar).

Its extent over 180 degrees longitude caused climatic contrasts between its oceanic side and continental part”.

The dry belt moved from south to north and so did the DNA.

“The land topography contributed to further divide the aforementioned large climatic zones into smaller climatic areas or regions, with a significant role played by land and sea arrangement, altitude, land exposure to various climatic changes and weather influences; then the obstacles created by mountain ranges and massifs. Accordingly, there was a great diversity of climates in Europe, and that is why it is necessary to analyze the main climate types.

Atmospheric circulation. A large part of Europe was exposed to the general circulation of air from west to east - which was typical for middle latitudes - with frequent cyclonic disturbances, which brought rain in all seasons, cooler summers, and a mild climate in winter.

However, in addition to the general circulation of air masses, there were other areas with high air pressure in the northwest and southeast, from where the movement of air masses occurred, which changed the original direction of air circulation and interrupted the changes in the general air circulation from west to east.

Arctic sea air descended in the winter towards the south and was joined by an anticyclone which was created after the temperatures in Siberia dropped.

Dry and icy winds from the north and northeast ('northerly') blew across Europe at that time. In the summer, the Arctic air rose towards the north and the Siberian anticyclone was replaced by low air pressures, which facilitated the deep penetration of oceanic air currents and rain towards the interior of the continent.

A subtropical anticyclone from the Azores descended in the winter towards the south, that is, southwest, while low air pressures (barometric depression) prevailed in the Mediterranean Sea, which brought strong cyclonic storms from the west and abundant amounts of precipitation. In contrast, the subtropical anticyclone covered the entire Midwest in the summer, creating a hot and dry continental basin.

Temperatures. Temperatures played a very important role in the differentiation of climate in the middle latitudes.

In winter, the temperatures decreased from west to east, as a result of the distance from the sea to eastern Siberia. Here the entire oceanic side of Europe had a mild climate extending to the far north.

In summer, the temperature increased from northwest to southeast, at the same time reflecting the difference in latitude, rapid continental heating of the air and the penetration of warm air masses. The annual amplitude and thermal regime were expressed in contrasts, especially between the oceanic areas, which were characterized by small amplitudes and mild variations, and the continental areas with strong weather and climate contrasts, on the basis of which only two seasons

were distinguished: warm summers and cold winters. Under the influence of relief, the regions with mountain climates were particularly prominent, where not only the altitude played a significant role, but also the morphological forms of the terrain, and especially the exposure of the mountain sides to atmospheric phenomena, even at relatively moderate altitudes.

**Precipitation.** Atmospheric precipitation or precipitation was influenced by less complex natural conditions.

Annual amounts of precipitation seem to differ on the Atlantic side of Europe and the western mountains facing the westerly winds, which receive up to 2000 mm of precipitation per year, for most of Europe, west of the line connecting the Danube Delta with the Moscow Basin and the northernmost end of the Gulf of Bothnia, in whose area the annual amounts of precipitation were more than 500 mm. Finally, three types of arid zones were distinguished in Europe:

- 1) the area very distant from the ocean, but which nevertheless received 250-500 mm of precipitation;
- 2) a subtropical depression, protected by mountains from humid winds (southeastern part of the Iberian Peninsula, i.e. Iberian Peninsula, Central Asia or Soviet Central Asia); and
- 3) an area on the edge of the Arctic Ocean, too cold for evaporation to be significant.

Seasonal precipitation regimes contrasted with the significantly simplified regime of the oceanic sector of Europe, wetter during all four seasons, with a relatively pronounced maximum during the equinox, while the continental and Mediterranean areas had less moisture, with precipitation concentrated during the summer in the former, and during the cold season in the latter, but always with few rainy days.

**Climatic regions.** Areas with particularly specific climate characteristics occupy very small areas:



1. The high mountains, cold and covered with snow;
2. The Arctic rim of the former USSR, cold and dry;
3. Soviet Central Asia, semi-desert character. However, in general, three main climatic zones were distinguished in Europe:

A - Oceanic Europe, constantly humid, with a weak thermal amplitude, between mild winters and cool summers, decreasing in the direction of the interior.

B - Continental Europe, a larger area, with greater thermal contrasts, with moderate humidity, but with an advantage in terms of summer distribution of rain and heat.

C - Mediterranean Europe, climatically more diverse, with more sunny days, heat and drought during the summer, and mild winters in terms of temperature, but very rainy.”

Since the dry belt tended to move from south to north, migrations took place from the warmer, drier belts to the colder and wetter belts in the north. It followed then that the DNA geographic moved from south to north, never the other way around.

So, during the Ice Age the white race had withdrawn towards the Levant.

## **MIGRATION FROM THE LEVANT TO THE NORTH**

On page 10, T.F. Gaskell, <sup>2</sup> wrote: “The distribution of water on Earth has changed throughout the entire geological period. Today 70.8% of our planet’s surface is covered by seas, whose average depth ranges from 3-4 km, and the total water surface is 361,045,106 km<sup>2</sup>...”

---

<sup>2</sup> T.F.Gaskell, Mora, karte i ljudi, Mladost, Zagreb, 1969.

On pg. 14 Gaskell wrote: "From time to time during ice ages throughout the Earth's geological history, a significant amount of water has been trapped in ice. Today, we live in the dying grip of an ice age that reached its fourth peak some 10,000 years ago, and began some 500,000 - 1,000,000 years earlier. About 1/10 of the total land area is now frozen."

During the ice age period, the white race was forced to migrate south.

Larousse <sup>3</sup>, talking about Early Antiquity, under the first subtitle 'Domain of History and Method of History', said: "The Legacy of the Paleolithic Age (the era of roughly worked stone) lasted until about 8000 years ago. It is usually believed that humanity began its epoch with the appearance of tools. It was about 1,800,000 years ago when living beings in East Africa began to use sharp quartz rocks which were consciously and deliberately broken to make blades... Since the beginning of the Quaternary - some two million years ago - the Earth had gone through many ice ages which have left behind traces of sedimentation, and have caused large temperature drops above the 35th parallel. There were also interglacial periods, significantly drier and locally warmer..."

So, here we are talking about the 35th parallel. And that 35th parallel is just south of Crete.

Crete had the oldest and most perfect buildings, etc. So Crete was part of the Levant.

Here is what Horst Kline <sup>4</sup>wrote: "The Levant consisted of the coastal areas of Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt... As well as the Mediterranean countries east of Italy, including Greece..."

---

<sup>3</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 224.

<sup>4</sup> Horst Klen, Der große Duden, VEB Bibliographische Institut, Leipzig, 1971, p. 273.

Levant-v=leant; Levant-n=levat; Levant-t=levan=lean=lean with sea water. (Левант - в = леант; Левант - н = леват; Левант-т = леван = леан = лиен со морска вода.)

H.G. Wells <sup>5</sup>wrote: “According to geologists, the earliest of these eoliths came from the Pliocene Era, that is, before the first glacial period. They can still be found throughout the first interglacial period. We, however, know of no bones or any other materials used in Europe or America from half a million years ago from which this tool could have been made and used...”

“As we have already said, we do not yet know the region in which the ancestors of the dark Neolithic people, starting from the Paleolithic stage, created their cultural development. It is probable that somewhere in southwestern Asia or in some region covered by the Mediterranean Sea or the Indian Ocean (while the Neanderthals with their difficult life were still living in the cold climate of glacial Europe) the ancestors of the white people perfected their crude skills of the later Paleolithic period... <sup>6</sup>

All these early sections of human history have yet to be discovered. The material for them will probably be found in Asia Minor, Persia, Arabia, India, or North Africa, and perhaps it lies under the Mediterranean Sea or the Red Sea or the Indian Ocean. Twelve thousand years ago or thereabouts (we are still in no position to be able to use anything other than the most rough determination of time) the Neolithic people dispersed throughout Europe, North Africa and Asia. They were at the same level of education as the Polynesian islanders of the last century, and at that time they were the most advanced tribes in the world.”

---

<sup>5</sup> Herbert George Wells, *Istoriju sveta*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 29.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

Knowing that “the Neolithic peoples dispersed throughout Europe, North Africa and Asia”, we can confirm that their migrations began in the Levant – not in North Africa...

“Until now we have been talking about a history without events, a history of centuries, a history of periods and stages of development. But, before we finish with that part of human history we must turn to something that was probably a tragic but epic historic event for humanity as it was developing. This was the Atlantic Ocean breaking through into the great valley and creating today’s Mediterranean Sea.”<sup>7</sup>

The reader should not forget... It is quite certain that the Mediterranean Sea at the end of the last ice or glacial age, represented two or three closed basins with nothing connected or perhaps connected only by some lush river that carried away the excess water from them. Fresh water flowed into the eastern basin. The Nile, the Adriatic River, the Red Sea River and perhaps a river that descended between the mountains that are now the Greek Archipelago, which came from a much larger sea in central Asia that existed there then. And it is also certain that at that time the Neolithic people wandered in that now lost Mediterranean paradise.

“In the last four chapters we have traced the emergence of civilized states rising from primitive Neolithic farming. This began perhaps 15,000 years ago, somewhere around the eastern Mediterranean. At first they were more into horticulture than agriculture. Before the invention of the plough, tillage was done with a hoe, and farming at first served more as an adjunct to hunting and herding sheep, goats and cattle, from which the family tribe derived most of its sustenance.”<sup>8</sup>

Their connection was with the eastern Mediterranean, where the post-glacial period began. From there the migrations were northwards, and therefore so was the DNA going from south to north.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 112.

Climatic characteristics. According to Larousse <sup>9</sup>: “Due to its geographical position in terms of latitude between 35° and 80° north latitude (from Crete to Novaya Zemlya), Europe is connected to three major climatic zones: subtropical, temperate and arctic (polar). Its expanse over 180 degrees of longitude causes climatic contrasts between its oceanic side and the continental part.”

The dry belt moved from south to north and so did DNA.

So, it follows that the Macedonians were close to the Cretans in their DNA, but not to the Danubians and Transcarpathians. According to their DNA, the Macedonians were from the eastern Mediterranean.

So, the migrations were only from south to north, not vice versa - north to south.

“It is necessary at this point to establish a picture of the period and location where people settled in Europe starting from prehistoric migrations; then to show the main stages of land occupation, i.e. essentially the clearing of forests: and finally attempts to divide the main types of landscapes where people settled at a time when, after the cessation of the great invasions, i.e. the migrations of peoples, an original European civilization began to emerge and finally, to outline the political division of Europe. <sup>10</sup>

Migration. Paleolithic.- Before the last great ice age, big game hunters came in smaller groups from Asia or Africa and occupied the steppes of southern Europe. The nomads, grouped in clans of a few dozen people, camped on the terraces of the great valleys or on some plateaus. Finally, the glacial retreat opened the way for big game and hunters to go north towards the northern steppe regions. After the climate began to change, forests began to appear in large parts of Europe.

---

<sup>9</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 55.

<sup>10</sup> Pg. 57.

From Neolithic agriculture to the Roman Empire. • Three main zones in Europe were progressively populated and began to develop:

1. The Mediterranean Basin and the Atlantic littoral, starting from the Greek (or Balkan) <sup>11</sup>, Apennine and Iberian (Pyrenean) Peninsulas;
2. The Pontic (Black Sea) and Danubian steppes, the mountain ranges of the Alps and their northern rim; and,
- 3) The North European Plain, the Paris Basin and the southeastern part of the British Isles.” (The migrations were gradual from south to north, not vice versa: north-south, R.I.)

It has been confirmed that southern Europe was inhabited first, and the north later.

So far, there is no evidence/findings of migrations of white people from north to south.

Also, DNA has shown that migrations took place from south to north.

“• Three successive stages of economy can be distinguished:

1. Mobile agriculture during the Neolithic period moved from one place to another when the land became empty, and on land obtained by deforestation and grass fires, with the use of hoeing. This was especially widespread in the Danube Basin;
2. Permanent or stable agriculture was developed with the help of animal teams, starting from the Bronze Age and well into the Iron Age. This kind of civilization existed in large part in the lakeside villages (Swiss palafitte settlements - on stilts or poles; Terramar settlements in marly clay, in northern Italy), where communities were involved in weaving, metal processing, pottery making, etc. The commodities made here were exchanged (amber, tin, etc.) with commodities made in

---

<sup>11</sup> Historically, there was only Macedonia, a Macedonian dynasty and the Macedonian Peninsula, and no Greek.

distant countries which were involved mainly in maritime or continental trade. These were well developed urban civilizations, existing in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Crete whose people went through Greece and Italy to trade with the northerners.”

Following them their DNA also moved from south to north. This was the reason why Macedonian DNA is close to Cretan DNA but not to Danubian or even further to the Transcarpathian DNA. According to researcher Arnaiz-Velena (Spain) and others, the Macedonians have similar genetic frequencies with the inhabitants of the Mediterranean islands Crete, Corsica, Sicily and Sardinia. According to the dendrogram, the Macedonians belong to the older Mediterranean substratum, as do the Iberians, including the Basques, North Africans, Italians, French...

Herodotus (5th century B.C.) stated that the Thracians lived north of the Danube River, in Transcarpathia... He never met any Slavs. The same was confirmed by Emperor Hadrian (2nd century AD), in the Memoirs of Emperor Hadrian. He lived north of the Danube River, in the areas that should be Slavic, but he did not see any Slavs. It follows that from the 5th century B.C. to the 2nd century AD there were no Slavs. Since it is said that the Russians are Slavs, and that they lived in Transcarpathia, then where did the Russians come from?

According to the Kievan priest Nestor (11th-12th century), the Russians came from Illyricum, which was in the Balkans. All Russian traditions were connected with the Danube River, but not with the Russian territories. The question then arises, where did the so-called Slavs come from? According to mainstream history, all these people, Russians, Ukrainians, Romanians, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles... the people in the Balkans... they are all Slavs who came from Transcarpathia. Since Transcarpathia has four geographical sides, east, south, west and north, there should be no dispute as to who came from where. Let everyone buy a lottery ticket and whoever wins will get their pick and, with luck, it will only apply to them.

It has been said that the Russians came from Transcarpathia, where the Thracians had settled (Herodotus). It follows that Nestor was right - the Transcarpathians were Russian. The Russians, however, have origins from the Balkans, from Illyricum. Their traditions come from south of the Danube, from the Balkans.

So, what is the connection between the Russians and Macedonia? According to Eremij Russo: "The Russians or Muscovites speak the same language as the ancient Macedonians. This was written by Mavro Orbini (1601), who has cited unknown authors.

From what was said above, it follows that the Russians originated from the Balkans. The migrations were from south to north - not vice versa. Exactly for that reason DNA traveled from south to north. This was also the reason why Macedonian DNA is close to Cretan DNA, but not at all to the Danubians or even further north to Transcarpathian DNA.

So, "as per the appendix" the question is: "Were there any migrations of Transdanubians and Transcarpathians south of the Danube River - to the Balkans?" There is not a single piece of material evidence/findings to support such migrations of separate Slavic peoples. Again, the so-called Slavic language was the so-called Homeric language.

## **LEVANTE CIVILIZATIONS**

### **Civilization of the Stone and Copper Ages**

*"Villages and Cities of Mesopotamia to the Fall of the Akkadian Empire (7th-3rd millennium)"* <sup>12</sup>

Peasants (before 3600). The rainy season, which in these latitudes coincided with the last period of the Ice Age, made the land around the Tigris and Euphrates an inaccessible wasteland for people. The hill dwellers (in Kurdistan, Zagros) labored in agriculture (the locality

---

<sup>12</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 227.



around Shanidar in Kurdistan, 8600; the village of Jarmo, 6500), made ceramics and processed copper. The climate, which gradually became drier, opened these valleys to the first inhabitants.<sup>13</sup> Here, differences arose between individual areas. The hills to the northwest (future Assyria) were cold and wet enough to be permanently occupied with livestock and the cultivation of agricultural species that loved drought (today there is 300-600 mm of atmospheric precipitation per year). In the southeast (historical lands of the Akkadians and Sumerians), due to the hot sun and drought, the soil had to be irrigated (today there is 100 mm of atmospheric precipitation). As a result, cultivation was facilitated in the plain in the proximity of the two rivers. The rest of Mesopotamia (Subar in the north and Amur in the west), the areas that were elevated formed by deep valleys, seemed to have gradually dried out. Cultivation of the land was more or less replaced by nomadic livestock and agriculture was preserved only in the large valleys where irrigation was possible. In northern Mesopotamia, a sequence of civilizations began to develop quite well (Hasun, 7th millennium; Samarra 7th-6th millennium; Tell Khalaf 6th-5th millennium), which were distinguished from one another by the characteristic decorations of their beautiful pottery, which was found in Kurdistan and northern Syria. On the contrary, the origin of the inhabitants who founded the first settlements in the marshes in the southeast (Eridu, 5500 B.C.) is still unknown. These inhabitants, isolated on the hills in the lowlands, used reeds and clay as their only material from which they made ceramics, houses and boats. The people in the north, who had access to the mountains, were the first to use copper and stone seals. Instead of temples made of unbaked brick (čerpić), which were found in Eridu, the people of Arpachia and Gavri used stone tholos.

Irrigation, that gave these people rich harvests of dates, sesame, wheat and barley, first began in the southeast, creating a surplus of agricultural products, which revived trade with the rest of the Near East. The El-

---

<sup>13</sup> 13 Where did the first inhabitants come from? From the Levant - there the white race lived during the Ice Age.

Ubaid civilization (4200-3600), which was also found in the Susa basin, spread across Mesopotamia from the lower to the upper reaches of its rivers.

Cities and temples (3600-3000). Real change was brought by the Uruk civilization (3600-3400), when great architecture, the pottery wheel, the roll seal and writing was introduced in the lowlands. This rapid advance is usually attributed to the Sumerian invasion. The Sumerians appeared to be the creators of the Mesopotamian script. Since no major changes were observed after this period, it was assumed that the Sumerians settled there after their neighbours, the Mesopotamian Semites and Elamites from Susa and southwestern Iran had already settled. These uncertainties are the reason why this civilization is called 'Mesopotamian' or 'Sumerian'. It appeared in the Uruk period and the Jemdet Nasra period (3400-300), and continued from the previous one without major changes.

The population, which was constantly increasing, was concentrated in small towns above whose modest houses rose large temples. In each city walls surrounded one or more temples. On one hand, they were content with building small foundation walls to protect them from floods, and on the other they erected hills, ziggurats, mysterious buildings of unknown functionality. It is unknown whether they served as a refuge in time of great danger, or as an observatory, or as 'mountains' to remind the Sumerians of their birthplace, or a point where heaven and earth met and where the gods descended. The temples of that period which served their gods, of whom we don't know much, had columns of brick or wood, decorated with frescoes and especially mosaics. On their tops they had painted clay cups driven into the walls. Uruk, which for some time was the metropolis of the lowlands, erected many such temples, which sometimes reached large dimensions (80 x 50 m). The houses of their God were decorated with statuettes of supplicants praying to the distinguished people. The masterpieces of these sculptures were female heads from Uruk. Without

abandoning the described scenes, fantastic animals were drawn in the glyptics, a practice which continued even in European heraldry.

The use of the roller seals, with which respectable citizens could immortalize themselves, were actually distributed for economic reasons. An impression of a small scene was engraved on a roller and placed on a clay stopper of a container holding liquid to guarantee its inviolability and quality.

The invention of writing contributed to the need and importance of keeping track of things. The first testimony of this was provided by the lists of provisions the rulers of Uruk used, which they received and distributed. The writing consisted of a very large number of signs (ideograms) [2000 in Uruk], written as notches with a notching reed sketched on fresh clay, which they then dried in a furnace or in the sun to preserve them. It is not difficult to guess that the economy of the city at that time was managed by a temple (management of the divine gods). The city administrators put many residents to work in the fields or in workshops for the benefit of the god who took care of their survival.

Period of the first dynasties (about 3000-2300). Technology progressed very slowly, but social life became increasingly complex. During excavations we came across palaces. Around 2600 short dedications written in the Sumerian language began to appear, in the name of individual city rulers-administrators, who received their power from the local deity and their Caesar (king) who, starting from his city, imposed his power on part of Mesopotamia. Again, according to archaeological discoveries, the history of dynasties that were known only from various lists of legendary origin, was compiled only in the 2nd millennium. These are: the first was the dynasty of Ur, of which only one temple remains at El-Obeid, second, the dynasty of Mari, whose palace was discovered in 1964 by André Parrot. But most of the buildings found remained unidentified, nameless. Included in these buildings are: the temples of Diyala and Nippur, rich in statuettes of suppliants, and then the terraced sanctuaries of Kish, which are the first true ziggurats. The

difference between the Semitic and Sumerian cities (the land at the mouths of the two rivers) was better preserved in the sculptures than in the inscriptions, which were often written in two languages. The more familiar, the usual gravity of Sumerian works, was sometimes contrasted in the Maria of Diyala works which show a more realistic and lively style in which there are real portraits. The famous 'royal tomb' of Ur, whose treasures of goldsmith works are unique in the East, is particularly enigmatic because of the multitude of servants who were sacrificed on the occasion of the burial of persons who probably never reigned. The site at Telo alone, in which 30,000 tablets and a whole heap of art objects (hawk stelae) were found, allowed us to follow the history of the Sumerian city (Lagash) princes and the priesthood for over a period of three hundred years. (T + Ur = Tur: Ta + Ur = Taur-Taurus [cattle]; Taur-t=aur [pondile], R.I.) (T + Yp = Typ: Ta + Yp = Таур- Таурус [гове́до]; Таур-t=аур [пондила], Р.И.)

It seems that continuous wars were the main feature the period of the first dynasties. The commander riding a four-wheeled chariot, drawn by hemioni (animals similar to donkeys), rode ahead of a phalanx of spearmen and light infantry, armed with spears and axes, and plundered the neighbouring cities. Sometimes he dared to attack even his own chieftain, whose position he envied. These battles did not hinder the economic development of the lowland, whose agricultural surpluses encouraged great trade. Mesopotamian traders traded grain, oil, dates, seals, jewelry and weapons produced in their country with people in distant lands. They went to Dilmun (present-day Bahrain), where they stockpiled Iranian, Arab and Hindu products, as well as copper, lapis lazuli and ivory.

Akkadian Empire (2300-2160). The way for the creation of the Akkadian Empire was prepared by the Sumerian Lugalzagsi, king of Uruk (2325-2300), who imposed his power from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf. This power was overthrown by the Semitic Sargon, whom we know only from legendary stories from the 2nd millennium. His capital Akkad (near Kish?), whose name now designates the

northern part of the plain (in contrast to Sumer, which is further south), has not yet been found. Sargon, who conquered Elam and penetrated into Syria and Anatolia, left to his successors an empire shaken by rebellions, but in which centralization had already begun. His grandson Naram-Sin, with strange titles, expressed the growing prestige of the monarchy: king of the four regions (of Mesopotamia), king of the whole world, god of Akkad.

In the valley of Mesopotamia, the Semitic element, constantly strengthening with tribes coming from the deserts, emerged first without racial antagonism. Adopting Sumerian culture, the Semites of these cities expressed their national self-consciousness. The priests of the Akkadian Empire adopted the Sumerian language, but the administrative language of the empire remained Akkadian. It was a Semitic dialect deeply imbued with a multitude of Sumerian words. While writing in Akkadian, the scribes used the writing invented by the Sumerians. Its signs were far from the primitive pictorial writing, and from then on it truly deserved the name cuneiform (made of wedges). Art was being renewed. Artists used two new materials: hard stone and bronze. The Akkadian dynasty stelae were distinguished by simplicity and elegance; (Naram-Sons, found in Susa), seals (Shar-kali-shari) and the figures (the heads of Nineveh).

The subjugated neighbouring peoples gradually conquered the Akkadian civilization, its artistic forms, cuneiform writing and, sometimes, wrote their texts in the Sumerian and Akkadian languages. Only then did the peoples of northern Mesopotamia began to appear. The Hurrians came from the mountains of Kurdistan and gradually penetrated into Mesopotamia and northern Syria, and the Assyrians, Semites, worshipers of the god Assur, came from the steppes of Jabal Sinjar, west of the Tigris and founded their kingdom on its right bank.

The fertile fields and rich cities of Mesopotamia were destined throughout history to tempt the neighbouring peoples among whom poverty was supported by military means. The Lulubs and Gutians, a

pastoral peoples from the Zagros, destroyed the Akkadian dynasty (around 2160) whose capital disappeared from history, and supremacy was passed on to the Gutians. However, the Mesopotamian civilization created by the Sumerians and Semites, as well as the effort to unify the great plain, would outlive the Sargonic empire.”

*Iran and India by the end of the 3rd millennium*

“Iranian villages. The city Susa. Iran, where strong humidity had long been maintained in its mountain ranges, was the cradle of agriculture which, from the 7th to the 6th millennium, appeared in the bays near the Caspian regions along the shores of the local lake which was then swollen in the depressions (Tep, Sialk, Bakun, Ray), in the Zagros valley (Tep Sarab). Samples of ceramics and copper tools found in Iran were very similar in origin to the Mesopotamian ones, items which may have come from the East. But, following the rapid drying up of the Iranian lakes, agriculture was limited to individual isolated spots. The population of Iran remained in the stage of peasantry and soon ended its ability to support large-scale trade coming from India and Mesopotamia, which crossed the mountains during the 3rd millennium.

Even though there was general decline in Iran, the fertile basin of Susiana, wide open to the lands between the two rivers, was an exception. The great Elamite city of Susa, which arose under the influence of trade and irrigation, represented a junction between the urban Sumerian civilization and the mountainous regions of Elam, under whose protection the city was, which in the time of El-Ubaid (4000) produced the most beautiful pottery, adopted the proto-Elamite script which was similar to the Sumerian, but which did not exceed the level of pictorial writing and which after the Akkadian conquest, gave way to the cuneiform script (2250).

Civilization of the Indus. Separated by high mountains and still isolated, India lagged behind the Middle East. The villages that arose in eastern Afghanistan and Baluchistan in contact with Iran, were of later origin (4th millennium) and remained in the Copper Age at least 3000 years.

The great civilization in the Indus Valley which emerged around 2400, was less mysterious. Dealing with agriculture (barley, wheat, rice and cotton) and crafts using bronze, two large cities (sites near Harapp and Mohenjo-Daro) emerged with chessboard-shaped plans and a system of sewage and drainage that testify to the care for urbanism, unique at that time. The use of writing is evidenced by stone seals and copper plates, but to this day we have not yet deciphered this writing. On the other hand, as there are no remains of palaces and temples, nothing is known about their political organization or religion. Archaeology has nevertheless indicated a connection with distant lands. The Harapp (representatives of the Hindu civilization) sailed to Dilmun and founded ports and agricultural colonies on both sides of the mouth of the Indus.

The wealth the great valleys produced led to the creation of an original civilization, but the Harapp seem to have quickly ceased to advance, which undoubtedly occurred after the decline of wholesale trade, the overland route of which became difficult with the desiccation of Iran.”

The Caucasians from the Eastern Mediterranean came to India, China, Japan, America...

*“Syrian civilization until the arrival of the Western Semites (8th-3rd millennium)”*

Between the Mediterranean Sea and the Syrian-Arabian desert, from Taurus to Sinai, lies the Syrian region consisting of mountain ranges, narrow valleys and mostly small coastal plains. The mountains rich in forests supplied water for irrigation to some areas not far from the sea. The barren land somewhat further east supported a pastoral life for the population. The geographical fragmentation made it impossible to create a large state in the area that was otherwise coveted by its neighbours. All trade routes from the Near East to the Mediterranean and vice versa lead through Syria, rich in forests, ores and agricultural production.

Towards the end of the prehistoric period, culture developed particularly rapidly. Groups of hunters built villages (Einan, in the north of Palestine) and fortifications (Jericho) before adopting the agricultural method of life and pottery production (VIII-VII millennium). Round stone buildings, tombs with cist (a coffin made of thick tiles) covered with a mound, sometimes led to the idea that megalithism was of Syrian origin. Foreign influence was also expressed. This was characterized by the adoption of various styles of ceramics and the use of seals from Mesopotamia (VI-IV millennium). A fruitful but fragmented exchange took place between Palestine and Egypt.

But, lacking flat plains and dealing with destructive invasions hindered Syria's cultural development. From Anatolia, and especially from the deserts, poorly developed tribes invaded the region. In the absence of a written language, they imposed their own language on Syria. But the first Semitic group, of which we know for sure, were the Western Semites, from some 2000 years ago. As for the III millennium, archaeology has discovered a large number of fortified, without a doubt, capitals of small kingdoms that lived constantly defending themselves from neighbours or from the great states of the East. Palestine and the Syrian coast were protectorates of Pharaonic Egypt, but texts only mentioned the port of Kepen (Greek Byblos), where fleets came to pick up wood and ores. On the contrary, Mesopotamian sovereigns (Lugalzagesius of Uruk or Sargon of Akkad), who wanted to control the routes to the forested mountains and Anatolia, were credited with the destruction of the cities around 2300. Rich and weak, Syria was an attractive prey for the first great conquerors in history."

*The first African civilization. The Old Egyptian Empire (7th-3rd millennium)*

African Neolithic. The part of Africa in which excavations have been carried out (in the north and east) show the existence of an identical culture which existed until the end of the Paleolithic era (when, due to the abundance of water deposits, the deserts of that continent



disappeared), which can be explained by the unbroken relief: everywhere there are the same tools, the same paintings made by hunters on the walls of their shelters. It seems that the polishing of stone, ceramics and cattle breeding preceded the real agriculture of the permanent inhabitants. Incomplete excavations have revealed prominent centers in Kenya, Uganda, Nubia, Cyrenaica and the Sahara (the Ajera, Tenere plateaus) from the beginning of the Neolithic Era. A group of Africans, undoubtedly reinforced by settlers from Palestine, began to establish themselves in the Nile Valley (5000). The drying up of the Sahara, which has been accelerating since 3000, scattered its farmers who were moving north and south, without any doubt throughout Africa. But already, even at that time, the fertile silt deposited by the Nile gave Egypt the upper hand.

The beginnings of Egyptian civilization. The 'Egyptian race' arose from the mixing of the very diverse population that inhabited that country, but its culture was influenced by Africa's nature whose fauna and flora gave a special stamp to the art and religion of Egypt. While it was possible to hunt game in the nearer areas, progress was very slow. Then, as the population multiplied and the dry land expanded, the gifts offered by the Nile became more prominent. The river in its annual increase in water (from June to September) covered a part of the valley, bringing water and silt that restored the fertility of the soil. People first cleared the thickets and drained the swamps left behind by the Nile waters which gradually retreated into their regular bed. The Egyptians then undertook projects to expand the zone covered by fertile soil. To make that possible they built dams that would hold back the water and dug canals that would carry it as far as possible. For these works, which required serious social organization, the Egyptian people received portions of fertile land, be it a narrow one: only 23,000 km<sup>2</sup> for Upper Egypt (a narrow valley between the first waterfall and the Fayum) and Lower Egypt (the Delta). (Delta=delta; prostata=prostata: v-n-t, R.I.) (Делта=дел та; простата=проста та: в-н-т, Р.И.)

A general civilization was born during the 4th millennium, which arose thanks to the relations established by river navigation between individual villages, which was carried out with papyrus boats. Copper tools also appeared. Craftsmen produced beautiful vases from hard stone, and sculpted objects for the needs of the cult (ivory statuettes and slate pallets). An equitable division of water and land required that the villages be grouped under a common authority. Small kingdoms were created whose deities ruled over nomes (administrative units). They were grouped into two rival states, North and South. Perhaps the beginning progress in Egypt was brought on by the arrival of Asiatics, who brought new artistic forms from Mesopotamia (3300). At some point then the Egyptians invented hieroglyphs (a type of writing that will always retain the appearance of an exact drawing and which would later be used for inscriptions carved in stone). A little later, according to this writing, is revealed the victory of the South. King 'Scorpio' and Narmer, rulers of Hierakonopolis (city of the falcon god Horus), defeated the people of the Delta and the Asiatics. From then on, the ruler of Egypt was king of both kingdoms. He was called Horus ('the one of the palace'). Until the end of the Egyptian monarchy, this dualism and unity, was expressed by the coronation ceremony and by a royal headdress that united the white crown of Upper Egypt and the red crown of Lower Egypt.

Historic sources and division of Pharaonic Egypt. For the period starting from the unification of the country (3100), Egyptologists have incomplete lists of the dynastic kings, as well as the annals that speak of their powers. After that they began to use tombstone inscriptions for pharaohs and high-ranking figures. The victory stelae and inscriptions in the sanctuaries from the 2nd millennium, tell us about the wars. The temples and tombs do not have information about the civilization of all eras - it seems that these are the only monuments that have outlived their time. Modern historians believe there were thirty one dynastic divisions (of which 26 took place before the Persian conquest in 525). This information was compiled by the Egyptian Manetho, who wrote a

history about his country in the 3rd century B.C.. Historians group the divisions into kingdoms (enlightenment eras) and a transitional period (in which documents were rare after anarchy).

Kings of Tinis (Tisa) (I and II dynasties, 3100-2700). According to Manetho, Horus ruled Tis, in Upper Egypt (it is unknown exactly where Tis was located). These kings may have also had a seat in the Bel Wall (future Memphis), from where they could supervise the Delta. Two of their known necropolises were located in Abydos (south) and in Saqqara (north).

During this period, in which events are not sufficiently known to us, those with intellectual and technical values were educated with pharaonic knowledge which Egypt employed throughout its history. Mathematical formulas, still quite accurate to this day ( $\pi = 3.1605$ ), were invented to measure and track property lines (land division) and architectural plans. Priests increasingly looked at the sky and the stars to track direction and time. We should be thankful to them for the two calendars that were in use in Egypt: one, the lunar calendar (based on the lunar cycle) for determining holidays, and the other, the solar calendar (official), for the 365 days in a year. The first such calendar began on July 19, around 2780 B.C. which is the day when both the Sun and Sirius rose simultaneously, which in the latitudes of Memphis usually coincided with the general rise of the water. To satisfy the needs of the administration a cursive script was invented (during the 1st dynasty) called hieratic, as well as the material on which to write, a sheet of papyrus (made from the heart of the papyrus plant).

Priests build their theological systems. Some equate their local gods with the cosmic gods, whose cult was an important factor in the unity of Egypt. Others placed a creator (god) above all other gods: Ptah (a god in human form in Memphis), Thoth (the Moon, Ibis or monkey in Hermopolis), Atum-Ra (the Sun of Heliopolis). This last god soon became the most important one, but still did not reach the popularity of Osiris, the god of vegetation, who died and was reborn every year. At

the time when Osiris ruled Egypt, his brother Seth, jealous of his power, killed him and cut his body into pieces. Osiris' widow Isis reassembled the parts of his body and breathed life into his corpse. His son Horus, even before he came to his father's throne, defeated Seth and expelled him from Egypt. Osiris, however, being resurrected, ruled over the (resurrected) dead, in the west (where the Sun died). From this comforting legend, the idea arose that the body should be preserved from decay in order to ensure an afterlife. Therefore, the custom arose where the corpse was covered with natron (sodium carbonate), or bound with ribbons soaked in resin. Later, the brain and entrails were removed from the corpse and placed in a vase (canopic jar) next to the sarcophagus. The Egyptians did not see any contradiction in their belief of the afterlife. According to them, the idea of the western Osiris kingdom did not exclude the idea of life in the sky (in the form of a star) or underground (in human form, which required regular offerings of food).

These beliefs and the prestige of the monarchy prevailed in the art of the Tinnitus. The tomb was usually a monument in the form of a bench, the so-called mastaba. It was made by piling stones that held the walls of hollow bricks. Below it was the basement in which the deceased was found, richly furnished with movable property. Only stone vases and jewelry were preserved. Next to that building, surrounded by a low fence, there were also steles with the name of the deceased, which later served as an altar. The tombs of the rulers differed from the tombs of high officials only in size (up to 85 m long in Nagadi), cells in which the bodies of the sacrificed servants were found. The stela of the Serpent King already showed perfection in the schematization characteristic of Egyptian art.

The Tinite kings were depicted as sons and visible forms of deities with various names, and as such were endowed with magical power to ensure the fertility of the fields. All of Egypt was in the service of that living deity: the peasants, the artisans, the priests, the writers... The ruler, the sole owner of the land, ceded the land from which the gods

lived, to the temples and their priests. In the rest, the royal administration supplied farmers with seeds for sowing, stored grain, oil and wine and then distributed them to the population. The same supervision was applied to livestock breeders, who were numerous until the 2nd millennium, as well as to artisans who filled the royal warehouses with their goods. The court administration sent sailing ships to the Syrian port Byblos, a loyal ally of Egypt, for wooden goods, and to Punt (a country in the south of the Red Sea) for incense. In order to obtain the treasure, in addition to trade, armed expeditions were undertaken in the neighbouring poor countries (the Libyans and the Kushites in Nubia), for the purpose of plundering cattle and slaves, and the Sinai mines and quarries (malachite and copper) were exploited, as well as the Arabian desert (hard stone and gold). Finally, in order to secure the gold ore veins of Kish (Nubia), Horus conquered the Nile Valley with armed forces up to the third cataract.

Old Kingdom (2700-2185). An ever-longer and more elaborate list of monuments, a complex architecture, large sculptures and frescoes, testify to the progress of the post-Tin era. The reign of Djoser (c. 2680), the second king of the Third Dynasty, represented a transitional period in which Thebes was abandoned for Memphis. His minister, the learned Imhotep, built a magnificent royal tomb of stone in Saqqara, so that it would last a long time. Enclosed by a 1600 m long enclosure, it was surrounded by a portico in which the first Egyptian colonnade appeared, a whole set of funerary sanctuaries where large Djoser statues were placed to ensure the afterlife of this ruler, and a 'stepped pyramid' (60 m high) was built by stacking mastabas one on top of the other. They rose above the royal tomb and with their shape represented the stairs on which the king died climbing to heaven. (Saqqara = skara = sahara = sagara, R.I)

Sneferu (c. 2600), founder of the IV dynasty, had three pyramids built, the first of which was inclined (in Dashur), reaching a height of 104 meters. This new shape would be known throughout the millennium as the tombs of the rulers and their relatives. During the Old Kingdom, the

great pyramid of the ruler was surrounded by smaller pyramids, for his close relatives, and mastabas for his courtiers. This last type of building became a stone massif in which there was a chapel and a serdab (a section with statues representing the deceased). The magical role of the 'stone images' explains the emergence of sculpture, in which two tendencies were distinguished: against the majestic pharaohs (Djoser, Khafre) stood realistic portraits (Sheikh el-Beled), but all have the cheerful face of a man who had achieved immortality. With the emergence of art, the gods were also portrayed in the same manner, of course, but nothing was left in their temples.

- The religious zeal of the Egyptians, who all expected their pharaoh to become a new god in the sky after death, could be explained by the incomparable dimensions of the Cheops and Khafre's (2550) buildings: the pyramid (146 and 143 m), the Sphinx, the funerary barque, etc. Later, a certain evolution in the religious mentality took place, which was fulfilled with the V dynasty's accession to the throne (around 2480). Namely, the priesthood of Heliopolis came to the fore, and we see how the gods (except Osiris and Ptah) were united with the god Ra in order to preserve the supremacy of his name. The kings built temples to the god of the Sun (like the one in Abusir). It was a terrace on which there was a brick barge (necessary for the daily journey of the Sun) and a massive obelisk, a symbol of a star. Towards the end of this dynasty's reign, 'pyramid texts' appeared on the walls of royal tombs, which were a synthesis of funeral customs performed in honour of the god of Heliopolis. Use of frescoes and painted bas-reliefs became increasingly common in private tombs and royal temples. These works were of magical significance and represented vivid images of everyday life, and especially funeral and religious rituals. At the same time, the custom of placing statuettes of his servants next to the deceased was also spreading.

This vigorous artistic activity, during the Third Dynasty, was the result of Egypt's demographic and economic growth, as well as its growing administrative power. By now Sneferu had created the position of tati

(chief) and strengthened the power of the nomarch (nome governor). Soon, all the rulers' relatives and high officials became aristocrats who received the right to inherit the position and land that the king had bestowed upon them. The king's prestige was somewhat diminished by the fact that these nobles acquired the right to a single horus. Towards the end of the sixth Dynasty's reign, the nome nobility took advantage of Pepi II's old age (who had reigned for 94 years!) and seized power, while the Kushites revolted and the Asiatics plundered the Delta.

First Interregnum (2185-2040). A revolt strengthened the ruling class. The right to a funeral ritual was appropriated by all those who could afford such an expense. Egypt was divided into principalities that fought for supremacy and whose rulers sometimes took the royal title (7th, 8th, 9th and 10th dynasties). Then the country was reunited (2040) during the 11th dynasty.

After the misfortunes brought on by the period of anarchy, the Memphite monarchy was soon regretted. The Egyptians, strictly conservative, would henceforth always remember the old kingdom, its religious rites and the rules of its art."

It was listed in order to confirm that the Whites had one and the same origin.

*"Villages and fortresses in Anatolia, Cyprus and the Aegean coast (VIII-III millennium)*

Anatolia was rich in ores. This massive peninsula had a high altitude and a complex relief with a large number of sharp depressions. Its valleys were full of lakes and the weather was much wetter back then, than it is today. This region reached the Neolithic period early. The production of ceramics (VIII millennium) and copper ornaments (VII millennium) preceded the development of agriculture. Layer VI in Çatal-Hüyük from about 6500 has revealed the existence of a town and stone statues were found in one of its six sanctuaries. The Anatolians of the Neolithic and Chalcolithic eras already possessed sacred objects and

had made several technological achievements, which in the West would be widely advertised as: ‘horns of dedications’, double edged axes, marble idols with geometric shapes, tholos for group burials, megarons (a rectangular hall in front of which was a colonnaded porch and in which there was a fireplace), etc. But, probably due to insufficient rainfall, Anatolia did not overcome the stage during which its villages and inhabitants became nomads. Sometimes invasions destroyed their local civilization, sometimes Anatolians migrated to other regions bringing with them their culture. Anatolian culture was brought to places like Cilicia, Cyprus, the Aegean Sea islands and the Balkan Peninsula. More and more fortresses were built during the 3rd millennium, whose masters controlled the trade between Mesopotamia and Egypt and whose importance was testified to by the beauty and quantity of jewelry and ritual objects discovered there. Royal tombs were found in Alaşı, Horoztepen, Mahmatlaru, Troy II (another settlement in a place that bears that legendary name), Poliochni and Beysultanu, where buried treasure was discovered during invasions that constantly plagued Anatolia. From cuneiform texts we have learned that Mesopotamian traders came to Anatolia during the 3rd millennium to what was known as the ‘silver land’ (Hatta) in the basin of the river Halis looking for metals, and that the Akkadian kings (c. 2300-2200) intervened to protect them from their native rulers.

Cyprus, the island of copper. <sup>14</sup> This island was settled by Anatolians and Syrians who were attracted by its land and forests. A village with round stone houses from 5700 B.C. was discovered at the Hirohitia site. But after that, technical progress was very slow. It would appear that copper ore was found on this island around the middle of the 3rd millennium, at the time of the new influx of Anatolians.

Ports on the Aegean coast. Since the start of the Neolithic period columns of traders had been crossing from Asia to Europe via Crete, via

---

<sup>14</sup> Cyprus=ki ar; Cupar=heap of ar: kip=heap of copper; ar=ar- Kupar=kupr + um = cuprum (copper).



the Cycladic Islands, the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. Since then Syrians, and especially Anatolians, had been sailing west along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea. As a result, an Aegean culture began to flourish on the Aegean islands and the Hellenic peninsula, similar to that of Asia Minor.

Crete, unique in the Aegean Sea for its forests and fertile land, attracted the Easterners, who brought various technical inventions and agriculture (in the 7th millennium). It was only during the Old Minoan period (named after Minos, the legendary Cretan king), that an original civilization began to flourish on this island. In the Old Minoan period I-II (2600-2200), the large family engaged in maritime trade, erected tholos and made truly elegant objects (fired ceramics, vases of veined stone, seals of steatite or ivory)."

The island Crete was part of the Levant, as were all the surrounding areas.

"Although territorially cramped, the small Cycladic islands are significant for their position in the Aegean Sea and for their mineral wealth: marble, gold, silver, copper, obsidian from Melos (of which the best tools were made during the Neolithic age). Archaeology, which has barely scratched the Neolithic Era in this archipelago, could, on the contrary, say that the Cycladic civilization (3rd millennium), meaning the islanders in these Aegean ports, sold vases, marble idols with geometric shapes and precious obsidian.

Hellenic Peninsula.<sup>15</sup> Agriculture in this area was employed very early (7th millennium), in conditions significantly different from today. At that time, the mountains, which covered a large part of the land, were forested. The valleys and bays were occupied by ponds or lakes. Villages appeared almost everywhere from Macedonia to the Peloponnese, with houses first built with woven wicker, and then with

---

<sup>15</sup> 15 The Balkans were not Hellenic, but Macedonian- Macedonian Peninsula until 1808 BC.

plaster and bricks, and their foundations were built with hard stones. Certain styles of pottery, stone seals, and megarons speak of trade links with Asia, if not of invasions. Migrations from Anatolia could have contributed to the cultural development of ancient Hellas (2500-2000). The use of copper began to spread widely and cities and even palaces were built (Lerna in Agrolis). Even treasuries were established.

Archaeology, which has just discovered the temporal advantage of the Anatolian civilization and the Aegean areas, still has to carry out research to determine exactly what the contribution of the Middle East was in the emergence of these cultures.

*Mesolithic and the spread of Neolithic culture to the west (9th-3rd millennium)*

Fishermen and hunters. At the beginning of the interglacial period (9th millennium), the reindeer retreated to the north. Limited to small game, the inhabitants of Europe adopted the bow and arrow, a microlithic tool. The mild and humid climate favoured the spread of increasingly dense forests (pines, firs and finally oaks) that impeded movement. As a result, gathering became a source of food. The Maglemosa people (Denmark) became particularly influential when they advanced northward from England to the Urals, into a marshy zone from which the glaciers disappeared and the North and Baltic Seas emerged. This people adapted remarkably to the northern environment by inventing or perfecting the bow, harpoon, hook and net, dog sled, dugouts carved into tree trunks and boats made of bark or stretched leather, as well as tools for cutting wood. Their decisive progress came from being influenced by the eastern peoples.”

Europe was not populated. As people moved northward they brought animals (cattle, horses, sheep, goats, pigs...) with them from the Balkans. There was nothing European that was not from the Balkans or from Asia Minor. The so-called Slavic log boat originated in the Aegean, in the Balkans.

“Křčiteli. Overland route. Small groups of peasants from Macedonia or Anatolia, reached the Hungarian chernozem (formed by the decomposition of steppe grass). They created the Starcevac civilization (5400-4200) in the north of the Balkan Peninsula which is known for its small statues and clay ovens, as well as for founding the first Danubian civilization (5th-4th millennium), from which the famous decorative motif with meanders and spirals originated, and whose influence was felt even in the Ukrainian steppes and Italy. These small groups of ‘Danubians’ were engaged in mobile agriculture. They descended from the Central European lowlands and reached Germany, the Netherlands and northern France before 4000. Coming in contact with them, the hunters began to adopt an agricultural way of life. These became the Resen civilization (located north of the Alps 3300-2200) and the Nordic civilization (located south of Scandinavia and northern Germany 3300-1800).”

It appears that even other groups also originated from the Aegean. Unfortunately, they did not have the necessary time to achieve the degree of development to be called unique civilizations. These kinds of structures existed in the Aegean... However there existed older structures which had their own developmental stages.

“Mediterranean coastal navigation. Coastal navigation was started by people who were forced to constantly search for new land. After they left other natives followed. The first group of seafarers, who probably set out from northern Syria (6th millennium), introduced agriculture to the Greek, Italian, Maghreb and French coasts, and before 4000 they reached Quercia (cave in Ricadur). The next migration, called the ‘Chassé’ (from the ‘fields’ of Chassé, Soin-et-Loire), brought a more developed culture from the east (4th-3rd millennium). This migration led to the creation of settlements on the western shores of the Mediterranean Sea, and also influenced the rather weaker civilization of the Western Neolithic (northern Spain, western France, the British Isles). In the Paris basin, villages, which arose in the Neolithic Era under the influence of currents from the Mediterranean and the Danube,

came into contact with the Campignani, the ancient hunters of Maglemosa, who were skilled in the extraction and processing of flint.”

The first settlers that inhabited Europe went there to search for mineral wealth, especially tin - up to 10% of which was used to make bronze with copper. This was because pure copper oxide was lacking, and a layer of copper sulfate appeared, which was brittle. Wherever there was mineral wealth, the ore was first extracted and taken to be smelted in the Eastern Mediterranean. Later it was smelted near the mines.

“Metallurgy and trade (3rd millennium). After coming in contact with the Aegeans, another Danubian civilization (II) was born in central Europe. This one exploited the copper deposits in that area and exchanged its metallurgical products for amber from the Baltic coast. Merchants gradually began to transport amber, hard stones (liparite from the Aeolian Islands) and especially metals (gold, copper, tin) by sea routes. These were found in much smaller deposits in Europe, from which the highly advanced and very active metallurgy in the East would be supplied.

Megalithism. Some believe that sailors alone, without intermediaries, went along the coast to get copper from Spain, or to get amber from Denmark. Today, the “missionaries” from the East are credited with the spread of megaliths that are found along the coast in Europe, which were created between 3400 and 1400 years ago. But the dates of the Syrian megaliths, which are thought to have served as real models, have recently been corrected (beginning of the 2nd millennium, not the 6th or 7th). It would be more sensible to assume that these megalithic regions were created independently and not out of convergences (a phenomenon according to which peoples without mutual relations reach the same cultural stage, the same beliefs and artistic forms). Otherwise, everyone agrees when it comes to recognizing the autochthonous character of the first monumental tombs of the Neolithic Era. The dead were placed under wooden structures, or in a stone cist that covered the tumuli

individually or together (graves from Saint-Michel to Carnac, 4th millennium; Long Barrows in England, 3rd millennium).

The first dolmens appeared in Brittany (Carn Island, 3300) and in southern Spain (3100), then in the Netherlands (2600), and in northern Germany (2400) and finally in the British Isles (2200). In addition to dolmens, stone temples were erected in the Mediterranean region (Malta, 2700), tholos (Polatlia, Anatolia, 3rd millennium; in Crete, 3rd millennium; and in Los Millares, province of Almeria, 2400).

During the Neolithic era Europe still lagged behind the East in terms of technology. The East taught Europe its technology. But it was necessary to create significant social and religious organizations so that the inhabitants of small European villages could build tombs and dolmens.

Uninhabited Europe was inhabited only by the oldest Eastern Mediterranean stratum.

*“The steppes and forests of Eurasia before the 2nd millennium*

‘Land of grass’. In the interglacial period, the steppes, which stretched from the lower reaches of the Danube to Manchuria, were rich in fish and game for a long time. The Paleolithic Era lasted there until the ‘Danubians’, Anatolians and Iranians settled the steppe. With them they brought agriculture, ceramics and metallurgy. They passed this on to the inhabitants of the northern forests, who lived further away from them. The present-day Russian Plain developed faster thanks to the temperate continental climate. The Danubians brought agriculture to the areas rich in mulberries. Agriculture appeared in 4200 B.C. in northern Romania, then spread to the Dnieper. This region belonged to the Trypillian civilization, which adopted the plow and copper tools and transferred ceramics to neighbouring peoples, hunters and fishermen. After 2500, the inhabitants of the Pontic steppes around the Black Sea began to engage in agriculture where kurgans (tumuli) appeared, rising above the graves of the chieftains whose skeletons were covered with clay. In Western Siberia and Turkestan, where the climate was harsher, progress

was not so pronounced. Cattle breeding and copper metallurgy spread but only in the Minusinsk basin (the Afanasyevsky civilization, 3000-1600).”

So, the “steppe inhabitants” were originally from the south - everything that did not retreat from the north, froze. Therefore the “steppe inhabitants” did not originate in the steppe, they came from the south. Also, there is no evidence to show that life existed and was interrupted by the ice.

Since blood type A was created due to smallpox, caused by the plague of cattle domesticated in the Levant long before 15,000 B.C. - where cereals and legumes were grown -, the Caucasians originated from the Levant.

“The crossroads at Lake Balkai. The population still engages in fishing in this forested valley. But thanks to numerous connections from Tarim to Manchuria, stone tools and ceramics, brought from the west, were passed on to the peoples of the Siberian forests and steppes.

Yellow Earth: The Chinese Neolithic Era. Beyond the Mongolian and Manchurian prairies lay northern China. It differed from Mongolia and Manchuria in climate (known to be warmer and wetter than today) and in soil, yellow earth or loess, which the wind brought to the plain and the river terraces, and which the Yellow River spread across the great plain. The appearance of the Neolithic Era in northern China can be explained by the natural conditions which were favourable for agriculture, and without the assumption that technical inventions reached there through intermediaries; from the still backward steppe people. All that needed to be done was dry the marshes and clear the thickets that covered the ground and the land was ready to be cultivated. The first known type of agriculture appeared in Yangshao (in Ho-nan). Ceramics from that civilization were found in Chinese Turkestan in Shan-tong, and in small temporary villages. Then the Longshan culture (in Shan-tong) spread across the entire vast plain, creating very large villages surrounded by thick earthen mounds. Their jade ornaments

(with magical significance) and divination bones (which were placed in a fire and by their crackling the future could be predicted) are well known. Thus, while the steppe was under the influence of the great centers of civilization, northern China, although with some delays, also made technical achievements during the Neolithic Era.

The Whites with blood type A reached China and Japan, and in Japan it was 38%. As far as the Whites reached there was construction (pyramids ...), writing – it would appear they reached as far as the island of Okinawa.

*“The Pacific and America: great migration by the end of the 3rd millennium*

From southern China to Tasmania: Due to the humid tropical climate and the abundance of game, the Paleolithic period in southeast Asia, lasted for a long time. Nomadic hunters continued to move south or to the islands. Very few reached the Australian continent (which had already been inhabited in the 15th millennium) hoping to overcome their existing hostile environment and ended up in a largely arid environment.

Hunters and fishermen in northeast Asia. The Japanese island Hondo, with a temperate climate, developed the Neolithic culture before the 2nd millennium which was called Jomon due to its ceramics. But on the Siberian coast with a much harsher climate, people engaged in fishing and gathering snails and thus continued to migrate towards the American continent.

Separation of the American civilization. Chasing the herds of bison and mammoths across the Bering Strait, which appeared at that time, Siberian hunters arrived in America very early. The first undeniable traces of people (southwest of the USA) date back to the 13th millennium. By around the 7th millennium humans had already reached the southernmost part of the continent (cave in Patagonia).

In the interglacial period (from the 8th millennium) the climate became drier and in many areas game became rarer. Certain groups of people reached the north where, after the melting of the continental ice, tundras formed. Others decided to harvest wild herbs. There was also the Cochise civilization (Arizona) from the 7th millennium which was known for its ability to crush grains by mortar and pestle. This was the right kind of environment for people to gradually adapt the use of agriculture. Pumpkins, fruits and beans were grown (6700) in the Tehuacana region (Mexico, Pueblo state) and soil irrigation and cultivation of corn began in the 5th millennium B.C. Later (2800) people began to develop ceramics. Corn, the basis of all pre-Columbian civilizations, came into wide use at the end of the 5th millennium in New Mexico and in Temolipas (northeastern Mexico). On the coast of Peru, fishermen and snail collectors were forced by drought to develop irrigation systems to water the land to grow plants whose fruits and grains they ate. According to what we know, the oldest agricultural group (3800) was located at the mouth of the Chilca River (60 km south of Lima) which, by then, had already developed pottery. Following their example, small communities on the coast began to use water from the streams to grow beans, squash, pumpkins and cotton, from whose fibers they made nets and fabrics. At the end of the 3rd millennium, these vast spaces around the Pacific and the American continent were still very sparsely populated, which hindered the technical progress of their populations.”

“The Mongolian Indians had close DNA to Korea and Taiwan, and the mummies from the Caucases had blood type A. For blood type A to be present, people had to be in contact with cattle, related to bison. Wherever blood type A was found, Caucasians had been there. And in America too, there were buildings (pyramids...), hieroglyphs, and Pelasgian (so-called Greek) scripts...

## **CIVILIZATIONS OF THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN Bronze Age (2300-1200)**



*“Beginning of the general migration (end of the 3rd millennium)”*

These migrations were well known to us but only in the East, where writing was found on monuments, which informed us of who the conquerors were. In other places, they were nameless barbarians, of whom traces remain only in the ash deposits, thus ending the cultural layer in question.

People from the deserts. These people came from around the Arabian Peninsula. Occasionally affected by terrible drought, these people, most of whom were shepherds, fled. At the end of the 3rd millennium, the western Semites (or Amorites) conquered Syria and Mesopotamia, imposed their language and established a new kingdom. After the violent upheaval there was a slow infiltration of new herders who, wherever they could, plundered the local people.

People of the steppes and forests. Having only recently reached an agricultural stage and way of life, these people were not yet completely attached to the soil, which was rapidly depleting. They were happy to leave their land and, being on the same technological level as their neighbours, migrated in large numbers. It is believed that the ‘Indo-European’ peoples were responsible for the conquests carried out by the peoples of the north. Their languages, which are undoubtedly related, appeared in the vast spaces of Europe and Asia during the period of the conquests, that is the 2nd and 1st millennium. It has been concluded that these were the peoples who moved to all four corners of the world. However, this phenomenon, without a doubt, is not so simple and its historical development is not well-defined.

The people who built the tumuli in the Black Sea steppes, rose up in military campaigns that devastated the Balkans at the end of the 3rd millennium. These people, or at least their technical products (ceramics with an imprinted cord, battle axes), then reached the Rhine and Denmark. There is certainly some connection between these nameless groups and the Indo-Europeans (Greeks and Libyans) who, passing west of the Black Sea, occupied western Anatolia and the Hellenic

peninsula. The Hittites, also speaking an Indo-European language, who penetrated eastern Anatolia around 2000 B.C., probably came from the East. It is possible that pressure from the steppe peoples caused the migration of the neighbouring mountain peoples between 2160 and 2070 B.C. The Hurrians, leaving Kurdistan, continued their penetration and at the beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C., reached Elam, Cilicia and northern Syria, where the local people became acquainted with their deities (Teshub, god of the storm; Hepet, goddess of the Sun).

The conquerors from the end of the 3rd millennium ravaged Europe and the Aegean world but in the densely populated East they had to be content with just imposing their rule.

### *Egypt and Africa in the Middle Kingdom (2040-1778)*

After the anarchy that brought about the collapse of the Old Kingdom, Mentuhotep I (XI Dynasty), king of the Theban monarchy, reunited Egypt, established order and increased prosperity. Although the new civilization extended the civilization of the Old Kingdom, the new pharaohs, originating from Thebes, showed a military spirit hitherto unknown on the banks of the Nile.

Monarchy and Egyptian society. Establishment of monarchy. It took some time for royal power to be established in Egypt. The power of the nomarchs, who had become independent at the end of the Old Kingdom, was very limited during the time of Mentuhotep I, then reestablished during the time of Amenhemat I (Amenemes I, 1991-1962), founder of the XII Dynasty, and from then on it gradually became hereditary. Now strengthened, the monarchy had to take into account public opinion. The ruler, who was supposed to dispense justice and punish, organized his propaganda using the development of literature that had reached its peak during the dull period of the interregnum. The royal instruction of his son, the Satire on the Crafts, edited by a scribe proud of his title, the Adventure of Sinuhe, the works are imbued with a deep love of the laws. As during the Old Kingdom, the monarchy tried to influence religion and its use. Antef

(XIth Dynasty) placed Osiris (of Delta origin) over his country in Abid, who became the center of a cult whose importance was constantly growing. Amon of Karnak, a deity of the Theban monarchy with ram's horns or feathers in his hair, merged with Ra, the Sun god of Heliopolis and remained the master of Egypt for an entire millennium.

Technology and art did not offer many novelties. Bronze metallurgy spread very slowly in the Nile Valley. Thanks to the great works, culture gradually spread in the Fayum, favourite residence of the kings of the 12th dynasty. Horus built his pyramids of rubble and limestone blocks. The massive stones seemed to have been reserved for the construction of temples, which no longer exist today. The Middle Kingdom art is particularly famous for the brilliant jewelry for the princesses and for the royal statues that the rulers idealized or, alternatively, for their extraordinary portraits (Senusret [Sesostris] III, Amenhemat III). The great men of Upper Egypt built hypogea (tombs carved into the rocks, consisting of a corridor and a shaft leading into the tomb). At the end of the Old Kingdom, novelties appeared: wooden sarcophagi with texts dedicated to Osiris, wooden statues representing servants, masks of the mummy's face and especially scarabs-seal-amulets popular in many countries of the East.

Wars and conquests. To prevent nomad incursions and to regularly exploit the quarries and mines in the deserts, the Middle Kingdom kings established standing armies unknown to their predecessors. These would later conquer the Kush kingdom, which existed in Nubia. After Senusret III's (1878-1843) decisive victory, donkey caravans coming from the mines and carrying minerals enjoyed complete security provided by fourteen fortresses (like those recently excavated at Buchen and Morgis,). On the other hand, little is known about the policy of the Theban rulers towards Asia. The only war taking place on Asian soil, about which there is evidence, was waged by Senusret III when he pursued the nomads and conquered the rich Syrian fields. However, the objects of Egyptian arts bequeathed by the officials or the Horus vassals

in Ugarit, Byblos, Qatni and Megiddo show that Egypt's political influence was spreading.

Another period of interregnum (1778-1557). This epoch, very poorly known, began with the XIII dynasty (Theban) which very quickly had to abandon Nubia and share its power with the XIV dynasty (from Xoïs in the western Delta). The Hyksos ('foreign princes'), Syrians, founded the kingdom of Avaris (XV and XVI dynasties) in the eastern Delta and, around 1670, completed the conquest of the Nile valley. In the tradition of the Egyptians they remained hated masters. (Avar = a barbarian, R.I.) (Bap + vap = vapvap, P.II.)

The kings were responsible for giving the Middle Kingdom its strength. Its was tragic that the people were passive and allowed the high officials to be selfish and not adhere to the moral teachings of their official literature.”

Since the horse in Syria was of Brygian origin, the Hyksos people must have also been of Brygian origin with their own cattle, who pulled the funeral chariots of the pharaohs, but not Egyptian with horns in front.

*“Unification of Mesopotamia from the 3rd Dynasty of Ur to the 1st Dynasty of Babylon*

The End of the Gutians. Kingdom of Ur (2065-1956). The barbarian Gutians, who came from Zargos and imposed their rule on Mesopotamia, were expelled by the Sumerian Etuhegal, king of Uruk (2070). Somewhat later, Ur gained supremacy during the 3rd Mesopotamian dynasty. The founder of this dynasty was Ur-Nam, whose state soon expanded to Elam and northern Syria. Magnificent monuments were erected in the cities in which the technical perfection of the Akkadians would be combined with the traditional inspiration of the Sumerians. The court bureaucracy (organized in the image of a temple) carefully supervised both the sanctuaries and the elders and commanders who depended on Ur. The established security contributed to economic development, which was managed by the temple of the god

Nan (or Sin, the moon god, protector of the capital). Masters of the sacred wealth, the rulers of the city erected a sanctuary in Sumer and beautified their capital. In Ur, they built a sacred city in honour of the god Nan, which included a ziggurat (whose base was 75 x 40 m and height up to 19 m), temples, palaces a monument in which the kings built a chamber for their future life. The principality of Lagash, ruled by Gudei (c. 2015-1990), one of the most powerful vassals of Ur, was also an artistic center. The governor, whose inscriptions expressed piety, erected fifteen sanctuaries, full of beautiful statues which constantly prayed for the life of Gudei. (Var + var = barbarian, R.I.)

The Third Ur Dynasty, which led many preventive campaigns against the nomadic lachrymanders, collapsed under the blows of the Semitic and Elamite alliance (1956).

Epoch IZIN-LARS. Struggle for supremacy (XX-VII centuries). Dynasties appeared in the cities of Mesopotamia, most of which traced their origin to a single Western Semite.

All of them, and especially the dynasty of IZIN and LARS, sought to inherit the Ur kingdom, which had just fallen. The Western Semites, illiterate soldiers, soon adopted the Akkadian language which became official. The Sumerian Renaissance under the Third Ur Dynasty affected only the few intellectuals. The Sumerian people, who were becoming a minority due to the constant influx of Semites, were finally assimilated. The Sumerian language however, survived because it was useful in describing rituals, myths and technical achievements.”

Sumerian was the language of Whites and Semitic was the language of Blacks. After the Sumerian the Akkadian language was adopted. The Akkadians were Black people and with their influx the languages turned into mixed-race languages.

“The constant struggles for supremacy in Mesopotamia did not deter intellectual and technical progress. Decipherment of countless Sumerian tablets from Nippur, which was slow due to the difficulty of

interpretation, yielded texts of various kinds (epics, myths, hymns, books of wisdom, lists, instructive treatises). In these texts from the Izin-Lars period, Sumer revealed its wonderful poetic imagination. Through the epic, and especially the myths, we became acquainted with Sumerian religion. The magical power of words, the gods who differed from humans only in immortality, the cosmogony that showed the gods as creators of matter, and especially the problem of inevitable death and the evil that attacked the righteous, these were elements of Sumerian religion. The last theme inspired the great epic of Gilgamesh. That Uruk king, whose strength defied humans and gods, was stunned by the death of his friend Enkidu. He called out to the soul of his friend, who described hell as a chamber full of dust and darkness (the rarity of tombstones in Mesopotamia is understandable). Gilgamesh went to the end of the world to find Ziusurd, who survived the flood and was made immortal by the gods. The Mesopotamian Noah showed the hero the herb that gave immortality, but the serpent stole it from Gilgamesh; man could only be happy on Earth.

Science. Science also advanced during this period. Akkadian tablets found in the kingdom of Eshu showed that the Semites, as disciples of the Sumerians, had undoubtedly more scientific spirit than was usually attributed to the inhabitants of the ancient East. Scribes of the 18th century B.C. used Euclid's methods and the Pythagorean theorem and were able to calculate the sides of a rectangle if they knew its area and diagonal. The progress in geometry and astronomy (Zodiac; division of the day into hours, minutes and seconds; division of the circle into 360 degrees) in Mesopotamia was explained by the finding of precise number values which the Sumerians had advanced.

Economic development. This development was the work of merchants, who became capitalists (tamkarum) when they freed themselves from the tutelage of the temples. Craftsmen discovered glass and molds that enabled them to produce large amounts of clay figurines. Sumerian cities suffered severely from the decline of trade and the salinization of the land that followed irrigation in the Persian Gulf. The central and

northern kingdoms, where horses began to be used, eventually began to engage in horsemanship.”

The horse came from the Balkans - it was present in the Mediterranean during the Ice Age.

“Assur and Mari. Assur, an Assyrian city, founded in the 3rd millennium, emerged from obscurity when an inscription about governor Puzur-Assur (c. 1835), a contemporary of the first colony of Assyrian merchants in Anatolia, was found. Assyria became powerful in Shamshi-Adad I's (1775-1721) era, whose deeds were known from the documents found in the Mari archives (on the Euphrates). Shamshi-Adad I, a West Semite, conquered the Assyrian kingdom, then took advantage of the murdered Mari king and seized the city Mari. After his death however, Mari was returned to its dynasty. Babylon subjugated Assyria after which Assyrian merchants disappeared from Anatolia.

Mari, which controlled the trade route to the Euphrates, rose to prominence very early. After it was rebuilt in the 24th century, due to being destroyed by a terrible fire, it was ruled by Western Semites who finally adopted the royal title (1775). Their successor Zimri-Lim (1720-1688) took over the city after the Assyrian occupation. The wealth amassed and activities that took place during the reign of Mari's last king were explained by the documents found in the city's buildings and archives (more than 20,000 tablets). The entire East marveled at the palaces decorated with beautiful frescoes, some of which survived the final catastrophe, when Babylonian troops (1688) captured and burned Mari.

Hammurabi of Babylon's works (1723-1680). Babylon, founded during the Akkadian period, emerged from obscurity when Samu-Abum, a Western Semite, assumed the royal title (1825). This dynasty had not yet achieved any major conquests when Hammurabi came to the throne. Leaving the Mesopotamian state to exhaust itself with its intricate wars, this ruler, after several decisive battles, imposed his authority on all the cities of the great plain. Being a good administrator, he managed to

merge the cities Sumer and Akkad into a single united state called Babylonia. Since then, his capital, its dialect (Babylonian, as a local form of the Akkadian language) and his gods Marduk and Ishtar - goddess of fertility and war had no rival. But more important than this king's works were his legal codes (which were actually a collection of judgments). These codes, written in a clear language, surpassed the codes of Sumerian law. The king, responsible for law and order, however, was no longer satisfied with just fines demanded from the guilty or with compensation for damages. On top of fines terrible talion punishments were also imposed (an 'eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth' type punishments)."

Akkadian; the language of the Acadians – who were Black. Sumerians and Egyptians were Whites

"On top of being the state's administrative and economic center, Babylon became a city of scholars and with that the intellectual capital of the Middle East. This lasted until the emergence of so-called Greek science. The Babylonians even managed to translate the works from the Nippurian school into their own language, adapting Semitic sentiments. Thus, in the Song of Creation, read during Marduk's feasts, the god of the throne, having liberated the other deities and arranged the heavens and the earth, took the place of his father Enki. Continuing the work of the Sumerians, the Babylonian school collected preserved signs intended for divination: the position of the stars, the appearance of the entrails of sacrificed animals and unexpected events of all kinds. On the other hand, the numerous diseases, due to the unhealthy environment in which they lived, led Babylonian scholars to seek witchcraft to cleanse the 'cadres' and expel demons and other agents that caused diseases. They also applied appropriate medical measures.

Although this age left many tablets, their art is known to us only through stelae (such as the Codex Stele), which with their perfection and coldness returned to Akkadian traditions.



End of the First Babylonian Dynasty. After Hammurabi's death, the kingdom had to withstand the onslaught of neighbouring nomads (the Kassites of the Zagros and the Semites of the Syro-Arabian Desert) and Persian attacks during which time the coastal areas (at the mouth of the river) separated. After Marshal I's Hittite invasion the last representative of the dynasty (1526) was overthrown and the barbarians spread throughout Babylonia.

Intelligent, active and greedy for money, the Mesopotamians finally reached a peak in their civilization when they united with the Sumerians and Akkadians; however, they were still left to the mercy of their starving neighbours.

*Anatolia in the first half of the 2nd millennium B.C.*

Emergence of the Luwian and Hittite states. Invasions devastated Asia Minor towards the end of the 3rd millennium, so the period that follows is only known from the small number of finds.

The most famous place during this time period was Beychesultan, the capital of Arzawa, a Luwians (Indo-European conquerors) state mentioned in the Hittite archives. A palace was discovered in the V layer (1900-1750) notable for its hot air heating devices and wall decorations.

Two very rich sites were excavated in Kiltepe: the city Kanej and the Assyrian and West Semitic merchant outpost. Found there were Bronze objects, beautiful ceramics, seals with a complex style and tens of thousands of famous Cappadocian tiles (Halis basin). Mesopotamian merchants of the 19th and 18th centuries created these scripts, recording imported fabrics and tin from Mesopotamia and exported gold, silver, copper and lead to Anatolia. In Cappadocian cities they established contact with the natives (the Hattians) and the conquering Indo-Europeans.

The Indo-Europeans would later merge with the Hattians, from whom they would take their name (to distinguish them from the others, we

gave the new arrivals and inhabitants of the Anatolian kingdom in the 2nd millennium the name Hittites). The most prominent place in Anatolia belonged to the Hattusha dynasty (today's Bogazkoya), an old Hittite kingdom (1650-1450).

This dynasty came into conflict with neighbouring principalities and the Hurrians who were penetrating the western region. Murshil I, king of Hattusha, conquered the kingdom of Aleppo and went on to sack Babylon (1526). But after this conqueror was executed dynastic struggles began to take place which ruined the kingdom.

Anatolia did not progress beyond the intermediate levels of social organization while conquered by the Indo-Europeans, as was shown by the fact that they abandoned writing when the Mesopotamian merchants left (around 1650).

*Syria, Cyprus and the Aegean region: the civilization of the great merchants in the first half of the 2nd millennium*

Traffic was significant only in the eastern Mediterranean where ships connected the Aegean, Syrian and Aegean coasts to which caravans arrived from the interior.

Syrian crossroads. From the Western Semite invasions to the Egyptian conquests (XXII-XV centuries). The Western Semite invasions actually renewed the ruling class. The area was frequently fragmented into small independent cities that constantly fortified their protective walls. Palaces were more numerous but inscribed monuments were rare. Political fragmentation impaired imperialism in the large neighbouring states. Syria was first to become a protectorate of the III Ur dynasty (XXI century). The III Ur dynasty also made its presence in Qatni, where a temple to the Sumerian goddess Ninegal was built. Then, under the rule of the Middle Egyptian kingdom, Byblos artists were influenced by Egyptian art. During the 17th century, the rulers of the great Syrian cities (Aleppo, Qatne, Hazor) founded a real kingdom, subjugating the neighbouring cities, while in the south Hyksos, a

military force (around 1730-1550), appeared which later conquered and ruled Egypt.

Syrian cities also adopted foreign innovations. Their craftsmen were well-known for their mastery of foreign technology and metallurgy. However, even though these people were poorly skilled in domestic crafts, they made some innovations of their own, building numerous dolmens in the regions bordering the desert.

Developments in the cities of Cyprus. Great wealth began to emerge in the cities of Cyprus, accumulated through trade. Ceramics, wood and especially copper bars were exported from Cyprus, through the port of Alashia (today Enkomi), which were in great demand throughout the East. Cypriot vases expressed the artistic synthesis of foreign influences.

The Palaces in Crete (Old Minoan III and Middle Minoan Culture, 2200-1580). The first explorations of the Aegean world unearthed many artifacts with undecipherable scripts and discouraging texts, treasure troves whose age could not be determined. Unfortunately, most of the items discovered did not even fit into the great web of Greek legends from the 1st millennium B.C. (Manes=Mones=Mine+ki=Mine[v]ski Macedonian surnames, R.I.) (Манес=Монес=Минес+ки=Мине[в]ски македонски презимиња, Р.И.)

Around 2200, the Cretan civilization experiences a sharp rise of innovations thanks to the influence, if not the settlement, of Anatolians. In the rich fields in the middle of the island, cities began to develop bronze metallurgy which began to spread out. Cretan sailors began to export and sell seals, jewelry, 'Kamaresa pottery' in places like Argolis, Cyprus, Syria and everywhere else these brilliant products were highly valued. Around the year 2000 palaces began to appear in Knossos, Phaistos and Malia. Each palace consisted of a central courtyard facing north-south, around which groups of individual buildings were built without regard to symmetry, except on the west side, where a monumental facade stood out above an esplanade. The porticoes and the

cypress columns, whose bases were thin at the top, gave the impression of lightness. Archaeologists recognized the chapels, reception halls, private chambers, workshops, shops and archives. These last two categories, with their huge jars and sun-dried clay tablets, left no room for doubt. The script was first used on seals (hieroglyphs A and B), then on inventory tablets (hieroglyph B; Linear A) but neither of these graphic systems has yet been elucidated.<sup>16</sup>

It is therefore necessary to examine the artistic achievements in order to learn something about the social and religious order. Rise of the physical and spiritual environment in these great kingdoms took place in a very different way from those in the East.

Crete had no individual monument tombs and the king was nowhere represented as larger than the rest of the people. It seems that the palaces belonged to the deities who had their priesthood housed in them, obliged to manage the cult and the local economy. The religion was also very unique: there were no temples, only modest chapels, open-air altars, crypts and sacred caves. There were no idols. The mother goddess, whose existence was attested to by the seals, was not at all noticeable. Objects found there belonged to a deity or were used for rituals: pillars, double axes, shields with eight corners of 'horns'. In certain rituals women played an important role and this gave them exceptional freedom.

The settlements were destroyed (probably by an earthquake) around 1700 but the palaces were repaired and decorated quite quickly (Middle Minoan III, 1700-1580). Comfort and hygienic devices were also perfected. The walls were decorated with small frescoes. Excavations from the end of this period revealed aristocratic houses built around the palaces of Knossos, with residences of rulers located in the middle of the fields, with cities whose houses were clustered along the streets in the slopes. Cretan sailors, who had to abandon the eastern market

---

<sup>16</sup> Everything from the so-called Slavic authors has been deciphered, as well as the language of the Etruscans - Europeans do not accept it.

because it had fallen prey to invasions, sold their products in all the cities of the Aegean region.”

Crete and its settlements were connected to the Levant that submerged under sea water.

“Seaside fortresses (Troy and the Cyclades) and Gradchina on the Hellenic Peninsula (XXII-XVI centuries). When the relocations were completed, the area around the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles became important again. Troy VI <sup>17</sup> (1900-1300) was a large fortified city, populated by craftsmen and sailors. On the other hand, the Cyclades, deprived of agricultural resources, no longer progressed but built fortresses that testified to the new danger. Cycladic art fell into the shadow of Minoan art. Finally the Hellenic Peninsula, it seems, was completely devoid of its original culture. The sudden development of ceramics does not suggest that some invasion took place around 2000 (Greeks? Luwians?). The civilization was in retreat until it re-established relations with Crete, which had been interrupted between 2000 and 1600.

In the midst of a military world were the Aegean barbarians, the great conquerors of the East.

Syria and Crete stood out for their contributions to trade and minor arts, but the Syrian fortresses present a strange contrast to the Minoan palaces, which were completely defenseless.

*New pressure from the peoples of the north (18th-15th centuries)*

Indo-European migrations during this period originated from the steppes with which we are more familiar than with previous invasions.

Settlements in areas without writing. Harappi and Mohenjo-Daro were abandoned around 1700. After a short period of decline, the Indian civilization died out without experiencing any evolution. Its end can be

---

<sup>17</sup> A sixth city built on the site of Troy.

attributed more to the rapid drying of the climate and the catastrophic floods which occurred after the rapid deforestation of the upper Indus valleys than to any invasion. The Harappans, it seems, quickly established their settlements in Gujarat, which preserved elements of the great civilization until 1000. The Indus Valley was soon conquered by uncultured people.

There is no certainty that these newcomers (Indo-Europeans who in the 1st millennium B.C. inhabited Iran and India) were Aryans. It seems that they had always been close to Mesopotamia, who at that time had penetrated the region to some extent.

Since the two races lived in India, the dark and the white, it was biologically impossible for both races to have originated from the same areas. Then we must assume that the white race moved from West to East and the dark race moved from India to West. The Indian buffalo <sup>18</sup> also reached Mesopotamia by the new era. So there were no Indo-Europeans.

“Invasion of the East. Aristocratic groups, some of which spoke an Indo-European language, formed a warrior caste that brought in wanderers from the Middle East and subjugated peoples. This explains the short-lived appearance of the Hicks and the rise of the ancient peoples such as the Hurrians and Kassites.”

The white race followed from the West to the East, and the dark race went in the opposite direction.

“Supremacy of the Hyksos in Egypt (1720-1557). These barbarian conquerors, who founded the first Avari kingdom (1720), took advantage of the weakening of the Egyptian monarchy (second interregnum) and conquered the entire Nile Valley (around 1670). We know very little about them because the Egyptians consider their

---

<sup>18</sup> Just as the buffalo was Mongol-Indian-Negro, the Mongols, Indians and Negroes had a common origin before the continents existed: southern Africa was united with India - the same foundation.

supremacy a national disgrace and therefore, due to their excesses, the Egyptians avoided talking about them. We only know some things about them from Manetho who explained the success they had a result of their ability to wage war and accused them of barbarism and desecrating their sanctuaries. Scarabs of the Hyksos found in Egypt and Syria, contained mostly Semitic royal names foreign to the Egyptian language. The Hyksos were a mixed population organized in military clans, which set out from Syria to conquer Egypt, waging war against the pharaohs of the Middle Kingdom. (Barbarian = var + var; ver-ver[ica], R.I.) (Варвар=вар + вар; вер-вер[ица], Р.И.)

The occupiers, who introduced the use of the horse and chariot in the Nile Valley, partly adopted the Egyptian culture. Their kings began to place native princesses at the head of individual nomes in the south where Theban lords waged national wars against the Asiatics. After Pharaoh Achmes's victory he captured the Avaris (1557) and expelled the Hyksos to Palestine. Vanquished they disappeared from history."

Since the Hyksos were foreigners in Syria, they introduced their own Balkan horse.

"Arrival of the Kassites in Mesopotamia. These barbarians from the Zagros had long attempted to take Babylon. They took advantage of the anarchy resulting from the Hittite invasion of the capital and the disappearance of the First Babylonian Dynasty (1526). Their kings conquered Sumer and Akkad, Assyria and Elam and the coastal lands and founded the Babylonian kingdom Karduniash, which lasted until 1154.

The Kassites, who worshipped the Aryan gods, were probably organized by some Indo-European clan. These herders who introduced the use of horse-drawn chariots in the Mesopotamian valleys lived in military communities on large estates, which were cultivated by the natives. Illiterate, they entrusted the administration of their state to scribes of Semitic origin."

Since the cattle were of Balkan origin, they too were from the Balkans-Kassites of horse trot.

“Hurrian people-Kingdom of Mitanni. This ancient ethnic group continued to penetrate through Mesopotamia and Syria during the 2nd millennium and played a key role in the mixing of civilizations. They migrated throughout the East with the use of the horse and war chariot and spread the Cuneiform and Sumerian-Akkadian texts in Syria and Anatolia. On the other hand, the Hurrian culture, in the strict sense of the word, is almost completely unknown to us.”

It was confirmed that in Syria they jointly wrote in “Sumerian-Akkadian texts.”

“Around the middle of the 2nd millennium the Hurrian people organized and strengthened an Indo-European group, which we came to recognize by the names of its chiefs and which founded the great state Mitanni. It ruled over a federation of Hurrian principalities from the Zagros to the Sinai.

*Clash of the conquerors of the Middle East, the end of the Hyksos. The arrival of the people from the sea (1557-1200)*

Egypt and the Mitanni, the dominant powers (16th-15th centuries). Egypt. • The Pharaohs of the 18th Dynasty (1557-1316) and the New Kingdom (1557-1085). This was the most glorious period in the history of Egypt. The Theban Pharaoh, who liberated the country and depicted the union of his mother with Amun-Ra on the walls of his temples, was an all-powerful monarch. He was able to harness the military spirit that developed among his subjects during the terrible struggle against the Hyksos and to acquire a colonial empire in Nubia and Syria. But from then on the monarchy had to take into account the two new powers - the priesthood of the god Amun and the army - which equally shared power and the spoils of war.

Even the gods, to whom the victory over the invaders was attributed, were rewarded. The first rulers of the 18th dynasty dedicated



themselves to erecting new temples and restoring the old ones that were devastated by the Hyksos. Amun, god of Thebes, the homeland and capital of the dynasty, acquired large parcels of land and slaves from the Middle Kingdom and from the main god of Egypt. The head of his priesthood, the first prophet, played a political role in directing interventions for the god, whose statue, moved by priestly hands, made prophecies and even appointed the new pharaoh. This last function was of great importance when a crisis arose over succession to the throne. The heir to the throne had to belong to the pharaoh's family through both his father and mother. And if there was no legal heir, then, it seems, illegitimate sons could be placed on the throne (Thutmose [Thutmes] I 1514-1505; Thutmose II 1505-1503). At one point a woman, Hatshepsut (1503-1482), removed her husband, the young Thutmose III, from power. A queen, who was particularly interested in building religious buildings (chapels and obelisks at Karnak, a temple-tomb at Deir el-Bahari), let her father lead. Royal power was established by Thutmose III (1482-1449), who had to wait for Hatshepsut to die before taking power.

- Large Egyptian army and conquests. At the head of the army was the military nobility, with each member leading a specific task. The soldiers, who were now respected and highly valued, would also benefit from this system. The military command had a variety of troops at its disposal: tribal cavalry with chariots, Egyptian infantry, auxiliary infantry from Nubia and Syria, a fleet and a landing unit.

Gold from Nubia was essential for the Egyptian monarchy, so the pharaohs of the 18th dynasty directed their military operations in that direction. The kingdom of Kush, which during the Second Interregnum had been transformed into Buchen, was devastated and the conquest was completed by Thutmose I (1513), who erected a stele in Kenis-Kurgu (between the fourth and fifth dynasties). The vast Nubian valley was developed in the image of Egypt. Small towns sprang up around the fortresses, which the pharaohs adorned with magnificent temples.

The sons of local elders, hostages in Thebes, were brought up to respect Egypt and its kings, and this respect was passed on to their subjects.

Fearing the Egyptian fleet, Cretan and Cycladic sailors buy the right to trade in Egypt from the pharaohs, by offering them gifts. From the beginning of the 18th dynasty, Aegean vases and jewelry began to appear in the Nile Valley where tomb painting was inspired by Cretan artistic styles.

After the displacement of the Hyksos, the pharaoh in Syria had only the ruins of cities and the remnants of nomadic tribes before him, but their resistance would support the Mitanni state that had emerged at the end of the Euphrates bend. Thanking his predecessors for the victory, Thutmose I erected a stele on the banks of the great river but Hatshepsut evacuated the entire conquered zone to Syria. On the other hand, the energetic Thutmose III won his sixteenth victory in the battle in Asia between 1481 and 1462. While waging war on the local prince, he defeated the large Mitanni army (1471) and crossed the Euphrates, whose eastern bank he then fortified. The pharaoh then established a protectorate in Syria. The small, local rulers and senates, paying tribute, maintained their power under the supervision of Egyptian garrisons which occupied a small number of strategically important locations. The tranquility of the provinces was ensured by a peace treaty concluded under Thutmose IV (c. 1420). The Mitanni state, which retained only the area near the Euphrates, ceded the rest of Syria to Egypt.

Never before had Egypt been so open to foreign influence. Syrian merchants brought wine, oil, vases and wood from their lands to the banks of the Nile River. Sometime later the Egyptians adopted Syrian deities and Syrian technical products (hourglass, shaduf) while Syrian scholars spread decorative themes from ancient Egypt to the rest of the East.

The Mitanni and the Mesopotamian state in the 15th century. • This state, an opponent of the pharaohs, is not sufficiently known to us even

today because its capital, which must have been located somewhere near the Khabur, has not been found. We can only guess what they were like from the texts and objects that came to us from the vassal and neighbouring cities (Nuzi, Assur, Alalakh). The Mitanni state rose in importance at the end of the 16th century, as a rather loose federation that, before the Egyptian offensive, extended from Zagros to Palestine. Its population, dominated by the Hurrian aristocracy, was very mixed. From the names of the kings and sometimes from the gods we can deduce that an Aryan tribe was dominant. Mitanni culture, which was very complex, is still known to us only from the royal seal, the archives of the Akkadian merchants and the ceramics from Nuzia.

- The rest of Mesopotamia suffered from the fall of the Mitanni state. God Assur's small state broke away from Kassite dominance long enough to submit to Hurrian dominance. Expelled from Upper Mesopotamia, the Kassite kings of Babylonia multiplied their settlements along Elam. Taking advantage of wholesale trade, they managed to build a royal city (Mur-de-Kurigalzu) and a monument on which the bas-relief technique in molded brick was expressed.

Egypt's triumph and the religion of Aten (until 1353). Rigorous art and practice. The levies allowed the kings to erect many temples, fill them with their own statues and cover them with inscriptions in their glory. We are especially familiar with the buildings of Nubia and the Theban nomes that did not need to be repaired.

The Nile divides the capital into the city of the living and the city of the dead. East of the river, in the city of the living, houses and palaces were built with light material and temples with stone. Their plan from this era, such as the temples in Karnak and Luxor, from then on served as a model. An avenue lined with sphinxes led to massive doors in front of which were obelisks and flagpoles. Behind this was a courtyard with a portico in which processions were held. Only the initiated could enter the other spaces. These rooms were: a pillared hall in which the god pronounced his prophecy, a porch and a nave (naos) in whose rooms the

treasures and idols of the gods were located. West of the Nile was the land of the dead. On it were the necropolises and funerary temples. A little further, in the ravines of the Valley of the Kings, hidden tombs of kings could be found. These kings abandoned the pyramids reserved only for the particularly distinguished and accepted underground tombs. Mummies everywhere received magical protection, a funeral book, a collection of pictures to guide the deceased to the afterlife.

Although architecture remained sober in its grandeur, other forms of art showed that from the end of the 15th century, thanks to Asian influence, tastes changed. Painting came under Minoan influence as glass making was discovered and real masterpieces were produced as jewelry.

Supremacy in the East. Egypt's supremacy was seen in the tablets from Tel-el-Amarna (an abandoned Egyptian capital), which provided us with a portion of the correspondence between the Syrian vassal, the Asian kings, Pharaoh Amenophis III (1408-1372) and his son Amenophis IV (1371-1353). The master of Egypt, who brought daughters of foreign kings into his harem but refused to give them to Egyptian princes in marriage, easily subdued these Asiatics who begged him for a little Nubian gold. Unfortunately, the peace secured in Syria by an agreement with the Mitanni state began to weaken with the decline of that state, which was threatened by the Hittites and their rebellious vassals (Assyrians).

Prophet of Aton. The official god Amon, during the 15th century supported the popular piety that saw him as the protector of every person. It seemed that nothing could stop the rise of this high priest who, taking advantage of Amenophis III's negligence, put his hand on the most important matters of administrative authority. When the young Amenophis IV ascended the throne, the court decided to react and special honour was shown to the Sun cult in the form of Aton, the Solar Disc, whose rays ended in hands. He was a god who did good and was accessible to all people. The king, who was at the head of this movement, left Thebes (1366) and moved to a new city, Horizont Aten

(actually Tel-el-Amarna) and changed his name from Amenophis ('Amun is pleased') to Akhenaten ('Glory to Aten').<sup>19</sup> Amun's possessions were added to the court. Due to the resistance of the Theban priests, the pharaoh ordered the name of the Theban god to be erased from the records and his temples to be removed. But Akhenaten was more fanatic than politician. He was a prophet who considered it his duty to inform the world of the benevolence of the supreme god. Under his influence, Egyptian culture underwent radical change. Following the example of the hymn composed by the king, scribes replaced the Egyptian literary language with the spoken language. Aten art, whose rise was short-lived, was full of sensitivity and realism. El-Amarna left for us extraordinary wall decorations and fragile portraits of the king and queen Nefertiti, where the artist even took advantage of their physical flaws.

This complete break with tradition angered the anti-foreign party, which saw in all this only the work of a family in which Asian blood was mixed with the pharaoh. Under the influence of General Horemheb, the successor of Akhenaten, Tuankamon (especially famous for the fact that archaeologists found his funerary inventory almost intact), abandoned the cult and the city Aten. Horemheb finally conquered the throne (1342) and declared himself Amun's avenger. The city Aten was mourned and the names of Aten and Akhenaten were erased. But the new pharaoh was careful not to return political power to the high priest.

Rivalry between the Hittites and the pharaohs (14th-13th centuries). Rise of Hattius. The old Hittite Empire had fallen into anarchy. Duadali (Tuthalli) II, founder of the new empire (c. 1440), and his successors, who are also little known, continued to wage war against the Mitanni state. The information, which the archives of the capital Hattusa provided for us, was abundant when it came to Shupiluliyumi I (1382-1341) who transformed Hattius into the main power of Asia. Having

---

<sup>19</sup> Akhenaten, god of the sun disk Aten. Akhenaten=Egnaton=e gnat on-gnat=gonat=gonadi-gonet.

established his power over the Anatolian kingdoms, this Hittite conqueror took northern Syria from the Mitanni state and gradually occupied the Pharaoh's Syrian territory to which the pharaoh reacted weakly. His son Murshil II (1340) waged a long struggle with Assyria for the protectorate over the remnants of the Mitanni confederation.

The Hittite civilization. This civilization, which arose from a mixture of Hattic, Indo-European and Hurrian cultures, and following the example of the great eastern states, is only known to us from the documents of a single city, the archives and libraries of the Hattusan palaces. The lack of unity, which was characteristic of this empire, was also manifested in the use of various languages written in cuneiform. The most common language used was a combination of Akkadian and Nesith, an Indo-European dialect, which was the official language of the empire. There were also ritual texts written in Sumerian, Hurrian, or Anatolian and Indo-European dialects in which the priesthood worshiped the gods of the aforementioned peoples. On the other hand, the Hittites used hieroglyphs called 'Hittite' for inscriptions on monuments and seals (which apparently were a transcription of the Luwian-Indo-European language of southern Anatolia). The scribes of Hattusha collected Mesopotamian and Hurrian myths, compiled royal chronicles and collected 'treaties' (charters that the Great King and his vassals had signed with the oath of the interested parties). Such contractual relations were the basis of the Hittite Empire, which in this part of Anatolia, with such a complex relief, did not have time to move from the stage of a federation to the stage of a single (unitary) state. Following the example of the pharaohs, the Hittite king of the 14th century called 'My Sun' became a 'god' after death but his power never exceeded the limits of the authority of the head of a military aristocracy and the high priest whose duty was to perform rituals."

Only the Akkadians were Black. According to the authors, they were "black-headed foreigners."

“The federal structure of the empire led to the accumulation of a huge number of gods. But the figures of the ‘thousand gods of Hattia’, known to us only from their ritual capitals, almost completely escaped our awareness. The political role of the large number of priests did not go beyond the limits of local significance. The texts mention three cities ruled by a high priest.

In addition to the priesthood, there were also nobles in society who went to war in chariots, accompanied by soldiers who they were obliged to give to the king, soldiers who received estates for their service and peasants who were tied to the land they cultivated. The collection of laws showed that the mentality of those people was more archaic than that of Hammurabi’s code. Most offenses were compensated in cattle.

The Hittite Empire had a monopoly on black metallurgy. Iron from Kizunatna (Anti-Taurus), then still produced in small quantities, was in demand throughout the East. Stone, as another mineral resource, contributed to the originality of Hittite art. The cities were significantly protected by systems of fortifications, the base of which was made of stone and the top made of brick. Sculptors decorated the city gates with lions and sphinxes and orthostats (stone slabs that covered the base of the walls) with bas-reliefs. The sculptors showed a certain clumsiness, especially in the representations of Teshub of Hattusha (a Hurrian god of the storm), which was lost in the large reliefs on the walls (the divine accompaniment of Yazilikay) in the open-air sanctuary.

Egypt opposed Hattia (13th century). Horemheba, the last king of the 18th dynasty, was succeeded by Ramses I (1311-1310), founder of the 19th dynasty, originally from Seti’s city of Tanis (ancient Avaris). Ramses I and his son Seti I (1310-1292) lived between Thebes, where they began to build a great pillared hall for Amun at Karnak and Tanais, from where they could oversee and stop the Lebanese, Syrians and Hittites.

- Ramesses II (1292-1226), son of Seti I, was the most famous pharaoh well-known for his building zeal. Having reconquered Palestine, he

clashed with the army of the Hittite ruler Mevutalius (1310-1286) in the Battle of Kadesh (1288), which was not the success that Egyptian writers praised. Unable to change the balance, Ramesses II and the Hittite Hattushil III concluded a treaty in 1277, according to which Palestine and the Syrian coast were ceded to Egypt. The long period of peace that followed allowed the pharaoh to devote himself to rebuilding his empire. Ramesses II, who valued his reputation highly, was able to erect a monument in almost every city in honour of their gods. But the magnificent beauties of Per-Ramesses ('House of Ramses', a new name for Tanis) have disappeared, and from that reign we have only the monuments of the Theban nomes and Nubia: the temple at Luxor, the pillared hall at Karnak, the Ramesseum (royal temple-tomb) and the underground temple at Impsambul. These buildings, erected hastily, were not beautiful. The architect relied more on size than on harmony and the overcrowded decorations were poor copies of the masterpieces from the XVIII dynasty.

- Ramses II's successor. Menepthah (1225-1217) had to repel attacks from various peoples from the sea (migration from the north), who he kept in Libya and Palestine. That dynasty ended miserably. A Syrian, becoming pharaoh, tried to impose foreign cults on the country. A popular uprising brought Setnakhta to power (1200) who founded the 20th dynasty, which had to withstand another onslaught from the sea.<sup>20</sup>

Hatti, Mesopotamia and Elam before the great invasion. The Hittite Empire. This empire, whose importance depended only on the personality of its ruler, quickly ceased to prosper. Muwatali experienced only defeat or semi-success in the wars against Assyria, Egypt and the Anatolian barbarians. Hattushil III (1279-1256) was a usurper who pursued a sensible policy (agreement with Ramses II). The Hittite state under the onslaught of the Sea People is known to us only from Egyptian comments. But this decline can only be sufficiently explained

---

<sup>20</sup> There were never any peoples of the sea, but the terms were only naval orders in ... Dalmatia ...



by the lack of cohesion in the empire. However, the most strange factor was that this civilization lived in the 'Neo-Hittite' kingdoms (between the Taurus and the Euphrates) until the 8th century.

However, we have a lot more information on the Babylonian civilization, about which we have numerous documents from the 14th century. The official art of the Kassite kings, who ruled the Mesopotamian plain, was particularly reflected in the monuments called kuduru. These steles, decorated with symbols of the gods calling for help, showed that the king of the temple, or some Kassite nobleman, exempted certain areas from paying taxes. In Nippur and Babylon, scribes completed the processing of the Sumero-Akkadian classics, continued to collect prophecies, and from the end of the 15th century, kept chronicles for the kingdoms.

The Kassites, whose military power was declining, had to endure difficult battles against Assyria and Elam. They lost their supremacy after two successive invasions. One was led by the Assyrian Ashurbanipal and the other by the Elamite Shutruk-nahunte I, who took the famous monuments from Babylonia (the stele of Naram-Sin, the Code of Hammurabi, the Kuduru) to Susa where archaeologists found them. This was the end of the Kassite dynasty (1154), whose peoples were expelled from Babylonia by the Semites.

Elam. Liberated and reunited around 1300, Elam lived in prosperity for two centuries. The scribes from Susa, abandoning the Akkadian language, wrote in the Elamite language with a new script that was a special syllabic form of the cuneiform script. The kings erected many magnificent buildings. Untash-Gal (around 1240) left a Ziggurat above his royal city (now Choga Zanbil) that was preserved better than all the others. After the fall of the Kassite dynasty (1154), the Elamite conquerors imposed their supremacy on all of Mesopotamia, but before the end of the 12th century Elam, the victim of an invasion, was torn apart and fell into obscurity.

Assyria. It was the only one that survived. This poor country, in which cattle breeding was first and culture second, must have enriched itself in the wars it waged after it freed itself from Mitanni slavery (around 1375). The kings of the 18th century built magnificent capitals: Shulmanesarid I, (1266-1236) in Kulhu, and Tukultininurt I (1216-1199) in the port that bears his name. The artistic forms were borrowed from the Mitanni and the Babylonian Kassites. The literary city, important at the time, was particularly inspired by Babylonian works.

The second half of the 2nd millennium was significant in the East after the wars of the great states were waged in the desire to enrich themselves and seize Syria and upper Mesopotamia. But the army, composed of foreign mercenaries, was not able to resist the onslaught of the sea peoples who stopped at the entrance to the Nile delta.

### *Spread of writing and culture in the East in the 2nd millennium*

The Cuneiform and Sumero-Akkadian culture. Unlike Egyptian cultural influence, limited to Nubia and a few Syrian cities, the culture of Mesopotamia did not stop spreading during the 2nd millennium. Cuneiform, very simplified, which the Hurrians and Elamites used already in the 3rd millennium, was adopted by both Syrian cities (from the 18th century) and the Hittite Empire (16th century?). However, it is not known whether its spread in those countries should be attributed to the Hurrians or to the Western Semites. Sometimes cuneiform was used to write in Hurrian, Hattic, or Elamite. But generally speaking, foreign scribes, referring to the classical and scientific works of Babylonia, adopted it with the Mesopotamian script and the Akkadian language (for official and commercial texts) and Sumerian (for ritual texts). Thus the letters from Tel el Amarna (14th century) show that at the height of Egyptian power international correspondence was conducted in the Akkadian language.”

It is said that the writing belonged to the white race and that the Akkadian language was for Black people, while the other languages were for the Whites. Since two races, the white and the black, lived in

Mesopotamia and Egypt, the Akkadian language was even used in Egypt.

“The emergence of the alphabet. • The scripts of the ancient East (cuneiform, Egyptian or Hittite hieroglyphs) were very difficult to learn due to the large number of signs, and because they were the property of a small minority of literate people who found, that in their complexity, they would maintain their high position. They already used, for example in Hattusha, a cuneiform script composed almost entirely of phonetic (syllabic) signs. Only the structure of the Semitic languages, where the consonants themselves constituted an invariable framework of the root of words, imposed a simplification of great importance. Once the vowels were omitted from the syllabic script (about a hundred signs) then one could write only in consonants (thirty signs). To write in this way, foreign scripts were first used. Then, since this turned out to be very complex, those scripts were replaced by linear signs.

Without a doubt, it took half a millennium filled with attempts made throughout Syria to finally find a solution. The most famous was the Ugaritic alphabet (15th-14th centuries) which used thirty-one cuneiform signs to record Ugaritic rites and myths (in West Semitic dialects). But the alphabet was definitely created with the invention of twenty-two characters (created at the beginning of the 10th century), which is usually called ‘Phoenician’ because it was preserved by the Phoenician people. Since it was adopted very early by the Arameans, Arabs and Greeks, it was accepted by most of the Old World except for the areas under Chinese influence. In the countries that adopted it, it allowed many citizens to learn it because it was simple.

*Trading peoples: Syrians, Cypriots, Cretans, Mycenaeans from the 16th to the 13th century B.C.*

Syrian cities. After the fall of the Hyksos, the wealth and strategic importance of the Syrian crossing attracted conquerors: the states of these areas were under the protection of the Mitanni, Egypt and Hattia. Syria continued to be a center of trade that developed domestic crafts in

which the characteristics of all foreign influences were visible; especially the contributions from Egypt and the Aegean areas. The Syrians knew how to adapt to their customers. They often spread their specialties to neighbouring countries, copying on a large scale Egyptian faience and scarabs, Babylonian seals and Mycenaean vases, perfecting the technique of glass making, glass mixture (glazed ceramics) and purple dye. Sometimes even their technical skill and taste for foreign decorative themes allowed them to create real masterpieces, such as gold tableware, ceremonial weapons and ivory objects found in Byblos, Ugarit and Megiddo.

But, beside the complex character of the material Syrian civilization in the 2nd millennium, one can sense the exceptional importance of the Semites who, finally, under constant pressure from desert elements, mixed and merged with the Anatolians, Indo-Europeans, Hurrians, Aegeans and Egyptians who migrated there and settled in Syrian cities. This background information of Semitic culture is known to us especially from the findings in Ugarit, an international city where Mycenaean ivory products, Cypriot vases, Mycenaean merchant tholos, an Egyptian temple and a sanctuary of the goddess Nisaba (patron of scribes in Sumer) have been found. But the biblical king Nikimadu (c. 1350) whose tablets prove that the inhabitants of Ugarit spoke seven languages, gave us wonderful poems written in Ugaritic. These texts, read at that time on the occasion of religious ceremonies, preserved very old forms of Semitic myths about which scholars are still arguing for the true meaning of the experiences of El (the chief god) or Baal (god of mountains and storms). Fortunately, archaeology provided us with more texts from the first millennium B.C. Here the god was shown to exist on some elevated place (a hill, then an artificial elevation) on which there was an altar, a pool and a sacred grove. He was represented by a betil (an elevated stone or stele that was a symbol of the covenant) and an asherah (a roughly hewn tree). The Syrian god, who gave life, was a deity who demanded a lot. At his request, sacred fornication was committed on the high places and a child was sacrificed to redeem the

rest of the family. This religion, which drew much from the same sources as the Mesopotamian cults, but which evolved less, persisted in the next millennium throughout Syria and had a considerable influence on the life of the Jews” (There were no Jews until 444 B.C., see Ezra, R.I.)

Then the races with distinct languages mixed, and mixed languages were created.

“The peak and mysterious end of Minoan Crete (1580-1375); the beginnings of the Mycenaean civilization (1580-1375). Despite the great earthquakes (1580-1510?), the young Monocan period I (1580-1460) was a brilliant epoch of the great island in which its exchange of goods was still increasing. Cretan sailors were more numerous than those in Syria and Greece and traded directly with Egypt. The palaces were even larger. The Phaistos palace was twice as large with the erection of the ‘villa’ at Hagia Triada. Minoan art reached its peak. This was pottery with floral or marine decor, steatite vases from Hagia Triada, painted stucco (Prince with a Flowering Lily) and a particularly beautiful fresco from Knossos that reflected the local sense of nature and colour (Blue Bird). This was also when human figures began to be depicted (Rhyton Bearer, ‘Parisian Woman’).

At the same time a new civilization was born extending from Messenia to Thessaly, on the coast of the Hellenic peninsula but towards Crete. However, this was disputed. Documents of this were provided from the 13th century by Indo-European people, the ancestors of the Greeks of the 1st millennium B.C., who developed their culture here. However it is unknown if these people arrived on the Hellenic peninsula <sup>21</sup> around 2000 (with a large influx of northern tribes) or around 1600, at a time when their culture appeared and what was the contribution of foreigners (Cretans and Egyptians) in the beginnings of that civilization? The only

---

<sup>21</sup> The Hellenic Peninsula was not the Balkan Peninsula. Since the first tribe called Hellenes originated from Thessaly, where Hella was revered, the Hellenes had no connection with Hellas - therefore there were no Hellenes.

monuments found belonging to the first phase (Mycenaean period I, 1600-1460), and probably to the second phase (Mycenaean period II, 1460-1350) were the tombs, mainly tholos, in which, along with the dead, their valuable objects were found. Two circles of rock-cut tombs were discovered in Mycenae (1876, 1952) and marked with stelae; some of the stelae depicted scenes of hunting and war (the first depiction of a horse and chariot in the Aegean world). The dead were buried with a funerary mask and gold jewelry, weapons, blades and ivory - all treasures that explained the name given to the people and their civilization. Here too, experts still do not agree on everything. According to some, it was a question of barbarians who plundered Crete, or who brought Cretan artists to their court, while according to others, a distinction should be made between Minoan objects and domestic works of a very original art.

There is also disagreement about the nature of the relations between the Hellenic peninsula and Crete where, it seems, with the late Minoan II period (1460-1375) a new spirit appeared, which represented Knossos in particular. The artist was happy to depict infantry, horses and chariots - an unusual image in a previously peaceful country. Did the Achaeans begin to invade Crete without conflict and mix with the local inhabitants? Or did they seize the kingdom of Knossos because they had previously destroyed the other palaces? We also know nothing for sure about the nature of the catastrophe that destroyed the capital of the island around 1375 B.C. Was it a fire caused by an earthquake or war? Was it an attack by the Mycenaeans or a Minoan revolt? But even more difficult is the disagreement about the date the great Minoan civilization ended. For a long time, Evans's opinion was adopted. The researcher of Knossos, Evans, claimed that the civilization did not survive the fire at the end of the Late Minoan II period, that its fleet then disappeared, because everywhere in the East the Mycenaean vase replaced the Minoan one from the 14th century. But this theory encounters difficulty. Namely, the different types of ceramics cannot be so easily distinguished. In palaces in Knossos tablets are found whose script is

Linear B, a transcription of a so-called Greek dialect (Mycenaean). These tablets are similar to the tablets from the Mycenaean palaces (late 13th century). More recently, Professor L.R. Palmer claimed that Evans was mistaken and that the Knossos civilization lived and flourished until the Late Minoan III period (1375-1200) creating works of art ('throne room') which were wrongly attributed to the famous Minoan II period. (Vase + n = vase, R.I.) (Ваза + н = вазна, Р.И.)

Mycenaean Age III (1350-1100): Peak and decline. We do not know much about the first Mycenaean palace, which could have originated during the Mycenaean Period II (1460-1350). It has also been said that at the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 13th century there was a sudden boom in construction (fortresses, palaces, tholos). Among the many ruling places, one stands out clearly: Iolcos, whose king ruled the northern part of the Aegean region; Ochromenum in Boeotia, where there was a tholos (Minia's treasury) 13.60 m high and 14.20 m in diameter; Thebes, in Cadmus's palace, decorated with frescoes, there was a cache of Babylonian seals, discovered in 1964; The Acropolis in Athens; Tiryns, whose palace was beautifully frescoed and protected by 'Cyclopic' walls 17 meters thick; Pylos, whose king ruled the Ionian Sea. But the rapid restoration of Mycenaean monuments proves that Mycenae was in ascendancy; Cyclopean walls, the Treasury of Atreus (a tholos equal in size to that of Orchomenus), the Lion's Gate, a palace decorated with frescoes. In decoration and comfort, the royal residences everywhere resembled those in the Cretan palaces, but they differed in fortifications and in megaron layouts. Found in the fortresses were more characteristic objects than those found in cities that are not yet sufficiently excavated. These were: vases, terracottas, ivory, seals on which Minoan themes were treated, but the style was heavier and more realistic. (Yolk-os was changed to Volos [Veles] = so-called Slavic god, R.I.) (Јолк-ос било променето во Волос[Велес]= тн. словенски бог, Р.И.)

Tablets with Linear B writing were discovered in Pylos and Mycenae - not to mention Knossos, dating from the period before the collapse of

these palaces (around 1200). Written on the tablets were annual inventories. The writing was done on fresh clay which was then baked and preserved. Deciphering these tablets gave us an understanding of the basic features of society and religion. Although there was, as in the East, a bureaucracy that controlled taxes and the cult, here the king seemed to have been the leader of only the aristocracy. The Mycenaeans, who, like the Cretans, were content with court chapels and altars under the open sky, already worshipped many of the gods of classical Olympus.

The economy of the Hellenic peninsula was based simultaneously on agriculture, crafts and trade that distributed their products far and wide. Archaeological discoveries provided little information about the Mycenaean voyages, which seem to have followed the example of the Cretans and their predecessors on the Hellenic peninsula. Sailors from Greece reached Asia Minor via the Cyclades. Following the example of the Minoans, they settled on Chios, Samos and Miletus, traded with Troy VI (which was destroyed by an earthquake in 1300 B.C.) and penetrated the Black Sea. The destruction of Troy VII (1300-1260) inspired Homer to write the entire epic.

- On the way to the Middle East, the Mycenaeans established trading posts on Rhodes, in Pamphylia and on Cyprus. The case of Cyprus is somewhat exceptional. Better suited to the assimilation of foreign cultures, this island, which had conquered the Assyrian culture of Ugarit and adapted the Minoan script to its own language (the Linear Cypriot script), also adopted the themes of Mycenaean art for its ceramics, which sold well in the East. For their part, the Mycenaeans were committed to extensively selling copper ingots from Alasiya. (Ugarit=ugarit=ugar it: to ugari-t, R.I.) (Угарит=угарит=угар ит: да се угари-т, Р.И.)

- In Syria and Egypt, where the Mycenaeans founded small colonies, their ceramics enjoyed great success and many imitations were produced. Products from Mycenae and from actual colonies originating



in the Peloponnese were even sold in Italy. Finally, the Hellenic peninsula played an important role at the end of the routes carrying amber and bronze to the Near East.

End of the Achaean world. At the end of the 13th century, fires and accelerated defense work reflected new uncertainties. It is not known for sure whether these were civil wars or, more likely, the beginning of the migration of the peoples from the sea. Did the Mycenaeans succumb to this invasion by not joining the invaders of Egypt? What role did the Dorians, a branch of the Greek people who began to move to the Peloponnese and conquer it in the 12th century, play in this catastrophe? Amid all of those uncertainties, only one thing is certain: the decline and then the disappearance of the Mycenaean civilization. The brilliant achievements at the end of the Bronze Age in the eastern Mediterranean - the great Mycenaean trade and culture - were survived by the new migration of the northern peoples. (Peloponnes = pelo po nes[+t = nest], R.I.) (Пелопонес=пело по нес[+т=нест], Р.И.)

### *Eurasian Steppes and Europe in the Age of the First Migrations (2300-1200)*

The Great Steppes: Civilization of the Copper and Bronze Ages. This period of history in these areas is least known to us. At the end of the 3rd millennium, the spread of copper ceased and the migrations that began from the Pontic steppes apparently had certain echoes even in the East. But we are unable to determine either the time when the first centers of Bronze Age culture arose (in the north of the Caucasus) or the hoards (graves from Maikop and Kuban) that would testify to the connections between the Pontic steppe and the Near East. It seems that Iran, east of the Urals, introduced bronze to the civilization in Anatolia (1700-750), which was inherited by the Chalcolithic Afanasiev culture. (Pont - n = sunk in water, R.I.) (ПОНТ - н = пот[онато] во вода, Р.И.)

Cultural contrasts in Europe. The peak and end of megalithism. The construction of dolmens, which dates back to the 4th millennium, continues until the 15th century. Although it ceased early in the

‘Nordic’ area (northern European plain, southern Scandinavia), it nevertheless flourished in the British archipelago and in the interior of France. New forms appeared in the Parisian plain: covered corridors (extended dolmens) with perforated slabs divided into halls and artificial caves. More and more stones were raised and some were sculpted into human figures (statues-menhirs in Corsica around 1500). Large numbers of people came to work on huge construction projects in large centers such as: Morbihan, with regular rows like at Karnak, the cromlech of Er-Lanica, the menhir of Locmariac, the Men Er Hroek (23 m high, 348 tons). Salisbury Plain is famous for the crommelin at Avebury and especially at Stonehenge,<sup>22</sup> which seems to represent a point where two different cults converged. These religiously inspired works, if not evidence of a deeper equality (dolmens are communal tombs), ceased to be erected around 1500 when social development brought to the forefront leaders who demanded separate tumuli.

---

<sup>22</sup> British fraud of the century: Stonehenge was built only 60 years ago?! A Russian portal has published the thesis that the megalithic monument Stonehenge was not built 5,000 years ago, but that construction began only 60 years ago! But if the story would not remain told, the same portal fishki.net has also published 108 photographs taken from 1954 to 1958, which show how Stonehenge was built! Yes, you read that right, one hundred and eight photographs! And in them you can see how the project of the ‘ancient building’ is being built with modern cranes and hoists with numerous participants and supervisors. Practically all phases have been recorded, from preparing the ground for construction, while there is nothing on it yet, to the completion of this structure of the aforementioned ‘megalithic’ culture. Well, now, the first reaction of some readers will be that this is a matter of ‘renovation’, ‘restoration’, ‘replacement’ of the ancient megaliths and the like. But, in the early photographs, starting from the first ones, you can see white circles of lime that indicate the location of the future ‘megaliths’. This was a ‘massive job’ for the builders. The ‘megalith’ cannot be pulled out like a carrot, leaving no trace of the process. Furthermore, if you examine the pictures carefully, you will find military barbed wire in that area, and other details, which tell us that at that moment the location of the construction of the future ‘Cyclopic buildings’, the ‘ancient Druid-Altanto-Assyrian-Aryan’ monument, is protected from public view. Look at the photographs that expose the great, one might say, megalithic fraud”. The following pictures... (“Druid-Altanto-Assyrian-Aryan”- Belts One People, R.I.) („друидско-алтанта-асиријско- аријевски”-Белците еден народ, Р.И.)

Adaptation of agriculture to the European environment. The arable land expanded increasingly northward, especially toward Scandinavia, where the great glaciers had already melted. Average income increased with the use of the bronze axe (more suitable for tilling), the gradual replacement of the hoe by the plow and especially the emergence of an optimum climate (summers gradually becoming warmer and drier) from the middle of the 2nd millennium. But even in this more favourable period, the tools for cultivating the land, then still very primitive, were not suitable for all land and every climate in Europe. The peoples of Western Europe spontaneously switched to an economy based on hunting and nomadic pastoralism (culture Seine-Oise-Marne, around 2400-1300). In the rest of Europe, the evolution was somewhat different. The Baden culture (near Vienna), which existed at the end of the 3rd millennium in the Danube region, received the plow from the east, the cart, the breeding of horses and cattle, which they introduced to their neighbouring peoples. On the other hand, it seems that the inhabitants of the steppes, thanks to their stone weapons in the form of axes, spread semi-nomadic cattle breeding and, in normal connection with it, the military spirit throughout northern Europe.”

It was said that: “The arable land was increasingly expanding northward, especially toward Scandinavia, where the great glacier had already melted.”

So, the migrations were only northward, not vice versa – even today there are no vineyards there.

The Persians had cattle, which were only the Balkan-European wild kind.

“Metallurgy and trade. An unknown people of nomadic archers, who made bell-shaped vases, spread the use of copper in the West between 2300 and 1800, which was already known in southeastern Europe.”

The subsequent migrations were only from the southeast to the northwest throughout Europe.

“• The technique of making bronze went from the East to the western shores of the Mediterranean Sea at the beginning of the 2nd millennium. Maritime trade, which was carried out at the expense of the Easterners along the European coast, enabled the exploitation of new mineral resources (tin from Galicia, gold from Ireland, copper and tin from Wales and Cornwall) which also supplied the local centers of metallurgy and goldsmithing. But the main centers of European Bronze Age culture arose at the beginning of the 13th century (Toszeg, Unetis, Straubing) thanks to the successful exploration of minerals in the Hercynian massifs of central Europe.

• European metallurgy still worked in favour of the minority. Flint tools and weapons, such as those made in the Grande-Pressigny area (Indre-et-Loire) still prevailed. Bronze was a valuable material, intended for the manufacture of weapons (swords, battle axes), jewelry (bracelets) and objects for religious ceremonies (vases). Goldsmiths from central Europe competed with the goldsmiths from the East for best technical skill and artistic inspiration and worked only for their chiefs. New wealth provided by agriculture, and especially craftsmanship and trade, stimulated the development of the ruling class during this period. The superiority of weapons came at a high cost for the protection it offered to the other layers of society. The excavations carried out unearthed many of the treasures that the rulers of central Europe and Wessex had accumulated. They controlled the land and sea routes, by which bronze, Irish gold and Baltic amber reached the eastern states via the Aegeans.”

It was confirmed that everything was the legacy of the Aegeans: the migrations, the ore, the metals, etc.

“• But part of the population was still not sufficiently connected to the land it cultivated. The migrations that occurred in the 13th century from east to west (the Urnfield civilization) [necropolites with funerary vases] and from north to south (peoples of the sea) are most easily explained by the more humid climate which existed at the end of this millennium.

During the 2nd millennium, Europe, rich in mines, ceased to depend on the Middle East but its underdeveloped agriculture prevented the creation of large social organizations and later led the population to bold ventures.”

The migrations and everything else followed the Vardar-Morava-Danube...Rhine route...

*“The Shang Dynasty (1523-1028): Chinese Bronze Age*

In some exceptional areas of northern China, there was a sudden transition, without external influences, from the Neolithic Age to a civilization characterized by the need for bronze, horses and chariots, by palatial cities and writing. Discoveries allow us to attribute all this to the Shang (or Yin) dynasty, well-known from Chinese historical tradition.”

The Chinese-Indian-Black buffalo was the buffalo whose hair did not match that of cattle and horses - the Mongolian Indians did not know the horse until the 15th century, whereas horses were known in the Mediterranean during the Ice Age. With the migrations of the Whites from the Eastern Mediterranean, horses were taken to the Mongols. Even construction (pyramids...)...

“Excavations first uncovered graves containing bronze vases decorated with signs and bones used for divination (a tortoise shell and a cow’s shoulder blade were placed in the fire so that the interpretation of the cracks that appeared would provide an answer to a posed question). Later, capitals were discovered in Honan, of which the most famous was Yin (near An-yang, formerly Ngan-yang). The city-palace was built according to a magical plan that ran through the entire history of China. It was square or rectangle, protected by earthen ramparts, facing the cardinal points. In the center was a royal residence, whose shape and direction of extension was the same as the city itself and which consisted of buildings with earthen walls and a roof with a terrace of columns. The central courtyard of the palace in which rituals from the

north were performed was surrounded by a reception hall, to the west by an altar to the Earth and to the east by the temple of the royal ancestors (where they were represented by their tombstones). Outside the palace a royal tomb rose like a tumulus that covered the underground room in which the deceased rested, surrounded by bronze vases and other treasures. Remains of hundreds of sacrificed servants, whose heads were cut off, filled the neighbouring graves.”

Since the cattle belonged to the white race, Whites had migrated to China. Mummies of the Caucasian type of Whites were found, who when alive spoke a Tocharian language (so-called Slavic).

“When the wealthy monarchy needed to write, the scribes of the Shang dynasty used 3,500 ideograms, a third of which we have interpreted thanks to their similarity to modern ideograms. A thousand bones were found with inscriptions. So, on the inscriptions were questions asked of ancestors and answers written, others contained sorcerous knowledge and court rituals (arithmetic and astronomy were already highly developed). To ensure the well-being of the country, the king offered sacrifices to the supreme god, Earth, to the deities of the cardinal points, rivers and mountains, and especially to the spirits of the royal ancestors. Extraordinary feasting and drinking took place on the occasion of the annual festivities held in honour of these spirits who resided in the sky and protected their descendants. Also found were beautiful works of art from the Shang dynasty period - marble vases, bronze vases intended for use at feasts in honour of the ancestors, bronze weapons inlaid with jade, malachite or turquoise - decorated with cosmic symbols, representations of monsters or stylized animals with magical powers.

The Shang king, whose territory was limited to northern Hunan, his court and his vassals, who divided the rest of northern China between them, constituted a military aristocracy that lived off the exploitation of the farmers. But the cultivated fields were still only islands of civilization among the hunting and fishing tribes that the Shang

civilization constantly suppressed and gradually brought under its influence.

According to traditional history, the Shang dynasty, sinking into wastefulness, was overthrown by Prince Zhou (1028) and directed its expansion westward (the Wei Valley).

The kingdom of the 2nd millennium already possessed what was essential in Chinese civilization (cultivation, ancestor worship, artistic formulas) but its culture, created in a short time, was a strange mixture of developed technology and barbarism.

### *Southeast Asia, Oceania and America in the 2nd millennium*

The influence of the Shang civilization did not extend to the Pei-ho or Blue River.

- Southeast Asia was content with the axe, polished stone for tilling the land and agriculture based on the cultivation of rice, yams and raising pigs. The peoples who migrated from these areas became increasingly bold in setting out to sea. They first migrated to the Palaus and Mariana Islands.
- In America, progress seemed to be slow. It was only during the old preclassic period (1500-1100) that the first villages appeared (in the land of the Maya, on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, in the valleys of the Mexican plateau). The latest excavations, however, have uncovered old pre-Columbian temples (1900 B.C.) in Cotosh (central Peru).
- Except for China, which discovered bronze, the world around the Pacific was still in the Neolithic age and in such a primitive stage that migrations continued almost everywhere.

People who had blood type A belonged to the Caucasian white race. Blood type A surfaced due to a smallpox outbreak from cattle that belonged to the Caucasian white race with which they intermingled. When they migrated to other places they brought with them their

building and cultivation skills, the ability to build pyramids and grow cereals and legumes suitable for blood type A vegetarians. The mummies of White Indians were found to have blood type A and followed the god of all things under the leadership of Perun to Peru. The Mayans originated from Maya = Maia, daughter of Atlas, who gave birth to Hermes with Zeus and to corn Zea mais. Since the people with blood type O cannot tolerate corn because it creates lectins, which does not apply to people with blood type A, corn was associated with the Eastern Mediterranean people. So corn was mentioned by Arrian, book one, under IV. "...a large field of corn... the corn...". So, corn existed even during the time of Alexander the Great.<sup>23</sup> To this should be added, the first scientific expedition to expand knowledge of the world set off from the Mediterranean Sea. Around 1200 B.C. the Phoenicians had already crossed the Pillars of Hercules (Gibraltar) and reached the Scilly Islands under the English coast where they discovered the Canary Islands. The Vikings reached Greenland (around 900) and arrived in the year 1000 as the first people on the coast of North America. S. Antoljak, "Medieval Macedonia", Mislja, Skopje, 1985, said that this "was known in our regions even before the discovery of America"... "As early as 1974, we put forward the thesis, based on original data from the 11th and 12th centuries, about the origin and spread of corn from Asia through Sicily to southern Italy and to our countries, primarily in the areas washed by the Adriatic Sea". Norse gods are also depicted on tapestries. "One-eyed Odin holds an axe, Thor has his hammer, and Frey holds a sheaf of corn. From the church in Skogo, Sweden, 12th century." Corn did not belong to that genetic-geographical area, which is true even in the 20th century when hybrids with a short growing season were created that would thrive in those areas - there is still no grapevine there, etc.

Bullock et al. wrote: The first cultivated corn known was found in a cave in the southwestern United States and is 8000 years old. In the book by Cavendish-Ling, in the section on North and South America,

---

<sup>23</sup> Alexander the Great played ball - the Maya also played ball.



under the title North American Indians, in the section under the title How corn originated, it said: "Grain or corn was by far the most important food of the indigenous North Americans, and in many agricultural tribes we find a history of its origin"...

Since it says "in the southwestern United States" where Alexander the Great's lost fleet arrived, traveling along the Patifik=pathi-fik=tivik=tivok but not the Atlantic that the Phoenicians traveled, corn was brought to "the southwestern United States." That 8000 B.C. means nothing because the C-14 method is unreliable, etc.

### **From the invasion of the Sea Peoples to the founding of the Persian Empire: the Early Iron Age**

*"Sea Peoples and the spread of black metallurgy (13th-12th centuries)*

Destructive invasions. From the end of the 3rd millennium, people have been on the move.

New tribes were constantly arriving from the Arab regions but for the great civilization the main danger always came from the steppes and the temperate zone. At the beginning of the 14th century, a harsher climate began to eradicate the insufficiently settled tribes. In contact with the Mediterranean, the attack was more brutal. The towns of southern Italy and Sicily were devastated, the Mycenaean world was falling apart, the barbarians in their advance took with them the people whose lands they conquered. Unfortunately, we only have accurate information on the waves that attacked Egypt: on the Sea People (as the Egyptian scribes called them because they thought they came from the sea) who landed in Libya and along the Asian coast.<sup>24</sup> The First group was destroyed by Pharaoh Menepthah (1221). Somewhat later, a great migration of people came, destroyed the Hittite Empire and burned Syrian cities. Fortunately for Egypt they were stopped by Ramses III (1191) at the mouth of the Delta. The exact origin and identity of these invaders may

---

<sup>24</sup> They were sailors, with their own duties on the ship. So their names are only naval orders.

be a subject of discussion, but it is established that after the catastrophe, Indo-European peoples settled in the East: Dorians in Greece, Thracians on both sides of the Bosphorus and Dardanians, Phrygians <sup>25</sup> from central Anatolia and perhaps Philistines who then occupied southwest Syria.

Origin and spread of ferrous metallurgy. Before the 14th century, iron, which comes mainly from meteorites, was more expensive than gold. Processing of iron ore, discovered in the second half of the 2nd millennium in the Kizuvatny Mountains (Anti-Taurus), and the sale of iron, long remained a monopoly of the Hittite Empire. Then the Sea Peoples, suppressed blacksmiths from eastern Anatolia, spread the secret of black metallurgy far and wide. However, many centuries passed before the method of processing iron became common in the East and the West. The Early Iron Age (12th-6th centuries) was actually characterized by the simultaneous use of iron and bronze, which was still more often used for artistic objects than for weapons.

#### *Decline of the great states and Syria's supremacy (10th-9th century)*

Egypt and Africans (10th-9th century). End of the New Kingdom. After the short reign of Pharaoh Sentakhta, founder of the XXth Dynasty (1200-1085), his son Ramses III (1198-1166), the last great pharaoh of the Theban period, undertook to restore the power of Egypt. He reorganized the army and introduced foreigners into Egyptian occupations (Egyptians skills and occupations until this time were hereditary). Having defeated (1194-1188) the Libyans and the Sea People (1191), Ramses III reconquered part of Palestine. Ramses III used captured civilians and prisoners of war to erect many buildings in Thebes, especially in the quarter of Medinet Habu (fortress, palace, temple-tomb). However, when he was not waging war, Ramses III did not have the same energy as his namesake from the 19th dynasty, a great pharaoh whom he admired. He followed his cupbearers, who were

---

<sup>25</sup> The Phrygians were Brygians, resettled from the Balkans-Bryggia with Philip of Macedon in Macedonia.

often foreigners, and gave many gifts to the gods, especially to Amun, which led his state to ruin.

After Ramses III's time, the Egyptians withdrew from Palestine. The monarchy no longer had any power. The priesthood of Amun tried to manage all affairs. All valuable objects were taken and the underground tombs were desecrated.

Third Interregnum (XXI-XXV dynasties). After the last pharaoh of the 20th dynasty died, Egypt was practically divided into two states. The 21st Dynasty (1085-950) claimed descent from the previous kings in the Delta, and a branch of high priests of Amun ruled Upper Egypt. Some of these priests took royal titles and lived on good terms with the lords of Lower Egypt. The army, which rarely left the barracks, became the ruling class. It was composed of foreigners, soldiers whose military service was passed on from father to son. Many of the troops came from Libya and were considered semi-barbarian. One of them, Sheshok I, founded the 22nd Dynasty in 950 and established the supremacy of Egypt by plundering Palestine at the moment when the unity of the Jewish Kingdom was broken (c. 930).<sup>26</sup> The wealth found in the royal tombs at Tanis came from the plunder of Jerusalem. Found in the tombs were ornaments and bronze objects which resembled the style of objects from the old kingdom. They were the first manifestations of elegant and modest art usually called Saisian (after Sais, capital in the 7th and 6th centuries). Since the Libyans had not yet thought of creating their own state, Egypt was soon divided into small principalities governed by local military commanders who sometimes assumed the title of king (XXIII and XXIV dynasties).

This command led to the intervention of those who, since the time of Manetho, had been called 'Ethiopian kings' (XXV Egyptian dynasty, 751-656). They were the lords of the new Kush kingdom which was probably founded in Napata by the priests of Aman fleeing from Libyan

---

<sup>26</sup> Jewish history was 100% foreign history - Judaism only from 444 BC with Ezra.

Rule (950). In any case, these blacks from Nubia officially used the Egyptian language and preserved the rites of the new Theban kingdom. Rich and powerful, they easily imposed their rule over the small Libyan kingdoms as far as the Nile Valley.

During the Ethiopian dynasty reign, influence of Egyptian culture spread far and wide towards the Upper Nile. Other areas of Africa also began to prosper. Cattle herders gave way to horse-breeding and chariot-riding in the Sahara. In the area of the Nok civilization (Nigeria) in tropical Africa, famous terracotta statuettes were produced - the first examples of 'Black art'.

Decline of Assyria and Babylon (12th-10th centuries). Assyria, a land of plains and hills, had no natural borders to protect itself from its dangerous neighbours which included the mountain peoples of the Zagros and Kurdistan, and especially the Aramean shepherds. After a brilliant period of successful incursions into Mitanni and Babylonia (14th-13th centuries), Assyria had to eventually withdraw. Although Tukulti-Apal-Eshar I (Tiglath-Pileser, 1115-1076) was the victor over the plundering nomads and reached the Mediterranean, after his death the Arameans regained strength and over the course of two centuries continued raiding the villages, penetrating deep into the kingdom.

The situation in Babylonia was even worse. After the disappearance of the Kassites (1154), a new Semitic dynasty took power in Babylon and soon pushed the Elamites into the mountains. But at the beginning of the 11th century, the Aramean invasion devastated the country and brought down the monarchy. More divisions took place until the kings of the 8th Babylonian dynasty (985-748) settled near the Zagros, and the large cities in the plains surrendered power to their priesthood.

Neo-Hittites. This name was given by historians to the small kingdoms in the northern regions of Syria under the rule of the aristocracy, which used Hittite hieroglyphs and craft formulas of the Hittian Empire, destroyed at the beginning of the 12th century. Whether they came as refugees who had fled their lands after the

invasion of the Sea Peoples, or from the garrisons founded in the 14th century by the great rulers of the state of Hatti, these Neo-Hittites were only a military minority which ruled over the Phrygians, Hurrians and Syrians and exploited the transit trade. Their art, particularly famous for the palaces of the 9th century (Malatya [Melide] in Melitene, Karatepe, Samal, Kargamish or Kurkemish), was already beginning to fall under the influence of the Syrians and Assyrians.

Arameans in the 8th century: Wandering tribes and kingdoms. This new Semitic people, who emerged from the deserts, took advantage of the weakening of the great states after the passage of the Sea Peoples. Nomadic shepherds, the Arameans had long terrorized the farmers of Mesopotamia and Syria.

Already in the 11th century, some tribes settled permanently and created kingdoms, the most important of which were based on the exploitation of some ancient city (Damascus, Aleppo, Ham, etc.). Those states whose capitals are still found under today's settlements, and which are often mentioned in the Bible and Assyrian chronicles, have left no traces. Secondary sites, some of which have been excavated, left the impression that the Arameans - a military minority - as a people with low culture, conquered the civilization (Syrian, Neo-Hittite, Mitanni) of the cities in which they kept their garrisons. Royal stelae (9th-8th centuries), inscribed in Phoenician, and later in Aramaic, are not numerous. Due to the practical side of the Aramaic script (derived from the Phoenician script), most of the Semitic East would later, along with the script itself, take over the Aramaic language."

The Aramaic language can be distinguished from the Phoenician (Pelasgian = so-called Slavic) language.

"The Aramaic tribes remained nomadic and aggressive. They were found everywhere, in small numbers, especially in the desert: the Chaldeans (who later conquered Babylon in Lower Mesopotamia); on the shores of the Dead Sea, the small peoples of the Midianites,

Edomites, Amalekites. Moabites, Ammonites, and related Jews. (Until the 5th century B.C., excluding Jews, R.I.)

“People of the Bible” to the 10th century B.C. The name “Jews” was used during the period of their migration. Later, while their national state existed (11th-6th centuries), they were called “Israelites”, named after the patriarch Jacob.

Israel (‘who fought with the Gods’). Finally, when their center became Judea (the land of Judah’s tribe) these people became known as ‘Judeans’. Many historians and writers, however, do not make a distinction between these three names (Jews, Israelites and Judeans).” (Israel=isroil=iz roil, just izrojuval- just moved, R.I.) (Израил=изроил=из роил, само изројувал- само се селел, Р.И.)

The Bible was an appropriation of foreign history without any proof until Ezra’s time (5th century B.C.).

“Bible. The people of Judah’s tribe left no archaeological traces. Their place in history was taken according to the holy book, the Bible (from the Greek word byblos, meaning book). Here, only the Old Testament is called by that word. This work shows us the mentality and culture of the Middle East. It expresses religious thought that is significantly different from the other religions of that era. Yahweh, the god of the Jews, does not have a divine consort. Man could not force him to do anything through magic. The future happiness that he promised to his people would be eternal. The value of the Bible as a document obviously depends on the circumstances in which it was written. The book is history, that is, a reconstruction of the past for a specific purpose. The Old Testament was compiled gradually, from the 10th to the 2nd century B.C.<sup>27</sup> Its writers used a variety of documents, oral (family traditions, epic poems, laws, court decisions) and written (chronicles, official Acts, ritual books, works of ancient writers). Having previously developed or purified these sources, the writers of the Bible combined

---

<sup>27</sup> Ivanovski Risto, Macedonians Older Than the Biblical Ezra-Jews, Bitola, 2017.

them into one work with the intention of giving the Israeli people a theological, moral, political and social foundation. The Bible is valuable in that it reveals to us the material and spiritual life of the Jewish people but it mixes literary genres of moral fable (taken from Mesopotamian myth), epic and history, and the Book presents events only in their initial form.

Patriarchs and Sojourn in Egypt • Genesis, the first book of the Bible, begins with narratives (creation of the world, the sin of the first people, the flood) that form the basis of Israelite theology. It then focuses with interest on Abraham, the Pasir leader born in Ur, who would settle in Palestine with his tribe and make a covenant with God who promised him numerous descendants, destined to populate that land. The Bible then tells of the lives of Isaac and Jacob, son and grandson of Abraham. Joseph, one of Jacob's sons, became the Pharaoh's highest officer and led his father's tribe to Egypt.

• According to Exodus (the second book of the Bible), the Jews remained in Egypt for four hundred years. Towards the end of that period, the Pharaoh began to persecute these foreigners. One of them, Moses, retreating into the desert, experienced a revelation. In the 'burning bush' the exile recognized the god of his fathers and asked him his name. But he received only the answer 'I am' (the Bible says Jah ve, 'he is'). Moses then received instructions to deliver God's order to the Pharaoh to let the Jews leave Egypt. When the ruler refused, he encountered ten plagues in the Nile Valley. The memory of the last plague (the death of the firstborn in every Egyptian household) forced the king to relent. Since then, the Jews have celebrated Passover. Changing his mind, the Pharaoh pursued the fugitives who were escaping on foot, crossing the Red Sea whose waters had parted and then closed. The waves of the sea merged and drowned the Egyptian army. (Yahweh - x = yave[=god appears]; Pascha=pescha=sand- sand, R.I.) (Jaxbe - x = jave[=богот се jave]; Пасха=песха=песка- пескара, P.И.)

Religious organization and conquest of the Promised Land. After their liberation (which is usually placed at the end of the 13th century, but the date apparently cannot be determined precisely), the Jews spent forty years in the desert that separated Palestine from Egypt. The events of that period are recounted in the books of Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Leviticus which, together with the Book of Genesis, make up the Pentateuch, or Law. In fact, in addition to recounting the rebellions of that people against Moses and against Yahweh, the collection contains religious and civil laws. Among those that truly date from the time of the Exodus, the Ten Commandments (Decalogue) are the main document. Regardless of whether we believe in the divine revelation of that text on Sinai, Moses was shown to be an extraordinary person, a leader of the people and a profound thinker. These ten commandments (or Decalogue), which are a condition for the renewal of the covenant between God and the Israelites, represent an astonishing progress in the relationship between the religious and moral understandings of the time.

Of all the peoples, the Israelites are the only ones who think that they are forbidden to worship gods other than their own and that any images and statues that would represent him are truly sacred. The Decalogue is the first law in which a sin committed in thought is condemned: 'You shall not covet your neighbour's house, nor his wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his donkey, nor anything that belongs to your neighbour.' On the contrary, the rites described in the Pentateuch are from the religion of neighbouring peoples, of Semitic origin, since they were previously cleansed of obscene elements. The Jews, like those peoples, had sacred objects: 'cubes' that communicated the will of God, the 'Tabernacle of the Covenant', a chest decorated with two cherubim (fantastic creatures with wings), which was both the throne of the invisible deity and a repository where the tablets of the Law given at Sinai were kept. There is no doubt, the Israelites are a people who celebrate the Day of the Lord (Saturday) with absolute rest. (Jews only one - Monotheists, R.I.)



The Book of Joshua, a loose collection of local traditions and anecdotal commentary, does not explain much of the history of the conquest of the Promised Land.

Scholars who are not satisfied with these accounts think that the refugees from Egypt were confused with other Semitic shepherds, even with those of Abraham's tribe who did not settle on the banks of the Nile. But it is undeniable that the people of that desert slowly conquered Palestine. Also, a considerable number of natives (Canaanites, as the Bible calls them) assimilated with the chosen people who took over their language (a West Semitic dialect), while retaining the Aramaic form. (Aramaic was the language of Syria, R.I.)

By settling this land, much more suitable for cultivation, the Jews became a sedentary, agricultural people. They suffered occasional incursions from their neighbours (the Canaanites, shepherds of the desert, and the Philistines of the coast). This danger led to the emergence of local warlords, judges inspired by Yahweh, to whom a book of the Bible is dedicated. Religion is, in fact, an element of the unity of the Jewish tribes. Although there are several sanctuaries, only one Ark of the Covenant and one priestly order (which originates from Moses' brother Aaron) are known. The last judge, Samuel, is not a soldier, but a servant of the temple in Shiloh. Wanting to imitate their neighbours, the people appointed King Saul (1030-1010), who soon after quarreled with the priesthood, which David opposed.

Israelite supremacy (10th century). • After the death of King Saul, who was overthrown by the Philistines, David (1010-970), a cruel ruler and a godly poet, came to the throne, conquered Jerusalem, destroyed the power of the Philistines and imposed his supreme rule over all of Syria. That is why his rule is considered glorious.

• His son Solomon (970-930), with a peaceful spirit, content to become the richest king in the East, took advantage of the great trade that passed through his country in the direction of Arabia. The income from this trade allowed him to build a temple to Yahweh, the construction of

which he entrusted to the craftsmen of Tyre. But the creation of a meticulous administration, which was very demanding, had devastating consequences. New classes of rich people and tyrants appeared who oppressed the poor, no longer taking into account religious and tribal solidarity. The severity of the impositions led the central and northern tribes to reject his son Rehoboam after Solomon's death, leaving only two tribes: Judah and Benjamin (the Kingdom of Judah, whose capital was Jerusalem). The rebels founded the Kingdom of Israel, whose kings helped the local shrines of Yahweh to turn their subjects away from Solomon's Temple. Divided into two hostile states, the Jewish people had to give up dominance over their neighbours. Although the Kingdom of Israel, which was larger, experienced several glorious reigns - Ahab (874-853) and Jeroboam II (783-743) achieved brilliant victories over the Arameans of Damascus - the danger that soon threatened them from the Assyrians showed how trivial the ambitions and quarrels of the rulers of the Israelite state were.

Religious renewal of Israel. In Israel there were always 'visionaries' who spoke in the name of Jehovah and took care to preserve the people from being corrupted with Canaanite impurities. But from the 9th century onwards, the Israelites and their kings, affected by political decline, increasingly came under the temptation to adopt the gods and rituals that had brought great prosperity to the neighbouring peoples (Phoenicians, Arameans). The prophets then created a movement of religious reaction that consisted of a return to Mosaic orthodoxy. To the people, who were disappointed that they should no longer seek help from their god against their enemies, they explained that misfortunes were punishment for Israel's sin, for its unfaithfulness to the covenant with God, and that Yahweh expected good deeds from Israel more than sacrifices. They promised a new David, the 'anointed one' (Messiah in Hebrew). After the 9th century and the prophet Elijah and his disciple Elisha, this movement was represented by Amos, Hosea, Micah and especially Isaiah, the most brilliant, who began preaching before the fall of the Kingdom of Israel (722).

The same spiritual current, explained by the sudden, rapid development of Israeli literature. Two groups of writers - in Judea, the Yahwists (they call God Yahweh, Jehovah), in the Kingdom of Israel the Elohimists (they use the word Elohim for the concept of God) - each composed, on their own, the history of the chosen people.

Syrian dominance (10th-8th centuries). While Egypt and the Mesopotamian kingdom were still fighting the barbarians, Syrian cities established their independence (some of them were ruled by the Aramean or Neo-Hittite aristocracy) and became active again. And while the Arameans and Israelites became stronger the Philistines became weaker. Meanwhile the Mycenaean fleet ceased to exist after the 13th century. As a result, the coastal cities of the central seaboard (Phoenician) took over the coastal trade monopoly corresponding to the caravan trade. Having placed its practical intelligence and technical skill at the service of the great states in the past millennium, Syria was now taking advantage of the disappearance of the imperialist powers to develop a culture in which foreign elements were harmoniously combined. In doing so they greatly benefited themselves and their neighbours, who were in decline after the great invasions of the 13th and 12th centuries.

The Jews that were in Phoenician territories - were Pelasgians = so-called Slavic people.

“Unfortunately only a few documents from that glorious period were found. Important cities in the interior (Damascus, Hama, Aleppo) have not yet been excavated. The coastal region, which has been more thoroughly explored, has provided us with only short tombstone inscriptions. We must be content with the Assyrian chronicles. The Bible and Greek writers agree with the glorification of wealth and activity of Syria.

Even today, modern historians are interested in Phoenician cities, that is, in the Syrian city-states that, during the era of the Sea Peoples' invasions, did not come under the rule of the Neo-Hittites, Arameans,

Jews, or Philistines. The ports: Arados, Byblos, Sidon and especially Tyre seemed to rule over the others. From the funerary texts and the Bible, it could be concluded that the religion there was the same as that which inspired the Ugaritic poems of the 14th century.

The craftsmen of these city-states continued to produce purple dye, glass, weapons, goldsmith items and luxury goods. But their art was especially represented by ivory made according to Egyptian themes, which was found throughout the Near East and which, moreover, mixed with the products of the inland Syrian cities.

- The alphabet, which the Syrians perfected in the 2nd millennium so that merchants could use it more easily, was adopted by peoples who did not have their own script and came to settle in Syria (Jews, Maovichens, Arameans), or those who traded with the Syrians (Greeks and Arabs).
- But the greatest feature of the Phoenicians was their maritime expansion. Unfortunately, most of us are unaware of how this process was started: relations with Arabia, the settlement of Cyprus (Kition, Hamathon), the connection with the Greeks, the settlement of the eastern Mediterranean – also, we are unable to determine the exact timeline.

The rise of Arabia. One of the most valuable products of that era was frankincense, a resin collected in southeastern Arabia. Arabia carried out its trade, which was developed by the Syrians, first through the Red Sea and then with caravans crossing the entire Arabian Peninsula. This trade enriched all the Arabian tribes and during the 1st millennium introduced writing modeled after the Syrian script. From the 2nd millennium, thanks to this and the climate that made agriculture possible, the people of the south switched to a sedentary life. Around the year 800, a priestly state called Sabaean appeared in that area, which erected significant monuments in the capital Mariba.

After the peoples from the sea stopped arriving, the Syrian states and kingdoms rose from the ruins, evidenced by their artistic and intellectual dynamism, a real contrast to Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, and withdrew to themselves. But the political command, which was unavoidable, held back this culture from the Syrian crossroads for a long period of time.

*Assyrian Empire and its victims (9th-7th centuries)*

Military campaigns and penetration into Syria (9th-8th centuries). After two centuries of fierce defense against the Arameans, Assyria went on the offensive and by the end of the 10th century began a merciless struggle, which with its cruelty should have once and for all deterred the neighbouring peoples from even the thought of daring to attack Assyrian land. Using the system - which has long existed in the ancient East - of levies and forced labour for prisoners of war, the nobility led by the Assyrian state derived much benefit from it so that war soon became an unavoidable necessity.

The first great conqueror of that era was Assur-Nasir-Apli II (884-859) who greatly intimidated the Aramaean tribes and states. Later Syria was intimidated in the same way and similar fines were imposed. The wealth of the Syrian state was such a revelation that Shulman-Asharid III (Shalmaneser, 859-824), Assur-Nasir-Apli II's successor undertook a campaign to crush the most powerful states in Syria so that he could more easily plunder that region. However, before he could do so, he undertook a lighter campaign against Cilicia, Urarat (the region around Lake Van) and Media (east of Lake Urmia), a land rich in horses.

The war profits contributed to the flourishing of architecture in Assyria. The most important monuments were in Kalhu (today Nimrud), which by the will of Assur-Nasir-Apli II became the capital again. Found at this site was a royal statue sculpted by the Assyrians, along with a collection of ivory objects and many stone bas-reliefs covering the base of the brick walls. These bas-reliefs are an indication of the art and mentality of the Assyrians. In the 13th century Assyria had already

synthesized the themes and techniques of its neighbours (Syrians, Hittites, Mitanni, Babylonians). In the 1st millennium these artists moved quickly to produce stereotypical themes. They were original only when representing animals. But they worked mostly as propaganda in favour of the king, the deputy of the god of Assur, than on the art itself. It is interesting that the deity is rarely represented. In the court in a symbolic form, and on the bas-reliefs the king was often depicted performing rituals in honour of the gods (sacrifices, hunting, feasts), receiving subjects and especially driving his enemies out, and waging terrible wars. The portraits of all the rulers were beautiful, created without any resemblance to the people themselves, but they still corresponded to the ethnic type in terms of a large and heavy body, a rough and massive face, thick lips and hooked noses.

At the end of his reign, Shalmaneser III, surviving the social crisis which had lasted almost a century, causing a decline, as a result Assyria weakened and had to abandon Syria in order to defend itself from the mighty Urartian tribe.

Urartu. At the beginning of the 9th century, Assyrian incursions forced the small kingdoms in the Armenian hills to move near to the kingdom on the eastern shore of Lake Van for defense. The newly formed state expanded northward and took its civilization toward the Assyrian region, where the Urartians prospered until the energetic Tukulti-Apal-Eshar III (Tiglath-Pileser, 746) appeared.

Urartu was a state organized along the lines of Mesopotamia. Although, as it seems, most of its tablet documents have disappeared, numerous inscriptions on the walls have remained, written in the native language, and sometimes accompanied by Assyrian translations. In these texts, the kings recount their battles and at the same time boasted of how they developed agriculture by building dams and digging canals. Besides the art found in these lands, which were rich in quarries and mines, left behind were fortresses with cyclopean walls and bronze objects. The themes borrowed from the old Sumerian repertoire (fantastic animals)

decorate the Urartian cauldrons, known and valued even in Greece and Etruria.

So, the “native language” here was Pelasgian=so-called Slavic, as well as that of the Etruscans.

“The Assyrian Empire (8th-7th century). Easy conquest (746-705).

- Tukulti-Apal-Eshar III (746-727) began his reign with administrative and military reforms. The fragmentation actually weakened the high nobility. Permanent units, recruited from prisoners of war, replaced the local militia and the Assyrians now represented only the elite in these units (engineers, charioteers and especially the cavalry, which advanced the importance of horsemanship to the forefront). War was waged more methodically. The displacement of people was carried out systematically in order to destroy local patriotism.

In the beginning of Eshar’s reign, the Assyrian army had already defeated the Urartian king and drove him out of Syria. The Syrian royals either surrendered or were captured, sent into exile and replaced by Assyrian rulers. The Damascun kingdom was destroyed (732) and the Philistine cities, which had secret connections with Egypt, were annexed to Assyria. Rejecting his predecessor’s policy, who had protected the weak Babylonian rulers and their holy cities, the Assyrian ruler expelled the Babylonian king and seized his throne (729).

After his elder son and successor Shulman-Asharidua V (Shalmaneser, 727-722) lost his rule, power was taken over by his younger son Tukulti-Apal-Eshar III, Sargon II (722-705). Fierce, energetic and methodical, the new king spent almost all of his reign waging wars. He began with the destruction of the Kingdom of Israel,<sup>28</sup> which had rebelled against his predecessor. The prominent exiled Israelites were replaced by Mesopotamians and Syrians. Then came the Samaritans, who would always be hostile to their Jewish neighbours. Sargon then

---

<sup>28</sup> There was nothing Jewish until 444 BC - until Ezra everything was foreign history, and only with Ezra Jewish.

turned to lower Mesopotamia, where the Chaldean Marduk-Apal-Idin (Merodach-Baladin) II captured Babylon but was defeated by the Elamites, who were determined to preserve the independence of Babylonia at all costs (720). Before he could undertake his punitive campaign, the Assyrians, one by one, had to crush the lands of the Syrian coalition supported by Egypt, annex the new Hittite kingdom which had secret ties with the Phrygian king Midas, and devastate Urartu, a city that challenged his protectorate over the Medes and Mannaeans (near Lake Urmia). Finally, in 710-709, Sargon defeated the Elamites and Chaldeans and proclaimed himself the king of Babylon.

With the annexation of the regions and the migration of the population, the Assyrian Empire began to achieve its cultural unity. All of Western Asia recognized the great Mesopotamian gods (Assur, Marduk and his son Nab, Sin and Ishtar) and engaged in Babylonian astrology (worshiping the stars). Aramaic was spoken throughout the empire and the official scribes were divided into two categories: those who wrote in cuneiform on tablets and those who wrote Aramaic on parchment or papyrus. All cities became known for their artistic forms: those who produced minor arts had Syria to thank for their Egyptian themes and monuments. There was also the official Assyrian art which found its most beautiful expression in the palace of Khorsabad, the royal city of Sargon II. From there came the famous bas-relief found in the Louvre Museum: Gilgamesh strangling a lion, the geniuses engaging in ritual purification, Sargon and his minister, etc. But the great king did not get to enjoy the benefits of his capital, completed in 706. The following year he died in an insignificant battle on the border of Iran.” (Lion to drown + t = davit[David], R.I.) (Лав да дави + т = давит[Давит], Р.И.)

It has been said that the Aramaic language was biracial belonging to both the white and black race.

“Difficulty in the Assyrian policy of conquest in the 7th century. The successors to Sargon II were forced to exhaust their army in Babylonia and Syria because the rebels in those areas relied on the powerful states,



Elam and Egypt, which could not be conquered due to the great distances and natural obstacles. It seems that these two factors were the reason why the Assyrians lost sight of the northern regions, from where the barbarians would soon come.

Every time the throne changed in Assyria it caused internal crises that were taken advantage of by the unconquered peoples. While the son of Sargon II, Sin-Ahe-Eriba (Sennacherib, 705-681), who seemed to have inherited his father's cruelty and energy, was consolidating his power in Nineveh, the new Assyrian capital, Marduk-Apal-Idin II reappeared in Babylon. Having put down the unrest, the Assyrians defeated the Elamites and the shepherds from the south and reconquered Babylon (704). But as soon as he withdrew, uprisings broke out again in the great city with support from Elam. Enraged, Sennacherib destroyed the holy city and its temples (689). The campaign against the Syrian rebels: the king of Tyre and Sidon, the Philistine cities and Hezekiah of Judah, who was condemned to pay tribute (701), did not require much effort.

Sennacherib went to great lengths to beautify Nineveh: he built aqueducts, stone bridges, temples and especially the huge 'palaces of the southwest', rich in bas-reliefs and tablets. His reign ended tragically. Two of his sons were murdered in the temple and the third, Assur-Ah-Idin (Esarhaddon), took advantage of a civil war to seize the throne (681).

Conquest of Egypt and Elam. • The new king, whose mother and wife were Babylonians, pursued a more conciliatory policy towards the great city in which he had recently rebuilt temples. Rushing to conquer Egypt, Assur-Ah-Idin first had to stop the barbarians (Cimmerians and Scythians) who had come from the great steppes, then punish the Phoenicians and Cilicia, which had rebelled at the instigation of the 'Ethiopian' pharaoh Taharqa. After their first failure to enter Egypt (675), the Assyrians captured Memphis (671). Taharqa fled to the Nubian Kingdom and the Egyptian royals become vassals of Assyria.

But the Ethiopians reappeared in 669 in the Delta and Assur-Ah-Idin died at the moment when he should have gone to battle.

- By dividing the kingdom, the late king left the province of Babylon to his son Shamash-Shum-Ukin, son of a Babylonian woman, to govern under the supreme authority of his younger brother, the king of Assyria, Ashurbanipal (668-631). The latter was best known for the countless bas-reliefs and tablets found in his palace at Nineveh. At that time Assyrian art had reached its peak. Many wild animals and hunting scenes were depicted. The library in his palace provided us with the most complete collections of Sumerian and Babylonian classics, which were collected mainly due to his personal royal taste. He was an educated man, proud of his knowledge.

On the other hand, he did not seem to have personally led any major military campaigns while in government. After their first campaign in Egypt which ended with no lasting results, the Assyrians re-grouped and sacked Thebes (663), which never rose again. The Ethiopians finally renounced their Egyptian neighbours. After that, in 625, Assyria faced the general coalition raised by Shamash-Shum-Ukin, the younger brother's rival. After the second war, Ashurbanipal was defeated, and Shamash-Shum-Ukin lost his life in a fire in his palace in Babylon (648). The last campaign of Elam remained in memory after the terrible cry of Susa (640).

The fall of Assyria. The circumstances under which Assyria was destroyed are not sufficiently known, because many Assyrian documents were destroyed in the early defeats. Before Ashurbanipal's death, Egypt under the Saisian king Psammetichus I regained independence. Ashurbanipal's sons were unable to prevent the Chaldean Nabu-Apal-Usur (Nabopolassar) from becoming the king of Babylon (625). With the help of Cyaxares, the king of Media, the Babylonians captured and destroyed the capitals of Assyria (Assur 614, Kalkh, Nineveh 612). Remnants of the Assyrian army scattered while

the people disappeared from history as victims of their own cruelty and excessive ambitions.

And so Assyria collapsed which, by its cruel methods, had managed to unite the East, but also weakened it and it fell under Iranian rule.

### *Peoples of the Eurasian Steppes (12th-6th centuries)*

Since they learned to make weapons from bronze and to harness and ride horses during the 2nd millennium, the peoples who ruled the steppe later adopted nomadic pastoralism. Volatile and warlike, these horse-riding archers became a danger to the large agricultural states. On the other hand, through contact with the old civilizations, the nomads of the prairies became intermediaries in major trade (jade from Baikal, gold from Altai, furs from the taiga, silk from China). Their craftsmen developed the famous steppe art, an art with motifs from the animal world, gradually stylized; it was used to decorate horse equipment, belt buckles, jewelry and tableware. Originating as an imitation of Chinese art from the time of the Shang dynasty, it would later adopt themes from the Middle East.

Neighbouring China. China's closest neighbours were the Xiongnu, herders from Mongolia who made beautiful bronze objects from Ordos and came to plunder the Chinese fields. A little further north, the Muninsky basin was invaded by migrating Mongols and Indo-European tribes, passing through Siberia. Here the Andronovo civilization was replaced by that of Kara-Sukha (1000-750), which adopted a nomadic way of animal husbandry. After that the Tagara civilization rose (from 750), whose beautiful bronze objects were imitated by the peoples of Ordos and later by China.

Neighbours in the Middle East. There is no doubt, the Cimmerian and Scythian migration were identified by the advancement of nomadic cattle breeding. According to Herodotus (5th century B.C.), the Scythians came from the Aral Sea region and conquered the steppe in the Pontic region. Some inhabitants of this area apparently fled to the

Azov Sea peninsula. Others, the Cimmerians, who were constantly pursued by the Scythians, seemed to have penetrated the Near East, being mentioned in the Assyrian annals as having arrived at the end of the 8th century. The Cimmerians ravaged Urartu, devastated the Phrygian kingdom and killed Gyges, king of Lydia (652), but they were then destroyed by the Assyrians. However, we know nothing for certain about the role of the Scythians who, it seems, ruled the East (at the end of Ashurbanipal's rule) and then returned to the Pontic steppes where their civilization developed from the 6th to the 3rd century". (Scythian = wandering Scythian, R.I.) (СКИТ=скиит кој скита, Р.И.)

Herodotus, Thucydides... Plato... Procopius... did not know or mention anything about any Slavs. Procopius and others wrote only about the Sclaveni with their Chorus (Horus). So the Romans were Christians.

"Even though the steppe people were viewed as barbarians, their organizational skills, mobility and military power were effective and they maintained ties with the great civilizations, which began to play a significant role over time.

### *Babylonian revival. Iranians conquer the East*

Settlement of Indo-Europeans in Iran. Steppe warriors imposed their rule over the isolated Iranian villages without much difficulty. By the middle of the 2nd millennium the Aryan invasion (future Iranians and Hindus) in Mesopotamia probably began in Iran. But it seems that the victory of the Indo-European tribes was a result of a new advance by the Aryans. From the 12th to the 8th century, they crossed the Iranian plateau from east to west and adopted the culture of earlier inhabitants, which was mainly influenced by Susa and Babylon.

The Iranians were white and the Hindus were dark. No trace of any Indo-Europeans.

"The Medes and their kingdom. This people, the most important among the Iranian Aryans, were shepherds and horsemen. They settled in the northwest of the plateau. From the 9th to the 7th century, they suffered

invasions from the Assyrians who imposed the rule of their numerous commanders. In the history of the Medes' royal house, which Herodotus told us about, there is nothing that can be considered reliable. The Medes united only at the end of the 7th century under the government of Cyaxares, after his decisive victories over Assyria (614-612), which was on the verge of collapse. After that the Medes destroyed Urartu and, after the war against the Lydians, stopped at Hylas (585). Their kingdom was fragile, ruled by people who did not care about literacy. (Med[ani] = Med[ani], meda = border, R.I.) (Мед[ани]=Меѓ[ани], меда=меѓа, Р.И.)

New Babylonian Empire (625-539). This kingdom was founded by the Chaldean Nabu-Apal-Usur (Nabopolassar, 625-605). Except for the areas north of Mesopotamia, which remained in the hands of the Medes, the Babylonian Empire took over the eastern parts of Assyria and thus contributed to the fall of the Assyrian Empire. The other king of that dynasty, Nabu-Kadur-Usur II (605-562), the biblical Nebuchadnezzar, would have to wage many wars to take Syria from Egypt, which it coveted.

Nebuchadnezzar, who was generally peaceful, was able to devote his reign to carrying out great works of fortification and beautification of Babylon. Behind the double walls of the capital are magnificent buildings: the palace of the fortress with hanging gardens, summer palaces, the temple of Marduk with a seven-story ziggurat, which reaches 90 m in height. The walls of the main buildings are decorated with friezes of symbolic animals in glazed brick (the dragon represents Marduk; the griffin Adad, the storm god; the lion, the goddess Ishtar). Enriched by agriculture and trade, Babylonia became a great cultural center. Its scribes continued to write chronicles and make predictions and, it seems, at that time great progress was made in astronomy."

Sea water rose by 90 m. flooding the Mediterranean Basin, and in the Levant during the Ice Age, the white race - blood group A existed around 15000 B.C.

“The fall of the Kingdom of Judah and ‘Babylonian captivity’. During these imperialist conflicts, the small state of Judah, despite its weaknesses, outlasted Assyria and continued to develop the spiritual gift of Moses. At the end of the 8th century, a period of spiritual upsurge occurred in the kingdom of Jerusalem, thanks to the arrival of those who had survived the Kingdom of Israel, with the sermons of the prophet Isaiah and the personal work of the pious king Hezekiah (716-687 or 715-686). The Levites (members of the Levitical tribes and assistants of the priests) compiled the Elohim and Yahwist history of the chosen people into a single entity. Thus, a collection of sayings was created that made up the Law, which would end with Deuteronomy (repeated laws). The purification of the cult, which began during Hezekiah’s reign, continued during Josiah’s reign (640-609). He assisted the Levites, who then published the Code of the Covenant (a continuation of the Decalogue), the first version of Deuteronomy, and the ‘law of holiness’ (which would later appear in the Book of Leviticus). Compilation of the history book continued with the Book of Joshua, the Book of Judges, the Book of Samuel and the Book of Kings. New prophets appeared. The most famous among them was Jeremiah, who in vain advised the king and the people to respect the powerful Babylonian government. But the nationalist current of the time, supported by Egypt’s promises rejected this and its rude provocation led to Nebuchadnezzar’s intervention (586): Jerusalem was sacked, the temple destroyed and the prominent Jews were taken into captivity. This was the beginning of the Diaspora (a Greek word meaning displacement) when the Jewish people were scattered throughout the world.”

There never were any Jews who had a small Judean-Jewish state except during Ezra’s time.

“The elite of society were taken to Mesopotamia where they continued to work on developing the doctrine. The prophet Hezekiah, who declared that Jehovah’s protection would outlive the temple and the

kingdom, inspired priestly literature, supplemented the history books and harmonized them with priestly teachings.

Creation of the Persian Empire. After the Aryan Persian people migrated under unclear circumstances under the leadership of the Achaemenid family, they settled in southwestern Iran, in the border regions of Elam, whose civilization they adopted (7th century). This empire was the work of one man, Cyrus II (558-528), whose personality is little known to us and only from legends but who, contrary to Eastern traditions, seems to have been humane towards the conquered. Around 550 he deposed his emperor Astyages, king of the Medes, and proclaimed himself king of the Persians and the Medes. The balance of eastern powers was thus disturbed. Croesus, king of Lydia, and Nabonidus, king of Babylonia, tried to stop the Persian expansion. But the Lydian king was captured in his capital in 546. As a result, Babylonia was weakened by a coups d'état, especially after Nebuchadnezzar's death, who did not at all defend the unpopular Nabonidus, later executed in the city (539). Cyrus was welcomed in Babylonia as a liberator who freed the people brought to the Babylonian Empire as slaves.

Since Nabonidus was a heretic, the Babylonians were against him and supported Cyrus. Since he was a monotheist, he made sure no Jews=monotheists were imprisoned in Babylon.

“Having subdued the farmers and herders of eastern Iran under his rule, Cyrus died fighting the nomads of the Aral steppes (529/8). Of the entire ancient East, only Egypt had not yet fallen under Persian rule, but its military weakness tempted the foreigners.

Sayan period. Last great pharaoh (663-525). Psamtik I (663-609), king of Sayan, founder of the 26th dynasty (663-525), reunited Egypt and freed it from the Assyrian yoke. The establishment of royal power had a positive effect on the new economic and cultural boom. Sayan art in many ways imitated the art of the Old Kingdom but it should also be given some credit for perfecting technical discoveries. In that

atmosphere, things returned to the old ways, the priesthood returned to respecting the old gods and resumed using forgotten rites, but the people were increasingly inclined to worship sacred animals, the most famous of which was the Apis bull, the incarnation of the god Ptah of Memphis. Despite its wealth, Egypt felt weaker than the Asian powers and again resorted to the policy of preventive occupation of Syria. When Nebuchadnezzar pushed Egypt out of Syrian areas, Pharaoh Necha (609-594) built a fleet that would ensure its supremacy at sea. During this period, Egypt returned to its glorious past, resuming its hatred of foreigners, incited by the Assyrian occupation, and brought back the Greeks who replaced the Libyan army, and the merchants who came to buy grain. Pharaoh Apries was deposed from the throne because he was sympathetic to the Greeks. He was replaced by Pharaoh Achmes (Amasis, 568-526), who led a wise policy, placing the Greek merchants in the settlement of Naucratis. Anticipating an attack, he tried to gather all of Cyrus' opponents but still found himself alone when Cambyses, son and heir of the great Persian king, attacked Egypt. During the conflict Achmes died and his son Psamtik III (526-525) was defeated and captured.

In that short period from 612 to 525, the states of the East (Judea, Media, Lydia, Babylon, Egypt) collapsed; they were conquered by Cyrus the Persian who had created the largest empire up to that time. But the East, although in the hands of the barbarians from Iran, still retained its cultural advantage. Egypt and Mesopotamia remained the centers of civilization and the Jewish people continued their spiritual progress.”

There was never anything Jewish until the 5th century B.C. Monotheism was probably a legacy from the time of Akhenaten, which had to be kept secret. Otherwise, the Polytheists would have exterminated it. This was exactly what happened to Nabonidus.

*“The Emergence and Rise of the Hellenic World (12th-6th centuries)*



‘Centuries in Darkness’ (12th-8th centuries). While the fate and history of the East were turbulent, the Hellenic peninsula went through a long period without writing and without significant connections with the East. Its chronology is based on ceramics and history begins above all with the epic traditions collected by the writers of the time that followed.

Migration. When the Mycenaean world collapsed (13th-7th centuries), either as a victim of internal crisis or external attacks, a new branch of the Greek people, the Dorians and their brothers, peoples who spoke a northwestern dialect (Helicians, Acarnacians, Aetolians) conquered certain areas of Greece. These people did not bring any cultural novelty. Nothing is known about their origin, nor about where they came from. It is not even known whether this was a real invasion. But the linguistic map of the Greek world in the 1st millennium B.C. shows that the Dorians did conquer Greece. According to legend, the Achaean and Ionian civilizations originated before the invasion in the 12th century. Accordingly, the Achaean dialect, which turned out to be closest to the dialects of the Linear B script, was known in the 1st millennium only in Arcadia and Cyprus, two areas that had no contact with each other and which represented the remains of the disappeared kingdom. In Europe, the Ionian dialect was still spoken only in Attica and the northern Cyclades islands. The peoples who spoke Doric and the northwestern dialect (Corinthians, Argives, Laconians, Messenians, Eligians) indeed surrounded Arcadia. There also existed an Aeolian dialect (Thessalian, Boeotian) in which the northwestern drift mixed with the old foundation. Better explained by tradition was the settlement (new or reinforced) on the western coast of Anatolia. Those who escaped the invasion founded the Aeolian states in the north and Ionian cities in the middle. The victors, on the other hand, who took Crete and the southern Kilkade Islands, founded Doric fortifications in Asia.

A new civilization. The new civilization was based on the Cretan-Mycenaean one (the list of gods from classical Olympus was already almost complete in the Mycenaean tablets). But the mixing of the

population caused by the migrations allowed the spread of innovations and ended with the creation of the Greek people (that is a Latin word: in Greece 'Hellenic' was spoken).<sup>29</sup> It was a community wider than the Achaeans world which Achaea inherited. Despite the darkness surrounding it, the first Greek civilization was very significant because it paved the way for the better-known eras: the Achaeans (8th-6th century) and the Classical (5th-4th century). Since there are no texts from that period, historians referred to Homer's works and archaeology, which provided quite contradictory images of the 'ages shrouded in darkness'.

Homeric poems. The Iliad tells us of the wrath of Achilles, an episode from the time when the Achaeans besieged Troy (Greek Ilion); the Odyssey relived the adventures of Ulysses (Greek Odysseus) on his return from the Trojan War. The Greeks attributed both of these epics to Homer, a poet originally from Asia Minor. It is not known when exactly Homer was born. Since 1664, when the abbot D'Aubignac doubted Homer's origin, and even his existence, many hypotheses have been put forward about the origin of his two works. It was assumed that each of the forty Homeric poems were written by a different poet. The Iliad and the Odyssey, however, separated by one or two generations, which appeared to be composed by two brilliant poets who probably gathered older epic elements. These poems, some episodes of which were recited as early as the 8th century, received several insertions before they were first published (6th century).<sup>30</sup> Their creators, by inserting into the text of these poems traditions and even expressions that penetrated the Mycenaean era, attempted to make a historical restitution. Describing the material world in which they lived, they threw out from it

---

<sup>29</sup> There was never anything Greek. Then came Hellas (so-called Greece) and Hellenic (so-called Greek) - the Greek work of Rome.

<sup>30</sup> Pisistratus (6th century B.C.) commissioned his Editorial Board, which compiled a work of three genetic-geographical areas: with donkeys and saffron from Egypt with Mesopotamia, cattle and horses from Brigium (in the east Lake Pelagonia with eel and in the west Baba Planina) and the Adriatic islands - inhabited since the 6th century B.C.

everything that they thought represented modern elements for them, and systematically introduced customs and objects that were already on the way to extinction. This intellectual, not to say historical work, in which there must have been deviations and errors, presents us with a picture of the society of the heroic age. Opinions still differ on the value of this work.

The basic social unit was the *genos*, a large family whose members were governed by the head of the clan who was considered to have descended from the same deity or heroic ancestor. Placed above these old groupings is the city (Greek *polis*) which, under the guardianship of a deity (called *polyadic*) houses a certain number of families and individuals. The city-*polis*, e.g. of the Phoenicians, is governed by a council (*bula*) in which elders and kings, elders of the families, sit.

One of them who is 'more of a king' than the rest takes it upon himself the duty of presenting the decisions of the council to the assembly (*ekklesia* or *apela*) of soldiers.

Conversely, the king of Mycenae seems to have owned a third of the Peloponnese himself.

The ruler is a large landowner who supervises the work of the peasants. In his smoky *megaron* he organizes great feasts, at which distinguished guests tell of their wars or naval adventures. If one travels by sea rather than by land, then the western land, which is believed to be inhabited by monsters, remains inaccessible, and the trade in luxury items brought from the East remains the monopoly of the Phoenicians. Despite the developed piracy, the source of wealth comes from the exploitation of the peasant. In Greece, which remains largely under forest and is less populated than in the classical era, livestock farming, especially cattle breeding, was still the main branch of the economy. The craftsman, whose skills and sense of aesthetics were highly valued, depends on the orders of the greats, but he was not as subservient to them as the peasant.

Homer, the great poet, also describes the environment of the educated classes, which rejects the mystical side of religion and creates the great gods on Olympus by mixing in countless local 'demons'. These exaggerated deities are presented as immortal giants, full of flaws, very close to people in their passions and drunkenness. The myth is no longer a description of natural phenomena, but rather a humorous or bitter study of human psychology. The spirit is then limited to a constant thought about death, which is especially deeply expressed in the Iliad. Morality is still only respect for the given faith and for the guest. The gods above all mortals expect people to bring them sacrifices with which they feed, and religion is reduced to a public or family cult with offerings and drinks in honour of the gods, which are given by kings or elders of families.

Archaeology of an 'age shrouded in darkness'. Neither palaces nor treasuries have been found from that era. Our documentation is limited to tomb sanctuaries. The most widespread method of burial was cremation. Iron grave goods (weapons, embalming tools, brooches) were found in the tombs. The ceramics, which were especially found in the Dipylon cemetery (one of the Athenian gates), also allow us to determine the chronology. There is a subtle transition towards the stylization of Mycenaean motifs which ended with schematic figures of the sub-Mycenaean period (11th century). In the proto-geometric style (10th century) were found assemblies of lines that tended to cover the entire surface of the vase and whose combination were multiplied (old geometric style 900-775). Finally, in the 8th century, the geometric style was developed which allowed friezes of schematic human and animal figures. Unlike the Mycenaeans, who were content with chapels, palaces or altars under the open sky, the first Greeks came up with the idea of building houses for all the gods. The oldest temples (Thermos in Aetolia, Artemis Orthia in Sparta, Hera Acraea near Corinth, 10th-9th centuries) were made of unbaked bricks and consisted of quadrangular rooms of modest dimensions, the roof structure was sometimes supported by a longitudinal colonnade with wooden columns. The

precious objects in the tombs and votive shrines (made of bronze, ivory, terracotta) were characterized by a highly schematic plasticity. Under the influence of objects imported from Syria in the 9th century, Crete soon set an example of the new realistic art.

- Cyprus is a unique case in the Hellenic community. The Mycenaeans, conquerors or refugees, who settled there in the 13th-12th centuries, maintained their tradition. On the other hand, relations with the East and Greece never ceased. Although there was already a geometric style, in the 8th century, ceramics with lush and complex decorations appeared under the influence of the East. Since trade required knowledge of writing, the islanders used a syllabary (derived from their linear script), which would serve to write Ethio-Cypriot (the local language) and Greek. On the other hand, the Hellenes turned to the Phoenicians whose script they perfected. Namely, to record vowels, which the Semites had neglected, the Greeks used those Phoenician consonants that were not used in their phonetics. Later, this first complete script spread to the west.

Greece. Archaic period (7th-6th centuries). The first known inscription (on vases) dates from the second half of the 8th century. Somewhat later, lists of winners of the Olympic Games and magistrates began to be kept, which served as a chronological framework for Greek historians (Herodotus 5th century and his followers). These are our main source, since only fragments of poems and a small number of stone inscriptions survived from the Archaic era.

Fragmentation and political organization. The first written texts show us a higher level of education in the language groups. Aware of their common origin, the Hellenes attached great importance to those minimal linguistic differences which, indeed, always went hand in hand with special traditions (cult, number and names of tribes to which families belonged).

Political fragmentation is more pronounced. Some provinces (Elis, Acarnia, Aetolia) which engaged solely in agriculture, for a long time

lived only in villages, united exclusively by the performance of common rites. The end of the age shrouded in darkness was marked by frequent *synechiai* - the association of several villages into a polis (city). But, even after the period of unification, Greece was still divided into a large number of city-polises, which were actually proud of their independence and were always ready to fight with their neighbours over some fields or a disputed spring. The fact that the Greeks did not spread much in their ethnic space is explained by their love for purely local problems, as well as their love for equality. The polis had dimensions that allowed the citizen living in it to easily go to the capital.

The beautiful weather and leisure that came with engaging in 'dry' agriculture had a favourable effect on public discussion. Under such conditions, royal power gradually lost its sacred character and a parliamentary regime developed, in which eloquence was valued more than force. From the 8th to the 7th century, royal power gradually disappeared everywhere and its function was divided between elected judges from tribal families, who were considered to be descended from the gods. Then an aristocratic form of government arose.

A time of turmoil. Many Greek states felt the revolution caused by the surge of large-scale trade at the end of the 'unknown age'. The nobleman, who was also a large landowner, tried to produce as much grain as possible in order to exchange it for valuable products from the East. The appearance of money (which occurred in the Ionian cities at the beginning of the 7th century), which led to the accumulation of wealth, encouraged greed for profit among the nobles. The peasant who frivolously borrowed money from his rich neighbour soon fell into debt that he could not repay. He then became a publican, an exile and was even sold into slavery. With the revival of trade in the city, a class of artisans developed. The vases of the potters and makers of bronze objects, the woolen and linen fabrics, the weapons of bronze or iron were sold in the barbarian countries to the north and west, as well as in the Middle East. The majority of the population in the cities of Ionia, Aeolian Lesbos and in some city-states of the Hellenic peninsula, which

were located along the main trade routes (in Chalcis, Eretria, Corinth, Megara, Athens) lived off crafts. The merchant bourgeoisie were created here, sometimes as rich as the landowners.

There are rare states (like Athens) in which the nobility accepted the change from the aristocratic form of government to a timocracy (the rich retain power). But the new rich, whom most despised as nobles, put their talents at the service of the people, and attracted sailors and craftsmen to themselves.

The poor peasant class, completely incapable of defending itself, went with this movement. The class struggle in the 7th-6th centuries led to the suppression of the landowners wherever trade and crafts significantly contributed to the affirmation of the urban class. The nobles, who had a monopoly on justice, first had to agree to promulgate laws. Then the popular leaders demanded free access to the magistracy, the cancellation of debts and the division of land. When the nobility refused to make even the slightest concession, it led to the emergence of a tyrant, a leader whose authority rested neither on religion nor on legality. These tyrants of the 7th-6th centuries (Panetilius in Leontini, Phalaris in Agrigentum, Cleisthenes in Sicily, Cypselus in Corinth, Theagemeus in Megara, Lygdamides in Naxos) were all intelligent and active men and their work represented a decisive stage in social evolution. They did not destroy the land estates but they destroyed their prestige and overthrew their leaders. They opened magistracies of the middle class of wealthy craftsmen and merchants, and their economic policy solved rural issues by providing work for all (by carrying out large-scale construction works) who came to live in the city. But tyranny, which was the work of a strong person, was difficult to reconcile with the true heritage. It was quickly replaced by oligarchy, power in the hands of the wealthy minority and the moderate nobility. In exceptional cases (Chios, Athens) a gradual increase in the number of those participating in political life was required, and thus a transition was made to democracy, power held by the community of citizens. This political evolution coincides with the change in the army through the

Greek states. The army with chariots disappeared. The cavalry, composed only of nobles (in Greece the warrior equipped himself at his own expense), was now less valued than the phalanx, a dense and deep mass of hoplites (fully equipped infantry) recruited from the lower landed classes. The trading states had to protect their maritime traffic with warships, whose number of rowers could only be drawn from the ranks of the poor urban population.

Exchanges with the East. Although these exchanges were not the real cause of the 'Greek miracle', the Hellenic world nevertheless owed the East much in its artistic, technical and intellectual development. But the history of this relationship is not sufficiently known.

- The influence of Egypt on Greek culture seems limited and we have no evidence of a Hellenic presence on the banks of the Nile before the beginning of the reign of the 26th dynasty (663).
- Syria's cultural contributions, which achieved the synthesis of the culture of the Near East seems, on the contrary, to be important, but the way in which the relationship between the Greek and Syrian civilizations came about has yet to be determined. The usual old opinion assigns an intermediary role to the Asia Minor states - Lydia and Phrygia - through which the other trade route from the Euphrates to the Ionian ports led. But new excavations have not provided any definitive evidence.

The Phrygian kingdom was short-lived (775 to about 675). In the large tumuli of its capital Gordion, beautiful bronze objects have been found, which appear to have been influenced by Urartian or Assyrian art, and in graffiti written in an alphabet similar to the Greek alphabet (8th century). The Phrygian civilization, surviving the kingdom which was destroyed by the Cimmerians, fell more and more under Greek influence, but the princely tombs of the 6th century were still influenced by Hittite art. In the 7th century, the Lydian Kingdom, founded by Gyges (687-652), took over Anatolia. This kingdom outlived its founder who was killed by the Cimmerians. The Lydian rulers, great



admirers of Hellenic culture, were satisfied only when they had subdued the Greek cities on the coast. Croesus (560-546), the last Lydian king who always consulted the Greek oracles for advice, spoke Greek, as did the elite of his subjects. In his kingdom, the native languages (Lydian, Lycian and Carian, 6th century) began to be written in the Greek alphabet. In Sardis, the capital of Lydia, royal mounds were erected over tombs in which the Mycenaean or Anatolian tradition seemed to have been continued. It could be said then, that the Anatolian kings, who began to unite local traditions with Eastern and Greek influences rather late, brought nothing of importance to the Hellenes. Modern discoveries on the other hand, confirm the accuracy of the tradition according to which the main role belonged to the Phoenicians. They brought objects of art to the Cretans, which contributed to the emergence of an 'orientalizing' artistic style on the island (9th-8th centuries). On the other hand, Cycladic and Rhodian sailors had already encountered the Phoenicians in Cyprus and on the coast of Syria in the 9th century, where they founded trading settlements (Al Mina, Tel Sukkas, 8th century). Landing in these ports, the Greeks learned the alphabet (10th or 9th century) and acquired Eastern art (Syrian-Phoenician, Neo-Hittite, Urartian and Assyrian), bronze, ivory and textile objects.

Greek colonization. Very often the Greeks, during their colonization, took over and expanded Minoan and Mycenaean settlements. If the date given to us by Greek historians for colonization is of no value, at least, thanks to them, we know the causes of this movement and expansion. On the one hand, from the 8th century onwards, the Greeks founded trading posts on the sea routes which, unresisted by the natives, later became cities, on the other hand, the social crises of the 7th and 6th centuries forced the peasants, who had their land taken away, and those who had been defeated in political struggles, to seek a new homeland in groups. In both cases, the settlers did not choose the same area: good land, hills that could be easily fortified and close to the sea coast. From the 8th and 6th centuries, the Greeks founded hundreds of settlements

on the coast of the Mediterranean and Black Seas. However, since they had transferred the spirit of independence of the polis across the sea, the power of each city remained limited and the Hellenic population did not penetrate into the interior.

- As for the settlement near the eastern states, the possibilities were limited. Since the Assyrians had pushed them to the Syrian coast, the Greeks settled in the settlement of Naucratis, thanks to the understanding of the pharaoh. Peoples with a less developed social organization however, were able to do good things and occupy fertile fields.
- Hellene settlement on the coast of Thrace, the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles (Chalkidiki, Thasos, Byzantium), colonies that were mainly engaged in mining and fishing, travelled along the shores of the restless Black Sea where they sought grain and fish in the Cimmerian Bosphorus (at the exit from the Sea of Azov) steppe markets. Ionian Miletus founded many trading posts there, some of which would become large cities (Istros, Olbia, Sinop, second half of the 7th century).

In the second half of the 7th century, Dorian sailors landed on the coast of Libya, where they founded Cyrene, which marked the beginning of the settlement of the agricultural population, to the detriment of the Libyans.

- From the beginning of the 8th century, the Greeks began to push their intermediaries westward from the sea route leading from the east to the mines of Tuscany, the Central Massif and southern Spain. There they founded colonies on both sides of the Sicilian Strait (Catania, Naxos, Zancle, founded Euboea; Syracuse was built by the Corinthians) and in the Neapolitan region. (Eubaeae Cumae dominating Campania).

A little later, the Peloponnesian peoples established themselves on the Italian coast near the isthmuses through which land routes led from the Ionian to the Tyrrhenian Sea (Sybaris, Croton, Tarentum). The Hellenic

settlements in Italy, whose agriculture was very advanced, built the largest temples (Selinon) of the Achaean Greek world.

Thanks to trade, the peoples of Italy became acquainted with the Greek civilization, especially the Etruscans, who then themselves expanded further. • Further west, the Hellenes, who around 700 reached the coast of the Gulf of Lyon, and shortly after that Andalusia, had to retreat because of Phoenician competition. Here they had only one real colony, Marseilles, which was founded around 600 by the Phocians.

General Hellenic heritage. Regardless of the various forms of religion, art and literature they took with them to the regions they occupied, the Greeks remained unique by ignoring local particularisms.

Cult. When addressing the city's deity, or the patron genos (Zeus was the father in the true sense of the word, higher than the rest; Hestia was the goddess of the Hearth; these were their ancestors), a rite was performed by a high official or the father of the family. The rite was a prayer, a libation on the altar, and a sacrifice of a domestic animal part of whose meat was completely burned (holocaust) and the rest divided among the participants. The part set aside for the deity was destroyed by fire.

Holidays, as a memory of certain mythical events, were marked by litanies, musical competitions and games, which was a characteristic expression of Greek religion.

The largest councils (panegyries-panadours) were held on the occasion of provincial or Panhellenic festivals. Even in the Dark Ages, Delos, an island dedicated to Apollo, received delegations of Ionians, Lycians, sometimes Aeolians and Dorians during the spring festivities, which were accompanied by musical and gymnastic competitions. In the Archaic period, the prestige of these festivities surpassed the games intended for all Greeks, such as the Pythian at Delphi, the Isthmian near Corinth, the Nemean in the north of the Peloponnese and the Olympic games. The most sacred were the Olympic games which were thought

to have been first held in 776 B.C. (a date that Greek historians used to start their reckoning of time). Every fourth year, messengers went throughout the Hellenic world to announce the sacred truce on the occasion of the Olympic Games. Large numbers of people gathered at the race courses and hippodromes. At first, running was the only competition (1 stadia = about 180 m or 600 feet): the competition was later enriched with other sports: wrestling, boxing (fighting with leather gloves with lead balls), discus and javelin throwing, chariot racing, foot races of two and ten stadia, pankration (a mixture of wrestling and boxing), pentathlon (a competition in five athletic disciplines). The winners received a wreath of olive leaves. In the Hellenic world, where attending a gymnasium was a noble activity in the strictest sense of the word, they enjoyed honours as heroes and the state supported them for life. (Pent - n = five, R.I.) (Пент - н = пет, Р.И.)

Being more superstitious than pious, the Greeks often undertook long journeys to seek advice from their deity. The most famous was the oracle of Apollo Pythianus at Delphi. Also, often visited was the sanctuary at Epidaurus, where the sick sought healing from the god Asclepius.

The Greeks did not hesitate to put religion at the service of their internal conflicts. The priesthood of Apollo Delphic was able to manage colonization in the 6th century but it did not occur to them to take on the role of judges, and they often gave in to bribery. The Amphictyons (representatives of the cities who managed the affairs of common temples) did the same. In order to satisfy the population of Thessaly, those of the Demeter sanctuary at Antheli (in Thermopylae), launched a 'first world war' (593-583) against the town of Chryse, accusing its residents of inflicting insults against the priesthood at Delphi.

Personal piety and mysticism, it appears, sprang from secret rites. In some sanctuaries, such as the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis, the priests performed plays (mysteries) for the initiated, which provided a consoling revelation of the afterlife, promised to all observers. Some

sects, the best of which we know named after the legendary poet Orpheus, added doctrines of the soul's immortality and strict morality. During the 8<sup>th</sup> century in Greece, under the influence such rites, a moral code of conduct was established with regard to lying and committing crimes. (Orpheus=or fey: or=oro; fey=pey- oro is ori and is pey=pey, R.I.) (Ορφεј=ор феј: ор=оро; феј=пеј- оро се ори и се пеј=пеи, Р.И.)

Art. The artists first worked for the deity, to whom the state and its inhabitants gave offerings of dwellings and ritual objects. Minor art, in the service of private individuals, created mythological themes that served as magical decorations for the temple. But Greek art, no matter how religious it was, could not be practiced by slaves. The mentality of the Hellenes, formed in competitions to overcome opponents, and their sense of aesthetics explained the speed of evolution that led from geometric (8th century) to archaic (6th century) styles, passing through the influence of orientalizing styles (c. 720-580).

- Temple evolution began during the 7th century. Buildings were expanded using double rows of columns supporting the roof. The main hall (naos), which housed the idols and votive gifts, was complemented with a porch (pronaos) and a chamber as a divine treasury. The external colonnade, previously used only for the facade, now surrounded the entire temple. The columns and superstructure were built in two styles: Doric, which originated in the area of Mycenae and Corinth, and Ionic, which originated in Asia. The general use of stone testifies to the wealth of the Greek world. The greatest achievements were made in the Italian colonies and on the Aegean coast, in the trading cities and centers under the rule of tyrants eager for glory. Built in Asia was the temple of Hera at Samos (the most spacious, 112 x 56 m), in other places the temple of Apollo at Didyma (near Miletus) and Artemis at Ephesus; on the islands and on the peninsula, the temples of Apollo at Delos, Corinth and Delphi and the temples of Hera at Agros and Olympia.

In general, the Greek sanctuaries were decorated with elements of coloured terracotta (akroteria, antefixes) and especially with reliefs

carved on the Ionic frieze (Prinia) or in the Doric style, on the pediment (Hecatompedon in Athens) and metopes (Artemision in Mycenae, the Sicyonian treasury at Delphi).

- Sculpture in stone, depicting idols or sacred figures, began to appear. This little-known age left behind only heavy wooden idols or thin terracotta figurines. It was a novelty that the Cretan school, the so-called 'Daedalian' (7th century), produced statues that were rigid and elongated, in which the geometric taste was still prominent: the goddess of Gortyna and Prinia, the 'Lady of Auxerre'. Heirs of this technique, craftsmen from Corinth, Sicyon and Argos, at the beginning of the 6th century, created a slightly heavy type of kouros (young man), naked, strong with schematic musculature (the Argive twins of Delphi). At the same time, the Ionian school also began to create statues of Branchides (priests of Didyma). Then there was an abrupt transition from creating these light statues to using marble to create the delicate Hera of Samos (around 570). Her slenderness and smile, a product of the Ionians, inspired Cycladic craftsmen in the Athenian school, whose craftsmanship began to flourish under the rule of the Tyrant Pisistratus (after 560).

- The workshops of Corinth and Sicyon throughout the Archaic period created ivory and terracotta objects, kraters, tripods and bronze mirrors. The ancients of these two cities attributed the invention of painting to these workshops about which the Aetolian metopes (Thermon, Calydon) gave us some idea. Painting masterpieces continued to live on only in imitation by vase makers. The production of ceramics, influenced by oriental art, marketed since the 8th century, was now dominated by products made in Corinth. Ceramics (around 720-500) were in abundance painted with floral decorations, friezes of lions, sphinxes and sirens. After 575. Athenian vases experienced great success, using a new inclination towards mythological episodes or scenes from domestic life.

Literature. Was still limited to poetry. Homer's work, surpassing all others, had become classic; people learned how to read from it and learned about religion and customs. The epic source was already beginning to be exhausted but the Homeric language was still used (each literary genre is distinguished more or less by an artificial language) for hymns, the most beautiful of which (to Apollo, Aphrodite and Demeter) came from the 7th century. But the poems recited at this time had less success than the Illyrian works (which were sung to the accompaniment of the lyre or double flute). Choral lyrics (dithyramb to Dionysus, song to Apollo) embellished religious festivals. But individual lyrics, in which the poet dared to expose his personal feelings, represented a real spiritual revolution. This novelty probably originated from Archilochus of Paros (c. 705-640), who sang about his hatreds and disappointments. It was continued by Alcaeus and Sappho (c. 640-570), poets of that complex and voluptuous Lesbos. Finally, at the end of the 6th century, Tyrtaeus in Sparta and Solon in Athens put poetry at the service of their civic ideals. (Aphrodite=a phrodite=porodit a; Aborojin=a porodit, R.I.) (Афродита=a фродита=породит а; Абороцин=a породен, Р.И.)

Large Greek cities in the archaic period. Some cities, such as the Ionian cities or Corinth, were mainly engaged in science and trade. On the other hand, Sparta and Athens were more interesting for their original political evolution.

Ionian in contact with Asia and Europe. The terminus of the land route during the 8th century, which went from inner Anatolia, with parts of it going over the sea leading along the Asian coast and the Ionian ports, introduced Phrygia and Lydia to Greek culture. But the documents that show their prosperity and their originality came from the 6th century. Ionian at that time had great artists (architects, sculptors, masters in the manufacture of bronze objects).

However, for the European Greeks, the Ionians were above all the richest, whose sense of luxury and comfort was simply astonishing.

Twelve Ionian cities, which only united to organize a common festival, each had their own peculiarities. Ephesus was a city of bankers and shipowners. Well-known to the Anatolians who come to pay divine homage to Artemis. Chios, the island of wine and the first of all democracies (around 550). Phocaea, a small fishing town, created the most distant colonies in the west. Samos traded throughout the Mediterranean and was even more famous for the skill of its craftsmen and engineers. Miletus, master of trade in the Black Sea and an ally of Sybaris, which traded with the West, was the most active, the richest and the city most shaken by class struggles.

Corinth between two seas. Corinth, like the Ionian cities, was cosmopolitan but less intellectual. The acquisition of trade from the west was the source of its wealth. After 680, its ports were connected by the dioklos, a paved road on which ships were pulled from one sea to another by means of a roller. Corinth, which founded Syracuse (8th century), tried to conquer Corcyra (7th century) and increased the number of its settlements in Arcarnania and Illyria. But more important than trade were its crafts: shipbuilding, processing bronze, fabrics and especially ceramics whose products were sold throughout the Mediterranean.

Sparta before the political reaction. The second great Dorian city, built in Laconia, was Sparta. The Achaean name for that state was preserved, namely 'Lacedaemon'. There was no more famous city in Greece than Sparta. Also, there was no city in Greece whose history was less well-known to us than its own, which the official propaganda and the spirit of moralists deemed fit to see as an application of their principles.

In Lacedaemon, as in many Greek cities, a military aristocracy ruled. This was the government of the citizens who exploited the peasants (helots) living near the capital and the perieks, inhabitants of small towns on the periphery of the state territory, leaving them in a position of intermediate dependence. It is not entirely certain whether this hierarchy was the result of Dorian conquests or to retain its ethnic



criterion imposed in that distant era. Sparta preserved a dual kingdom. Two families, the Agids and the Eurypontids, each provided a king. The rulers commanded the army and performed sacrifices but the decisions were made by the *apela* (assembly of citizens) and especially the *gerusia* (council consisting of 28 elders and 2 kings).

According to archaeology this was a rich region (the Eurota Valley is an excellent country) whose inhabitants were engaged in crafts (ivory and bronze objects, ceramics), trade and were under the influence of the East.

The famous laws that turned Sparta into a military camp and set its citizens as their sole duty the defense of the state, became mandatory in the second half of the 6th century, when artistic crafts disappeared and relations with foreign countries ceased. But here we should also examine the hypotheses that connected this political reaction to the distant past. Herodotus attributed the Spartan laws to the reformer called Lycurgus, who may have lived in the 8th century, but who may also have been a local deity. On the other hand, the motive for the reaction could have been, it seems, a desire to protect the state from internal danger. But were the helots in question everywhere, whose fate did not have to be so difficult, since each citizen in war had an entourage of seven (?) helots? Or were they Messenians, who were subdued after bitter fighting (neither the date nor the duration of those wars is known)?

Athens, development towards democracy. The history of the Athenian state in the Archaic period, unlike the history of the Lacedaemonians, is fairly well known to us. The Athenian constitution by Aristotle (4th century B.C.), despite its anachronisms, contained the essence of political events from the middle of the 7th century.

By that time, the kingdom had already disappeared. The city was governed by high officials elected for a year (archons) but important decisions were made by a group called a *bull*, a council composed of old officials, who chose candidates for the archonship. Society was

divided into four classes according to property (citizens were classified according to income), of which the first group had a monopoly on magistracy.

The noble landowners (eupatrides), greedy and cruel, exploited the peasants on one hand and clashed in the city with the numerous, artisans and merchants on the other. However, this social crisis led to political evolution. Draco the legislator, who was put in charge (621) of issuing laws, mercilessly punished transgressions. In the year 592, the archon Solon, who was put in charge of resolving the incessant conflicts, carried out a goal through reforms: he abolished debt slavery, canceled debts, lowered the census and - according to Aristotle - even allowed others and third parties to be elected as archons. The remaining reforms probably date from a later period. The aristocratic bull, whose jurisdiction was limited to special cases of trials conducted at the Areopagus, gradually transferred power to the new bull of four hundred members, appointed according to the tribes, who elected ten archons, one from each tribe. The popular court of the heliiae ('who sit in the sun') was established to receive appeals against the decisions of the magistrates, who gradually left the administration of justice to the heliiae. (Heli=Ilil=il il, "Il vrn-il grm", R.I.) (Хелил=Илил=ил ил, „Ил врне- ил грме”, Р.И.)

The Athenians were not satisfied with this compromise for long. They began to argue about participation in the magistracies and about land issues. These struggles led to the establishment of the tyranny of Peisistratus (561-510), which established social progress by promoting economic development.

The Greek people, without any help created a deep original civilization. Its social organization forced some of its people to migrate and eventually spread Hellenic culture far and wide. But by the 6th century, the city-states on the coast had almost achieved political equilibrium. The craftsmen and the merchants now enjoyed enough freedom in Greece, that this small mountainous country began to dominate the

economy of the Mediterranean. Yet the fruitful course of Hellenism: temple, sculpture, lyric poetry and political discussion can be better explained by a sharp and free Greek spirit than by the accumulation of wealth.

Without Hellenism, whose concept of Helen originated from Thessaly, a neighbour of Macedonia:

Robert Graves, <sup>31</sup> under 38. Deucalion's Flood, writes: "9. Deucalion's son Helen gave the name to the entire Hellenic race (see 43, b); the name indicates that he was a royal envoy to the moon priestess Hela or Helena, or Selene, the goddess of the Moon, and according to Pausanias (III, 20, 6) the first tribe called Hellenes originated in Thessaly, where the goddess Hela was revered (see 70, 8)".

The name Hellenes came from Thessaly. So the Hellenes could not have been Hellenes.

Everything that was in Hellas follows, everything was a legacy from the Eastern Mediterranean.

### *"Progress to the West, the Rise of Italy (12th-6th centuries)*

The end of the 13th century represented a standstill only for Italy and southeastern Europe, which were devastated by invasions from the north. Otherwise, the Bronze Age with its masterpieces in weapon making was still ongoing. Iron came into use during the 8th century in central Europe and the 5th century in Great Britain and Scandinavia, areas that seemed to be in decline due to the wetter climate.

Movements. Moving became easier because the horse began to be used and it resembled military campaigns.

The culture, which we call 'urn fields' from the grave artifacts (located first in Hungary), spread throughout Europe but it seems that some

---

<sup>31</sup> Robert Graves, Grčki mitovi, Prva knjiga, Neolit • Belgrade, 1974.

population movements at that time were directed towards France and Spain (9th-8th centuries) and towards Great Britain (7th century).

The first Iron Age civilization was Hallstatt (a necropolis in Austria). It originated in the area north of the Eastern Alps (8th century). That civilization was ruled by a military aristocracy. To develop their iron metallurgy, they established themselves in areas in present-day France, Poland and Yugoslavia and placed them under their rule, this is where their tumuli were found.”

Since cattle, horses, etc. had Balkan origins which the people migrating northward took with them, the Europeans had Balkan origins. On the other hand, since the blood group A arose from smallpox that arose from the plague of cattle, which did not exist outside the Balkans, the Europeans would have had only the original blood group O. So it was they, like the Mongolian Indians, who would have died out from smallpox by 95%.

The migrations took place along the Vardar- Morava- Danube- Rhine..., where the climate was warmer.

Domestic cattle in Europe belonged to the Brigians=Phrygians, from whom the Friesian originated. The Viking symbol was a brig with small horns painted on top of its head.

“Phoenicians and Greeks in the Mediterranean. These two rival peoples equally tried to cross the sea routes leading to the mining areas (Tuscany, the Central Massif, Andalusia) from one end to the other. According to tradition, the Phoenicians seemed to have founded their colonies as early as the beginning of the 12th century but, according to the current situation, their priority over the Greeks was not proven by anything.”

Pavel Tulayev, <sup>32</sup> on p. 7, wrote: “The Greek literary tradition, which reaches back to Homer and Hesiod (8th century B.C.), has preserved

---

<sup>32</sup> Pavel Tulayev, Veneti, Pešić i sinovi, Belgrade, 2004.

much information about the Enetoi, whose name is linked to the legendary Aeneas, the hero of the Trojan War. The most complete information about this hero was found in the Iliad, where it is said that ‘the leader of the Trojans was Aeneas, a descendant of the ancient royal family of Dardanus’. Aeneas was Aphrodite’s favourite son. Aphrodite was Zeus’s daughter, who conceived Aeneas with the hero Anchises, on ‘the wooded heights of Mount Ida, rich in spacious valleys, not far from Troy... The genealogical message was firmly connected to Aeneas and thus received literary impetus in the work of the Roman poet Virgil (70-19 B.C.)... (V + eneto, R.I.) (B + енет, Р.И.)

The existence of the ancient tribe, the Veneti, was confirmed by historians and geographers of that time. One of the first testimonies is found in Herodotus (5th century B.C.) in the seventh book of his multi-volume ‘History’. He mentioned the port city of Aeneas,<sup>33</sup> in Macedonia, and in the first book he described the custom of selling brides that was common among the Illyrian Aeneids.<sup>34</sup> They were known for their beauty even at the time of Helen of Troy.”

The Phoenicians were associated with the so-called Olympian gods, one of whom was Poseidon, god of the seas.

“The best lands were occupied during the 8th century: the Greeks founded Syracuse, Zancle, Cumae and the Tyrrhenian regions and stopped migrating just before the Etruscan’s camp (around 700). The Phoenicians in the Maghreb (northern Africa) founded Carthage<sup>35</sup> (around 725, not 814/13) and opened trading posts on the way to the

---

<sup>33</sup> According to Stefan Byzantium, “Rakalos (Ράκηλος) is a city in Macedonia. Rakalos was located northwest of Aenea, today it is a suburb of Solun”. (V + Eneti = Veneti, R.I.) Солун”.(B + Енети = Венети, Р.И.)

<sup>34</sup> Herodotus, under I-196, writes: “The customs are like this. The most reasonable custom, in my opinion, and which, as I learn, the Illyrian Eneti also have...”. Aelian (3rd century AD) writes: “the Illyrian Brigi”.

<sup>35</sup> Carthage=karta gina: karta in Brigid=brsjachki- in it wine is brought for all the guests present to drink...Carter collector of water...; Woman=Gena=Gina...with uterus; Carthage only collected water.

Pillars of Hercules: Malta, Utica, Nora (Sardinia), Motya (Sicily), finally Gadir (today's Cadiz) in Tarshish (the state of Tartessos) in southern Spain. In the 7th century, the Hellenes completed their explorations of the western Mediterranean and acquired trade along the Adriatic Sea (amber), which allowed them to come into contact with the inhabitants of northern Italy and Central Europe. The decline of Tyre, which (in the 7th century) was sacked by the Assyrians and (in the 6th century) besieged by the Babylonians, enabled Carthage to gain supremacy over the Phoenician outposts in the West, as it was the only one capable of defending them from the Greeks. In the 6th century, the Semites crossed the Atlantic Ocean to obtain Cornish tin and Sudanese gold. With the help of the Etruscans, the Semites forced the Greeks to retreat to the western Mediterranean and settle for Marseilles (at the crossroads of the roads through the French mainland, the Rhone valley and the Aude). Three peoples controlled the Mediterranean trade: the Greeks, the Phoenicians and the Etruscans but Greek civilization spread the most. Therefore, excavations of the modest Tyrian settlements revealed that these merchants bought and sold mainly Hellenic products.

Awakening of Italy. The peninsula and plain of the Po River were still covered with forests and marshes, which were occasionally flooded by the rivers. During the 1st millennium B.C., peoples who continued to migrate settled in Italy. The Indo-Europeans came from central Europe in several waves and the Illyrians crossed the Adriatic Sea to conquer Apulia and Pisenum. Invasions in the 13th century destroyed the coastal fortifications, built under the influence of the Mycenaeans. But connections were established very quickly in the ports of the roads that crossed the Mediterranean from east to west. The Greeks and Phoenicians established their colonies and outposts on the Italian coast around the 8th century. Influence from these advanced foreigners was reflected in the entire colony but a real change began to appear in Tuscany.

Etruscans. Shortly before 700, the Italian Villanovan culture (a necropolis near Bologna, c. 1000-c. 700), known for its biconical urns containing ashes, replaced the tombs containing precious Greek and Oriental objects. As the geometric style of the Villanovans was abandoned, vases were decorated with images of wild animals and monsters. A new pottery, black bucchero, appeared imitating bronze shapes. Cities were built. Architects, who introduced the use of arches, vaults and domes to Italy, created an urban plan based on two roads intersecting at right angles. Cultivating and irrigating the land improved agriculture. Mines were increasingly exploited. Tuscan merchants sold their bucchero vases and bronze tripods on land and by sea, as far as Athens. Under the influence of Archaic Greece, a great art emerged in the 6th century: sculpture, terracotta and wall painting.

The material found is still the main source of our information. It was only at the time when this civilization was dying out (1st century B.C.) that Roman writers began to speak of the people of that area, the Tusci or Etruscans (those who called themselves Raseni; the Greeks called them Tyrrhenians). In Tuscany, the script, borrowed from the Greeks around 700 (the time of the Marsilian alphabet?), was poorly used and this is the reason why we lack the material to decipher the few Etruscan religious texts, whose language is not similar to any language known today. Therefore, the origin of the Raseni remains unknown. For a long time, Herodotus believed that they came from Asia Minor. But the oriental character of their art can be explained quite well by their connections with the Phoenicians and the Greeks. Today it is believed that the wealth of this area and contact with foreigners were enough for the natives to create this new civilization.

The Etruscan language is Pelasgian = so-called Slavic, confirmed by so-called Slavic authors.

“The Tyrrhenian pantheon seems to be composed of many local gods and heroes sometimes borrowed from the Greeks. In that pantheon, the

triad stands out: Tinia (god of thunder), <sup>36</sup> Uni (his wife - Roman Juno) and Menerva (classical Minerva). Divination was performed by special people, haruspices, who divined according to the victim's entrails (especially according to the liver), according to the flight of birds and lightning. The Etruscans created a dodecupola (a group of twelve major cities, whose common sanctuary was in Voltumni, probably near Vulturnum). But the kings of individual cities pursued a policy of personal prestige. In the 7th century, the Etruscans occupied the Latin towns from where they controlled the roads leading to the rich plain of Campania, where they founded another dodecapolis. In the 6th century they began to spread across the Apennines, towards the plain of the Po River. Their trade, which was as developed as that of Marseilles, carried beautiful Etruscan or Greek vases as far as Burgundy (crater of Vix, c. 500) and into southern Germany.

Latins and Romans. The Tyrrhenians introduced their neighbours and vassals to urban civilization. Thus the small Latin people with an Indo-European language, thanks to the appearance of merchants and the conqueror Campanius, acquired great wealth (treasure trove of tombs from Preneste, 7th century) and became acquainted with writing (c. 600). But the Latin towns (Tiber, Preneste, Lanuvium) completely fell into the shadow with the rise of Rome, which only recently began to develop.

The Indians were dark, the Europeans white but their language was that of the Whites.

“Myths about the rise of Rome were known during the 1st century B.C. which were then documented during the 1st century A.D. by Roman writers and historians, the likes of Titus Livius and the poet Virgil. Fleeing the destroyed city, the Trojans, under the leadership of Aeneas, came to Latium where they found Lavinium. Aeneas' son founded Alba, whose kings, his successors, ruled the Latin cities. The heirs of

---

<sup>36</sup> The Etruscans worshipped Perun (thunder...) - and so did the Russians. The Etruscans and the Russians were Veneti with their own runes.



that dynasty, the sons of the god Mars, the twins Romulus and Remus, were thrown into the Tiber but a she-wolf saved and fed them. Romulus, who was chosen by lot, built the city of Rome on the Palatine Hill near that place (according to tradition, 753). The city, which received the Sabians and annexed the defeated Albanians, was ruled by seven kings before the republic was founded. Until the arrival of the fifth king, the Etruscan Tarquinius the Elder (616, according to tradition, and around 550, according to more recent data), only myths circulated in Rome.

- Excavations carried out in the 20th century revealed very modest beginnings. Around 750, the first huts appeared on the western slope of Palatine, i.e. the first village. Then small settlements (Esquiline, Caelian, Velia, Viminal, Quirinal, Palatual – appeared in the eastern part of Palatine) sprang up on the neighbouring hills. The soil in that land was average. But that position was dominated by the main crossroads of central Italy, here the road passed over the Tiber, intersected with the road that led from Etruria to Campania and the river was crossed by boat. The appearance of Corinthian, Ionic and Attic vases in the graves of the 7th century testify to the development of trade and the relative enrichment of the inhabitants of these coasts. Their villages, united in the union of the ‘Seven Coasts’ (Septimontium), fell under the rule of the Etruscans, who settled here around 550, and founded a real city and kingdom. And thus began the history of Rome.

Most of Europe was still occupied by migrating soldiers, while Italy had acquired an urban civilization. Greek and Phoenician merchants, who founded many cities on the coast of the western Mediterranean, helped the inhabitants of Tuscany to develop their cultural to a higher level.

### *Feudal China from the 11th to the 6th century*

Western branch of the Zhou dynasty (1027-771). The Shang dynasty, which ruled northern China, was overthrown in 1027 by the ruler of the border region of Wei, the founder of the royal house of Zhou (1027-256/249 B.C.). Content with the appropriation of the border region, the

victor divided the territory of the defeated king into the younger branches of the Shang and Zhou dynasties. The extravagance and human sacrifice (on the occasion of royal and feudal feasts), which had characterized this brilliant civilization of the second millennium, gradually died out. Inscribed vases, reduced to geometric ornamentation, became rare. But writing no longer served only religion and magic. Scribes composed the first 'classics' (8th-6th centuries) which inform us about the institutions and events of the Zhou period.

It seems that the foundation of the new dynasty, which probably came from a semi-barbaric region, directed the development of Chinese culture. The supreme god of the Shang dynasty became Nebo, whose figure was not made, but who had a palace in the south with its altar, a round three-story elevation, without any symbols. The material for divination was changed. Bones were replaced with twigs from a plant, which were thrown in bundles, and the shapes that they made on the ground were observed and interpreted. The ruler, who was said to have been 'authorized by heaven' to rule, possessed, through his six ministers, elements of the central administration. On the other hand, he found himself at the head of a feudal system with an established hierarchy, which was made up of courtiers and heirs of the Shang era ruling families. The distinction between nobles and commoners was clearly established. The nobles, who were lords of the land or poor horsemen, could only perform rituals and administrative functions. Only they were allowed to have ancestors (grandfathers who were descended from Heaven) with whom they, with their descendants, ensured the cult's continuity. The peasants could only hope for an uncertain afterlife in the world of the 'Nine Darkesses'. Tied to the land, they formed a community that freely disposed of its harvest, since it had previously ensured the maintenance of the lord's court for a certain period.

Eastern branch of the Zhou dynasty and the 'elders' (8th-6th centuries). The settled population, expanding northwards, came into conflict with the pastoral tribes of Mongolia. In the year 771, members of the Xian-

yun tribe (future Xiong-nu?) attacked and killed King Yeu in Wei, his capital. His successor, Ping, established himself in a less exposed area, in Lo-yi (Honan), where he founded the Eastern Zhou dynasty (770-256), which quickly began to decline. Dividing the country, the kings soon reduced their power to a small area and retained the status of religious heads of China. The royals created a special class of captives who were freed by ransom. A crowd of slaves participated in gaining victories over the barbarians. A masterpiece of chronicled literature was composed in the Spring and Autumn (722-481) but did not survive because of the conflicts during that epoch. A barbarian people from Mana (middle reaches of the Blue River) began to engage in agriculture in permanent settlements, they established writing and founded the principality of Chu,<sup>37</sup> during which time one of the chiefs appointed himself king (704). The expansion of that state led to the concentration of the Chinese principality around a temporary leader whom historians designated by the Greek name hegemon. This office was assigned to prince Qi in Shan-tung (680-643), prince Qin in Shan-si (643-573) and finally to prince Ts-in in Shen-si. The heirs of the old region of Chu, advanced westward and reached Lan-chew on the Yellow River.

Relations with the West became increasingly important during the 7th century. Caravans that set out from Lanzhou, the end points of the waterway, reached India and Iran, where they brought a Chinese specialty, silk. At that time, Chinese craftsmanship was influenced by the art of the steppes and by the return of the technique of the Shang era. This was the Hu style, or 'late Chou' (starting around 600), which was characterized by malachite and turquoise inlay, with gold and silver decorations for mirrors, buttons and bronze vases. Relief (animals in a realistic style that served as vase lids) and sculpture (horses and soldiers) were developed.

---

<sup>37</sup> The white race took the Brighid=Brsjak dative u to India (Manu, Meru...Zebu), China (Batu Khan...), Japan white race Ainu + v + l + k = vlakinu (vlai)- vlaking, dragging..., hairy Whites.

The China of the Chou dynasty, slightly larger than the China of the Shang dynasty, continued their civilization, swept away by a new spirit of moderation. Nevertheless, the idea of royal power rising for personal gain - that idea that had been destroyed since the 8th century - began to reappear again in every great principality and everything was ready for the outbreak of a crisis in Chinese society.

*Civilization without writing in Asia and America from the 12th to the 6th century*

India and the Aryans. In contrast to China, where literature was in full swing, India was still in the stage of oral tradition. In the 1st millennium B.C., a great variety of cultures reigned from the Paleolithic to the Chalcolithic Era. The center of innovation by now was growing in the Ganges region in Shoti Nagyupuru. At the end of the 2nd millennium, a copper civilization appeared there and its development ended with the foundation of fortified cities around the 6th century. There is an attempt to attribute the emergence of this civilization to the Aryans, founders of Indo-European origin, for whom it is still unknown when they came to India. They did not know writing until the 3rd century B.C. but their sacred texts, the Vedas (Knowledge), transmitted by oral tradition, originated from ancient times. These religious texts and later collections of legends gave us some knowledge about the Aryans. Warlike farmers, divided into rival clans, the Aryans had no technical advantage over the inhabitants whose land they conquered. The Rig Veda (Knowledge of Hymns) was composed in the Punjab. Their society consisted of three classes: nobles (rajas), priests (brahmans, a neuter word denoting a ritual formula), who showed respect for numerous gods (Varun, Mithra, Indra, Nazatia or Ashvin, etc.) and farmers (vaishya). When the Aryans reached the banks of the Ganges, the Brahmins composed three other Vedas: Samaveda (ritual melody), Yujurveda (ritual formula) and Atharvaveda (magic formula). Their religion, Vedism, which seems to have constantly absorbed pre-Aryan elements, would transform into Brahmanism, the nature of which would be precisely determined in the era of the great movement of religious search in the 6th-5th centuries.

At the time of their arrival on the banks of the Ganges, the Aryans founded a kingdom or aristocratic confederation, whose center of gravity shifted from west to east. Their society was divided into castes: brahmins, soldiers (kshatriya), farmers and foreign servants (shudra)".<sup>38</sup> (Same Vedic Krishna, Egyptian Horus and Sclavonian in the Balkans Hora, R.I.) (Исто ведска Кришна, египетски Хорус и склавински на Балканот Хора, Р.И.)

In Sanskrit the singular m, s, t like the Brsjak: I am, you are, he et=it.

The white race, during the ice age, was withdrawn into the Levant. Everything that did not withdraw, froze. Then the whites from the Eastern Mediterranean reached India, China and Japan. Since the flora and fauna of India had no connection with that of the white race, there were never any Indo-Europeans but only white whites and dark Indians. India was connected with South Africa - Blacks and Indians of the same origin.

“From Asia towards Oceania. Although there was no substantial progress in the civilization of Southeast Asia and the archipelago that belonged to it, migration nevertheless continued: from Burma to the Deccan came the population of the Neolithic Brahmagiri civilization. From the Philippine Islands to New Caledonia (in the 8th century) came a population that knew how to process ceramics.”

“Beginning of the great civilization in America. • The inhabitants of the eastern United States of America and those in the Mississippi plains, during the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium, reached a cultural stage that would never be surpassed: textiles, pottery and processing of natural copper.

• In Mesoamerica (Mexico and Central America) the villages that appeared in the 2nd millennium stood out. Their craftsmen produced zoomorphic ceramics. These objects were made of carved jade, often representing a divine jaguar that brought rain. Then there were statues

---

<sup>38</sup> Caste=caste=house=house=house=house ta-namen ki with v-n-t: casva-casna-kasta/kućva-kućna-kućta

with frowning expressions in the body of a child, which were thought to be Olmec (an ancient people from the Gulf of Mexico). Around the 7th-6th centuries, religious centers (Cuicuilco in the Valley of Mexico, Mont-Alban in the state of Oaxaca, La Venta in the state of Tabasco) and pyramids (structures of capped pyramids on the upper surface of which there was an altar) began to spring up. Then writing and the calendar appeared in the Olmec country but this system we have not been able to decipher.

- There are assumptions that Mesoamerica influenced Peru with its cultural development at the end of the 2nd millennium, when maize and potato cultivation, lama husbandry and the cult of the jaguar began. It was the Chavina civilization (a place in the Monza Valley) which invented goldsmithing and built pyramid temples.

The main feature of the zones that ran along the coast of the Indian and Pacific Oceans was the dynamism and originality of the civilization that arose almost without any outside influence and which, in vast spaces, represented isolated islands.”

## **HEIRS OF THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN World in the Greek Age <sup>39</sup>**

### **Persians and Greeks in the second half of the 6th century B.C.**

#### *“Persian Empire*

Rise of the Persian Empire. In the middle of the 6th century B.C. there were two empires in Western Asia that arose after the collapse of Assyria: the Babylonian in Mesopotamia and the kingdom of the Medes, which stretched from the Iranian plateau to central Anatolia. Persia itself at that time was a kingdom state within the Median Empire to which it paid tribute. In the year 550, Cyrus II the Great, leader of the Persian party, deposed Astyages the Median ruler from the throne and

---

<sup>39</sup> This is the title in the encyclopedia. However, the terms Greece, Greeks and Greek were never used.

founded a new Persian dynasty, the Achaemenids. The new king then began a policy of conquest. He first set out for Asia Minor. Croesus (560-c. 547/546), who had brought the kingdom of Lydia to flourish, sought help from Egypt, Babylon and Sparta; but since Cyrus had defeated him in the open field, he escaped to Sardis and was forced to surrender. Lydia was annexed by the Persian Empire and soon the Greek cities of Ionia were also subjugated. By 540, the empire extended along the whole of Asia Minor to the coast of the Aegean Sea. Cyrus then attacked Babylon, captured the city (539) and quickly brought the entire Babylonian Empire under his rule. Cyrus continued to wage war until his death (529). He attacked eastern Iran, strengthening his eastern borders, and conquered the markets in the steppes of central Asia. His son Cambyses (529/528-522 or 521) continued Cyrus's conquests. He carefully prepared a campaign and easily conquered Egypt in 525. After him, several pretenders fought for power and these unrests brought the empire almost to ruin. Darius I (521-486), a distant relative of Cambyses, managed to impose himself, but was forced to cooperate with the nobility that had brought him to power. Under his leadership, the Persian conquests were moderated in the east and after a campaign prepared by the Greek Scylax, the Persian Empire was annexed to the region of the lower Indus. In the west, having crossed the Bosphorus, Darius conquered Thrace, but he did not succeed in annexing the Scythian kingdom. The Persian Empire, which then reached its greatest extent, became the largest state in the ancient world. (Perseus...to Persia- Herodotus..., R.I.) (Персеј...до Персија- Херодот..., Р.И.)

About the Persian Empire. The Persian king inherited the established habits of the great rulers of the East. Thus the absolute monarchy whose power was based on the will of the gods. But in that empire the different peoples and religions of the Persian rulers wisely invoked the gods of individual regions (in Persia to Akhur-Mazda; in Babylon to Marduk; in Egypt to Amun), thereby creating religious tolerance that contributed to the strengthening of the empire. The sacred character of the royal figures was expressed in the luxurious palaces in the capital

cities of the empire (Ecbatane, Pasagrade, Persepolis, Susa, Babylon and Sardis), as well as in the traditions that surrounded it (prostration). Darius organized his empire in an exemplary manner. Taking into account the diverse population, he divided it into vast territorial units of satrapies: <sup>40</sup> at the head of each satrapy was a governor with broad powers and with him a general who commanded the army. The ruler regularly supervised their work through his overseers, who were the 'royal eyes and ears', and strengthened the unity of the empire by building roads used by his envoys and caravans (the royal road) from Susa to Sardis, 2400 km. Such an arrangement allowed the Persian kingdom to accumulate enormous wealth and thus to have at its disposal immense financial resources for that era, and this allowed them to support a very large army. But, despite the minting of old money (darica), trade remained within the borders of the empire. The precious metals served the needs of the army and diplomats. The Persian army consisted of infantry from regularly settled farmers and an excellent cavalry, whose personnel were recruited from among the nomadic herders. As for the fleet, it was made up of crews from Phoenician ships.

Among the Persian rulers, royal power was identified with the concept of justice: the king was the protector of the weak, the guardian of order and responsible for the well-being of his subjects. In fact, the power of the nobility, often capricious, and the size of the empire limited royal absolutism.

The Persian civilization. The Achaemenid Empire, as created by Cyrus, Darius and Cambyse consisted of an original core - Iran - and the conquered lands. In terms of their population, natural resources and culture, these countries represented a very different whole. Under the direct supervision of the Great Kings, the inhabitants of Iran enjoyed privilege; exempt from duties, they paid reduced taxes; in return, the

---

<sup>40</sup> Area of Persian satrapy, on the Koine theme and on the popular barbarian = Pelasgian language Sclavina.



bulk of the imperial army was recruited from their ranks. The nomadic sheep and horse breeders, the Medes and Persians, retained their old tribal organizations, headed by hereditary elders. These elders constituted a real nobility, strong and protective of their freedom. The peasant population, tied to the land, was much more submissive to its leadership.

Primarily of Indo-European origin, the Median and Persian cultures flourished between the 6th and 4th centuries. They were, therefore, openly opposed to the culture of the various countries within the Achaemenid Empire, which retained their own cultures, most often of Semitic origin. This explains why, starting from the common foundation of other Eastern peoples, the Persians created an extraordinarily original religion. Like all Indo-Europeans, they worshiped the natural elements: air, earth, water, light, etc., but like the inhabitants of Mesopotamia they believed in the existence of many good and evil spirits. At the same time, they also worshiped individualized deities, such as Mithra, the god of the Sun, Anahita, the goddess of spring and fertility, and Akhur-Mazda, the god of light. The latter was especially revered. The Persians did not build temples to him because his cult was celebrated on altars under the open sky. In the middle of the 6th century (?) the sage Zarathustra tried to reform Mazdaism in order to create a monotheistic religion from it. The reform failed and the Persians remain polytheistic; nevertheless, they continued to honour Akhur-Mazda more than the other gods. From the teachings of Zoroastrianism, the belief that the world was the arena of a struggle between two deities, the god of good Ormuzd, the Wise Lord, and the god of evil Ahriman, for the soul, has been preserved. People were mixed up in this struggle. The fate of each person depended on his or her behaviour and participation in the struggle for the victory of Ormuzd. Hence, their true moral exaltation originated and it was likely that honourable people would be admitted to the kingdom of heaven after death.

With the exception of a few sacred records, we have no other evidence of the intellectual life of the Persian Empire. That life was nevertheless active; it seems that the Persians themselves did not create much, but they gladly hired scientists, doctors and foreign architects, especially from Greece and India. On the other hand, Persian art, which was actually Doric art, left behind many traces: palaces or royal tombs that owed much to the previous civilizations of Mesopotamia.

Thus, the Persians were at the same, if not a higher level of culture than the Greeks at the moment when they became entangled in the Greco-Persian wars.

### *The Greek world*

At the time when the Persian kings founded their empire, the Greek world found itself in a great crisis. Political and social unrest tore apart their cities, starting from the western colonies and all the way to continental Greece.

Political development in the cities. In Magna Graecia, there was political and economic rivalry between the cities; while in the rich city of Sybaris, the democratic party triumphed, until the aristocracy, aided by the Pythagorean sects, mastered the city of Croton. Croton destroyed its rival in 510 but, exhausted by the struggle, was forced to cede the primacy to Tarentum.

In Sicily, the people were ruled by tyrants who were fighting against the Carthaginians and Etruscans. The Etruscans united their forces against the Greek peoples who, like in Marseilles, were fighting for the supremacy of trade in the western Mediterranean (naval battle of Alalia, between 540 and 535). However, despite the danger that threatened them, the Greeks continued to fight amongst themselves and these discords hindered their unification.

Two cities began to rise in mainland Greece: Sparta and Athens.

- Sparta was ruled by a strict aristocratic and military regime since ancient times. The regime became even stricter in the middle of the 6th century under the leadership of Chilo. The Spartan state now took on the appearance of a strictly military community. Each citizen was assigned a property, *kleros*, which was cultivated by slaves or *heiliots*, in order to enable him to live and equip himself for the service of the state. Raised in a military spirit from his seventh year, the Spartan remained in his unit until the age of 60.

In principle, power was in the hands of the citizens; it was actually in the competence of the council (*gerousia*) of 30 members (28 *geronites* and 2 kings) who proposed 5 *ephors* to the assembly by citizens. They were elected for one year during which time they held executive power. Chilo's reform attempted to maintain the power of the Spartan aristocracy, inhibiting the political and social development of the city. It provided Sparta with unparalleled military power but at the same time, by limiting the rights of the city, it prevented the unification of Greece. Sparta had by then finished its conquests and would in the future be content only with imposing its alliances on neighbouring cities.

- In Athens, the Draconian and Solonian reforms helped the people throw off the yoke of the nobility (*eupatrida*) but the implementation of these measures led to conflicts. Unrest gave way to the ambitious nobleman *Pisistratus*, who placed himself at the head of fifty men armed with maces (561-560). As an all-powerful tyrant, he ruled from 560 to 528 despite being forced into exile twice. By pursuing a policy of force, he satisfied the national pride and commercial interests of the Athenians: he finally captured *Salamis*, secured Athens' supremacy over *Delos* (the sacred city) and colonized the coast of the *Bosphorus* and the *Dardanelles* leading to the *Black Sea* (a trade route for wine, oil, and pottery). He also helped the small peasantry by granting them loans at low interest and appointing judges who traveled in the interior; instructing this peasantry to improve themselves in the production of oil and wine, i.e. those products that gave a higher yield than grain and were sold abroad more easily; he began the construction of large

buildings by employing city workers (Eneacronus, a fountain with nine pipes; the aqueduct; temples of Hecatompedos [100 feet] and Olympeion). He was succeeded by his two sons, Hippias and Hipparchus, but in 510 the city expelled the tyrants.

In the rest of Greece and Sicily, tyrants were still in charge of many cities (Panaitius in Leontini, Phalaris in Argigen, Cleisthenes in Sicyon, Cypselus in Corinth, Theagenes in Megara [late 7th and early 6th century], Lygdamus in Naxos and Polycrates in Samos [second half of the 6th century]). The tyrants maintained good relations with each other and, like Pisistratus, led a policy of internal and external greatness. In general, Pisistratus protected the people from the nobility. In Athens, after the fall of the tyrants, the nobles thought that the hour of their revenge had come; but one of them, Callisthenes (between 508 and 506), introduced a new order. He classified all citizens into ten phyla, regardless of their origin. Thus, with this reform, he freed the citizens from class control, allowing them to be equal citizens. Each phylum, consisting of ten demi (territorial and fiscal unit), provided magistrates, archons and a certain contingent of soldiers. In this way, it directly participated in the conduct of general affairs. With his reform, Cleisthenes finally established a democratic regime in Athens and, according to tradition, prevented the return of tyranny, it seems that he introduced ostracism, which allowed any citizen considered dangerous to the state to be sent into exile for 10 years.

At the end of the 6th century, the Greek world, unable to unite despite a common faith and culture, was threatened from all sides; in the west were the Carthaginians and Etruscans and in the east was the expansionist Persian Empire.

Greek culture on the eve of the Persian Wars. But at a time when Greece clashed with the Persians, Greek culture had reached its peak. A characteristic of the classical age: order and clarity, a sense of harmony was already coming to the fore. Everything seemed to be available to people. The first philosophical systems appeared: gradually separating

itself from religion. Its creators began to turn to matters that expressed fundamental elements that lay beneath the apparent. In this alone, they marked a significant advance in the field of knowledge. Such people were Thales of Miletus, who was already able to calculate the journey of the stars and was considered the true founder of geometry, and his students Anaximander and Anaximenes. Heraclitus built his own doctrine of constant change and the origin of the world, while Pythagoras of Samos established a school in Croton. Scientists and artists easily traveled from place to place and settled in any Greek city in the East or the West. But the two great centers of culture remained Ionia and Athens. Faith inspired artistic life: temples from then on were built of stone on the basis of two architectural styles : the Doric style, very mathematical in its harmonic accuracy, and the Ionic style, less severe but more graceful and elegant. The influence of Ionia was particularly evident in sculpture, where the old and austere statues were replaced by statues of girls (kora) and youths (kouros) of more slender and graceful lines. Decorative moderation and pottery also changed. Athenian pottery suppressed the competing wares made by Corinthian workshops on the market. This success can be partly explained by the progress of Athens in the era of Peisistratus (the rise of agriculture, the export of oil and wine). The technique of painting clay with black figures on a red ground replaced the technique of red figures on a black ground. At that time, Athens reached perfection in the field of clay painting.

On the other hand, the luxurious life of the tyrants developed a desire for splendor and theatrical performances. The ruler formed a circle of poets and sages around him, such as Anacreon, who was in favour with both Polycrates of Samos and Hipparchus of Athens. At the tyrant's request, the great religious festivals took on a more solemn appearance. Pisistratus confirmed the order of the processions during the great Panathenaea, and a great musical performance was organized; at such a public recitation, Homer's text took on the form that has survived to this day. As for the great Dionysian festivities, they were the beginning

of a new branch of art that awaited a great future - theaters. (Dionysus = dianis = dianish = pianish-opi ...; opium, R.I.)

“(Дионис=дианис=дианиш=пианиш-опи...; опи-ум, Р.И.)

It was confirmed that the Iliad was the work of an Editorial Board during Pisistratus's time.

## **The Mediterranean and Middle Eastern worlds during the Age of Classical Greece**

### *“Persian Wars and Their First Consequences*

Two Persian Wars. Revolt of the Asian Greeks. The Greek cities in Ionia had already fallen under Persian rule. The damage suffered as a result was enormous. Their trade declined after Persia captured Egypt and the Moreus, only because their rivals, the Phoenicians, found themselves under the protection of the Persians. Moreover, Darius imposed heavy taxes on the Asian Greeks and, against the will of the Ionians, supported the rule of tyrants in their cities. In Miletus, the democratic party, rose up against the foreign supreme power, forced the tyrant Aristagoras to abdicate and called upon the people to fight against the conqueror. The other cities followed this example; the Ionians, seeking help from all the Greeks, rose up and expelled the Persians and the tyrants who collaborated with them (499). Only Erythraea and Athens sent an expeditionary corps, which in 498, captured and burned Sardis. But after the Greeks withdrew, the Ionians could no longer resist the Persian onslaught. In 494, Miletus was captured and destroyed and its inhabitants were displaced. In doing so, they abandoned their Asian brothers. The Greeks showed great inconsistency and misunderstood the danger they faced from the Persians. Having defeated the Ionians, Darius invaded Greece.

Darius' campaign and the first Persian war. At the beginning of the attack from Asia only Athens, at the instigation of the archon Themistocles, took action... In the summer of 490 B.C., the Persian army, which sailed from the port of Asia Minor, captured Naxos,

burned the Eritrean pass and landed on the field of Marathon, northeast of Athens. Under the leadership of Miliad, the Athenian army, taking advantage of a Persian tactical blunder, dealt a final blow to the enemy infantry. Darius' attempt ended in failure, which had a painful echo in the empire.

Second Persian War. After Darius (486/485) died, Egypt revolted and then Babylon. Xerxes established order and, in order to take revenge on Athens, made great military preparations (created food reserves, concentrated troops), as well as diplomatic ones (concluded an alliance with Carthage against the Western Greeks; provided support for the aristocratic movement in Greece; received favourable prophecies given to the Persians by deceived priests). In Greece, Athens and Sparta assumed control of the resistance movement and formed a league of 31 cities, with a reinforced and powerful fleet founded by Themistocles in Athens after 490. At first the war developed favourably for the Persians, when they defeated the Spartan army at Thermopylae, occupied central Greece, devastated Attica and burned Athens but the Athenian triremes soon completely destroyed the Persian fleet at Salamis (480). Greece was saved again. At the same time, the western Greeks, led by Gelon of Syracuse, defeated the Carthaginian forces at Chimera. Using their advantage, the Greeks defeated the Persian army at Plataea, and Xerxes' fleet at Cape Mycale (479)". (So there was never anything Greek but only Hellenic and Helladic, R.I.)

There was only eastern Hellas and western Greika: greik=grei ik-grei just come. Греика:греик=греи ик-греи само дојди.

"Creation of the Athenian Empire. Athens led the campaign against the Persians, with the aim of liberating the Aegean Sea and the Greek cities in Asia, and gathering around itself the maritime cities created the Delian League (477). Each allied city had to participate equally in military effort, but Athens very quickly emphasized its naval power and reputation, all the more so since it had acquired the right to command the army. It took over the common treasury, which was supplemented

by the allied cities. The Athenian Cimon defeated the Persian fleet and gave his city colonies, mines and trade routes (the route through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles). Angry with the Persians, Athens even intervened in Egypt (459). When the Delian League collapsed; the allies wanted to leave the alliance because they saw that it worked only in favour of the Athenians; Athens, however, kept them in the League by force. The other Greeks, the Spartans, and especially the Boeotians, viewed this rapid rise with hostility and then open war began. Athens' position quickly became critical. Pericles, Athens's new leader, began a struggle on two fronts, trying to establish peace. The Persians defeated the Athenian expeditionary force in Egypt (454) but Cimon won another naval victory in Cyprus, thus securing an honourable peace with Persia (the peace concluded by Callias at Susa, 449/448). Persia recognized the autonomy of the Greek cities in Asia and ceded the Aegean Sea to the Greek squadrons but retained Egypt and Cyprus. Faced with the other Greek cities, Athens, which followed the changing fortunes, had to wage an armed struggle; finally a thirty-year peace was concluded with Sparta (446); Athens no longer claimed the Peloponnese but retained Naupactus (for the inhabitants of Messina), Aegina and the other islands inhabited by cleruchii (military colonies). Sparta recognized the Delian League, which was led by Athens. This peace allowed Athens to take advantage of its victory and develop considerably.

### *Flourishing of Athens under Pericles*

Democracy. Pericles. For thirty years (457-429) one man, Pericles, dominated the political life of Athens. He very quickly became a symbol of its flourishing in the 5th century, which is called the Age of Pericles. He belonged to the Alcmaeonid family and received a comprehensive rationalist education from his teacher Anaxagoras of Clazomenae. Having acquired a wide culture, this famous orator was able to inspire people with his honesty and reasonable convincing arguments. Because of his humility, which inspired respect, he was called 'Olympian'. He did not receive any special title but between 443



and 429, because his reputation was so great, the people chose him as strategist every year, this way he remained in power for a long time. His ideal was to make Athens the power of Greece and, by developing and helping the democratic system function properly, ensuring a life of freedom and legal protection for all citizens. He joined forces with Ephialtes, who destroyed the authority of the Areopagus, depriving them of political and judicial power, in order to transfer them to the jurisdiction of the *bulla*, the *ecclesia* and the *heliia* (462/461). These reforms cause unrest. Ephialtes was assassinated in 457 but Pericles, with support from the people, managed to eliminate his main rivals using ostracism. His success meant victory for democracy, finally consolidating the principle of payment for public services (establishing *mystophoria* [compensation] in favour of the officials of the *heliia*, the *bulla*, the *prithans* and the *archons*, as well as those holding lower offices.

Democratic institutions in the 5th century were based on a popular assembly, the *ecclesia*, which had all the power. In fact, not all citizens were gathered on the Pnyx Hill. It was enough to have 6000 to adopt a major decision. The assembly met for its legislative work and ensured the continuity of power, a permanent assembly was established - the *bull*, which consisted of 500 members chosen by lot, 50 from each *phyle*. During the year, 50 members of the *bull* from each *phyle*, bearing the title of *prithan*, alternately ensured the continuity of power. The *bull* implemented laws, prepared draft laws and passed them on to the magistrates. Those among them who were responsible for implementing the decisions of the assembly and exercised executive power on behalf of the people, were subject to the control of the assembly which, naturally, was considerate of the people in whose hands any power was placed. They remained in that position for a year. In one place, several magistrates were appointed, of whom a certain number were chosen by lot, in order to avoid intrigues and part was left to the choice of the gods. Such was the case of ten *archonates* who were in charge of religious matters and some legal matters. When the

performance of their duty required knowledge of a technical nature, then magistrates were chosen; such was the case of ten strategoi who managed the army, the fleet and diplomacy. Justice divided the people. Every year, 6000 citizens were chosen by lot for the court of heliia. For each problem that needed to be solved, they were arranged in a section of 500 members. To cover its expenses, the state had limited funds (customs, fines, income from state goods), relieving itself of certain expenses at the expense of the richest citizens; this was a system of liturgy, which required funds to pay for equipment for the fleet (trihierarchy) or expenses that were required for large religious festivities.

Athens and the sea. However, Athens's expenses far exceeded its meager income. The city drew money from the common treasury of the Delian League. Namely, the Delian League very quickly turned into an Athenian maritime empire. The cities, until recently allies, now became subordinate. Athens managed the army, the fleet, diplomacy, collecting taxes, sometimes in a harsh manner and disposed of league money at its discretion. This imposed a democratic regime everywhere, even against the will of the inhabitants. Some cities rebelled (Samos, 440-439). Discontent arose everywhere. Athens established supervision over the empire, settling soldier-colonists (cleruchi) everywhere to whom it allocated the best land. They were located all along the trade routes (the grain route to the Black Sea). With the founding of Amphipolis in Thrace (436), ore and wood for shipbuilding were provided. In this way, Athens used all the institutions of the league exclusively for its own purposes. This brought her great prosperity but also hatred from her allies. Once an agricultural town, Athens became a major trading metropolis in just a few years. Attica itself was poor in agricultural products; due to water shortages, the plains were not irrigated sufficiently; sheep, goats and bees were raised on the slopes of the mountains; agricultural products did not satisfy the needs of the great city. The prosperity of Athens, therefore, depended on the sea. Ships supplied the city with both fish and grain imported from the Black Sea

coast. Weapons, pottery, fabrics and luxury items made in the city were exported. In this way, Piraeus remained a huge warehouse in which products from all over the world arrived and were re-exported from there. And finally, thanks to the silver mines of the Laurion hill, Athens minted excellent coins with the image of an owl, much sought after throughout the Mediterranean. (Piraeus from Pyrrhus, pirates, R.I.) (Пиреј од пир, пират-и, Р.И.)

Athenian society and culture in the age of Pericles. Social class.

Athenian democracy was limited. The citizens of Athens were actually a minority (one third or a quarter of the population). They, however, had economic and political advantages; they constituted the privileged class, which after 451-450 no one could join and citizenship could only be granted to those Athenians who were born of an Athenian father and mother. Under these conditions, politics of Athens became extremely selfish and was often dominated by demagogues who flattered this minority. However, Athens, wary of foreigners, allowed some of them - the Meteki - to settle permanently in the city. Protected by law, they had the same tax and military obligations as citizens. A small additional tax, the metoikion, marked their status as foreigners. Since they did not have the right to be landowners, they engaged in crafts and especially trade. Athens had to thank them for a good part of its wealth. And finally, a large part of the population of Attica was made up of slaves. As prisoners of war or children of slaves, they belonged to the state, private individuals, citizens, or to the Meteki. They were generally treated well. (Meteci + l = Venetians - island of Mljet like sun = elephant, R.I.) “(Метеци+л= Млетеци-острово Млет како сонце=слонце, Р.И.)

Since the Venetians spoke the so-called Slavic language, the same language was spoken in Athens. “A monumental framework of life. Athens suffered greatly from the Persian invasion. Its trade wealth and tribute, which it collected throughout the empire, enabled it to undertake great works for the development of the city. Pericles entrusted the execution of works to Phidias. The Acropolis became a

monumental and sacred building. The framework worthy of the Panathenaea, great ceremonial processions in honour of the goddess Athena, whose statue of ivory and gold was found in the Parthenon. This temple, unique in its plan and ornamentation, with its beauty and motifs of its sculptures, symbolized the triumph of the Greeks over the barbarians and the victory of order and reason over chaos. (With v-n-t Athens to Vatina-Natina-Tatina: from father, R.I.) (Со в-н-т АТИНА до ВАТИНА-НАТИНА-ТАТИНА: од татко, Р.И.)

Intellectual life. At that time, Athens experienced an extraordinary intellectual flourishing. Democracy encouraged the development of oratory. A small number of speeches from that time have been preserved but we know that Pericles was a great orator and that his period was above all the mastery of words. Democracy also encouraged the progress of dramatic art. Beautiful performances always attracted the Athenians and the Greek people in general. Organized at the expense of the richest according to the system of liturgy, dramatic competitions allowed the Athenians to choose the best authors whose works would be performed; the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides were crowned with fame. Even the poorest could attend the performances, thanks to the treasury from which the amount needed to pay for admission to the theater was obtained. As for the theater, in the 5th century it was a temporary building located on the slope of the Acropolis in Dionysius' playground. In Greece, intellectual work in all its forms was highly respected. Philosophy, which appeared in the 6th century, attracted the most intelligent people. Leucippus, and then Democritus, tried to understand the complexity of things and imagined that they were composed of infinitely small parts, atoms. Others, such as Protagoras, Gorgias or Prodicus of Ceos, called sophists because of their general knowledge, began to spread their idea of predictions to students. These philosophers were studied throughout the Greek world, but in the end, Athens reaped the fruits of this intellectual flowering. The attractiveness of the city was so great that all writers in the Greek language settled in Athens or stayed in it for a while, like the historian

Herodotus. (Herodotus = Herodotus = and genus = genus ot, v-n-t, R.I.)  
(Херодот=Иродот=и родот=род от, в-н-т, Р.И.)

But this prosperity and splendor was disturbed by unrest that led to Greece's ruin.

### *Political disintegration of the East*

Greece torn by war (end of 5th - beginning of 4th - 5th century B.C.). Peloponnesian War (431- 404). For almost thirty years, a merciless war was waged between Sparta and Athens. Athens, with its ambitions, finally threatened all the cities and aroused the hatred of the other coastal cities, especially Corinth. And Sparta, an oligarchic land city, was agitated and jealous of Athen's power. Athens, however, did nothing to calm this jealousy. On the contrary, Sparta developed its trade and empire by any means possible. In 433, Sparta helped Kerkyra, a Corinthian colony, in the war against her metropolis. In the year 433 or 432, Sparta tried to destroy her neighbour Magare, forbidding it access to the market and port that was under the control of Athens. Then Corinth managed to drag Sparta into a war that engulfed the entire Greek world, both at sea and on land. During the first ten years of the war, neither side won a decisive victory. The Spartans, skilled in land warfare, devastated Attica (431-425). At sea, the Athenians devastated the coast of the Peloponnese. However, besieged Athens was severely affected by an epidemic of plague that claimed a thousand lives, including Pericles (429). Divided between the uncompromising policy of Cleon and the moderate and more conciliatory policy, Athens opted for Nicia, which concluded an alliance with Sparta (421). Peace again led to the situation of 431. In fact, it was only a truce. Alcibiades, an ambitious young man, wanting to extend Athens's hegemony to the central Mediterranean, dragged the people's assembly into a war with Syracuse. Athens tried to take advantage of the discord that had arisen on the island after their victory over the Carthaginians (Chimera, 480). The poorly prepared campaign (415-413) ended in complete defeat. The Athenian army and fleet almost completely destroyed Sparta and

Corinth took advantage of the situation, the failure of the campaign caused civil strife in Athens; war broke out again (413-404). The Athenian fleet, which emerged victorious from the battle of the island of Arginus (406), was destroyed by the Spartans at Aegospotam (405). Athens itself was also captured (404). It was then forced to renounce its kingdom and fleet and enter into an alliance with Sparta. In order to claim this victory, however, Sparta had to turn to the rich Persians for help, which then allowed them to resume the role they had lost after the Persian wars and retake the Greek cities of Ionia.

Having won, instead of liberating the subjugated cities, Sparta took over the power previously held by Athens; it collected taxes, brought troops and imposed an oligarchic type of government on the other cities. In Athens itself, under the protection of the Spartans who had encamped on the Acropolis, thirty oligarchs began to commit acts of violence. But they were unable to hold out for long and in the end a democratic regime was reestablished.

Awakening of Athens. The dominance of Sparta brought Thebes and Athens together, which renewed their strength, while Sparta, exhausted by leading a costly interventionist policy in Persia, first tried to support Cyrus at the expense of his brother Artaxerxes II. This attempt failed with the death of Cyrus (withdrawal of the Ten Thousand). Sparta then transferred the war to Asia Minor, where King Agesilaus won an insignificant victory. In Greece, Athens, Corinth, Thebes and Argos formed an alliance against Sparta. Sparta won a victory on land at Choronea (394). But in the same year the renewed Athenian fleet, with help from the Persians, defeated the Spartan squadron at Cnidus. As a result, Persia becomes the arbiter in the Greek disputes. The hostilities continued until 387, and the Persians, worried about the renewed strengthening of Athens, supported Sparta. Sparta, Syracuse and Persia formed a coalition and impose a general peace agreement on Athens and its allies (386). It was called the Peace of Antalcidas, named after the Spartan envoy, or the Royal Peace, after the name of the one who

replaced him. The Athenians lost part of their power. Sparta established aristocratic regimes everywhere which accelerated its own downfall.

Short-lived Theban hegemony. Thebes, which had been under the supervision of a Spartan garrison since 382, revolted in 379 under the leadership of Epaminondas and Pelopidas and expelled the Spartan soldiers. Having organized the infantry well, Epaminondas defeated the Spartans at Leuctra (371). This ended Sparta's supremacy. Thebes then tried to dominate the Greek world. It intervened in Thessaly and the Peloponnese, ravaging Sparta (373), continuing at its own expense, a policy of alliance with Persia (367) and establishing a fleet (364) in order to deprive Athens of its supremacy at sea. But the Greeks united against her. Epaminondas undertook (362) a campaign in the Peloponnese, in order to develop an alliance between the Spartans, the Peloponnesians and the Athenians. In the battle of Mantinea, he defeated the allied forces but he himself died, and the hegemony of Thebes was extinguished with him.

Second Athenian alliance. Immediately after the battle of Mantinea, the Theban territory was again reduced to a region of central Greece; Sparta had not yet recovered from the defeat at Leuctra; Athens, which had once again become one of the leading powers of Greece, considered it necessary to take advantage of the failures of its rivals. Renewing relations with the former members of the Delian League, it created a new naval alliance (378-377) but this time the allied cities demanded that they be recognized as autonomous. Athens gave up the establishment of a cleruchy and the collection of taxes. Despite everything, it remained the leading city in the league, owning the same land and islands as before, except for the Greek cities of Ionia, which had again fallen under Persian rule. (No Greek cities, only Hellenic in Ionia, R.I.)

Greek culture during the 4th century. Around 360, the Greek world seemed to have reached a kind of equilibrium. No great city was able to impose its rule over another. After seventy years of hostilities, peace

had finally come but Greece was exhausted. Not only had the war devastated the region, but it had also thinned out the peasant population that made up the main army. Greece lacked people and material goods. However, Hellas's <sup>41</sup> political decline did not mean the decline of its culture. However, events still influenced free thinking and art. During the restless age, while certain spirits put their talent at the service of current events and participated in battles, others distanced themselves from the excessive rudeness, and began to focus their energies on artistic activities in which they found peace of mind.

- Among the first were the orators, such as Isseus, Lysias and Andocides, as well as the historians Thucydides and Xenophon, who presented us with contemporary events. Pindar (518-438) the Theban brought Illyrian poetry to the top, who with his Odes celebrated the great men of his time and the victors in the games. Aristophanes with his works attacked the demagogues with a deep desire to defend the little people.

- A second tradition was especially fulfilled by the philosophers who tried to establish their own rule of life, like the Cynics, or to build a broad system of the world and find ideal political principles, like Plato (428-348/347). The philosopher and scientist, Aristotle (384-322) tried to introduce the scholarly treasures of his time. Art, however, increasingly sought pure beauty, which can be seen in the sculptures of the sculptor Pakistela. Although Athens was the capital of art in the intellectual Greek world (construction of the Erechtheion and the sanctuary of Athena Nike on the Acropolis) it was no longer the only city that adorned itself with works of art. At that time, the most important temples were built in Delphi, Epidauros and Ephesus, announcing the new influence of the centers of Greek culture.

Decline of the Persian Empire. The wars between the Greek cities enabled Persia to play a significant role in the Aegean Sea, although in

---

<sup>41</sup> It is confirmed that there was only Hellenic, Helladic and Hellas, nothing Greek according to the concept of Greik = grei ik.



fact the empire found itself in decline after the Persian wars, because the poor functioning of the royal institutions was eroding from within. The rulers were surrounded by courtiers, often a source of intrigue. Their power was restrained by the rebellious nobility and the vast expanse of the country. The history of successions to the Persian throne is full of bitter struggles, conspiracies and murders. Persian rule was characterized by the constant campaigns against the rebellious regions. After Persia was defeated during the wars, Egypt rebelled (460) and immediately received support from Athens. Egypt was reconquered but, according to the Peace of Callias, signed with Athens in 449, the expansion of the empire towards the west was stopped and revived again after the Persians took advantage of the wars between Sparta and Athens. And so, in 413, after the Athenian collapse in Sicily, Tissaphernes, the Lydian satrap retook Ionia. The position of the empire was strengthened but the crisis over the succession led to danger. In order to usurp the throne of his brother Artaxerxes II (404-358), Cyrus the Younger used a certain Greek mercenary. After the victory at Cunaxa in 401, he died in battle. Artaxerxes wanted to reinstate the Spartan mercenaries but they refused and, under the leadership of Xenophon, managed to invade Greece, crossing the entire empire (the Campaign of the Ten Thousand). The great king must have also withstood Sparta's attack from Agesilaus, who was sent to fight in Asia Minor. But Persian diplomacy emboldened Sparta's enemies, promoting the revival of Athens and thus managing to bring Agesilaus back (394-393). Then, breaking the alliance and supporting Sparta in the fight against Athens, the great king managed to impose the Peace of Antalcidas in 386, which established discord in Greece and Persian rule over the Ionian cities. This time too, Persian diplomacy won a victory in the Aegean Sea. In contrast, the situation elsewhere was delicate. Cyprus rebelled starting in 411, Egypt in 405 and attempts to reconquer it failed. Little by little, the empire fell apart. Under the influence of his courtiers, the king allowed the satraps to separate from the central government. The old men of Asia Minor revolted in 363 and concluded an agreement with Egypt to conquer Palestine. Artaxerxes II managed to save his empire thanks to

the discord of his opponents. His successor Artaxerxes III (358-338) even managed to conquer Cyprus in 344 and retake Egypt. This restoration, however, was short-lived: after Artaxerxes III died (338), Egypt rebelled again and soon after (336, then 334) Macedonian troops invaded Asia.

### *Development of the Western States*

Carthage and the Western Greeks. Expansion of Carthage. While the East was collapsing due to constant fighting, the western states, on the western shores of the Mediterranean, began to develop and gradually integrated into the international economy and then into politics. The Western Mediterranean originally served the Greeks and Phoenicians as a colonial territory. The Tyrrhenians settled on the coasts of Spain as early as the 11th century, from where they exported metals produced in Tartes (Baetica). But in the 6th century, Tyre, which fell under the Persians, severed relations with the West and was succeeded by its former colony Carthage. From then on, this predominantly maritime city, which occupied a good position at the junction of two basins in the Mediterranean, began to build an empire at the expense of the western Greeks. In Spain, Carthage pushed the Greeks northward, the Iberians inland and turned the Phoenician trading cities into its own colonies. It then occupied Corsica and Sicily and left the Greeks in Chimera (480). There were ports in Africa, from the Atlantic to Libya, which supplied Carthage and allowed it to trade. Carthage was initially a royal city under the rule of the powerful Mago family and then, around 450, it turned into an aristocratic republic in the hands of wealthy working people. They managed politics through a senate and tribunal consisting of one hundred and four members. Magistrates - two sufets were selected from among their ranks which the popular assembly elected annually. Wealth also grew along with the establishment of the oligarchy. In order to provide itself with supplies and protect itself, Carthage conquered a vast plain in its advance. Interested in finding new sea routes and markets, Carthage sent an expedition (around 450) into the Atlantic. Towards the south, its sailors explored the coast of

Africa as far as the Gulf of Guinea and established strongholds in Morocco, Senegal and the Canary Islands. Towards the north, the Carthageans traveled as far as Great Britain. Carthage managed its own fleet and army, while the cities of its empire remained autonomous. Its shipowners held a monopoly on transport and, unlike Athens, did not admit foreigners into their empire. Thus this city, which strived for the primacy of commercial expansion, came into conflict with Syracuse.

Syracuse and its tyrants. • After its victory over Carthage (480), a period of prosperity began in Syracuse while Hieron (478- 466) the tyrant ruled it, who intended to unify Sicily. His power extended along the coast as far as Messina, whose strait was under his control, and to the west as far as Agrigento and Chimera, where he established a protectorate. His death led to the fall of the tyranny. However, after 445 the cities turned against each other. Athens wanted to take advantage of this weakness in 413 but Syracuse inflicted a terrible defeat on it. Thanks to this victory, the democratic party overthrew the warlike tyranny and took power. Taking advantage of the civil strife, Carthage invaded Sicily with an army, destroyed Selinunte and Chimera and annexed Agrigento. The defeats of the democrats facilitated the re-establishment of tyranny. Dionysius (405-367) with aristocrat help assumed command of the army and then the title of strategos autocrat (406). To suppress the danger that threatened him from Carthage, Dionysius gathered a large number of mercenaries in Campania and Greece, and built a strong defense system to protect Syracuse and developed a fleet. After several battles in which he was sometimes badly defeated, he managed to push the Carthaginians west of the island. In the meantime, he founded an empire on land; because in 387 he captured Rhegium, and then in 379 Croton, he advanced towards the Adriatic Sea, founded Ancona and Adria and fought on the Illyrian coast against the pirates who were ravaging those regions. In the west he reached an alliance with Naples and intervened in Corsica and Etruria. But he failed to subdue Tarentum, which at that time was ruled by a tyrant, the philosopher Archytas, a friend of Plato. Dionysius

exercised a real hegemony over the entire western Greek world and this was seen from the Peace of Antalcida, by which the Mediterranean world was divided between the Persian king, Sparta and Dionysius himself. As a faithful ally of Sparta, Dionysius helped Sparta establish hegemony over continental Greece. But Dionysius the Elder's regime, which caused much discontent, did not last long after his death. He was succeeded by his son Dionysius the Younger who, however, did not have the ability of his father. Dionysius the Younger exiled his minister and relative Dion (366), who a few years later returned to seize power (357) but was killed (354)."

It was said: "Dionysius exercised real hegemony over the entire western Greek world." There has never been anything Greek, in the west there was no Hellenism of any kind, but only Greik, from greik=grei ik=tn. Slavic suffix: grei=grej newcomers from where the Sun grei=grej- that means newcomers only from the south, from where it shines. (греи=греј дојденци од каде што Сонцето греи=греј- тоа значи дојденци само од југот, откаде што грее.)

"• New unrest and political instability. The kingdom of Dionysus was falling apart.

All cities regain independence and local tyranny appears everywhere.

Carthage again used the opportunity anew to start fighting again, and Syracuse escaped ruin thanks only to the help sent from Corinth under the leadership of Timoleon (344). In order to restore the previous situation, Timoleon carried out political reforms, establishing a democracy determined by a census in Syracuse and conquered the other island cities, which expelled their tyrants. Then he influenced the Carthaginians on the shores of Crimisus (341); with the peace of 339/337 to reduce the Punic possessions to a narrow strip in the western part of the island. Finally, in order to restore the economy of Sicily, which had been devastated by the war and had lost many people, Timoleon called back the exiled Sicilians and brought colonists from all parts of the Greek world. After peace and prosperity was restored on the

island, Timoleon withdrew (337). But he, with his part, gained so much influence, remained a counselor whom the people obediently listened to until the end of his life. He continued his work in southern Italy by sending Spartan expeditions to the aid of Tarentum, which was attacked by the hillmen from the surrounding areas (343-338). So, myth and prosperity reigned again in Magna Greika and Sicily. “(Magna Greika:magna=megna=međna - n = međa;f=d: Medjci=Međijci, R.I.) (Magna Greika:magna=megna=meġna - n = meġa; ġ=d: Медијци=Meġијци, P.II.)

Not “Magna Greika” but Magna Greika=grei ik a- final a for the feminine gender.

“Founding of Rome. Etruscan Age. While the Greeks in southern Italy deeply respected their roots, the Etruscans expanded their empire to the north of the peninsula, where their power around 550 B.C. was at its peak. Having captured Felsina (the future Bologna), and then a good part of the plain around Pos, where they founded a new alliance of ten cities modeled on the twelve largest cities of Tuscany, the Etruscans expanded their commercial activity (selling Mediterranean bronze outside Italy, especially in central Europe and Gaul [crater Vix in Burgundy around 500]; buying tin and amber, whose routes reached the ports at the mouth of the Po, Adria and Spinea. At the same time, their power was also felt in Latium, where Rome was still only a small city on the banks of the Tiber. By the 6th century the population of that city had probably settled on seven hills, where they planned their future city. Due to its location, it represented a crossroads of several natural routes, and from the sea coast to the interior there is only one road. At that time, the leaders of the Etruscan groups put themselves at the head of the Latin and Sabine villages, built on the hills. Since they were at a higher level of civilization, they founded Rome and created their first institutions that gave the city its character. According to Roman tradition, Etruscan royal power was held by three figures: Tarquinius the Elder, Servius Tullius and Tarquinius Ocholi. Their power gave these people the authority to carry out projects in several neighbouring

towns: the erection of a strong defensive wall, the sewage system of the Forum (Cloaca maxima) and the construction of a temple on the Capitol. Attracted by the Etruscan civilization, the Roman population, although speaking Latin, adopted the alphabet of Etruscan origin. Their primitive faith consisted of fetish ceremonies: the ritual had to be strictly observed, as it would preserve the favour of the gods towards the city. The rite was not performed by the priests but by the king in the name of the state and the father in the name of the family. The city was initially divided into three tribes, each consisting of ten curiae, and each was further divided into ten decuries. This division was of military nature: each tribe provided a thousand infantry and a hundred cavalry. “Since the “Greeks in southern Italy” spoke a barbarian = Pelasgian = Slavic language, which was also the case with the Etruscans with the so-called Slavic god Perun as well as the Russians, which was also true with the Venetian runes of the Etruscans and Russians, the Romans also spoke the same barbarian and Pelasgian language. According to Dionysius <sup>42</sup>: “The language used by the Romans was neither entirely barbarian nor absolutely Hellenic but a mixture of both. The greater part of that language was identical with the Aeolian dialect...” all the same.

The Latin language was new to Livy Andronicus (240 B.C.) the Greek.

Latin was a vulgar Koine - translations were made from Koine into Latin.

“Birth of the Republic. Rome strongly developed under Etruscan rule. But, according to tradition, the Romans revolted and expelled their masters in 509. The main cause for abandoning Rome was the defeat the Etruscans suffered fighting against the Greeks and the Latins. After losing Latium, the Etruscans lost contact with their possessions in Campania in 474. Their fleet and the Punic fleet won at Syracuse and Cyma. This victory also marked the decline of their power. After the Etruscan expulsion, Rome, once again becoming a small Latin city, was

---

<sup>42</sup> The historian Dionysius (60 BC-7 A.D.) was from Halicarnassus - The Romans were Barbarians = Pelasgians.

forced to fight to impose itself on the other cities of Latium. Defeating the Latin League at Lake Rhegium between 496 and 449, it concluded an alliance with the Latins that enabled it to subjugate the surrounding hill peoples (the Hernici, the Sabine and the Volscians).

Patrician and plebeians. • The age of the patricians. In internal politics, the history of the first centuries of the Republic is marked by constant struggles between the patricians and the plebeians. The patricians consisted of a collection of *gentes*, which brought together families of common origin. Each *gentes* had its own gods, rites, land, troops and its own proteges and clients. At the head of the *gentes* was the *pater familias*, an undisputed master, at the same time judge and priest. Only the patricians were entitled to public honours and to perform priestly duties; their power and wealth seemed to increase after the fall of the kingdom. From their ranks the chief magistrates would be elected in the future and they themselves, at least in the beginning, would represent the religious core of the city: hence the conflict with those who were excluded from it.

Plebeians were free people who, together with the patricians, represented the Roman people. But they were second-class citizens: they did not vote; they could not become magistrates or priests. They did not know the laws (which were not published). Marriages between these two classes were prohibited. Finally, the plebeians were often economically dependent on the patricians, who owned real estate and were their trustees. Many plebeians who could not pay usually fell into debt and slavery. A struggle waged between these two classes since the founding of the republic. To oppose the patricians, the kings relied on the plebeians; However, when royal power passed into the hands of the patricians, the plebeians, in order to maintain themselves, were forced to organize and fight. Like the Greek cities, Rome was ruled by aristocracy. The patricians assumed the exclusive right of supervision over the legislative institutions of the kingdom (the *curiae* commission and the senate). The executive power, which was taken from the king, was transferred for a year to two consuls. In case of danger, absolute

power was entrusted to a dictator, but for only six months, whose right hand was the commander of the cavalry. But it seemed that the plebs owed their political consciousness to those in charge of the military organization, on the basis of which the infantry, recruited from the ranks of the plebs, assumed the main role in battle.

- Rise of the plebs. During the end of the 6th or at the latest during the beginning of the 5th century, citizens, based on the taxes they paid, were classified into classes divided into centuries, which were the basis for recruiting the army. At the assemblies of these classes, or centuriate comitia, held outside the city on the Campus Martius, consuls and military tribunes were elected. This allowed the plebs to put pressure on the patricians. In 494, a legion of plebeians renounced its obedience to the consul and retreated to the Sacred Hill, not far from Rome. The patricians were forced to obey them and accept the election of a magistrate, whose duty was to defend the plebs, a popular tribune, who would be determined by the plebeians themselves, united in tribute comitia (citizens gathered in tribes according to their place of residence).

These popular tribunes possessed great power, the right to veto every legislative and executive act, while their representative was inviolable.

In the middle of the 5th century, the plebeians won another victory: Roman law, which until then was known only to the patrician high priests, was compiled and renewed. The new code was called the Law of the Twelve Tables. A little later, in 445 (437), the ban on marriages between patricians and plebeians was lifted, and in 443, a new magistracy, censorship was established, headed by two magistrates who were elected every five years for eighteen months, and their duty was to classify citizens into classes according to their property status. The tax system of the republic became increasingly precise. Finally, in 409 or 401, the plebeians receive a new right to be elected quaestors (guardians of public treasuries).



Rome and the Celts. Soon, however, Rome was faced with a great danger posed by the arrival of northerners on its borders. Originating from central Europe, in the areas between the Rhine and the Danube, the Celts appeared in northern Italy (Hallstatt) in the beginning of the Iron Age. At the beginning of the 6th century, they settled in Gaul, where their culture, called the La Tène culture (after the name of the archaeological site not far from Lake Neuchâtel), came in contact with the local population (they gradually abandoned cremation [urns] and introduced burial under tumuli). Skillfully working the metals and wood from their forests, they invented the wheeled plow (carruca) and cooperage, which explained the development of agriculture in the countries they inhabited. These technical innovations also manifested themselves in the manufacture of dangerous swords, the felt necklaces, so-called tarques, jewelry sometimes enameled, as well as vases made of molten metal. Accordingly, they had a brilliant material culture which, in addition, had originality. But on the political level, they were distinguished by indifference and their inability to establish a great state. And indeed, there was often disorder among their various tribes, sometimes gathered in alliances ruled by kings but always subordinate to a military aristocracy and under the influence of the priestly class, the druids who, at the same time priests, judges and deities, seemed to enjoy greater prestige than the military elders.”

When the Celts arrived in the Balkans they did not bring plants or animals with them. This was because everything they had was of Balkan origin.

If the Celts had originated north of the Balkans, where cattle were wild animals, they would have had retained their original blood group O. - blood group A arose from smallpox that arose from the plague of cattle.

The Celts cut down the forests with an axe. So celta means axe. It follows celta = kilta = kirta - kirta = sek kirta: kirta = axe; Shakespeare = sekpir = sek with pir for axe: seki (sechi) with pir = piri gori - the piri is burning; druid=druid=drvit=drviti. (Следи келта = килта =

кирта – секирта = сек кирта: секирта = секира; Шекспир =секспир  
= сек с пир за секира: секи (сечи) с пир=пири гори- пирејот се  
гори; друид=дрвид=дрвит=дрвити.)

“They made up for the fragmentation with their military qualities and very quickly managed to expand their territory and spread out with mass movements that brought them towards the rich Mediterranean peninsula. While the Transcaucasian Celts seemed to settle in northern Gaul under the name ‘Belgi’, some of them settled on the Iberian Peninsula (6th century), where about 300 appeared under the name Celtiberi; others, passing through Bohemia, penetrated like a torrent towards Greece (they sacked Delphi 279/278) or went to Asia Minor, where they appeared under the name Galatians (around 278/270) and where they finally defeated King Attalus I of Pergamum (241). In the meantime, a third group, which came from Gaul, penetrated the valley of Tessin River into Italy and occupied the area around Milan. Then these Celts clashed with The Etruscans. And finally, they came into contact with the Romans, whose legions they defeated in 381 on the banks of the Allium. The victorious Celts then stormed the city burning and plundering but did not take the entire Capitol. The Romans paid them off with a very large ransom. This was the most dangerous invasion Rome faced, but those that took place later, during the 4th century, kept the Romans in constant fear of the blond soldiers dressed in ‘Gallic chasseurs’. The Romans expanded their horizon during the second half of the 4th century. After their victory over the Latins, they appropriated the whole of Latium and established a colony and a municipality. The Latins were then given second-class citizenships according to civil Latin law.”

## **The Mediterranean World and the Near East during the Macedonian and Hellenistic Age (359-20 B.C.)**

### *Macedonian conquests*

Economic and social changes in Greece. Prosperity and misery. Despite being involved in wars, Greece maintained a certain level of prosperity. Archaeology revealed that tools were improved and that artisanal production was increased. Trade in particular was on the rise, thanks to the development of both seafaring and banking. But this prosperity was not enjoyed equally by all segments of the population. Small holdings disappeared, large ones were created and the land was better cultivated. The small peasantry abandoned their holdings after they were devastated by war. A huge influx of people from the countryside increased the number of inhabitants in the cities. But even in the cities, wealth was not better distributed. The vast majority of the population lived on meager incomes. Unemployment, which was endemic due to competition from slave labour, worsened with the arrival of the peasants. The contradiction between the rich and poor was becoming more acute, leading to bloody civil conflicts. Athens managed to save itself from this by helping the poor the most. Many Greeks, who were forced to leave the cities because of unemployment or civil war, entered the service of mercenaries. These economic and social transformations led to a change in mentality in this cruel world in which it was difficult to live; the Greeks, especially those from Piraeus, who were in close contact with the East, were very tolerant and, although they did not always abandon their traditional gods, did not hesitate when it came to accepting, of course cautiously at first, foreign Eastern gods (the Egyptian goddess Isis). The city suffered from these changes. Its excessively narrow political framework gave way to alliances in which several cities were grouped and the need for political unification of all Greeks was increasingly felt. Thus, little by little, certain Greeks became accustomed to the idea of someone appearing and granting peace and unity to Hellas.

Decline or development: Sparta and Athens. The fourth century was a century of decadence for Sparta. Even during its heyday, with the influx of wealth, property equality increased and the state power based on austerity and virtue was undermined. Moreover, the city suffered from

population displacements, as the number of citizens steadily declined, so that by the end of the century it would be reduced to a few hundred. Depopulated, deprived of Messenia after the military invasion of Thebes in the Peloponnese (369), this city fell to the level of an ordinary town. Institutions developed in Athens. After its defeat in 404, the oligarchs established a government of violence called the Trisetoric. Despite Sparta's support they lasted only a year. But the renewed democracy was even more crude and radical than before. Sometimes, in the desire to destroy the opposition, it showed itself to be limited and erroneous. Thus in 399 Socrates was condemned to death, accused of not believing in the gods and of corrupting their youth. In fact, he fell victim to numerous enemies when he acquired his critical spirit and contempt for prejudice. The senate (bule), which led a more conciliatory policy, lost its power to the assembly (ekklesia), which fell under the influence of demagogues. But many citizens, forced to earn a living with difficulty, stopped attending the assemblies. In order to attract citizens, it was necessary to pay those present a stipend (misthos ecclesiasticos, 395). In general, civic consciousness declined. Citizens avoided military service, while tax evasion significantly reduced the income from permanent taxes paid by the richest (eisphora, tax on the entire capital), and when danger arose from Macedonia Athens lacked the spiritual strength and material goods with which to resist. (Gods/myths of the Hellenes, R.I.)

Macedonian expansion. A country, Macedonia, located in the neighbourhood of Thessaly. The Greeks considered it a 'barbarian' country. Compared to the Greek city states, Macedonia was a country with a vast territory. Naturally protected by mountains, it could only be approached from the coast, along which the Greeks established colonies. But the population, mainly peasants and shepherds, were not interested in the sea. Power was in the hands of the landowners, who politically supported anarchy by replacing the kings."

Then came the barbarians (herders) and sailors - the sailors were pirates - pyri = mountains...

“Philip of Macedon. The situation in Macedonia changed when Philip of Macedon became regent in 359 and then king in 356. The character as left to us by the artists of the ancient world revealed his physical strength, endurance and courage, as well as great intelligence and unscrupulous ambition. At first, Philip strengthened his power by getting rid of pretensions and forcing the nobility to obey. He ensured the security of the kingdom, settling accounts with the neighbouring Illyrians, Paeonians and Thracians. Then he strengthened his supremacy by building a network of roads and reorganizing the army, which was intended to be composed mainly of Macedonians. The infantry was arranged in a phalanx and equipped with a new weapon called the sarissa (long spear over five meters). He also harmonized the actions of the infantry and cavalry. Philip’s strength and accomplishments were put to the test when he came face to face with the city states. His actions also contributed to the circumstances that created discord between the Greek cities.

Philip against Athens. His great advantage was that he used every opportunity to realize his ambition. And so, while on the one hand the Athenian alliance was falling apart, on the other hand the king of Macedonia was rising. Then in 357, Chios, Rhodes, Byzantium, Eritrea and Kos rose up against Athens. Their fleet ravaged Imbros, Lemnos and besieged Samos. Many shortcomings of the alliance were realized and the Athenian fleet was defeated at Embata in 356. Philip used this opportunity to capture Amphipolis on the Macedonian coast (357). He then captured Pydna and Potidaea (an Athenian colony) in 356 as well as the gold mines at Mount Pangaea, which represented a huge source of income for his military budget. Continuing his conquests, he captured Meton, the last city in which Athens still held kleruhi (354) but, while trying to cross Thermopylae, in 353 he was stopped by a Greek coalition; Philip was not persistent, he withdrew but retained Thessaly. After the collapse of its empire, Athens needed peace. For almost five years, Athens lived in seclusion under the leadership of Eubulus, who restored its finances and the fleet. Nevertheless, sooner or

later, a conflict between Athenian and Macedonian imperialism was bound to occur. During the winter of 352-351, Philip attacked the Athenian allies at sea, landing on Lemnos and Imbros, and then in the south of Euboea and in the Gulf of Marathon. The excitement in Athens was great. Demosthenes came out criticizing Philip with his First Philippic, making a strong accusation against the king of Macedonia. But despite the Athenians undertaking a campaign, Philip occupied the whole of Chalkidiki, conquered and destroyed the city Olynthus (348). Abandoned by its allies, Athens was forced to accept the Peace of Philocrates (346). In essence, however, Athens refused to accept its fate. Demosthenes becomes the political leader of the city and with his fiery speeches against Philip forced the ecclesia to take action. However, they clashed with the passivity of their fellow citizens, and even with the impatience of some who were convinced that Philip was not an enemy of Athens. Demosthenes nevertheless managed to persuade or weaken his political opponents (such as the orator Aeschines). He re-established a permanent military obligation and increased the budget. At the same time, great effort was made to rebuild the fleet. Since Philip had launched a new operation in Thrace (342) and besieged Byzantium (340), thus endangering the grain route, Athens declared war on him (340). Despite Philip's defeat at Byzantium and the support of Thebes (Sparta remained neutral), the effort was made too late. From then on, Philip could only attack the heart of Greece where he defeated two allied armies at Chaeronea (338).

Greece conquered. Philip dealt harshly with Thebes (he placed a Macedonian garrison inside it) but lightly with Athens, which lost Chersonese but retained its government. After his victory, over the next few months, Philip imposed his tutelage on all the Greek cities. His army devastated Sparta, which tried to resist. Philip became master of all of Greece. However, he did not annex them to the Macedonian kingdom: the cities remained free and autonomous and united in a permanent alliance that sent its representatives to the alliance council (sinhedrin). The alliance was governed by an executive union of five

proedarii, who met in Corinth, hence the name Corinthian League. Philip was at the head of the alliance (hegemon) and was the commander-in-chief of the army during the war (strategist autocrate). At his suggestion, the alliance then decided to wage war against Persia (June 337). When the vanguard of the Greek troops had already passed the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, Philip killed a Macedonian nobleman (summer 326).

### *Alexander the Great <sup>43</sup> and the conquest of Asia*

Person. Philip left behind his twenty-year-old son, Alexander. Alexander had yet to conquer his own kingdom. Inside Macedonia he fought against the pretenders; in the Balkans, he repelled the barbarian <sup>44</sup> peoples (Thracians, Illyrians, etc.) who threatened his borders; finally, in Greece, he clashed with a rebellion that he managed to suppress by conquering Thebes and razing it to the ground (335); Athens was forced to deliver to him his enemies. From the very beginning, young Alexander knew how to win victories and assert himself. He was an exceptional person, strong, tireless and had a strong character. At the same time, he was a man of broad culture, a student of Aristotle. He had the beauty, courage, political and military genius and considered himself to be the descendant of Achilles and Hercules. As a result, he exerted extraordinary influence on his contemporaries. He was the first great conqueror of the ancient era.

Conqueror. Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt. Continuing the work of his father, Alexander crossed into Asia with 37,000 men. The core of his army consisted of 13,500 Macedonians in the phalanx and an excellent cavalry of 5,000 men. This numerical situation was maintained thanks to the constant reinforcements arriving from Macedonia and the recruitment of local troops. Alexander established a world empire with

---

<sup>43</sup> Alexander the Great never existed, but only Alexander the Great of Macedonia - the Great only Roman.

<sup>44</sup> The Macedonians were barbarians, and so were the others. Well, the only barbarian language was Pelasgian = so-called Slavic.

a relatively small force. Opposite him was a vast empire but in disintegration; its ruler, the Great King, to whom Alexander refused to show obedience. As a result, Alexander gave the Great King no choice but fight. But despite experiencing rebellion from his satraps, the Great King had a very large army and his strength was based on the enormous wealth accumulated by the Achaemenids. And so Alexander's adventurous campaign began in the spring of 334. Alexander landed not far from Troy, where he glorified the memories of Achilles before him by defeating the satraps to the ground on the banks of the Granicus (334). He then conquered the Ionian cities; at Gordion he cut the famous Gordian knot which, according to prophecy, made him master of Asia (333). Whenever he passed, Alexander was received more as a liberator than as a conqueror; instead of Persian satraps he appointed Macedonian generals but left the old Persian administrative system intact. Soon after that, Darius III, leading a vastly larger army, set out to meet Alexander. After his victory at Issus (333, November), thanks to his skillful tactics, Alexander nevertheless gave up pursuing the Great King, who was on the run, because he intended to conquer Syria and Phoenicia first. Darius unsuccessfully tried to negotiate. Taking Tyre, and then Gaza (332), Alexander penetrated Egypt, advanced along the Nile all the way to Memphis, where he presented himself as the heir to the pharaohs; not the heir to the Persian kings. Alexander then founded a city at the mouth of the Nile that would bear his name (Alexandria) and that would surpass Tyre in trade with Greece. He then visited the sanctuary of Amun at Siwa (Amun Oasis) where, according to the Ancients, the conqueror's god confirmed his divine origin and promised him a world empire (winter and spring 332-331).

Mesopotamia, Iran, Bactria and India. Returning to Asia, Alexander, although numerically weaker, destroyed the last of Darius's army at Gaugamela, not far from Arbela (331). The capitals of the defeated, Babylon and then Susa opened their doors to the Macedonian king who thus seized the treasures of the Achaemenid dynasty; this allowed him to send money to Macedonia to his viceroy Antipater, who was fighting



against rebellious Sparta and who, in October 331, defeated Sparta at Megalopolis. Finally, Antipater captured and sacked Persepolis. The Macedonians gained a huge amount of booty. Darius was still retreating while Alexander continued to advance. Alexander pursued him to Ecbatana and then through the Caspian Gate. When he finally caught up to him, he found Darius dead. He had been killed by one of his officers (July 330). Alexander then took the title “King of Persia”. Now being the victor and heir to the Achaemenid dynasty, Alexander’s comrades expected Alexander to end his campaign and retire as the ruler of the entire Persian Empire, but he didn’t. Alexander led his army in the conquest of the eastern provinces. Between 330 and 327 he reached the border of India, which was a difficult campaign since he was leading an already tired army through the desert regions of Bactria and Sogdiana. Moreover, Alexander came into conflict with his associates who were upset that he was adopting Eastern customs, marrying Roxana, a Persian woman and acting just like the Achaemenids, demanding that his own people bow before him: he was forced to suppress several conspiracies hatched against him. He then set out to conquer the Indus basin, defeating the Indian prince Porus (326) and reached the Hyphasis (a left tributary of the Indus). But he did not go any further because his army refused to follow him. Alexander then issued an order to turn back.

The return. Alexander traveled down the Indus River with the ships he had built and then divided his army into three columns: one, led by Craterus, turned back via the north; the second, led by Alexander himself, went along the coast; the third, led by Nearchus, boarded the ships and reached the mouth of the Euphrates; this, at the same time, was a voyage of exploration and conquest. Alexander and the remnants of his army arrived in Susa in 324. Discipline was breaking down in his large empire so Alexander felt the need to organize his vast territory. He wanted to unite the Macedonians with the conquered peoples. One example of this was his marriage to a Persian princess, as well as the marriage of tens of thousands of his soldiers to Eastern women. While

still in Asia Alexander also solved the problem that was plaguing Greece; in order to calm the situation, he ordered the Greek cities to return the old expatriates and then, in order to confirm his absolute power, he forced them to celebrate him as a deity. But illness prevented him from completing the work he had begun. He died, struck down by a sudden illness, when he was thirty-two years and eight months old (June 31, 323).<sup>45</sup> In less than fifteen years he became absolute lord of the cradle of Greece and Asia; his work remained unfinished but it was immense. He founded colonies that became the focus of Macedonian culture; he succeeded in bringing together the victors and vanquished in Macedonia, Greece and the East to some extent. He unified Greece and destroyed all attempts at separatism and imposed his absolute rule over them. (Bringing death to the Hellenic Culture, R.I.)

The State of Alexander the Great after his death. The Hellenistic World.

Alexander. Alexander died without appointing an heir. However, the only political bond that united the conquered territories was the power of the Macedonian monarchy, the only way to save the empire was to form a viceroyalty in anticipation of Alexander and Roxana's son coming of age and ascending the throne. The viceroyalty was entrusted to Perdiccas and the empire was divided into large districts headed by Alexander's generals. But all that would soon fall apart.

The first consequence of Alexander's death was the revolt of the Greek cities, at the instigation of Athens and its fiery leader Demosthenes, who wanted to use the opportunity to free themselves from the Macedonian yoke. However, the Lamian War (323-322) ended in failure at Cranno (322) because Alexander's generals immediately agreed to suppress the revolt. The revenge was very cruel and Demosthenes committed suicide so as not to fall into the hands of the Macedonians (322). However, the initial agreement reached between the military leaders (diados) did not last long. Ambitions and personal

---

<sup>45</sup> He has been poisoned with arsenic in wine for a long time - and for a long time he has been unburied without change, stinking...

aspirations very quickly separated the recent allies who, having placed themselves at the head of the Empire's old provinces as monarchs, waged confusing, bitter and destructive wars against one another, which lasted almost forty-five years. Thus, several divisions of Alexander's empire were carried out, which were always contested by those who thought themselves aggrieved. A more permanent balance was established around 277 B.C. between three epigonic dynasties: the Ptolemaic or Lagid dynasty, which ruled Egypt; the Antigonid dynasty, under whose rule came Macedonia and Greece; and finally the Seleucid dynasty, which imposed its rule over the lands from Asia Minor to the Iranian plateau. The easternmost regions of the former empire, Bactria, Sogdiana and northwestern India became independent, although these states were still headed by descendants of Macedonian generals.

### *Great Hellenistic Monarchies*

Origin. Historians call the period from the division of Alexander's empire to the Roman conquests the Hellenistic period. It lasted a little more than two centuries. Three monarchies that emerged from this division lived side by side. Mutual, often fierce conflicts inevitably occurred. Given their origin, these states had certain common features: these were, first of all, warlike monarchies forced to constantly control their conquered territories, both in Greece, where the cities constantly tried to regain their freedom, and in Asia, where the common empire was prone to disintegration, and finally in Egypt, which was never completely conquered. In addition, the Seleucids and the Lagids began a bloody struggle for supremacy in the eastern Mediterranean (Syrian Wars) because the Ptolemies wanted to subjugate a large part of the islands and coasts so that maritime trade would remain in their hands. Both opponents were exhausted in these struggles. Weakened, the Seleucids could not prevent some of their provinces from seceding from the empire, both in the west in Asia Minor where, among others, the Hellenistic state of the Attalids in Pergamum was created, and in the east where the Parthian Kingdom was founded. As for the Lagids, they

were pushing themselves into ruin by calling for help from the Romans who will eventually conquered the entire kingdom.

The Macedonian kingdom. The Macedonian kingdom was ruled by the Antigonids.

They were, in general, the weakest and most ineffective Hellenistic rulers. Namely, they found themselves in a difficult situation because expansion towards Asia was carried out to the detriment of their members, the Greeks went to the service of the Lagids and the Seleucids. In addition, the Greek economy weakened due to the competition of the newly conquered kingdoms, whose agricultural and artisanal products were cheaper and available in abundance. Ruined peasants, unemployed artisans, that was the image that Greece portrayed during the Hellenistic era. Even trade was affected. Sea routes shifted eastward, closer to the new kingdoms, thus contributing to the prosperity of Rhodes and Delos, while Athens and Piraeus declined. The economic crisis was accompanied by a social crisis. While the population of Greece was declining, the contradictions between the wealthy minority and the growing mass of the poor were becoming more acute and, as in the time of the tyrants, internal struggles occurred. The establishment, or rather the renewal of the alliance in the 3rd century, which united several cities (the Achaean League, the Aetolian League), could not restore Greece to its former power. Athens even lost its intellectual prestige. Although great philosophers, such as Epicurus and Zeno of Citium, still taught in Athens, the literary and artistic activity of the former metropolis declined and developed in the great capitals of the other Hellenistic kingdoms. (Cition=kiti on: v-n-t[ov-on-ot], R.I.) (Китион=кити он: в-н-т[ов-он-от], Р.И.)

The Syrian kingdom. This was the most extensive kingdom and its vastness alone posed difficulties for the Seleucids in terms of organization and maintenance. The Seleucids considered themselves the heirs of the great Achaemenid kings. As absolute rulers of divine origin, surrounded by numerous courts, they adhered to Eastern rituals and

relied on a large bureaucracy and almost entirely on a Macedonian and Greek administration. In order to attract the Hellenes to their empire, the Seleucids founded many cities (about sixty) that enjoyed autonomous privileges. The Greeks lived in them but they retained their language, their own system of education and culture. The majority of the natives were not able to afford it but the elite were attracted to this way of life. And so these cities became hotbeds of Hellenistic culture. The Greeks also contributed to the development of economic life. Caravans cruised the fertile land and the shores of the Aegean Sea, thus contributing to the enrichment of large cities such as Babylon, Antioch, Seleucia and Pergamum. But the Seleucids were unable to maintain their vast empire as a whole: in the middle of the 3rd century, part of Asia Minor separated from Syria; independent states were created here (the kingdom of Pergamum, Pontus, Cappadocia and Bithynia) while the heart of Anatolia was settled by the Galatians, conquerors of Celtic origin. The most powerful kingdom was Pergamum (281/280-133) whose capital, under the influence of the Attalids, who (241) defeated the Galatians, became, after Alexandria, the second artistic and intellectual center of the Hellenistic world (remarkable sculptures of the Wounded Gaul, a large altar of Zeus, a library of 300,000 books and the production of parchment). In the east, the entire Iranian plateau escaped from Seleucid rule and became part of the Parthian Empire. Despite capable rulers, such as Antiochus III (223-187), who managed to temporarily establish power over the eastern provinces of the monarchy, the Seleucids were soon forced to content themselves with Syria and Mesopotamia.

The Egyptian kingdom. Of all the Hellenistic kingdoms, Egypt achieved the greatest power. The ruling Ptolemaic or Lagidae dynasty amassed what it had inherited from Alexander, who was buried in Alexandria. Proud to be Macedonian, they accepted being Egyptian pharaohs and as such recognized them as gods who had their own cult and their own priests. They retained the existing administrative system, a very heavy bureaucracy and courtiers who surrounded the pharaohs.

The entire Egyptian territory belonged to the king who regulated and benefited from the cultivation of the land: the native peasants thus become the monarch's tenants, to whom they were obliged to give tribute and kuluk. Of course, the administration strictly controlled the application of this system. However, part of the property was ceded to the great dignitaries, or klerus (military colonists), who provided regular recruits for the army. Industry, as a monopoly of the state, was also in the hands of the pharaohs. Following the example of the Seleucids, the Ptolemais also invited many Macedonians and Greeks who came to serve as officials or soldiers. But unlike their neighbours, the Ptolemais founded only a small number of cities, in order to avoid the creation of a large number of free enclaves because the Greeks theoretically did not fall under their jurisdiction. Alexandria was indeed the largest, richest and most magnificent Macedonian city. For two centuries, it was the new metropolis and a huge trading warehouse of products from Asia and Africa (Arabic perfumes, Indian spices and cotton, silk and porcelain from China). These goods were re-exported to all the countries of the Mediterranean. Hundreds of ships used the large Alexandrian port, which was well organized (the first lighthouse was built there on the island of Pharos). Finally, a good part of Egyptian industry was concentrated in the city with its ornate and magnificent monuments. (En-klave; Ex-klave; S-klave = Sklava-Sklavina, R.I.) En-klave;Ex-klave;S-klave=Sklava-Sklavina, P.II.)

There was nothing Greek but only Hellenistic - Greek created delusions.

“The Hellenistic culture. The expansion of the Greek world fundamentally changed its culture.

Monarchy. The cities in Greece, there is no doubt, preserved their autonomy but the assemblies and alliances had to work out a common policy; however, the decline of the Hellenic peninsula prevented the assemblies from playing a more significant political role. Little by little, the Greeks lost their civic spirit, especially among those who lived in

Asia or Egypt, where they went from being subjects to citizens. The monarchy, which at first relied only on force (the king being above all a victorious military leader), soon fell under the influence of religion. The ruler actually won a victory only because he was the protector of the gods, and therefore all Hellenistic gods nurtured this view of power. Therefore, the cult of the dynasty was imposed on all natives and Greeks in Egypt. The rulers began to add divine epithets to their names, such as 'saviour' (sotere) or 'benefactor' (eurgetes). This absolutist power contributed to centralization; the king controlled political life; ministers and governors were only his representatives, his officials. The king ruled and managed 'his country', all the wealth of which belonged to him through his large bureaucratic apparatus.

Economy. The Macedonians, with their expansion, transformed the entire economy of the eastern Mediterranean basin because they opened the conquered lands to international trade and exchange. By minting money, the Macedonians put into circulation the vast treasures of the Achaemenids and its use spread to many regions that had previously known only barter. The Hellenistic rulers helped the development of the economy in their own interests: new roads and trade ports increased customs revenue. Production was monopolistically organized. At first, wealth accumulated rapidly but, over time, this monarchical centralism turned into an oppressive system that would eventually paralyze some sectors of the economy, especially in Egypt, where peasants fled their lands to avoid paying taxes.

Spiritual culture and art. This expansion of the world also led to changes in the field of thought and art. In the foreign world, in the sea of natives, the Macedonians and Greeks were forced to stop their quarrels and preserve only what united them. This new unity was most clearly reflected in the adoption of a common language, koine, which was cleansed of dialectal differences. Far from their homeland, cut off from the city limits, facing the wide horizon, the Macedonians and Greeks, who had lost their peace and were seeking salvation, were no longer satisfied with the old beliefs or with the numerous deities. They

preferred to turn to abstract gods, to mystical beliefs, or accept the morality that, as a rule, Epicureanism and Stoicism provided them.”

Only one thing followed: in Alexandria, the “common language, the koine” was adopted.

“The Egyptian rulers adopted the Koine language as the language of their court, which was opened to everyone. This gift was shared by all, Macedonians, Greeks and foreigners. On top of that the Ptolemais opened their court to academics, scientists and artists supported and protected by the king. As a result, science achieved an unprecedented development. The mathematician Euclid and the geographer Eratosthenes spread their teachings in Alexandria; since the Ptolemies allowed dissection, knowledge of anatomy and physiology deepened.

The Hellenistic cities, with their vast and monumental vistas, built by great architects, were the centers of this culture; in Alexandria there was a ‘museum’ where writers and scientists gathered, with a rich library of 700,000 books, while the library of Pergamum had 300,000 books; although more poorly equipped, the small cities, thanks to their schools and gymnasiums, were centers for the spread of Macedonian supported enlightenment.

The importance of Hellenistic culture also spread to distant lands, in eastern Iran and northern India, where Macedonian and Greek artistic tradition was very clearly expressed in the Greco-Buddhist sculptures of Gandhara (today’s Afghanistan). This influence was also felt in the West thanks to Rome, whose victorious conquests in the Mediterranean region allowed this culture to expand its sphere of influence.

Rome’s geographical position at the home of Magna Graecia, and especially Sicily, where a citizens of Syracuse at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. founded a monarchy of the Hellenistic type, enabled the city to more easily accept the Greco-Macedonian heritage.

Sicily during the time of Agathocles (318/317- 289). When Timoleon abdicated and retired (337), the party struggles in Sicily revived, where



a mass of immigrants played a very significant role. Agathocles, also an immigrant, placed himself at the head of the popular party and, with the help of the Carthaginians, came to power (318/317- 289). He took the title 'autocratic general', seized the land from the aristocrats and distributed it to the people and postponed debt payments. Then he brought the neighbouring cities under his rule but clashed with Carthage, which sent an expedition to attack him (311). Besieged in Syracuse, Agathocles managed to escape from there and transferred the war to Africa. Not encountering much resistance, he ravaged the territory of Carthage but failed to capture the city. Exhausted he returned to Sicily by sea. Carthage accepted negotiations (306). As the undisputed master of all eastern Sicily, Agathocles, who wanted to be equal to the eastern diados, then took the title king (around 300). He then thought of extending his power to Magna Graecia, where around 300 he intervened at the invitation of Tarentum, who was constantly threatened by the neighbouring mountain tribes. After he established a democracy in Syracuse, he fought for several more years before his death (289). His death allowed Rome to intervene freely and ended the discord that soon appeared among the Greek island cities.

### *Rise of Roman power*

Conquest of Italy. Rome conquered Latium and resisted the Celtic attacks; now it would gradually expand to the border of the peninsula.

Fight against the Etruscans. As the invasions of the Celts deeply shook the Etruscan Empire, Rome, during the 4th century, took advantage of favourable opportunities to attack its largest cities (Veju, Cerveteri, Tarquinium). Veju fell first, around 396, and soon Cerveteri (351), but the resistance offered by the other cities continued until the beginning of the 3rd century and ended with the capitulation of Vulsius (around 280/373), and especially with the capitulation of the powerful Vulsinus (265). The Romans, who had already been influenced by Etruscan culture since the time of Tarquin, adopted the culture of the conquered cities.

Samnite Wars. Along with the conquest of the lands north of the Tiber, the Romans also intervened in Campania. At the invitation of Capua, which was forced to defend itself against the Samnite hillmen, Rome entered Samnium. The struggle, which would be long and difficult, required the undertaking of several campaigns in order to break the Samnite resistance. The first campaign was short-lived (around 343-342 or 340) but this did not prevent the Samnites from capturing Fregella again, a few years later, thus cutting off all communication between Rome and Capua. Rome then began a second, much longer war (327-304), which was particularly famous for the painful defeat called the 'Caudine Yoke' (321); it recaptured Fregella (313/311) and, as the victor, built a road connecting it to Capua (Via Appia). The Third Samnite War (298-271) was Rome's final victory, which, by defending the passage between Campania and Apulia, founded the colony of Venusia (today Venosa). The road to southern Italy was free.

War against Tarentum and the Greeks of southern Italy. Throughout the 4th century, Sicily was the scene of fighting between the Greeks and Carthaginians. Dionysius of Syracuse managed to hold back the Punic attacks; at the same time, the Greek cities south of the peninsula, suffered attacks from the Apulia tribes and were forced to call on the Greek royalty for help almost regularly. Unfortunately, at the end of the 4th century, the Greeks, who had been attracted to Asia since Alexander's conquests, stopped helping their colonies in the West and, left to their own devices, experienced more and more difficulties in preserving their independence, especially after Agathocles of Syracuse died (289).

In cases such as these, the Greek cities saw the Romans as a possible ally which could deal with the peoples who threatened them. Some, such as the Thurii, Locri and Rhegii asked Rome to station garrisons to defend them. But Tarentum, the strongest of them, felt, despite the agreement concluded with Rome probably around 303, saw a threat in the Romans themselves and expelled their garrisons. Rome immediately conquered its territory (281). Tarentum called for help from Pyrrhus,

the king of Epirus. Pyrrhus landed in Italy in 281-280 and defeated the Romans at Heraclea (280) and then at Ascula (279), but this victory was very costly and Pyrrhus did not know what to make of it. Having temporarily eliminated the Roman threat, he crossed to Sicily and conquered it (278); the Greek cities recognized him as 'king' of the island; but as he terrorized the people, around 276, they forced him to return to the peninsula. Pyrrhus suffered a serious defeat at Beneventum in 275 and returned to Greece the following year, conquering only a single garrison in the city of Tarentum. The Romans then brought the conquest of Magna Graecia to an end, capturing Tarentum (272/271) and Rhegium (270). In this way they conquered the entire peninsula, not with the speed with which the Macedonians had conquered Asia, but with a tenacity that enabled them to overcome all obstacles. (Epirus = ε πυρ, R.I.) (Епир=ε пир, Р.И.)

Consequences of the conquest of Italy. These incessant wars had a strong echo in the interior of the city.

- The Roman army. The Roman army was well organized. All citizens were obliged to serve in the army by going on a certain number of military campaigns; however, the poorest were exempt from this obligation; only part of the poorest conscripts were recruited and that by lot.

After the campaign ended, the soldiers and officers returned to their homes and continued their work. Soldiers were organized into legions, which secured the camps every night; at the end of the 4th century Rome regularly led four legions of 4200 infantry and 300 cavalry on each campaign. The legionaries received a salary. Tactically, the unit was a manipule, consisting of two centurions; during battles, the legion acted in three rows (hastati in the first row, principes in the second and, finally, triarii in the third); the last, heavily armed row was made up of the most distinguished soldiers. At the same time, Rome built a fleet and entered the ranks of naval powers by concluding treaties with

Rhodes (306), Tarentum (around 303?) and Carthage (348/344; 325; 306-305).

- Regulating conquered Italy. For this purpose, Rome used two procedures: annexation and federation. The annexed territories were under the direct rule of Rome and were inhabited by Roman citizens who, however, did not enjoy the same rights. Some (*cives optimo jure*) were full citizens, who enjoyed public and private law; they consisted of thirty-five Roman tribes and participated in political life thanks to their right to vote. The others were citizens with limited rights (*cives sine suffragio*) who enjoyed only private law but did not have the right to vote. When it came to the annexed territories, only Rome was a city, while the rest were municipalities with autonomous regulations or prefectures under Rome's direct administration. Moreover, Rome created colonies with its citizens, which took the role of military base outposts in strategically important places. The rest of Italy was a federal territory. The various cities within this territory concluded very different alliance agreements with Rome. The most favoured were allies with Latin names who received rights that were previously enjoyed by the inhabitants of Latium, before they became citizens of Rome. The rights and duties of each allied city were determined by various treaties. All cities recognized the supremacy of Rome and had to supply it with money and men for its army. In return, the City (*Urbs*) Rome guarded the entire peninsula.

- Internal circumstances in Rome. The role played by the plebs in the army allowed them to consolidate their political victory over the patricians: the opening of plebeian consulates; a better division of the conquered lands (*ager publicus*) on the basis of the laws of Licinius (367 or 363); the plebeians accessed the organs of judicial power (337-333); the publication of the regulations for judicial procedures (304); and even the pontificate itself was available to the plebeians (296). The struggle between the plebeians and the patricians was practically over; now the richest plebeians had access to the circles of aristocracy that governed the city through the senate.

- Change in the development of Rome. Bronze and even silver coins come into use; Rome minted its first silver coin in 268. With the conquest of southern Italy, Greek influence was felt more and more strongly in the fields of art and religion but with it Etruscan influence was rejected, which was clearly maintained on the beautiful bronze coffin, called the cist Ficoroni, made around 330.

Inheriting all the worries regarding the West, the Eternal City(Rome) took it upon itself to continue the centuries-old struggle with the Greeks and the Carthaginians.

The West on the eve of the Punic Wars. While the East and the eastern Mediterranean Basin, a world of wealth and prosperity, were in the hands of the Greeks, until then the West and the western Mediterranean Basin was populated by barbarians, outside the great commercial and cultural currents, and as such were suitable for conquest. Since the Western Greeks had left the stage, there were now two powers that could unite the Western world: Carthage and Rome.

Europe continued to be the territory of the Celts, who had successively dispersed in waves over that space inhabited by Neolithic tribes, where the first rudiments of civilization appeared, the diversity and instability of which we have already mentioned.

On the southern shore of the Mediterranean, another world had developed. It was separated by many external influences, namely the sea to the north and deserts to the south. This was the Berber world, consisting of descendants of Neolithic peoples, with a nomadic way of life. Gathered in tribes they were subordinate to one leader. But in times of war they united in clans headed by one leader, the agelid. They united in alliances or kingdoms, admittedly very weak; in the 3rd century four large areas were distinguished: in the south the territory of the Getuli, in the east the Massili, in the center the Massesili and in the west was the territory of the Moors.

The western world was first witness, and then prey to the struggle between Rome and Carthage.

Punic Wars. Reaching the south of Italy, Rome came into direct contact with Carthage. Maritime and commercial relations had already been linked with these two cities but until the end of the 4th century their interests did not clash, because Carthage enjoyed supremacy at sea, and Rome was occupied purely with land problems. The situation, however, changed at the beginning of the 3rd century. On the one hand, Rome had already built a fleet and, as the successor to the Greek trading cities, began to show interest in the sea; on the other hand, since it had reached the end point of the peninsula, it was naturally attracted by Sicily as an extension of the peninsula.

First Punic War. (264-241). The First Punic War began in 264 after Rome intervened in Messina, which was captured by a Carthaginian garrison. The Sicilian Greeks then supported Carthage and Rome was forced to fight them first. It quickly dealt with the new king of Syracuse, Hiero, who was defeated and forced to negotiate (263). Hiero retained his kingdom but had to pay a large indemnity and provide assistance to Roman troops during the war. The Romans captured Agrigentum in 262 and gained enormous booty. In Sicily, the Carthaginians were now Rome's sole opponents; but to defeat them Rome had to master the sea. This was achieved at the cost of a great effort in shipbuilding. And so in 260, after their first victory, the Roman ships, equipped with special hooks which facilitated the approach of the other ship, caused the Punic fleet to disperse at Mylae. However, despite Roman interventions in Corsica, Sardinia and Malta, Carthage still held most of Sicily and even stronger positions. Rome then tried to transfer the war to Africa; the campaign entrusted to the consul Regulus ended in defeat. Under the leadership of the Lacedaemonian Xanthippus, the Greek mercenary army in the service of Carthage destroyed the Roman expeditionary corps (255). The war then became difficult without any results. Then in 241, Rome finally won a decisive victory at sea by the Aegatic Islands. By a treaty in 241, Carthage was

forced to abandon Sicily (and the islands between Sicily and Italy) and pay a large indemnity of 3200 talents.

Between the Punic Wars. The consequences of the war were felt in both cities. In Rome, the social unrest caused by the war led to reforms of the assembly (241). In Carthage, the consequences were even more serious; the dismissed consuls raised a revolt. Rome took the opportunity to force Carthage to cede Corsica and Sardinia (238), and in return it helped Carthage subdue the rebels (237).

However, Carthage did not accept defeat. While the Roman conquest efforts were even greater after its victory, both sides began to prepare for new conquests. However, it would be twenty years before these two rivals, whose expansions were initially directed in different directions, would clash again.

Namely, Rome was now busy in the north and the east. First, it intervened in the Adriatic Sea, which was patrolled by pirates, whose strongholds were in Illyria. They often caused damage to Roman trade. In 229, Rome intervened on both land and at sea, imposing a protectorate on the Roman provinces of Epirus and the island of Kerkyra; at first, this protectorate was transitory, but after the second campaign the Romans made it permanent (220-219). This was how Rome's first contacts with Greece looked like. In 226, Rome was again pressured by the Gauls; they occupied Etruria but the Romans defeated the Gauls at Cape Talamon in 225, undertook conquests in Cisalpine Gaul and began to build a strategic road (via Flaminia)."

There was Hellas, never Greece - Greeks were members of the Patriarchate in Constantinople.

"The Punic expansion towards the West at that same time was directed under the leadership of Barcidas. Expelled from Sicily, the Carthaginians conquered Spain, rich in ore. One after another, Hamilcar, Hasdrubal and then Hannibal, over the course of several years, subjugated the Celto-Iberian lands, establishing a large number

of trading strongholds and finally New Carthage. Rome did not seem to mind this expansion; nevertheless, it wanted to direct itself towards the north, determining the Ebro (or Jucar?) as the border beyond which the Carthaginian troops must not cross (agreement of 226). But suddenly, in 219, The Romans provoked a conflict, accusing Carthage of violating the treaty by capturing Saguntum. War broke out between them again.

Second Punic War (218-201). The Carthaginians carefully prepared for this eventuality. Their leader Hannibal, who was then 28 years old, was an outstanding strategist and a wise statesman. He was able to take the initiative in operations and in a short time brought Rome to ruin. In the spring of 218, Hannibal crossed the Pyrenees, then the Alps and in September he arrived in the valley of the Po River. The Cisalpine Gauls welcomed Hannibal as a liberator and joined him. The Romans were defeated at Ticinum, then at Trebia (218) and in the spring of 217, at Lake Trasimene. The road to Rome was clear but Hannibal did not dare attack the city. Then Rome handed over power to Fabius Maximus Cunctator, who changed tactics and avoided frontal combat with the Carthaginians, but did not stop harassing them. However, this policy of avoidance quickly tired the Romans. In order to settle the score with Hannibal, who had encamped in southern Italy, the Romans gathered new troops, far more numerous than the Carthaginians, and began the battle of Cannae (August 2, 216); it was a complete defeat and Rome was on the verge of ruin. Soon after, a large part of southern Italy rebelled; Capua, in particular, hospitably opened its doors to Hannibal. After Hieron II did in 215, Syracuse chose Hannibal, which entailed the loss of Sicily. The Romans sent a legion to Spain under the leadership of two Scipios (Publius and Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio). At the same time Hannibal concluded an alliance with the Macedonians, the Antigonid king Philip V, who wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to throw the Romans out of Illyria.

- Finding itself in great danger, Rome stubbornly defended itself. Four new legions were raised; taxes were increased; attempts were made to appease the gods, both Roman and Greek, even the Punic ones. Rome



then took the initiative in the operations. Having captured Tarentum and the other cities of Magna Graecia, Hannibal again encamped in Capua (213-212). The city was again captured and severely punished. In the same year, Marcellus's Romans transferred the war to Sicily and captured Syracuse, despite Archimedes' good defense (211). In Greece, the Romans concluded an anti-Macedonian alliance and thus reduced the threat from Philip V. According to the Treaty of Phoenicia (205), the Romans retained part of the conquered territories. In Spain, young Publius Scipio renewed the Roman campaigns and managed to capture Carthage (early 209), but he was unable to hold the army which, under the command of Hasdrubal, set out for Italy to help. However, Hasdrubal was defeated at Metaura in Umbria, where he died (207). Scipio then captured all the Carthaginian possessions in Spain (victory at Ilippo, 206). He was elected consul in 205, crossed to Sicily and made preparations for landing in Africa, having made an alliance with the Numidian Masinias, king of Massilia, against another Numidian, Syphax, king of Massilia and ally of Carthage. In 203, Masinias overthrew Syphax with the help of the Romans. Carthage summoned Hannibal who was still in southern Italy; he wanted to negotiate but under pressure from his countrymen was forced to continue the war. Scipio, with the help of the Numidian cavalry, defeated Hannibal at Zama (202). Rome emerged victorious from this long and difficult war. Rome then demanded that Hannibal deprive himself of its fleet and colonies, pay a large indemnity, and establish a strong Numidian kingdom on his borders, an ally of Rome (peace of 201).

Consequences of the Punic Wars. The two Punic Wars, especially the second, profoundly changed Roman society and mentality. The human losses were heavy; in the second half of the 3rd century the number of citizens decreased noticeably. The war, often fought far from Rome, and even outside Italy, kept Roman peasants away from their lands for a long time, leaving their fields uncultivated. After returning home, the soldiers, starving and impoverished, sold their lands to the nobles. Here, as in Greece, the war widened the gap between rich and poor. The

middle class citizens and peasants disappeared and with it the strength of the democratic party. Having already seized all the power, the senatorial nobility also got their hands on the immovable properties. In addition to its lenders in times of war, the state, in the name of paying off the debt, granted them concessions of state land (*ager publicus*). Thus, with the increase in the number of *latifundia*, the appearance of the Italian provinces changed (cereal cultivation declined and extensive livestock farming developed, which contributed to the competition of grain from Sicily). By the law of 219, senators were forbidden from engaging in maritime trade. Movable goods were in the hands of the 'knights'. They represented a real capitalist class, dealing with trade and credit, and with large-scale contracts they concluded with the state (with public auctions, supplying the army, collecting state revenues).

Rome had to adapt to the situation created by the conquests; as master of the central part of the western basin of the Mediterranean, it established four provinces headed by four praetors (Sicily and Sardinia, 227; this side and that side of Spain, 197). On the other hand, the war changed Roman mentality. The citizen soldier, who had fought for a long time, became attached to his superiors; some leaders, such as Publius Cornelius Scipio, conqueror of Spain and victor at Zamae, enjoyed great prestige. Taking advantage of their personal prestige, the superiors sometimes disobeyed the orders of the senate. The position assumed by the victors was reminiscent of what had happened in the Greek world. However, a particularly great influence on Rome was exerted by the Hellenistic culture and Hellenistic monarchy. Hellenism penetrated Roman society during times of war, when the cities of Magna Graecia, Sicily and finally the kingdom of Syracuse fell under Roman rule. From this contact arose a Latin principality that immediately adopted the literary genres of classical Greece. Livy Andronicus translated the *Odyssey* and tragedies; Aenius composed a history of Rome in epic verse and Plautus entertained his contemporaries with comedies inspired by the Greek theater. At the

same time, the Greek gods and the cult of mysteries were introduced to Rome.”

In the B.C. centuries they spoke only Barbarian and Pelasgian (Dionysius).

“And so even before Rome set out to conquer the Hellenistic world, it was already imbued with Hellenism.”

Hellenism cannot be equated with Greeks=Greiks=Grei ks:

Helios=Ilios. (Хеленизам не може да се истовети со

Грци=Греики=Греи ик: Хелиос=Илиос.)

## **Rome and the unification of the Mediterranean world**

### *“Conquests and Hellenization*

The unification of the Mediterranean world was the work of Roman skill, which was said to be the essence of the genius of the peasant people, not very brilliant, but serious, energetic and melodious. Its main feature was a sense of order and organization. These qualities made the Roman citizens a nation of lawyers, historians, moralizers and realists. Strictly speaking, the culture remained quite poor but Rome knew how to conquer and organize Greek thought for the sake of further conquests; the consequence of this was the Hellenization of the ancient world.

The Mediterranean “Mare nostrum”. At the beginning of the Roman conquests there was a dramatic period that the City managed to overcome - the crisis of the Second Punic War. And the crisis was complete and touched all areas of state life, thus bringing Rome to the brink of ruin.

- Military crisis: the already celebrated legion suffered heavy losses, was already exhausted, destroyed, and worse, had to face the crisis caused by defeatism. The citizens no longer believed in the good

destiny of their City. They hid to avoid military service (especially in 210).

- Diplomatic crisis arose due to Hannibal's maneuvers in Italy to separate Rome from the Italian confederation; the consequence of this was the separation of Capua.
- Economic crisis: agriculture was ruined: the precious metal became a great rarity.
- A religious crisis, finally, is mixed with a political crisis: did the old ships abandon Rome?

The crisis was overcome by willpower, energy and resilience. Victory always helped to overcome all extraordinary problems. The army was increased. From six legions, as they had before the war, it had now grown, as Titus Livius testified, to twenty-three legions (one legion numbering 5,000 men). This meant that more than 100,000 Romans were under arms, and no doubt as many allies. After Capua was severely punished, the Italian confederation became more united than ever. Victory had enabled Rome to seize the Spanish silver mines, the Sicilian and Andalusian granaries and peace had enabled it to preserve all of this. Prices were soaring for everything except cereals. The Romans had therefore succeeded in creating a new type of agriculture on their war-ravaged land, modern, based on livestock and fruit growing. The Senate held, more than ever before, the unity of the City. It allowed the introduction of new traditions, such as the cult of the black stone of Pessinon 205/204, but supervised it very strictly and thus limited its full influence for a long time. From then on, everything went in Rome's favour while it continued its conquests: the celebrated army that saved it; the senate at the peak of power, eager to hold the strings of events in its hands; the mechanism of economics - the entire internal dynamism that made Rome the master of the world.

Conquest of the East. Even before the Second Punic War, Rome, apart from those military episodes with Pyrrhus, had military operations in

the eastern basin of the Mediterranean. In this way, it distinguished itself as a Hellenistic power. Even during the war with Hannibal, it sent an army against the Macedonian king Philip V, a Carthaginian ally. Thus it plunged into the Balkans (First Macedonian War of 215-205).

Balkans. When the conflict between Philip V's ambitions and the Greek states that defended the freedom of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles straits broke out, Rome opposed him with an ultimatum in 200. This began the Second Macedonian War (200-196). An expeditionary corps landed in Epirus in 199. The consul Flaminius defeated his opponent at Cynoscephalae (197). The war did not end with annexation. In 196, during the Isthmian Games in Corinth, which the consul presided over, he solemnly proclaimed freedom for the Greek states. This was undoubtedly wise but also an expression of respect for Hellenism, which had a powerful influence on the Romans.

After peace in the spring of 196, Macedonia still existed in the north of Thessaly, and it was still powerful. Philip V prepared for revenge. But when he died in 179, his successor Perseus took over. He led the Third Macedonian War (172) in Thessaly until the Roman victory at Pydna (22 June 168). The Roman occupation became increasingly difficult due to rebellions, especially by the Andrici (149-148). The Senate took very harsh measures. It destroyed Corinth which terrified the Greeks. The Romans victoriously transferred the wealth of this city to Rome. Macedonia became a Roman province. Greece also became a Roman province during the 1st century.

Asia. • At about the same time Rome also destroyed the Seleucid kingdom. Antiochus III the Great (223-187) extended his power through war to India (212-204). It seemed, therefore, that he would be the only ruler capable of stopping the Roman legions, especially after the victory over the Egyptians at Paneon (200?), and Ha Nibaldus' arrival at his court (late 196 or 195). But instead he attacked the small kingdom of Pergamum, a Roman protectorate, which brought Rome into the conflict. The struggle began in Greece in 192. Although he had

elephants, Antiochus was defeated at Thermopylae at sea (191) and then in the decisive battle of Sipylus near Magnesia (January, 189). He had to negotiate with Lucius Scipio, a Roman general, to whom his brother Scipio Africanus was a teacher and advisor. With the Peace of Apamea (188), Antiochus' state was not destroyed but it was pushed out of Asia Minor and weakened. From then on, his state was in constant decline. It was undermined by the nomadic Parthians from the Iranian plateau who soon conquered Mesopotamia. Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164) wanted to oppose them. But when he tried to expand his power by encroaching on Egypt, he came into conflict with Roman diplomacy. Then the famous event of the Popilius Circle actually happened. Namely, the Roman envoy drew a circle in the sand around the king and asked him to make a decision before he came out of the circle. Antiochus IV promised to withdraw (July 168).

- The Kingdom of Pergamum and Egypt. The constant dynastic disputes in which Rome was always the arbitrator weakened Egypt. Pergamum relied on Rome's friendship to keep it afloat. When Attalus III died without an heir, he bequeathed the kingdom to Rome. The uprising raised by his half-brother Aristonicus was defeated in 129 and the small kingdom became a Roman province in Asia.

But this was far from the end of the unification of the East - it would remain for the great undertakings of the 1st century.

Conquest of the West. The fall of Carthage created the opportunity for Rome to carry out conquests in the West. These conquests began first with the capture of northern Italy, that is, the dangerous Cisalpine Gaul, and ended in the first half of the 2nd century, when the Romans established their positions on the islands.

- After 197, there were two Spanish provinces: this side of Spain and that side of Spain (approximately Andalusia). Attracted by the country's wealth, colonists arrived in droves. But after 154, they caused terrible rebellions. Rome quickly responded with brutal measures that were not always successful. Scipio Aemilius, Rome's military leader, with a

skillful combination of force and cunning (capturing Numantia in 133), established peace in 133, expanding his conquests in Lusitania and the land of the Celtiberians. But then, only the northwestern part of the peninsula remained independent.

- Africa - the jewel of Rome in the West. As protector of the Numidian king Masinius, Rome watched with concern the renewed rise of Carthage. It expanded its territorial bases and its wealth was such that it paid without any difficulty the seemingly enormous war indemnity of 10,000 talents, 200 per year. This rent, which filled the Roman treasury, ceased in 151. The Romans intervened (Third Punic War 149-146) on the pretext that Carthage had begun what remained of its misfortune - a war against their protégé Masinius. Scipio Aemilianus besieged the city for three years. The city fell in 146, its remains were destroyed, the population was displaced and the territory turned into a Roman African province. Thus Rome became the master of North Africa, helping to create a great Numidia, which under King Messinis and his son Micips, remained loyal to Rome until 118.

- The Romans also crossed into Gaul and for the first time (154), at the request of the city of Marseille, it became its ally. A lasting result was achieved only in 122, when Sextius Calvinus founded the fortress of Aquae Sextiae (Aix-en-Provence). Gaul resistance provoked a major military operation. Consul Domitius Ahenobarbus conquered the entire area from the Alps to the Pyrenees and Toulouse and built a road from Italy to Spain, the so-called Domitian Road (via Domitia). West of Rhone, Rome founded the Narbo Martius (Narbona) colony in 118, which became the center of the area that was from then on called Prvincia (Provence) or Narbonne Province.

During the start of the 2nd century Rome had not yet created a homogeneous empire but soon it would become a power that would rule the entire known world. Was its situation solid? Its spiritual renewal should be examined.

Hellenization of the Roman world. The result of the Roman conquest of the Hellenic world was the Hellenization of the Roman world. Since then, a very rich mixture of Greek-Latin civilization had emerged, which created a spiritual force - the foundation for the unification of the Mediterranean peoples with Rome, despite their ethnic, political, social, economic and cultural differences. The Hellenization of Rome was not without difficulties. After the Punic Wars, it even became synonymous with decline and decay. It was still a period of deep crisis. But in order to understand the full scope of this crisis, one should be well acquainted with the Roman mentality attached to traditions. Only then can one begin to study what could be called the 'spiritual revolution of the 2nd century'.

Censor Cato or resistance to Hellenism. A cheerful, wise and less cynical Greece was seen as the opposite of the strict and rigid Rome. This contradiction came from the Romans themselves. It was expressed particularly vividly by the famous censor Cato, defender of *mos majorum* ('ancestral customs'). Politicians and writers of this era, Plautus for example, demanded respect for the old 'Roman traditions', opposing Greek customs, corruptions individualism, discord and weakness. It was natural that in times of crisis, these nationalist reactionaries wanted to defend the purity of the Latin heritage. The bearers of this resistance emphasized the virtues and character traits of a peasant people, simple-minded and resilient, statesmen, full of those virtues that ensured the glory of Rome. As if it were a classic return to the 'good old days', to some kind of 'golden age', to the myth of the blessed savagery embodied in the peasant of Latium. Such reactions also occurred in the field of religion. However, the oldest customs to which they returned were affected by an even greater crisis. After the war, no one paid any attention to mythology, instead to the ritual ceremonies inseparable from the existence of the state. When a mystical cult, such as that of Dionysus appeared, the Romans reacted strongly by issuing strict regulations and rules for its practice (as evidenced by the



Senate decision of 186, when the Bacchanalia were banned due to scandal).

Inevitable Hellenization. • After the crisis that occurred during the Second Punic War, the gap between Greece and Rome deepened. However, such a situation did not exist before, as Latin historians and moralists would have us believe: from the very beginning, Rome breathed the climate of Hellenism - the climate of classical Greek civilization. It could be said that Rome was the most Hellenized non-Greek city in Italy. Rome's negative attitude towards Hellenization was caused by the struggle against the oriental city of Carthage, against Hannibal, the disciple of the Greek strategists, as well as the rebellion of the Greek allies of Italy. Although victorious, Rome was angry at Hellenism but it could not renounce it. Rome eventually became the capital of the Hellenistic world. It succeeded Alexander by taking up his ideal and defeating the barbarians.

• Two figures were the bearers of this transformation: Cato, a small landowner from Tusculum, and Scipio Africanus, an aristocrat open to new ideas. Although short-lived, Cato (whose voice was heard at the end of the 2nd century) quickly became a representative of the most reactionary conservatism. His worldview was based on the idea of justice: popular virtue was always rewarded. When Rome applied it to defend its rights, victory was always its own. But if he expanded the field of conquest, his work was unjust. Although Scipio died in 183 (when his rival was Censor), his conception was nevertheless destined to triumph. He replaced the idea of 'justice' with the purely Hellenistic notion of 'fate'. The fate (Tychè) of Rome carried the city towards what was destined for it, which was a world empire. However, Hellenistic culture was still spreading despite philosophers being persecuted and cults being restricted. When Scipio Aemilius destroyed Macedonia, he took Perseus's famous Library. The sacking of Corinth created an opportunity for Rome to become acquainted with Greek art. Polybius wanted to explain the striving of that age in his history and to show the deep meaning of Rome's conquest of the world: the intention of

intelligent Providence to choose Rome as its instrument. With Scipio Aemilianus, the theses of his great-grandson, Scipio Africanus the Elder, won. This century was truly Scipio's century and represented the meeting of Roman aspirations and the Hellenistic understanding of the world, thus justifying the supremacy of Rome. The fate of the empire broke the old social foundations."

## **HUMANITY'S RACES**

H.G. Wells <sup>46</sup> wrote: "Among the numerous obstacles and interruptions in the crossings were certain major obstacles, such as the Atlantic Ocean, the mountains, the now-vanished seas of Central Asia, and the like, which for long periods separated the great groups of subspecies from each other. In these separated groups certain broad similarities and differences developed very early. In most of the human subspecies of East Asia and America, though not all, common were: yellow skin, straight black hair and often high facial bones. Most of the natives south of the Sahara in Africa have black or swarthy skin, flattened noses, thick lips and curly hair. A large number of people in Northern and Western Europe have blond hair, blue eyes and a ruddy complexion. The Mediterranean is dominated by a world of white skin, black eyes and black hair. This dark-white group seems to represent a middle humanity, which passed almost imperceptibly north, east, and south into subordinate white, yellow, and various black groups. The black hair of many of these dark-whites is straight, but by no means as strong and uncurled as that of the yellow man. In the east it is straighter than in the west. In southern India we find darker and darker people with straight black hair, and further east they give way to those more and more like those in the yellow world"

Connection of the races of people with the types of animals. The flora and fauna follow.

---

<sup>46</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 61.

“On the scattered islands, in Papua and New Guinea, we find other lines of black and brown humans of a southern type with curly hair.

It should be borne in mind that this is still a very insufficiently defined generalization. Some sections and isolated groups of the Asiatic area may have been under circumstances similar to those in Europe. In some of the African regions a more Asiatic and less defined African type had developed. Similarly, we find a curly, white, hairy race at Ainu in Japan. (с + k + l + Ainu = hair, R.I.) (в + к + л + Аину = влакину, Р.И.)

Their faces resembled those of Europeans more than those of the surrounding yellow Japanese. Perhaps they were some kind of subsidiary part of the white race, or perhaps they were some kind of completely separate race. In the Andaman Islands, very far from both Australia and Africa, we find primitive black people. A streak of almost pure blooded black people were observed in southern Persia and in some parts of India. These were the ‘Asiatic’ black people.

There is little evidence that shows that all black people in Australia, Asia and Africa have a common origin. They seem to have lived where they were found for an infinitely long period and under similar circumstances. Perhaps all the older human races were either dark or black, and that the colour is clearly new. Nor is it to be taken for granted that all human beings in the East, Asiatic land, drifted in one direction, and all the human beings from Africa in another. There were great currents in all directions, that is true, but there were also stops, eddies, mixtures from one main area with another. What map of the world, which was supposed to represent the different races in colours, would not simply show four great areas in colours, but would in one place or another, have sprinkles of a multitude of colour tones and transitions, and on another a mix and cross of people.”

It has been said: “There is little or no evidence at all that shows that all black people, Australians, Asians and Africans, have a common origin”...”It should not be accepted as certainty that all human beings

from East Asia diverged in one direction, and all human beings from Africa diverged in another”.

It has been confirmed that the dark people (Blacks, Indians and Mongols) had a common origin. Their origin was connected from the time before there were continents.

The blood group A was in Whites because of cattle - where cattle were found there were Whites.

“It is only within the last fifty or sixty years that the human species began to be viewed as a complex division or still developing divisions. Before that those who were engaged in the study of humanity, consciously or unconsciously influenced by the story of Noah, the ark, and his three sons Shem, Ham, and Japheth, were inclined to classify humans into three or four great races, and were ready to regard these races as having always been distinct, and as having descended from really distinct ancestors. They did not take into account the great possibility of the races blending together, and the possibility of particular local divisions of the mixture. Their classification has varied in many ways but there has always been too much readiness to accept as certain that humanity must be divisible completely into three or four main groups. Ethnologists, that is, those who study races, have fallen into serious disputes over the multitude of smaller peoples, whether those peoples belonged to this or that original race, whether they are ‘mixtures’, whether they are lost racial forms, or what not. And in fact all those races are more or less mixed. There is no doubt that there are four main groups; but, of course, of them there is a whole collection of diverse compositions, while there are also small groups that cannot be included in any of those four.”<sup>47</sup>

With due regard to that restraint, and when it is racially understood that, speaking of those main divisions, we do not mean simple and pure races but groups of races. In the European area and in the area around the

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 62.

Mediterranean Sea, as well as in West Africa, there exist and have existed for many thousands of years white peoples, whom we usually call Caucasians. They are divided into two or three groups: 1) the northern blond or Nordic race, which many scientists doubt, 2) the so-called Alpine race, and 3) the southern dark-white, Mediterranean or Iberian race. In East Asia and America another group of races prevails, the Mongols, people usually with yellow skin, straight black hair and a solid body. In Africa again Blacks, and in the regions of Australia and New Guinea black, primitive Australoids. These are convenient names, but they are not final. They represent only the general characteristics of certain main groups of races. They leave out a certain number of smaller peoples, who do not really belong to any of these divisions and do not take into account the continuous mixing where the main groups intersect. In early times the Mediterranean or Iberian <sup>48</sup> division of the Caucasian races extended further and had less than the Nordic one a special and distinct type.

The southern border that separates the Blacks from the first Mongols is very difficult to determine or mark. Wilfred S. Blank says that Huxley 'had long suspected that the Egyptians and Dravidians had a common origin in India, as if there had been perhaps at a very early period another belt of dark-skinned people from India to Spain'."

The whites from the Eastern Mediterranean went to India...Japan (Japheth = Japheth).

"The Huxley 'belt' of dark-white and dark-skinned people, the race of half-dark and dark peoples, extended outwards from India. They reached the Pacific coast and were the first to bring knowledge to the region during the Neolithic era. There were also the founders of what we call enlightenment or civilization. It is possible that these dark peoples were, as it were, the basic peoples of the present world. The Nordic and Mongolian peoples could only represent the north-western

---

<sup>48</sup> Iberia was in the Caucasus - to Albania. The Iberian Peninsula was renamed the Pyrenees.

and north-eastern branches of that basic stem. Or the Nordic race may have been one branch, while the Mongolian and the Black race were perhaps some other equal and sub-dual stock, with which the dark-skinned people met and mixed in South China. Or the Nordic peoples could also have developed separately from the Paleolithic stage.”

The white race was one with blood group A created in the Levant. It surfaced around 15,000 B.C. (P. Adamo). Its creation was due to smallpox caused by the rinderpest.<sup>49</sup> The blood group was followed by vegetarian foods (cereals and legumes) of the white race, raised in the Levant.

So since blood group A was from animal infection, it was vegetarian.

“It seems that at a certain period of human history (as is stated in *The Migration of Early Education*, by Elliot Smith) there was a special type of Neolithic education spread throughout the world; judging from many of its peculiarly interesting features, it was unlikely that these developed independently in different parts of the world; and this again does not convince us that it was really one and the same education. This education extended throughout all the regions inhabited by the dark Mediterranean race, as well as beyond them through India, Indo-China, along the Pacific coast of China, and finally spread across the Pacific Ocean to Mexico and Peru. It was a coastal education. This special development of Neolithic education, which Elliot Smith calls Heliolithic (‘sun-stone’) included all, or many of these strange customs: 1., circumcision;<sup>50</sup> 2., a ridiculous custom of sending the father to bed when the child is born; 3., the custom of rubbing; 4., artificial mutilation by twisting the heads of children;<sup>51</sup> 5., tattooing; 6., religious association of the sun with the snake, and 7., the use of a

---

<sup>49</sup> Mongolian Blood Type B after 3500 B.C.-into the Mongolian regions the Caucasians came ca. 4500 B.C.

<sup>50</sup> Circumcision was of the black race - see Herodotus with ...Colchi... The Dark Ones had cannibalism.

<sup>51</sup> Deforming the head for riders to be long was a Mongol feature - less resistance when riding.

pattern called the 'swastika' for good luck. That strange little pattern on the cart hung all over the world; and it is incredible that all people, quite independently of each other, invented it and amused themselves with it.

52

Eliot Smith has traced all these general customs which, like a constellation, extended over a great space around the Mediterranean Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Pacific. Wherever one of them is found, there will usually be several others.

They connected Brittany with Borneo and Peru. This alliance of customs does not appear in the primitive homes of the Nordic and Mongol peoples nor does it extend much further south into subtropical Africa.

For thousands of years, from fifteen to a thousand years before Christ, this heliolithic culture moved, with its dark-skinned representatives, slowly around the globe through the warmer regions of the world, often traveling by canoes across the wide parts of the sea. At that time this was the highest culture in the world; it spread through the oldest and most developed communities. And the environment of its origin had to be, according to Elliot Smith, the Mediterranean and the North African regions.

It was gradually transmitted from century to century. It had to spread along the Pacific coast, through the islands that served as a passage for it, to America, where it developed much later, and at a time when in the regions of its origin it had already passed into a second stage of development. Many of the peoples of the East Indies, Melanesia and Polynesia were still at that heliolithic stage of development when European sailors discovered them in the eighteenth century. The first enlightenment in Egypt and in the valleys around the Euphrates and Tigris probably developed from a far-spread education. And was the

---

<sup>52</sup> The swastika originating from the Eastern Mediterranean - it was present in Macedonia in the old and new era.

Chinese enlightenment transmitted by some other way?”...a topic for later discussion.

Just as the Semitic nomads of the Arabian desert passed through their heliolithic stage.”

The white race was one people with one enlightenment. It spread through migrations to India, China and Japan. There is a sunken city with pyramids and literacy, the work of the white race, found near the island of Okinawa (=okina wa). In the biblical regions there was a white (Pelagian) race and a black (Semitic) race originating from Black Africa.

“Meanwhile, in India and at the meeting point between Asia, Africa and Europe, the threefold system of enlightenment of the white people was developing, another and completely different enlightenment was developing and spreading from the then fertile, but now dry and desolate Tarim Valley, and also the slopes of the Kuen-lun Mountains, and it spread in two directions, along the course of the Huang-ho River, and later the Yangtze-kyangga Valley. Unfortunately, at present we know little about Chinese archaeology. Stone tools have been found in various parts of that country, and from excavations in Honan and Manchuria we know something about education during the Stone Age in that part of the world. The people of that time do not seem to have been much different from the present inhabitants of North China. They lived in villages and raised pigs. They used stone axes and rectangular knives, and the tips of their arrows were made of flint, bone and shells. They knew how to spin and make earthen vessels, which in many cases are identical to their present vessels. Apart from this scanty data, our present knowledge of that early civilization comes from the still poorly studied Chinese literature. Evidently, that civilization was from its beginning a Mongol type. Before Alexander the Great’s time, there was little to no trace of any Aryan or Semitic, and still less of Hamitic influence. All the influences came at a time when the place was completely different, a world separated by mountains, deserts and wild



nomadic tribes. The Chinese seem to have created their civilization by themselves, or spontaneously, without any help, while the modern writers think that there were certain connections between them and the ancient Sumer. In the Khonan excavations the appearance of a particular type of coloured earthenware, which is similar to pottery found in several earlier deposits of Central and Western Asia and Eastern Europe, suggests the possibility of cultural contact. It is understood that both China and Sumer rose above those foundations and spread their education during the early Neolithic era; the Tarim Valley and the lower Euphrates with their huge desert and mountain barriers isolated those regions and prevented migrations or exchange between those peoples, once they had settled down.”<sup>53</sup>

The white race penetrated into China, where mummies of Caucasian types were found and Tocharian language scripts... These people brought with them the blood group A which belonged to the white race, erected buildings (...pyramids...), and raised domestic animals such as cattle, horses, pigs, sheep, goats, etc.

“Perhaps some movement of a civilization from the north met some similar movement from the south. Although the Chinese civilization is purely Mongolian, it does not mean that its roots are only to be found in the north. And if this civilization was first conceived in the Tarim Valley, then it is no different from the other civilizations (including the Mexican and Peruvian ones), which arose from the Heliolithic civilization. We Europeans still know very little about the ethnology and prehistory of southern China. The Chinese are mixed with similar peoples such as the Siamese and Burmese, and it seems as if they also came into contact with the Dravidian peoples and the Malays.”

Today, the above-mentioned peoples also have blood type A in the Baltics and in America.

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 83

“We have already described the peculiarities of the Chinese language and script. The Japanese script is derived from the Chinese but it consists of characters that can be written more quickly than the Chinese. A large number of these Japanese letters are ideograms taken from the Chinese, and were used in the same way as in the Chinese; on the other hand, in the Japanese there are a certain number of characters that are used to mark certain syllables. There are Japanese written characters for syllables similar to the Sumerian ones, which we discussed in an earlier chapter. If the Japanese is as clumsy as the former cuneiform alphabet, it is not as clumsy as the Chinese script. In other respects, at one time there was a movement in Japan to adopt Western alphabets. Korea went a step further in this field by taking the Chinese script as a basis and developing an alphabet in the true sense of the word. With the exception of this script in the Far East, all the writing systems that are used in the world today are based on the Mediterranean groups of alphabets, and are incomparably easier to learn and master than the Chinese script. While other peoples learned characters relatively easily, with which they can write anything they want in their native or any other known language, the Chinese must learn an enormous amount of complex characters for individual words, and even individual groups of words. The Chinese must learn not only individual characters but also various ways of grouping these characters, which differ according to the thought a person wants to express. Therefore, one must become familiar with the purpose of a subject from classical works. Therefore, in China there are indeed many people who know the meanings of certain characters for words that are often used in everyday life; on the other hand, there are very few people whose literacy is sufficient to understand any major section of the news, and even fewer who, when reading, can grasp individual subtle nuances in expressions and thoughts. The same applies to Japan, although to a somewhat lesser extent. There is no doubt that among the readers of European nations there is a strong difference both in terms of the number of books that are generally accessible and how much an individual reader understands and comprehends what he or she is reading. However, this has nothing

to do with the ability to read as such, but depends only on the richness of the vocabulary and the general education of the individual reader. On the contrary, a Chinese who wants to reach a level that corresponds to a European who reads fluently must for this purpose make a disproportionately greater effort in terms of labour and time. The education in Mandarin in China largely consists of teaching a person to read.”<sup>54</sup>

Wherever the white race has gone, there is their heritage.

## LANGUAGES OF THE RACES

H.G. Wells<sup>55</sup> wrote: “The philosophers who study languages tell us that they are unable to trace them with certainty to any common features which would exist in all human languages. Over large areas we find groups of languages with similar root words and similar ways of expressing the same thoughts, while again in other areas we find languages which appear to be quite different down to their very basic structure, which express work and relations in quite different ways, and which have a completely different grammar.

A large group of languages now dominates all of Europe and extends as far as India. It includes English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Greek, Russian, Armenian, Persian and various Indian languages. It is called the Indo-European or Aryan group. The same basic roots can be traced throughout this group. Compare, for example, English father, mother, German Vater, Mutter, Latin pater, mater, Greek πατήρ, μήτηρ, French père, mère, Armenian hair, mair, Sanskrit pitar, matar, and so on. In a similar way, the Aryan languages also underwent changes in a large number of basic words. F in German becomes p in Latin, and so on. This change is carried out according to a law of sound change, which is known as Grimm’s law. These languages are nothing special,

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 328.

<sup>55</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 66.

but are different varieties of the same thing, and the peoples who use these languages think in the same way.

At one time in perhaps the distant past, in the Neolithic age, which is to say 8,000 or more years ago, there was a simple, primitive speech from which literally all these Aryan languages evolved.

It must be somewhere between central Europe and western Asia where a certain number of tribes wandered which had mixed sufficiently to be able to develop and use a single language. It would be convenient here to call them Aryan peoples. H.H. Johnston called them 'Aryan Russians'. They belonged in the majority to the white racial group, with Russian and northern subdivisions of that group, i.e. the Nordic race."

"But even that original Aryan language, which may have been spoken six or five thousand years before Christ, was by no means a primitive language or the language of some savage race. Those who first spoke it were at or above the Neolithic level of enlightenment. That language had its own grammatical forms and had a somewhat complex vocabulary. The extinct modes of expression among the later Neolithic peoples, among the Azilians or, for example, among the early Neolithic people, were probably crude but also the most basic form of the Aryan language.

In its own way, the group of Aryan languages could be reduced to a vast area in which the main rivers were the Danube, Dnieper, Don and Volga, and which extend eastward through the Ural Mountains to the north of the Caspian Sea. The region over which they wandered probably did not extend for a long time to the Atlantic, nor did it extend south of the Black Sea beyond Asia Minor. The real division of Europe from Asia at that time was not to be found at the Bosphorus. The Danube flowed into a great sea to the east, which extended across the Volga regions of southeastern Russia right into Turkestan, and which

included the present-day Black, Caspian and Aral Seas, <sup>56</sup> and which extended its arms even as far north as the Arctic Ocean. This sea certainly created a fairly strong barrier between those peoples who spoke Aryan and the peoples of northeastern Asia.

South of this sea stretched a single coast all the way to the Balkans and Afghanistan. Northwest of it a region of marshes and lagoons extended as far as the Baltic.”

From the above it follows that there were no good living conditions in the mentioned areas, and the climatic conditions were also unfavourable for living there, in order to have expanded reproduction whose increased population would seek new living spaces.

“Alongside the Aryan, philologists distinguished another group of languages that have become independent. These are the Semitic languages. Hebrew <sup>57</sup> and Arabic are similar, only that in their words there is a different root than in the Aryan languages. In them, the relative thoughts of expressions are spoken in a different way. The basic thoughts of their grammar are different. These languages undoubtedly created separate and independent human communities that had no contact with the true Aryans.

Hebrew, Arabic, Abyssinian, Old Assyrian, Old Phoenician <sup>58</sup> and a whole series of related languages are grouped together as branches of that other original language, which is called Semitic.

We see that at the very beginning of recorded history (and this would be about four thousand years before Christ and earlier) the peoples who spoke Aryan and the peoples who spoke Semitic came into the closest

---

<sup>56</sup> Herodotus wrote about uninhabited areas, which is confirmed by the memoirs of Hadrian. As proof that Russia is still not populated to the west of it, the mentioned areas have not had a lineage to this day.

<sup>57</sup> There was no Hebrew language. Since the Syrian Aramaic language was biblical, it was called Hebrew.

<sup>58</sup> The Phoenicians were only Pelasgians with a Pelasgian language and traditions. Their gods were Olympan.

contact with each other through wars and trade, and that too with the eastern king of the Mediterranean Sea.<sup>59</sup> But the basic differences in the original Aryan and original Semitic languages does not oblige us to believe that before the historical period in the Neolithic era there must have been a complete separation between the peoples who spoke Aryan and Semitic for thousands of years.

The Semitic people, it would appear, lived either in southern Arabia or in northeastern Africa. Those peoples who spoke a truly Semitic language, as well as those who spoke a truly Aryan, probably lived in separate worlds in the early Neolithic era.

Philosophers also speak with less unanimity about the third group of languages, the Hamitic group, which some say is distinct, while others say it is related to the Semitic group. The stronger opinion, however, is that there was some original connection between the two groups.

The Hamitic group is certainly a much more extensive and diverse language group than the Semitic or Aryan, while the Semitic languages clearly belong more to one family and have more similarities with each other than do the Aryans. The Semitic languages could have arisen as a kind of specialized proto-Hamitic group, just as birds arose from one special group, just as mammals arose from another group of reptiles. It would be a very attractive hypothesis, but without any real basis or justification, if we had assumed that the original and crude ancestral group of the Aryan languages separated from the Proto-Hamitic language formed at some still earlier period than the specialized Semitic group split off.

Both the peoples of the Hamitic and the Semitic languages belong to the main Mediterranean race. Included among the Hamitic languages are the ancient Egyptian and Coptic, the Paberber languages (the languages of the hill peoples of North Africa, the masked Taureans and other such

---

<sup>59</sup> Continued in The Eastern Mediterranean was inhabited by two races: the white (Pelagian) and the black (Semitic) races.

peoples), and the so-called Ethiopian group of African languages in East Africa, including the languages of the Galatians and the Somalis. These Hamitic languages may then have radiated to the Mediterranean coast, and may have radiated from some centers on the African coast of the Mediterranean, and may have extended beyond the then existing territorial connections even very far into Western Europe.

It may be noted that all three great groups of languages, Aryan, Semitic and Hamitic, have one common feature; their grammar is different. Whether this has much value as evidence of their common remoteness of origin is a question which might concern a linguist rather than an ordinary reader. And yet this does not take away from the clear evidence of a very long and old (prehistoric) division of those peoples who spoke these three different groups of languages.

The Semitic and the 'Northern' or 'Nordic' races have a certain physiognomy. They seem, as well as their characteristic languages, to be more marked and specialized than the wider, primitive peoples with Hamitic languages.

It has been confirmed that the Semitic group of languages, is a mixture of the languages of the white and black races. Such an influence existed in Mesopotamia...Phoenicia...Arabia...Egypt...

"Another special language system must have spread to the northeast of the Aryan and Semitic regions, which is now represented by the group of languages known as the Turanian, or Ural-Altaic group. This group also includes the Lappish of Lapland and the Samoyedic speech of Siberia, as well as the languages of the: Finnish, Hungarian, Turkish or Tatar, Anjur or Mongolian. As a group it has not yet been so exhaustively studied by European philologists, and there is not yet sufficient evidence whether or not it includes Korean and Japanese. H. B. Helbert published a comparative grammar of Korean and certain Dravidian languages of India, and proved that there was no close connection between them."

Black Africa was united with India - the basis of Blacks, Indians and Mongols.

“What an exhaustive research <sup>60</sup>...One language group which has been eagerly disputed is the Basque group of speech. The Basques now live on the northern and southern slopes of the Pyrenees. They number perhaps about 600,000 in all, and have survived to the present day as a single people. Their language is now quite developed. But it had developed in directions quite opposite to those of the Aryan languages around them. <sup>61</sup> (bi-racial, R.I.)

In Argentina and the United States the Basques were identified as a group of wealthy people who immigrated in Canada. As a result, there are Basque names among French Canadians which are still common today. According to archeological discoveries the Basque people once spread very far beyond Spain. (Basque with a multitude of so-called Slavic words, R.I.)

This language has long been the cause of deep confusion among scholars. While the features of its structure have led to the idea that it may be related to some American Indian language, but A. H. Keene in his works ‘Man Past and Present’ has given several reasons (however distant) connecting the Basque language with the Berber language of North Africa, and through it with the common basis of the Hamitic language. Other philologists have expressed doubts about this. They think that Basque is more similar to certain equally lost remnants of the languages found in the Caucasus mountains, and would rather think of it as the last surviving member of an otherwise extinct and once widely spread group of pre-Hamitic languages, spoken mainly by the peoples of that black-skinned Mediterranean race, which once occupied the majority of western and southern Europe and western Asia. They think that this language could have stood in very close affinity with the

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>61</sup> East of France are Gothic languages, and west of Germany Romance languages - Latinized.



Dravidian language of India and with the languages of the peoples of the Heliolithic culture who spread through East India east to Polynesia and beyond. (Basque as Pelasgian, R.I.)

It is quite possible that eight to ten thousand years ago a group of languages spread over western and southern Europe, which completely disappeared before the appearance of the Aryan languages. Later we will note in passing the possibility of the existence of three lost language groups, which were: 1. Old Cretan, Lydian and other languages (although they could belong, as Harry H. Johnston suggested, to the 'Basque-Caucasian-Dravidian group'); 2. Sumerian, and 3. Elamite.

Assumptions have been made that perhaps the Old Sumerian language was a bridge language between the early Basque-Caucasian and the early Mongolic groups. If this is correct, then in this Basque-Proto-Mongol group we have another older and a native system of speech than was the original Hamitic. We have something that is more of a linguistic 'lost link', something that is more like an ancestral language than anything else that we can imagine today. That language could be almost as closely related to the Aryan, Semitic and Hamitic languages as the primitive lizards of the later Palaeolithic were to mammals, birds and dinosaurs.

The Hottentot language is said to be related to the Hamitic languages, which were separated from the Bantu language spoken on the other side of Central Africa. In semi-arid East Africa a language similar to the Hottentot and related to the Bushman is still spoken. This confirms the idea that Hamitic was once spoken in East Africa."

**THE SUMERIANS AND EGYPTIANS WERE WHITE, AND THE ACADIANS WERE BLACK**

Pausanias <sup>62</sup> wrote under IX-21: “I find myself among the strange curiosities of Rome... For man is not the only being who has a different appearance according to the different climate or soil, but this happened with other creatures as well. Thus the Libyan snake has a skin colour like those in Egypt, while those in Ethiopia are black like the people who are born in that country...”

H.G. Wells <sup>63</sup> wrote: “But, among the numerous obstacles and interruptions... In most of the human subspecies in East Asia and America, though not in all, it is now common: the yellowish skin, straight black hair and often high facial bones. Most of the natives south of the Sahara in Africa have black or swarthy skin, flattened noses, thick lips and curly hair...”

The connection of the same genetic-geographical area of the black race of people with their animals is confirmed. The buffalo was Mongolian-Indo-African. The elephant was Indo-African. The camel belonged to those areas, as did the donkey, etc.

So the buffalo came to Mesopotamia by the new era - there were no Indo-Europeans.

During the floods, the Whites first moved eastward from the Levant.

“These changes of settlement, these nomadic conquests, refinements, new conquests, and new refinements, which are all noticeable at that turn of human history, are especially observed in the region around the Tigris and Euphrates, which was open on all sides to those great spaces which were neither dry enough to be deserts, nor fertile enough to develop an enlightened population. The first people to educate themselves, perhaps the first cities in that part of the world, were the Sumerians. This people was composed of a black-skinned people probably related to the Iberians or Dravidians. The Sumerians used some kind of writing which they carved into clay. Their alphabet has

---

<sup>62</sup> Pausanias, *Guide to Greece*, Logos, Split, 1980, Book Nine of Beotija, p. 462.

<sup>63</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 61.

been deciphered. Their language was more similar to the unclassified language groups than to any other present language. These new languages could have had connections to the Basque, which could mean that this was at one time a widespread primitive language group, which extended from Spain and Western Europe, to East India, and south to Central Africa.<sup>64</sup>

Excavations carried out by Captain R. Campbell Thomson at Eridu have revealed that early Neolithic agricultural conditions existed even before the invention of writing and the use of bronze. In that pre-Sumerian age harvest was already being reaped with sickles of clay.

The Sumerians shaved their heads and wore simple woolen garments similar to tunics. They first settled along the lower reaches of the great rivers and not far from the Persian Gulf, which at that time extended more than two hundred miles beyond its present extent. Sayce, in his works *Babylonian and Assyrian Life*, made claims that around 6500 B.C. Eridu extended as far as the seashore. The Sumerians increased the fertility of their fields by letting water rush through ditches, and thus gradually they became very skilled hydraulic engineers. They had cattle, donkeys, sheep and goats but no horses. From their small groups of mud huts cities were created, with tower-shaped temples.”

The Sumerians were Whites with white-race animals, sheep and goats but also cattle. Later the Balkan horse was also brought - it was even taken to Egypt, etc.

“Sun-dried clay was a great factor in the life of this people. There was little or no stone in the lower reaches of the Tigris and Euphrates valleys. They built walls with clay bricks. They made statues of clay and earth; they drew, and soon began to write, on thin, flaky clay tablets. They did not seem to have paper or to have used parchment. Books and notes, and even letters, were written on pieces of clay. They built a great clay brick tower for their chief god El-lil (Enlil) at Nippur,

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., p. 76.

whose memory was thought to be preserved in the story of the Tower of Babel. They seemed to have been divided into separate city-states, which fought among themselves and preserved their military prowess for many centuries. The soldiers carried long spears and shields, and fought in close ranks. The Sumerians were victorious. For a long time, in fact, no foreign race dominated Sumer. They developed their enlightenment, their alphabet and their navigation over time. They then began to gradually give away to the Semitic peoples.”

The Whites settled first, and only later did the Semites (Blacks) settle.

“Of all the known kingdoms, the first was founded by the high priest of the Sumerian city of Erech. According to records found in Nippur, it stretched from the Lower (Persian Gulf) to the Upper (Mediterranean or Red) Sea. The traces of that vast historical period, that first half century of cultivation, were buried in the muddy mounds of the Euphrates and Tigris valleys. Here the first temples flourished and the first priestly rulers known to mankind appeared.”

During the Ice Age the Whites lived in the Levant.

“From the many Semitic-speaking nomadic tribes a people appeared on the western edge of the region and traded, fought and enslaved Sumerians for many generations. Then Sargon (2750 B.C.), a great leader arose among these Semites and united them, and not only subdued the Sumerians, but also extended his rule from the Persian Gulf in the east to the Mediterranean Sea in the west. His people themselves were called Akkadians, his kingdom was called the Sumerian-Akkadian kingdom.”

Where the Blacks (Semites), who were Akkadians, settled, there the Whites lived. One such White was Sargon. He created his own kingdom there.

Some historians called the Akkadians “Black-headed foreigners” – but they were both Whites and Blacks.

“From the time of Sargon until the fourth or third century B.C., and for a period of two thousand years, the Semitic peoples had the upper hand in almost the entire Near East. The Semites conquered and provided kings to the Sumerian cities and their simple Semite education overpowered the Sumerian culture. The newcomers learned the Sumerian alphabet (‘climatic’) and the Sumerian language, without establishing any Semitic alphabet of their own. For these barbarians, the Sumerian language was a symbol of knowledge and power among the barbarian peoples of Europe in the Middle Ages. Also, Sumerian science had great vitality, because its destiny was to go through a long series of military campaigns and changes, which began in the valley of those two rivers at this time.”

“When the people of the Sumerian-Akkadian empire lost their political and military strength, a fresh onslaught of warlike people, the Elamites, came from the east, while the Semitic Amorites attacked from the west, and thus crushed the Sumerian-Akkadian empire. The Elamites were a people of unknown language and race, ‘neither Sumerian nor Semitic’, as Sayce has claimed. Their central city was Susa. Archaeology for the most part was still an unexcavated field. According to H. Johnston they were of the Black type. A strong Black streak really existed among the contemporary inhabitants of Elam. The Amorites, on the other hand, were of the same stock from which came Abraham and later the Jews. The Amorites settled first in Babylon where there was a small town on the upper course of the river. After a hundred years of warfare they became masters of all Mesopotamia under King Hammurabi (2100 B.C.), who founded the first Babylonian kingdom.”

It is only about Whites and Blacks. Again, there were never any Jews before the 5th century B.C.

“And then there was a time of peace and security again, with a decline in true heroism, until in another hundred years new nomads began to flood Babylonia, bringing with them horses and war chariots, and establishing their own king in Babylon. These were now the Kassites.”

It has been said that the buffalo and the elephant had hair not the same as that of the horse and cattle belonging to the white race - the Indians did not have horses until the 15th century A.D. The horses found in the Caucasus and Mongolia originated in the Balkans.

“Up the Tigris, the soil was made mostly of clay and it was full of stones which were handy for carving. Even before the Semites conquered the Sumerians, a Semitic people, named Assyrians, founded several cities, the chief of which were Assur and Nineveh. The Assyrians had peculiar facial expressions with a long nose and thick lips very similar to the simple type of today’s Polish Jews. They grew wide beards with long curly hair and wore high hats and long clothes. They were constantly at war with the Hittites to the west; and after they were defeated by Sargon I they were freed again. For a time their capital Nineveh was held by a certain Tushrat, king of Mitanni. They made an alliance with Egypt against Babylonia and joined the Egyptians as mercenaries. Their military skill rose to a high degree, and so they became powerful warriors and began to collect tribute. Finally, they adopted the horse and war chariot and, for some time, fought against the Hittites, and finally conquered them under Tiglath-Pileser I’s rule. Babylon (about 1100 B.C.). But their power did not feel secure in a lower, older and more enlightened country, so they kept Nineveh as their capital. Nineveh was a Semitic stone city, in contrast to Babylon, which was a Semitic clay brick city. For many centuries, power fluctuated between Nineveh and Babylon, one time Assyrian, another time Babylonian, Tiglath-Pileser I was able to declare himself ‘king of the world’.

New pressure came from the north due to the arrival of a new group of Semitic peoples, the Amorites, whose capital was Damascus, and whose present-day descendants are the Syrians. As a result, Assyria could not expand towards Egypt for four centuries. (Here we should note that there is no connection at all between the words Assyrian and Syrian. It is only a coincidental similarity). The Assyrian kings fought against the Syrians for supremacy and penetration in the south-westerly direction.

In the year 745 before Christ another Tiglath-pileser appeared, Tiglath-pileser III, the Tiglath-pileser of the Bible (II Kings, XV, 29, XVI, 7, etc.). And not only did he order the migration of the Israelites to Media (those ‘Lost Ten Tribes’, whose further fate had occupied so many curious minds), but he also triumphantly ruled Babylon, founding what is known in history as the New Assyrian Empire. His son, Shamasir IV (II Kings, XVII, 3), died during the siege of St. Mary, and was succeeded by a prodigal who, in order to flatter Babylonian sensibilities, took the old Akkadian-Sumerian name of Sargon II. He seemed to have first armed the Assyrian army with iron weapons. It is probable that Sargon II actually relocated those Ten Tribes, on the basis of an order issued by Tiglath-Pileser III.”

“This kind of population transfer became a very definite part of the political methods of the new Assyrian empire. Entire peoples, who could hardly be armed in their native land, were transferred to unknown regions and among foreign neighbours, where their only hope of survival could lie in submission to a higher power.

Sargon’s son, Sennacherib, led the Assyrian hordes to the Egyptian border where the plague destroyed the Assyrian army, a disaster that was described in the nineteenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings:

‘And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went down, and struck the camp of the Assyrian army of one hundred and eighty-five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, there were dead bodies all around. So Sennacherib, king of Assyria, departed and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh.’

Sennacherib, king of Assyria was killed by his own sons.

Sennacherib’s grandson, Ashurbanipal (whom the Greeks called Sardanapalus), succeeded in conquering and for a time ruled lower Egypt.

After Sargon II, the Assyrian empire lasted only a hundred and fifty years. It was attacked by the Chaldeans, a group of nomadic Semites

who came from the southeast. They were supported from the north by two peoples with Aryan speech, the Medes and the Persians, i.e. In 606 B.C. they captured Nineveh. And now for the first time in history a people who spoke an Aryan language appeared. They descended from the northwestern plains and mountains as tough and warlike groups of tribes. Some of them went to southeastern India, bringing with them an Aryan dialect which later developed into Sanskrit, while others turned to the old enlightenment. And so, the nomadic conquerors of the agricultural lands, the Elamites and Semites were replaced by Aryans who held the region under their control for about six centuries. The Elamites, unfortunately, disappeared from history.

The Chaldean Empire, with its capital Babylon (Second Babylonian Empire), under Nebuchadnezzar the Great (Hebuchadnezzar II) and his descendants, lasted until 538 B.C., when it succumbed to attacks from Cyrus, the founder of Persian rule.

And so in 330 B.C., as we shall later cover in greater detail, this was where a Macedonian conqueror, Alexander the Great,<sup>65</sup> looked upon the slain body of the last Persian ruler.

The history of enlightenment around the Tigris and Euphrates, of which we have so far given only a brief outline, is a history of successive conquests, where on the occasion of each conquest the old masters and ruling orders were replaced by new ones. Races, such as the Sumerians and Elamites, melted away, and their languages were lost. The Assyrians melted into the Chaldeans, and the Syrians, who had swallowed up the Sumerians, made way for these new masters from the north. The Medes and Persians appeared in place of the Elamites, and the Aryan Persian language ruled over that empire until the Aryan Macedonians threw it out of official use.”

---

<sup>65</sup> Alexander the Great was a Roman name. So there was only one - Alexander the Great.



The Greek language became Macedonian in Alexandria and was known as the Ptolemaic language Koine, which was a biracial language of Whites and Blacks. For this author, the biracial languages are Aryan.

“Year after year the plow did its work. Harvests were gathered, builders built as they were hired to do. Craftsmen worked and come up with new ideas. The science of writing spread. Innovations, horses, wheeled carts and iron, were introduced and remained part of the important human heritage. Human traffic increased in the sea and in the deserts, human concepts expanded and knowledge developed. In some places and times massacres and plagues forced the people to take backward steps but history as a whole constantly expanded. New enlightenment, which took root in the region around those two rivers, grew like a tree over four thousand years, expressing itself. Now and then losing a branch or two broken by a storm, but always growing and expanding. The ruling races changed; the languages changed, but development remained essentially the same. And four thousand years later, soldiers and conquerors still rushed here and there through it, not understanding, while it was developing, and while people by that time (by 330 B.C.) had already harnessed the horse, mastered iron, invented the alphabet, mastered mathematics, coined money, created more diverse food and fabric, and spread knowledge of everything in the world far and wide, much more than the Sumerians.

Let us emphasize that the time that passed from Sargon I’s reign to Alexander the Great’s victory over the Babylonians, was as long as the time from Alexander the Great to our time. Before Sargon I’s time, people were settled on Sumerian land, for a long time, lived in organized communities in orderly agricultural life. When Eridu, Lagos, Ur, Izin and Larsa appeared in history, they were already in the past.

It is difficult to comprehend these time differences. Half of the course of the entire human enlightenment, as well as the keys to all its main institutions, must be sought in the period before Sargon I.

“Along with the old beginnings of enlightenment in Sumer, a similar thing happened in Egypt. The question is still unresolved which of these two beginnings was older or to what extent they had a common origin and did not accidentally arise from each other.”

So the Egyptians, like the Sumerians, were Mediterraneans, who originated in the Levant.

The Sumerians and the Egyptians had slanted eyes to protect them from the sand.

“The history of the Nile Valley from the beginning of its known history to the time of Alexander the Great was very similar to that of Babylon. But while Babylon was open to attack on all sides, Egypt was protected on the west by deserts, on the east by deserts and the sea, and on the south by black peoples. Its history was therefore less punctuated by the invasions of foreign races than is the case with Assyrian and Babylonian history. And down to the eighth century before Christ, when it fell under an Egyptian dynasty, when a conqueror appeared in its history, that conqueror came across the Isthmus of Suez from Asia. It is uncertain when the Stone Age took place in Egypt. The same goes for the Palaeolithic as well as for the Neolithic ages. It is uncertain whether the Neolithic shepherds, of whom there are remains, were the immediate ancestors of the later Egyptians. In many respects they differed from their followers. They buried their dead; but before they buried them they cut up their bodies and apparently ate some parts. This, it seems, was done out of respect for the deceased. According to Flinders Petrie ‘they ate their dead out of respect’. Perhaps the survivors hoped in this way to retain some remnant of the strength and virtue that had disappeared with them. Traces of similar savage customs have been found in other mounds scattered throughout Western Europe during the spread of the Aryan peoples, and such customs were widespread in black Africa, where they began to disappear only in modern times.”

Cannibalism was a characteristic of the dark races (Blacks, Indians, and Mongols).

“About five thousand years or so ago before Christ, traces of these primitive peoples disappeared, and the real Egyptians appeared on the stage. The first people were at a relatively low level of culture and built huts; later they were a more enlightened Neolithic people, erecting buildings of brick and wood, instead of the original huts, and using stone. Soon after, they passed into the Bronze Age. They used a writing system with the help of pictures, which was as developed as the present alphabet of the Sumerians. Then, new people entered Upper Egypt through Aden from southern Arabia, who very slowly advanced towards the Nile Delta. According to Dr. Wallis they were ‘conquerors from the East’. But their gods and their customs, as well as their pictorial writing, were in fact very different from the Sumerian ones. One of the earliest known divine figures was the figure of a divine hippopotamus, which was already quite distinctly African in this respect.

The Nile clay was not as fine and plastic as that of the Sumerians, and the Egyptians did not use it for writing. Instead, they began to use sheets of papyrus reed, from whose name the present word ‘paper’ arose. The Assyrians used a kind of stylus or a seal cut in a way so as to leave cuneiform impressions; the Egyptians also wrote with a brush, to which we owe thanks to this way of writing.

The broad outlines of Egyptian history is simpler than that of Mesopotamian history. It has long been customary to divide the Egyptian rulers into a series of dynasties, and when speaking of the period of Egyptian history, the first, fourth, fourteenth, so-called dynasties are usually mentioned. The Persians, after they established themselves in Babylon, defeated the Egyptians. The reign of the XXXI dynasty ended when Egypt finally fell into the hands of Alexander the Great in 332 B.C.

In that long history of over 4000 years, a much longer period from Alexander the Great’s reign to the present day, we can trace a certain broad line of development. One such line, which begins with Menes’

consolidation of the northern and southern kingdoms and reaches its peak in the Fourth Dynasty, was known as the 'Old Kingdom'. This Fourth Dynasty marked a period of wealth and splendour. Its monarchs were consumed with a passion for erecting monuments to themselves, the kind that had never been seen or could be seen before or since. The three enormous pyramids of Giza were erected by Cheops (3733 B.C.), Khafre and Migerin, rulers of that Fourth Dynasty. The Great Pyramid of Cheops is 150 meters high and its sides are 330 meters long. It has been estimated (according to Wallis Budge) to weigh 4,883,000 tons. All those stones were dragged mainly by human muscle to their place. And those senseless and almost unbelievable tombstones were erected at a time when engineering and science were in their infancy. During three long reigns, they exhausted the Egyptian resources that left the country looking like it had been devastated by war.

Egypt's history from the 4th to the 15th dynasty is full of conflicts between alternating thrones and rival alliances, a history of divisions into several kingdoms and new unifications. This, so to speak, is an internal history. It is often called the feudal age. Here we need to mention that in a long line of pharaohs of that time, Pepi II ruled for ninety years, which is the longest known reign in history. He left behind many inscriptions on the walls. What happened to Egypt also happened to the enlightened people of Mesopotamia. Egypt was conquered by the nomadic Semites, who founded the 'pastoral' Hyksos dynasty (XIV), who were finally expelled from the country by the native Egyptians. This invasion probably occurred while the first Babylonian Empire, founded by Hammurabi, was still flourishing; however, the exact relationship in dates between early Egypt and Babylon is still very unreliable. These foreigners were expelled from the country by a popular uprising only after a long slavery. The Egyptian spirit was able to unite only by hatred towards foreigners."

It was said: "...Egypt was conquered by the nomadic Semites, who founded the 'pastoral' Hyksos dynasty..."

Since the Hyksos were horsemen and cattle breeders of Balkan origin, by no means Semites (Blacks) with elephant, buffalo, camel, donkey..., the Hyksos themselves were of Balkan origin.

“After their war of liberation (around 1600 B.C.) a great period of prosperity began in Egypt, which is known as the New Kingdom. Egypt became a large and united military state, which sent its army to the Euphrates. There, a struggle began between the Egyptian and Babylonian-Assyrian powers. These two great states, as before, were far from one another, so they avoided conflict; but now that transportation routes were developed between them, they reached a point where their armies could march from one river basin to the other.”

The Egyptians had Black soldiers, who had fought with the Persians.

“For a time, Egypt had the advantage in that conflict. Thutmose III and Amenophis III of the 18th dynasty (in the 15th century B.C.) ruled from Ethiopia to the Euphrates. These two kings stood out in Egyptian history for various reasons. They were very enterprising in building monuments and left many inscriptions on them. Amenophis III founded Luxor and contributed much to Karnak. A large number of royal correspondence documents were found at Tell-el-Amarni corresponding with Babylonian, Hittite and other rulers, including Tushrut who captured Nineveh. These documents revealed a great deal about the political and social circumstances of that special age. Amenophis IV about whom we will say more later, and Queen Hattos, one of the strangest and most capable Egyptian rulers, for whom we have no space here to dwell any longer, was represented as a male on her monuments, wearing male attire and with a long beard, which served as a kind of sign of wisdom.

After this came a short period of Syrian rule over Egypt, and then a series of alternating dynasties, among which we may note the XIX dynasty, of which Ramesses II, the great temple-builder, reigned for sixty-seven years (c. 1317 to 1250 B.C.). There are also many who believe that this Ramesses II was the Pharaoh during Moses's time. We

may also note the XXII dynasty, of which Shishak (c. 930 B.C.) plundered Solomon's temple. A famous Ethiopian conqueror from the upper Nile founded the XXV dynasty, a foreign dynasty, whose rule ceased in 670 B.C., before the new Assyrian Empire was established by Tiglath-Pileser III, Sargon II, and the already mentioned Sennacherib. Babylon was first to rule the Nile."

"For some time, Egyptian supremacy over foreign nations was drawing to a close. Home rule was reestablished for a time under Psamtik I of the 25th dynasty, while for a time Necho II regained the old Egyptian possessions in Syria as far as the Euphrates, when the Medes and the Chaldeans attacked Nineveh. And from these conquered lands Nebuchadnezzar II, the great Chaldean king, the biblical Nebuchadnezzar, after the fall of Nineveh and the Assyrians, Necho II expelled them again. As we will see later, Nebuchadnezzar then exiled the Jews who were in alliance with Necho II, and sent them into slavery in Babylon." (There were never any Jews, R.I.)

Since Nabonidus was a heretic, he could not have slaves Heretics=Jews.

"When Chaldea fell to the Persians in the sixth century B.C., it was Egypt's turn. Later, a revolt made it independent for another six years. Finally, in 332 B.C. it welcomed Alexander the Great as its conqueror, and since then it was ruled by foreigners, first Macedonians <sup>66</sup>, then Romans, then successively Arabs, Turks and British, until modern times when it became independent. This is, in short, the history of Egypt from its beginnings. First, the history of isolation, and then of increasing involvement in the affairs of other nations, as the well-known facilities for transportation brought people from the world into ever closer contact with each other.

The history of India, which we must now recount here, is simpler than that of Egypt. The Dravidian peoples in the Ganges valley developed

---

<sup>66</sup> There were never any Greeks but only Macedonians. Hellas was never Greece, nor will it ever be.

side by side and in the same direction as the Sumerian and Egyptian peoples. In northern India, seals were found from Sumer. But the question is whether the early Indian communities ever reached the high stage of social development reached by Sumer and early Egypt. They left behind few monuments and never attained artificial writing. In that ancient age, it seems, there were no conquests by the Semites in India.

Sometime during Hammurabi's time or later, a branch of the nomadic Aryans, who then ruled over northern Persia and Afghanistan, penetrated into India through the northwestern passes. They were closely related to the ancestors of the Medes and Persians. Their path was one of conquest, until they prevailed over all the dark inhabitants of northern India, and extended their rule and influence over the whole peninsula. But under them there never came to be any unification of the whole of India. Their history is the history of warlike kings and republics.

After the capture of Babylon, and in the period of its expansion, the Persian empire extended its borders beyond the Indies. Alexander the Great went on his campaign even to the borders of those deserts that separated the Punjab from the Ganges Valley. And with this simple information we will leave India's history until later."

## **BI-RACIAL LANGUAGES OF WHITES AND BLACKS**

According to Larousse <sup>67</sup>: "Period of the first dynasties (about 3000-2300) ... The difference between the Semitic cities and the cities of the Sumerians (the land at the mouth of the two rivers) was better preserved in sculptures than in inscriptions, which were often written in two languages..."

"The Semitic element the Mesopotamian valley was constantly being strengthened with tribes coming from the deserts, emerging in the first

---

<sup>67</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 228.

place, without racial antagonism. Adopting Sumerian culture, the Semites of the cities expressed their national self-consciousness. The priests in the Akkadian Empire adopted the Sumerian language, but the administrators used the Akkadian language as the official language of the empire. This was a Semitic dialect deeply imbued with a multitude of Sumerian words. When writing in Akkadian, scribes used the script invented by the Sumerians. Its characters were much different from the primitive pictorial script, and from then on it truly deserved to be called cuneiform (made of wedges)...

The subjugated neighbouring peoples gradually conquered the Akkadian civilization and adopted its artistic forms, cuneiform writing and sometimes wrote texts in Sumerian and Akkadian. Only then the peoples of northern Mesopotamia began to appear..."

There were two languages spoken and they belonged to both races: the white and the black.

"Epoch IZIN-LARS. Struggle for supremacy (XX-VII centuries). Dynasties appeared in the cities of Mesopotamia, most of which were descended from a single Western Semite tribe. All of them, and especially the dynasty of IZIN and LARS, sought to inherit the UR kingdom, which had just disappeared. The Western Semites, illiterate soldiers, soon adopted the Akkadian language, which became official. The Sumerian Renaissance under the III UR dynasty affected only the small intelligentsia. The Sumerian people, who had already begun to disappear, were flooded with a constant influx of Semites. But the Sumerian language survived all this because it supported an entire treasury of rituals, myths and technical achievements."<sup>68</sup>

Sumerian was the language of Whites and Semitic Blacks. The adoption of the Akkadian language followed. The Akkadians were Blacks.

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., p. 233.



“Works by Hammurabi the Babylonian (1723-1680). Babylon, founded during the Akkadian period, emerged from obscurity when Samu-Abum, a Western Semite, took the royal title (1825). When Hammurabi came to the throne, this dynasty had not yet achieved any major conquests. Leaving the Mesopotamian state to exhaust itself with its intricate wars, this ruler, after several decisive battles, imposed his authority on all the cities of the great plain. Being a good administrator, he managed to merge the cities Sumer and Akkad into a single united state, Babylonia. Since then, Babylonia became his capital with its dialectal language (Babylonian, a local form of the Akkadian language)...”<sup>69</sup>

The Akkadians were Blacks. It follows that their language was that of Blacks from Black Africa.

“End of the 1st Babylonian dynasty. After Hammurabi’s death, the kingdom withstood onslaughts from neighbouring nomads (the Kassites from the Zagros and the Semites from the Syrian-Arabian desert), as well as the coastal lands (at the mouth of the river). After the Hittite invasion, Marshall I, the last representative of the dynasty (1526), was overthrown and the barbarians spread throughout Babylonia.”<sup>70</sup>

The Semites (Blacks) “from the Syrian-Arabian desert” - from Black Africa.

According to Larousse<sup>71</sup>: “• The large Egyptian army and its conquests. At the head of the army stood the military nobility, each member had its own area of responsibility separate from the others. The soldiers who were now respected and highly valued also benefited from this system. The military command had a variety of troops at its disposal: tribal cavalry with chariots, Egyptian infantry, auxiliary infantry from Nubia and Syria, with a fleet and a landing unit.”

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>71</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 236.

That is “auxiliary infantry from Nubia” - only Blacks with solid helmets.

“This command led to the intervention of those who since the time of Manetho had been called ‘Ethiopian kings’ (XXV Egyptian dynasty, 751-656). They were the lords of the new kingdom of Kush, which was probably founded in Napata by the priests of Aman fleeing from the rule of the Libyans (950). In any case, these blacks from Nubia used the Egyptian language as their official language and preserved the rites of the new Theban kingdom. Rich and powerful, they easily imposed their rule on the small Libyan royalty up to the Nile valley.” <sup>72</sup>

“The Hurrite people - the kingdom of Mitanni. This group of ancient people continued to penetrate Mesopotamia and Syria during the 2nd millennium and played a major role in the mixing of civilizations. They expanded throughout the East using the horse and chariot, cuneiform and Sumerian-Akkadian texts throughout Syria and Anatolia. On the other hand, Hurrian culture, in the strict sense of the word, is almost completely unknown to us.” <sup>73</sup>

“Use of Cuneiform and Sumerian-Akkadian texts throughout Syria and Anatolia.”

It has been confirmed that “Sumerian-Akkadian texts” in Syria were written together.

“The Hittite civilization. This civilization, which arose from a mixture of Hattian, Indo-European and Hurrian cultures, and which was modeled after the great eastern states, is known to us only from the documents of a single city, the archives and libraries of the Hattusan palaces. The lack of unity, which was characteristic of this kingdom, was also manifested in the use of various languages written in cuneiform. Most often Akkadian and Neshit, an Indo-European dialect, were used, which was the official language of the kingdom. There are

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p. 241.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., p. 236.

also ritual texts written in Sumerian, Hurrian, or Anatolian and Indo-European dialects in which the priesthood worshipped the gods of the aforementioned peoples. On the other hand, the Hittites used hieroglyphs called ‘Hittite’ (which, apparently, are a transcription of the Luwian-Indo-European language of southern Anatolia) for inscriptions on monuments and seals...”<sup>74</sup>

Only the Akkadians were Blacks. According to the authors, they were “black-headed foreigners”.

“Elam. Liberated and reunited around 1300, Elam lived in prosperity for two centuries. The scribes of Susa, abandoning the Akkadian language, wrote in the Elamite language with a new script which was a special syllabic form of the cuneiform script...”<sup>75</sup>

The Akkadian language of the Blacks and the Elamite language of the Whites. Bi-racialism follows.

“The Cuneiform script and the Sumero-Akkadian culture. Unlike the Egyptian cultural influence, limited to Nubia and a few Syrian cities, the culture of Mesopotamia did not stop spreading during the 2nd millennium. The cuneiform script, very simplified, which the Hurrians and Elamites had already used in the 3rd millennium, was adopted by the Syrian cities (from the 18th century) and by the Hittite Empire (16th century?). However, it’s unknown whether its spread in those countries should be attributed to the Hurrians or the Western Semites. Sometimes cuneiform was used to write in the Hurrian, Hattic, or Elamite languages. But in general, foreign scribes, referring to the classical and scientific works of Babylonia, adopted it with the Mesopotamian script and the Akkadian language (for official and commercial texts) and Sumerian (for ritual texts). Thus, the letters from Tell el-Amarna (14th

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., p. 237.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., p. 238.

century) show that at the height of Egyptian power, international correspondence was conducted in the Akkadian language.”<sup>76</sup>

There is talk of a script of the white race and the Akkadian language of the Blacks, and the other languages belonged to the Whites. So the Akkadian language was not a pure language of the Blacks, it also contained words from the Whites. Since two races lived in Mesopotamia and Egypt, the white and the black, the Akkadian language was used even in Egypt.

“But, in addition to the complex character of the material Syrian civilization in the second millennium, one can sense the exceptional importance of the Semites, who finally, under the constant pressure of desert elements, mixed and merged with the Anatolians, Indo-Europeans, Hurrians, Aegeans and Egyptians, who came and settled in the Syrian cities. This background of Semitic culture is known to us especially from the finds from Ugarit, an international city in which Mycenaean ivory products, Cypriot vases, Mycenaean merchant tholos, an Egyptian temple and a sanctuary of the goddess Nisaba (patron of scribes in Sumer) have been found. But the biblical king Nikimadu (about 1350), whose tablets proved that the inhabitants of Ugarit used seven languages, gave us wonderful poems written in the Ugaritic language. These texts, which were read at that time on the occasion of religious ceremonies, have preserved very old forms of Semitic myths...”<sup>77</sup>

During those times mixed languages were created.

“In the 11th century, some of the poleis were settled permanently and existed as kingdoms, the most important of which were based on the exploitation of some ancient city (Damascus, Aleppo, Ham, etc.). Those states whose capitals are still found under today’s settlements, and which are often mentioned in the Bible and Assyrian chronicles, have

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., p. 238.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., p. 238.

left no traces. Secondary sites, some of which have been excavated, leave the impression that the Arameans - a military minority - as a people with low culture, conquered the civilization (Syrian, Neo-Hittite, Mitanni) of the cities in which they kept their garrisons. Royal steles (9th-8th centuries), inscribed in Phoenician, and later in Aramaic, are not numerous. Due to the practical side of the Aramaic script (derived from the Phoenician), most of the Semitic East would later, together with the script itself, replace the Aramaic language.”<sup>78</sup>

The Phoenician (Pelasgian=so-called Slavic) language and the Aramaic language are distinguished.

“Religious renewal of Israel. In Israel there have always been ‘seers’ who spoke in the name of Jehovah and took care to preserve the people so that they would not be infected with Canaanite impurities. But from the 9th century onward, the Israelites and their kings, affected by political decline, increasingly came under the temptation of adopting the gods and rites that brought great prosperity to their neighbouring peoples (Phoenicians, Arameans)...”<sup>79</sup>

Phoenicians with Pelasgian=so-called Slavic language and Aramaic biracial language.

“With the annexation of the regions and the resettlement of the population, the cultural unity of the Assyrian Empire began to be realized. All of western Asia recognized the great Mesopotamian gods (Assur, Mard uk and his son Neb, Sin and Ishtar) and dealt with Babylonian astrolatry (the cult of the stars). Aramaic was spoken throughout the empire and the official scribes were divided into two categories: those who wrote in cuneiform on tablets, and those who wrote Aramaic on parchment or papyrus...”<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., p. 241.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., p. 243.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 243.

They speak of Aramaic, which was biracial, of the white and black races.

“• Cyprus was a unique case in the Hellenic community. The Mycenaeans, conquerors or refugees, who settled there in the 13th-12th centuries, maintained the tradition. On the other hand, relations with the East and Greece never ceased. Although there was a geometric style, already in the 8th century, under the influence of the East, ceramics with lush and complex decorations appeared. Since trade required knowledge of writing, the islanders used a syllabic script (derived from their linear script), which served to write Ethio-Cypriot (the local language) and Greek. On the other hand, the Hellenes turned to the Phoenicians, whose script they perfected. Namely, in order to record the vowels that the Semites had neglected, the Greeks used those Phoenician consonants that were not used in their phonetics. Later this first complete script would spread to the west.”<sup>81</sup>

It reads: “to record the vowels that the Semites had neglected, the Greeks used those Phoenician consonants that were not used in their phonetics.”

H.G. Wells<sup>82</sup> wrote: “Around the Mediterranean there were a number of such alphabets, which differed greatly from each other. It may be noted that the Phoenician alphabet (and perhaps others) was without vowels. It is also possible that they pronounced their consonants very strongly, and that they had rather indefinite vowels, as is said to be the case today with the tribes of southern Arabia. It is also easy to believe that the Phoenicians first used the prefix before their alphabet not so much for writing, as for individual initial letters in their working calculations and records.

One of these Mediterranean alphabets, long after the time of the Iliad, reached the Greeks, who immediately set to work to adapt it so that it

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., p. 246.

<sup>82</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 98.

would express the clear and beautiful sounds of their own highly developed speech, but at first it consisted of consonants, then the Greeks gave it vowels. They also began to write for the sake of remembering things, and in order to help and establish the tradition of their poets. And thus written literature began as a sentence and later turned into a whole flood.”

“But, newer Ancient Greece, of which we are now speaking, still lived very visibly in the human imagination and institutions, because it also spoke a beautiful and most expressive Aryan language, similar to our own, and because it adopted the Mediterranean alphabet and perfected it by adding vowels, so that reading and writing now became a skill easy to learn and use, a large number of people could master it and leave records for later centuries.”<sup>83</sup>

The dark vowel was in the language of the white race, which was also the so-called Homeric language, until today barbarian = Pelasgian = so-called Slavic. It is confirmed, today it is only so-called Slavic. This was the reason for its use in the languages of the degenerated so-called Slavic languages in France, Portugal, Romania, Wallachia, Albania, etc.

In Europe there was one people, religiously divided: Romans = Christians with Koine and Latin without dark vowel and Sclavini with dark vowel - in Spain where there were Sclavini.

Since both races lived in Egypt, white and black, there was a biracial language:

According to Larousse<sup>84</sup>: “The prophet of Aton. The official god Amon during the 15th century favoured the popular piety that saw in him the protector of every person ... The court of Amenophis IV decided to react, and special honour was shown to the cult of the Sun in the form of Aton... Under his influence, Egyptian culture underwent a radical

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., p. 143.

<sup>84</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 237.

change. Following the example of the hymn that the king composed, the scribes replaced the Egyptian literary language with the spoken language...”

It is emphasized that: “they replaced the Egyptian literary language with the spoken language.”

There was talk of language replacement in Egypt. The official language in Egypt was replaced as follows:

“The Cuneiform script and the Sumero-Akkadian culture. Unlike the Egyptian cultural influence, limited to Nubia and a few Syrian cities, Mesopotamian culture did not stop spreading during the 2nd millennium. The cuneiform script, very simplified, which the Hurrians and Elamites had already used in the 3rd millennium, was adopted by the Syrian cities (from the 18th century) and the Hittite Empire (16th century?). However, it is not known whether its spread in those countries should be attributed to the Hurrians or the Western Semites. Sometimes cuneiform was used to write in the Hurrian, Hattic, or Elamite languages. But in general, foreign scribes, referring to the classical and scientific works of Babylonia, adopted it with the Mesopotamian script and the Akkadian language (for official and commercial texts) and Sumerian (for ritual texts). Thus, the letters from Tell el-Amarna (14th century) show that at the height of Egyptian power, international correspondence was conducted in the Akkadian language.<sup>85</sup>

They speak of a script of the white race and the Akkadian language of Blacks, while the other languages were of the Whites. So the Akkadian language could not be a pure language of the Blacks, but it also contained words of the Whites. Since two races lived in Mesopotamia and Egypt, the white and the black, the Akkadian language could have been used in Egypt.

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., p. 238.



Just as Akkadian was a biracial language, the same happened with ancient Egyptian.

“This command led to the intervention of those who since the time of Manetho have been called ‘Ethiopian kings’ (XXV Egyptian dynasty, 751-656). These were the masters of the new Kush kingdom probably founded in Napata by the priests of Aman fleeing from Libyan rule (950). In any case these blacks from Nubia used the Egyptian language as official and preserved the rites of the new Theban kingdom. Rich and powerful, they easily imposed their rule on the small Libyan kingdom up to the Nile valley.” <sup>86</sup>

It reads: “these blacks from Nubia used the Egyptian language as their official language.”

## **BIRACIALITY AND BIRACIAL LANGUAGES**

H.G. Wells <sup>87</sup> wrote: “A large group of languages now dominate all of Europe and extend as far as India... They call it the Indo-European or Aryan group...”

“At some, perhaps time in the remote past, in the Neolithic age, that is to say 8000 or more years ago, there existed a simple, primitive speech from which all these Aryan languages later branched out.

It must have been somewhere between central Europe and western Asia where a certain number of tribes wandered and mixed sufficiently to be able to develop and use a single language. It would be convenient to call them here Aryan peoples. H.H. Johnston has called them ‘Aryan Russians’...”

“Aryan philologists however have distinguished another group of languages which have apparently become independent. These are the Semitic languages...” <sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., p. 241.

<sup>87</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 66.

“We can see that at the very beginning of recorded history (and that would be about four thousand years before Christ or earlier), the Aryan-speaking peoples and the Semitic-speaking peoples came into the closest contact, through wars and trade, and even along the eastern coast of the Mediterranean. But the fundamental differences in the original Aryan and original Semitic languages do not oblige us to believe that before the Neolithic era there must have been a complete separation of thousands of years between the Aryan and Semitic-speaking peoples.”

“As for these others...Those peoples who spoke a truly Semitic language, as well as those who spoke a truly Aryan, probably lived in separate worlds in the early Neolithic era.”

It follows that the Semitic languages were of Black origin spoken south of the Sahara.

“With less unanimity, philosophers also speak of a third group of languages, the Hamitic group... that it is related to the Semitic group...

The Hamitic group is certainly much more extensive...The Semitic languages could have become a kind of specialized proto-Hamitic group...

How the peoples of the Hamitic...Among the Hamitic languages are...the so-called Ethiopian group of African languages in East Africa, including the languages of the Galatians and the Somalis...”

“The Hottentot language is said to be related to the Hamitic languages, from which it was separated by the expanse of Central Africa, where the Bantu language was spoken. A language similar to Hottentot and related to Bushman is still spoken in semi-arid East Africa, this confirms that Hamitic was once spoken in East Africa.”<sup>89</sup>

The Semitic languages belonged to the Hamitic group, which was black.

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., p. 67.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., p. 72.

“The Semitic and ‘northern’ or ‘Nordic’ races have a certain physiognomy. They seem to be more marked and specialized than the wider, primitive peoples who spoke the Hamitic languages.” <sup>90</sup>

It has been confirmed that the Semitic group of languages is a mixture of the languages of the white and black races. This kind of influence existed in Mesopotamia...Phoenicia...Arabia...Egypt...

“History of the Nile Valley from the beginning of its known history to the time of Alexander the Great was very similar to Babylonian history. But while Babylon was open to attack on all sides, Egypt was protected from the west by deserts, from the east by deserts and the sea, and in the south it had only black peoples. Its history is therefore less punctuated by invasions of foreign races than is the case with the history of Assyria and Babylon...” <sup>91</sup>

Blacks invaded from black Africa. Even the Egyptians had an army composed of Blacks, whose helmets were harder than those of the Persians (Her. III-12).

“About five thousand years ago... A new people probably entered Upper Egypt through Aden from southern Arabia, and very slowly advanced towards the Nile Delta. According to Dr. Wallis Budge they were ‘conquerors from the East.’ But their gods and customs, as well as their pictorial writing, were actually very different from the Sumerian ones. One of the earliest known divine figures was the figure of a divine hippopotamus, which was already completely African by that alone.

So, the connection was only from black Africa - that is where the Blacks originated.

“Slaves had been used from the earliest times to row galleys, although Thor (Old Ship) says that until the time of Pericles (450 B.C.) even free Athenians were not spared from this... The Pharaohs usually hunted for

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., p. 68.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., p. 80.

slaves in Nubia, as they had Black troops for their campaigns in Syria...”<sup>92</sup>

According to H.G. Wells<sup>93</sup>: “In early times the Mediterranean or Iberian section of the Caucasian races extended even further than the Nordic district. Its southern boundary connecting them with the Blacks is very difficult to determine or to trace back to the first Mongols. Wilfred S. Blank says that Huxley ‘had long suspected that the Egyptians and Dravidians had a common origin in India, where they may have existed at a very early period with another belt of dark-skinned people from India to Spain’.”

“That language...They think that Basque is more like the lost speech found in the Caucasus mountains...They think that this language may have stood in very close affinity to the Dravidian language of India and with the languages of the Heliolithic culture peoples who spread through East India eastward to Polynesia and beyond.”<sup>94</sup>

It is quite possible that eight to ten thousand years ago a group of languages spread over western and southern Europe which completely disappeared before the appearance of the Aryan languages. Later we will note in passing the possibility of the existence of three lost language groups, which represented: 1. Old Cretan, Lydian and other languages (although they may have belonged, as Harry H. Johnston suggests, to the ‘Basque-Caucasian-Dravidian group’); 2. Sumerian, and 3. Elamite.”

At first, it was written separately in the language of the Whites and the language of the Blacks. Later it was written together, using the Pelasgian script. Later, deutero-languages followed.

“The first merchants in the world were the owners of ships, like the people of Tyre and Knossos, or nomads who transported goods and

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>93</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 63.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., p. 71.

traded with them, hovering around the edges of primitive enlightenment. The Babylonian and Assyrian merchants were mostly Semitic Arameans, the ancestors of modern Syrians.<sup>95</sup>

“Stories of wars, religious conflicts, the seizure of power, murders, fratricides, how the throne would be preserved, lasted for three centuries. This was the first barbaric story. Israel was at war with Judah and the surrounding states; an alliance was formed first with some, and then with others. Aramaic Syria power burned over the Jews like an ominous star, and then behind it rose the great and ever-increasing power of the Assyrian empire. For three centuries it was shining over the life of the Jews...”<sup>96</sup>

The only official language in the above-mentioned region was the Syrian Aramaic language.

The Syrian Aramaic language better known as Hebrew, surfaced when the Aramaic and Arabic language emerged - it was new, and the only language of Islam:

“While the emperor Heraclius was trying to establish order in devastated Syria - it was after Hozroi II’s death, and before concluding a final peace with Persia, someone gave Heraclius an unusual letter. The bearer of this letter slipped through the imperial outpost at Bostra, in the deserts south of Damascus. The letter was written in Arabic, at that time a still poorly known Semitic language of the southern desert wandering tribes. Of course, Heraclius only heard the oral translation of the letter, and it is possible that the translator added a few contemptuous remarks of his own.”<sup>97</sup>

That letter was an unusual invitation, written in a flowery style, from a man who called himself Muhammad, the prophet of God. As far as it could be understood, Muhammad called upon Heraclius to

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., p. 118.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., p. 130.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., p. 319.

acknowledge the one true god and to serve him. Nothing else definite could be deduced from this letter.”

So Aramaic, Ancient Egyptian, New Persian, Koine, Latin, Arabic... were not the vernacular of a single White people (Pelasgians), but only official and religious languages.

Duden: <sup>98</sup> Aramaea Syria; Aramaic peoples in Northern Syria; Aramaic language.

The Syrian Aramaic language was a biracial language of Whites and Blacks (Semites).

Likewise, Ancient Egyptian was a biracial language of the White and Black races.

From Ancient Egyptian to Coptic and from Koine to Ecclesiastical: Coptic=Pelasgian.

According Ulrich Wilken <sup>99</sup>: “And in Egypt...the old Egyptian language survived forever among the masses, and after they became Christians, i.e. ‘Copts’, a literature developed which, like the Syriac, was predominantly Christian, including secular literature, such as the Coptic version of Alexander’s vision. It may be considered as the last triumph of Hellenism that in the third century A.D. the Egyptians transcribed the Coptic language, which was nothing more than a developed ancient Egyptian language, with a Greek alphabet, with a few additional demotic signs, and later they rejected hieroglyphs and demotic handwriting...”

“Expansion of the Greek language... in Egypt, the priests initially used the Greek language with which they had contact with the officials, because it was official. Undoubtedly, the oriental merchants and

---

<sup>98</sup> Horst Klen, *Der große Duden*, VEB Bibliographische Institut, Leipzig, 1971, p. 27.

<sup>99</sup> Ulrich Wilken, *Alexander the Great*, Mislal, Skopje, 1988, p. 349.

craftsmen immediately began to learn the official language for commercial reasons...”<sup>100</sup>

Since it did not arise from ancient Egyptian, it did not replace ancient Egyptian. Since ancient Egyptian was also biracial, the people did not understand it. So this was the reason for it to be reformed, to remove the Semitic (black) words from it, and the Coptic language came to be only the Pelasgian = so-called Slavic language. Constantinople did the same, and commissioned Constantine the Philosopher, a Macedonian, to reform it, removing incomprehensible Semitic words, from which the so-called Church Slavonic language was created. Church Slavonic was like Coptic.

According to H.G. Wells<sup>101</sup>: “During the Aryan invasion from the countries of their origin to the south and west, the Iberian race spread throughout Great Britain, Ireland, France, Spain, North Africa, Southern Italy and, in an enlightened state, to Greece and Asia Minor. That race was closely related to the Egyptian race...”

The Aryan language was Bavarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic, which was Homer’s language. Gothic (tri-racial) was spoken west of Germany, and Romance (bi-racial) was spoken east of France. As proof that the Europeans were reborn from their native so-called Slavic language, there is the so-called Slavic dark vowel, which is used in all the languages of France, Portuguese, Romanian and Scythian - Scythian is also Mongolian (G. Mayer...).

“While this primitive Aryan language spread and developed in its subdivisions in the west, the same thing happened to it in the east. North of the Carpathians and the Black Sea, the Aryan-speaking tribes used a special dialect called Slavic, from which Russian, Serbian, Polish, Czech and other languages arose. Other varieties of the Aryan language, spread throughout Asia Minor and Persia, also developed as

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., p. 336.

<sup>101</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 135.

the Armenian and Indo-Iranian languages, and from the latter the Sanskrit language later developed. In this book we have used the word Aryan for this entire language family, while sometimes the name Indo-European is also used to refer to the entire family, and the 'Aryan' branch itself is in the narrow sense of the Indo-Iranian language. The Indo-Iranian language was later divided into a larger number of languages, including Persian and Sanskrit, the latter of which was used by certain white Aryan tribes who, between three thousand to a thousand years before Christ, penetrated eastward into India and subdued the dark Dravidian peoples who then ruled that country.”<sup>102</sup> (Armenia and Anatolia were created by the Brigids [Herodotus]: Brigids=Phrygians, R.I.) (Ерменија и Анадолија ја создале Бригите [Херодот]: Бриги=Фриги, Р.И.)

“The Sanskrit epic has told us a story similar to that which served as the basis for the Iliad, the story of a white people, who ate beef - and only later acquired disturbing features - who came down from Persia to the plains of northern India and gradually conquered their way to the Indus. But, as they spread, they received much from the conquered dark Dravidians. They seemed to have lost their bardic traditions. The old verses, says Mr. Bass, were transmitted, mainly, by the women in the households.”<sup>103</sup>

Proof that Egyptians and Macedonians have a common origin is in the DNA: Egyptian DNA was close to that of Europeans, as were the Macedonians. Among them were the Cretans, who are DNA-related to the Macedonians, and the island of Crete was a border area of the Levant where the white race resided.

The connection is seen with the Egyptian language. The ancient Egyptian language, like Syrian Aramaic, was a biracial language - of Whites and Blacks. This was only because two races lived in Egypt and Mesopotamia - the white and the black. Over a long period of time,

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., p. 135.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., p. 142.



biracial languages were created from the two languages - Syriac and Egyptian. New Persian was created from Syriac, and Koine from Egyptian. They returned the people's language of the pharaohs by reforming ancient Egyptian - rejecting the Semitic words of the black race, and the Coptic language was created.<sup>104</sup> The Coptic language was Pelasgian, spoken by the pharaohs before the ancient Egyptian language existed. Therefore, Coptic as a pharaonic language was only a barbarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic language. As reform of ancient Egyptian was carried out in Egypt, Constantine the Philosopher repeated the same procedure: from the successor of ancient Egyptian Koine he removed only the Semitic words, and the result was the Pelasgian=so-called Slavic language. The statement confirms that there never were any separate Slavic peoples, and the Sclavini were Polytheists.

The Egyptians and Sumerians were White people with slanted eyes - the languages were similar.

According to David Aik<sup>105</sup>: "The Khazars and their closely related and subordinate Hungarians...The Hungarians were a nomadic people from the north with a language of Finno-Ugric origin. Dr. Salidor Nagy...The Forgotten Cradle of the Hungarian Culture...Dr. Nagy cites a great example to show the linguistic similarity between Sumerian, Old Hungarian and modern Hungarian. He also refers to several works written during the first millennium, including the Árpád Codex and De Administrando Imperio, and for 50 years he conducted his own research. He says that only two hundred Hungarian words come from the Finno-Ugric language, but more than two thousand words that are close to Sumerian... Kálmán Gosztory, professor of Sumerian philology at the Sorbonne, in the Sumerian Etymological Dictionary and Comparative Grammar has proven that the structure of the

---

<sup>104</sup> "...Coptic, a language derived from the language of ancient Egypt, continued to be used in religious rites, although as a spoken language it fell out of use already in the eighteenth century. (Watson, p. 305)

<sup>105</sup> David Icke, Priče iz vremena omče, TELEDisk, Zagreb, 2008, p. 106.

Hungarian language is closest to the Sumerian. Of the 53 features of Sumerian grammar, 51 coincide with Hungarian, compared with 29 of them in the Turkic languages, 24 with the Caucasian, 21 with the Uralic languages, 5 with the Semitic languages and 4 with Indo-Iranian. Linguistic similarities between Sumerian, Hungarian and other languages have been confirmed by archaeological and anthropological evidence. (In Sumerian a person is called “lu”, in Macedonian people are called “luqe”, R.I.) (Сумерски човек лу-на македонски луѓе за множина, Р.И.)

According to Herodotus the most numerous and powerful people were the Thracians, who lived south and north of the Danube River. These places are the so-called Slavic territories. Since there are no so-called Slavs, this is a conspiracy.

It was said that: “only two hundred Hungarian words come from the Finno-Ugric language, but more than two thousand words are closely related to Sumerian.”

According to H.S. Watson <sup>106</sup>: “The Hungarian nation, as it existed before the Ottoman victory at Mohács in 1526, was limited to the legal members of the nobility. This class comprised a little more than five percent of the population, and included a large number of poor people who lived like peasants. Hungary was a multilingual country, and Hungarian was not the first language of the Hungarian nobles.”

Then, it is only logical to assume that in Hungary lived 5% Hungarians and 95% so-called Slavs speaking the language of the Whites.

Däniken citing Juan Moritz the Argentine explorer, who determined that the ancient kingdom of Quito, in South America, before the Spanish conquest, spoke Hungarian. He found the same surnames, the same place names and the same funeral customs. When the ancient Hungarians buried their dead, they sent them away with the words -

---

<sup>106</sup> Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nacije i države*, Globus / Zagreb, 1980, p. 161.

may he ascend to the star, the Great Bear -. In the South American valley of Quinca and Kochasqui there are, among other things, grave hymns that faithfully refer to the seven main stars of the Great Bear.

Indians were Mongols with DNA close to Korea and Taiwan and Caucasians with blood type A. Caucasians had traditions from the Eastern Mediterranean, which reached from the west only by Patifik = path tyvik (silent), with hieroglyphs and the so-called Greek (Pelasgian) script. (Patifik=пат тивик (тивок), со хиероглифи и тн. грчко (пелазгиско) писмо).

Anthony Breyer and others <sup>107</sup> wrote about the first “dead” language. They said that the Sumerian language <sup>108</sup> remained official in the empire during the reign of the Third Dynasty under two of its representatives, Shu Sin and Ibi Sin, who had Akkadian names. <sup>109</sup> With the transition to the power of the Amorite rulers, the Sumerian language ceased to be spoken but did not completely fall out of use. The rulers carved their inscriptions in Sumerian, although often with an Akkadian version of the same text. In the list, the scribes also added the Akkadian translation for each Sumerian word. Most interesting here were the stories of the gods and heroes. These legends, whose central character was Gilgamesh, were very reminiscent of Homer’s epics. Gilgamesh’s victory over the celestial bull sent to him by the goddess of love Inama to fight for her because Gilgamesh had rejected her and clashed with his former king Kish.

Homer’s language was also Sumerian - there were biracial languages of white and black.

It follows “...a character was Gilgamesh, very reminiscent of Homer’s epics”.

---

<sup>107</sup> Anthony Brajer and others, “Stari svet”, Belgrade, 1984.

<sup>108</sup> The Sumerians were Whites with slanted eyes like the Egyptians. They were of the Mediterranean type - Pelasgians.

<sup>109</sup> The Akkadians were Blacks. According to the authors, they were “Black-headed foreigners” - of African origin.

Homer's language was barbaric = Pelasgian = so-called Slavic. This was the vernacular. The official languages were the Syrian Aramaic and ancient Egyptian. They were biracial, of the white and black (Semitic) races. From the former emerged the New Persian of 515 B.C., and from the latter emerged the Koine in Alexandria during the Ptolemaic reign of Egypt.

## **BLACK ATHENA**

According to Martin Bernal <sup>110</sup>: "The story of Black Athena is long, complex, and, I believe, interesting enough as a study in the sociology of knowledge to deserve a more extensive treatment; therefore, I will only offer it here as a sketch...

In 1975, I fell into a midlife crisis. The private causes of the crisis were not particularly interesting. Politically, however, it was linked to the end of American intervention in Indochina and the realization that the era of Maoism in China was coming to an end. It seemed to me that the central focus of danger and interest in the world was no longer East Asia but the Eastern Mediterranean. This shift stimulated my interest in Jewish history... I began to look at ancient Jewish history, and - since I myself had been placed on the periphery - of the relations between the Israelites and the peoples who surrounded them, especially the Canaanites and Phoenicians. I had always known that the Canaanites and Phoenicians spoke Semitic languages; but it was quite a shock to discover that Hebrew and Phoenician were mutually intelligible languages, and that serious linguists considered them to be dialects of a single Canaanite language.

During this period, I began to study Hebrew and discovered what seemed like a number of obvious similarities between it and Greek. Two factors contributed to my tendency not to accept these similarities as random coincidences. First, because I had studied Chinese, Japanese,

---

<sup>110</sup> Martin Bernal, *Black Athena*, Tabernacle, Skopje, p. 3. (Athena=Athens, R.I.)

and Vietnamese, as well as the relatively rare Chichewa—a Bantu language spoken in Zambia and Malawi—I realized that such a multitude of parallels was not normal for languages without contact.<sup>111</sup> Second, I now realize that Hebrew/Canaanite was not just the language of some small tribe, isolated in the mountains of Palestine, but that it was spoken throughout the Mediterranean—wherever the Phoenicians sailed and settled. I therefore saw no reason why the great number of important words of similar sound and meaning in Greek and Hebrew - or at least the vast majority of words that had no Indo-European roots - should not have been borrowed from Canaanite/Phoenician into Greek.

At this stage, guided by my friend David Owen, I was greatly influenced by the works of Cyrus Gordon and Michael Astur, on the general contacts between Semitic and Greek civilizations. Moreover, Astur convinced me that the legends concerning the founding of Thebes by the Phoenician Cadmus contained a grain of truth. However, like him, I dismissed the legends of the Egyptian population as either complete fantasy or cases of mistaken identity, believing that - whatever the Greeks wrote - the colonists did indeed speak Semitic languages.

For four years I worked along these lines and remained convinced that as much as a quarter of the Greek vocabulary could be of Semitic origin. This, together with the 40-50 percent that seemed Indo-European, still did not offer an explanation for a quarter to a third of the Greek vocabulary. I hesitated whether to view this irreducible part conventionally as ‘Pre-Hellenic’ or to postulate some third external language, Anatolian or—as I preferred—Hurricane. In the meantime, when I looked at these languages, they offered me almost no promising material. It was not until 1979, when I glanced through a copy of Czerny’s Coptic Etymological Dictionary, that I was able to extract some sense from the Late Antique Egyptian language. Almost immediately, I realized that this was the third external language. Within

---

<sup>111</sup> The whites reached... Japan, as well as South Africa. Wherever they went, they had an influence.

a few months, I became convinced that for the remaining 20-25 percent of the Greek vocabulary I could find plausible etymologies from the Egyptian language, as well as for the names of most of the Greek gods and the many toponyms. Putting together the Indo-European, Semitic and Egyptian roots, I now believe that with further research we could offer plausible explanations for 80 and 90 percent of the Greek vocabulary, a proportion that is high compared to present hope for any languages. Therefore, there was now no need for the ‘pre-Hellenic’ element at all.<sup>112</sup>

Early in my research, I had to confront this question: Why, if everything is so simple and obvious, has no one seen it before? The answer came to me when I read Gordon and Astur. They see the Mediterranean as a cultural whole, and Astur showed that anti-Semitism offered an explanation for the denial of the Phoenician role in the formation of Greece. Once I came across the Egyptian component, I soon became even more acutely involved in the problem of ‘why didn’t I think of Egypt before?’ It was so obvious! Egypt, without a doubt, possessed the most magnificent civilization of the Eastern Mediterranean during the millennium that Greece was formed. Greek writers wrote extensively about their debts to Egyptian religion, as well as to other aspects of culture. Moreover, my failure was all the more puzzling because my grandfather was an Egyptologist, and in my childhood I was extremely interested in ancient Egypt. There were obviously very deep inhibitions against associating Egypt with Greece.

At this point, I began to research the historiography of the origins of Greece, to make sure that the Greeks really believed that they had been colonized by Egyptians and Phoenicians, and that they had acquired most of their culture from these colonies and from later study in the Levant.

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

And again, I was very surprised. I was astonished to discover that what I had come to call the ‘Ancient Model’ was not overthrown until the early 19th century, and that the version of Greek history that I had been taught – far from being as old as the Greeks themselves – had only been developed in the 1840s and 1850s. Astur pointed out to me that historiographical attitudes towards the Phoenicians were deeply influenced by anti-Semitism; therefore, it was easy for me to make a connection between the rejection of the Egyptians and the explosion of Northern European racism in the 19th century. It took considerably longer to figure out the connections with Romanticism and the tensions between Egyptian religion and Christianity.”

“There are two models devoted to Greek history: one model sees Greece as essentially European or Aryan, and the other sees it as Levantine, on the periphery of the Egyptian and Semitic cultural sphere. I call them the ‘Aryan’ and the ‘Ancient’ models. The ‘Ancient Model’ was the conventional view among Greeks in the Classical and Hellenistic eras. According to this, Greek culture emerged as a result of colonization, around 1500 B.C., by Egyptians and Phoenicians who civilized the natives. Additionally, the Greeks continued to borrow heavily from Near Eastern cultures. <sup>113</sup>

Most people are surprised to learn that the Aryan Model, which many of us are led to believe, did not develop until the first half of the 19th century. In its earliest or ‘Broad’ form, the new model denied the truth of the Egyptian settlement and doubted the settlement of the Phoenicians. What I call the ‘Extreme’ Aryan Model, which flourished during the two peaks of anti-Semitism in the 1890s and again in the 1920s and 1930s, even called into question the cultural influence of the Phoenicians. According to the Aryan Model, there was some kind of invasion from the north – not recorded in ancient tradition – which gained supremacy over the local ‘Aegean’ or ‘pre-Hellenic’ culture. Greek civilization is seen as the result of the interbreeding between the

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

Indo-European-speaking Hellenes and their indigenous subjects. It is precisely because of the construction of this Aryan model that I call this *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985*.”

“However, the situation takes its most extreme form in the areas of language and names. Starting in the 1840s, Indo-European philology, or the study of the relationships between languages, was the core of the Aryan model. Then, as now, scholars of Indo-European and Greek philology were extremely resistant to perceiving any connection between Greek on the one hand and Egyptian and Semitic, the two major non-Indo-European languages of the ancient Eastern Mediterranean, on the other. There is no doubt that if Egyptian, West Semitic and Greek had been the languages of three important neighbouring tribes in the modern Third World, there would have been extensive comparative studies, after which most linguists would have concluded that they may have been quite distantly related to each other, but that they certainly had developed “considerable linguistic and probably other cultural borrowings between the three peoples. However, given the deep respect felt for the Greek and Hebrew languages, this kind of crude comparative work was considered inappropriate.”<sup>114</sup>

“Before setting out the themes present in my works, it may be useful to offer a general impression of my views on their historical background, especially where they differ from conventional wisdom. Like most learned men, I believe that it is impossible to offer a judgment between the theories of monogenesis and polygenesis of human language, although I am inclined towards monogenesis. On the other hand, recent work by a small but growing number of scholars has convinced me that there is a genetic connection between the Indo-European languages and the ‘superfamily’ languages of the Afroasiatic language. I am even more inclined to accept the conventional, though controversial, view that a family of languages arose from a single dialect. I believe, therefore, that

---

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., p. 13



there was certainly once a people speaking a Proto-Afroasiatic-Indo-European language. Such a language and culture must have diverged a very long time ago. The latest would probably be the Mousterian period, 50,000- 30,000 years before the present, but it is quite possible that it may have happened much earlier. The terminus ante quem is determined by the far greater differences between Indo-European and Afroasiatic, rather than by the differences within them, and I believe that the split of Afroasiatic languages can be placed in time of the ninth millennium B.C. <sup>115</sup>

I see the spread of Afroasiatic as an expansion of culture - long established in the East African Rift Valley - at the end of the last Ice Age in the 10th and 9th millennia B.C. During the Ice Ages, water was stored in the polar ice caps, and rainfall was considerably less than today. The Sahara and Arabian deserts were even larger and more inaccessible than they are now. With the increase in warmth and rainfall in the centuries that followed, much of those regions became savannahs, into which people from the surrounding areas gathered. The most successful of these people, I believe, were the Proto-Afro-Asiatic-speaking people of the Rift Valley. These people not only had an effective technique for hunting, but they also possessed domesticated animals and agricultural crops. Moving across the savannah, the Chadic-speaking people reached Lake Chad; the Berbers reached the Maghreb; and the Proto-Egyptians reached Upper Egypt. The Proto-Semitic-speaking people settled in Ethiopia and continued on to the Arabian savannah.”

According to Martin Bernal, the Blacks were penetrating northwards. It follows that “The Proto-Semitic-speaking people settled in Ethiopia and continued on to the Arabian savannah.”

The Semites were Blacks - Semitic languages were/are biracial, of Whites and Blacks.

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., p. 17.

“Along with the slow drying of the Sahara during the seventh and sixth millennia B.C., there were migrations into the Nile Valley of Egypt, from both the west and east, as well as from Sudan. I also believe - but I am in the minority here - that a similar migration took place from the Arabian savannahs to Lower Mesopotamia. Most scholars believe that this area was first settled by the Sumerians or Proto-Sumerians, and that the Semites from the deserts did not infiltrate until the third millennium B.C. I argue that during the sixth millennium B.C. the Semitic language spread with the so-called Ubaid pottery into Assyria and Syria, more or less occupying the region of Southwest Asia where Semitic is spoken today. I imagine the Sumerians came into Mesopotamia from the northeast, at the beginning of the fourth millennium B.C. In any case, from the earliest texts that have been written down - the Uruk texts of about 3000 B.C. - we now know that there was quite a noticeable bilingualism in the Semitic-Sumerian language.

Few scholars would dispute the idea that Mesopotamia was the scene where what we call ‘civilization’ was first created. With the possible exception of writing, all the elements of which civilization was composed—cities, agricultural irrigation, metalworking, stone architecture, and the wheel, both for vehicles and for the manufacture of pottery—had existed elsewhere before. But this sum, when crowned with writing, made possible a great economic and political accumulation, which we may rightly regard as the beginning of civilization.

Before discussing the rise and spread of this civilization, it is useful to consider the divergence and separate development of the Indo-European languages. In the first half of the 19th century, it was thought that the Indo-European language originated in some mountain range in Asia. While this was believed during the 19th century, there was general agreement that Proto-Indo-European was first the language of nomads somewhere north of the Black Sea. In the last half century or so, this has been largely identified with the so-called Kurgan culture, present in this region in the fourth and third millennia B.C. Presumably, the

people who possessed this material culture spread westward into Europe, southeastward into Iran and India, and southward into the Balkans and Greece.

The general scheme of expansion from Central Asia or the steppes was developed before the decipherment of Hittite texts, which showed that it was a 'primitive' Indo-European language, and the subsequent recognition of the existence of an Anatolian language family. The 'Anatolian' languages do not include languages such as Phrygian and Armenian <sup>116</sup> which, although spoken in Anatolia – modern Turkey – are clearly Indo-European. The true Anatolian languages – Hittite, Palaian, Luwian, Lycian, Lydian, Lemnian, probably Etruscan and perhaps Carian – raise a number of problems with the conventional view of Indo-European origins. There is general agreement that Proto-Anatolian diverged from Proto-Indo-European before the split of Proto-Indo-European. However, it is impossible to determine the length of time between the two events, which could range from 500 to 10,000 years. In any case, there is a significant difference that has led many linguists to make a distinction between Indo-European - which does not include the Anatolian languages - and Indo-Hittite, which includes both families.

The language of the Whites was one, with only dialectal differences and distance.

“If - as most historical linguists assume - not only Indo-European but also Indo-Hittite began to exist north of the Black Sea, then how and when did people speaking Anatolian languages enter Anatolia? Some authorities claim that this happened during the late third millennium B.C. when, as Mesopotamian sources indicate, barbarian invasions took place there. It is far more likely that these invasions were carried out by people speaking Phrygian and Proto-Armenian. It is almost improbable that a period of several hundred years, before the first evidence of

---

<sup>116</sup> According to Herodotus, the Brygians created Anatolia and Armenia. Since b=f to Phrygia with Phrygians.

Hittite and Palaian, would have allowed for a very marked differentiation between Indo-European and Anatolian, as well as within the Anatolian family itself. The archaeological record for the third millennium B.C. is extremely weak and inconsistent, but there is no obvious break in material culture here that would fit into such a major linguistic shift. Moreover, we should not rely too much on the argument from silence; we cannot rule out an influx of Anatolian culture in the fifth and fourth millennia B.C.

A more attractive possibility is the scheme proposed by Professors Georgiev and Renfrew. According to this scheme, Indo-European—I would prefer—Indo-Hittite—was already spoken in Southern Anatolia by the creators of the great Neolithic cultures of the eighth and seventh millennia B.C., including the famous Çatal Huyik culture in the Koina plain. Georgiev and Renfrew suggest that Asiatics moved towards Greece and Crete with the spread of agriculture in about 7000 B.C. According to archaeology, this is the time of a remarkable flourishing of material culture there. Therefore, some dialect of Indo-Hittite would have been the language of the Neolithic ‘civilization’ in Greece and the Balkans in the 5th and 4th millennia B.C. It would be convenient to accept the suggestion of the American professor Goodinaught, that the Kurgan nomadic culture was derived from the mixed agricultural systems of these Balkan cultures, and hence that its language was also derived from these cultures. In this way, it is possible to reconcile the theories of Georgiev and Renfrew with those of the orthodox Indo-Europeanists, by postulating that the Kurgan culture, which spoke an Indo-European language, spread back to the Balkans and Greece, through its population, spoke an Indo-Hittite language.

The hypothetical expansion of the Afroasiatic language, together with African agriculture in the 9th and 8th millennia B.C., as well as of the Indo-Hittite language together with Southeast Asian agriculture in the 8th and 7th millennia, could to some extent explain the fundamental differences between the northern and southern shores of the Mediterranean. These migrations took place mainly overland because

sea travel, although possible even in the 9th millennium B.C., was still risky and difficult. With the improvement of navigation in the 5th and 4th millennia B.C., the situation changed to a great extent. Although nomads continued to migrate overland, especially across the lowlands, transport and communication from the fourth millennium B.C. until the development of the railway in the 19th century, were largely facilitated by water rather than by land. During this long period, rivers and seas provided the means of communication, while territories were isolated by arid deserts and mountains. Such a pattern of historical stratification—land first, sea second—would explain the general paradox discussed here: the apparent contradiction between the striking cultural similarities between populations throughout the Mediterranean, and the profound linguistic and cultural divisions between the peoples of its southern and northern shores.

Civilization in Mesopotamia, from the fourth millennium B.C. onwards, spread with enormous rapidity. The idea of writing seems to have been adopted in India and in many parts of the Eastern Mediterranean, even before its codification as cuneiform in Mesopotamia. We know that hieroglyphs were being developed in the Nile Valley by the third quarter of this millennium; but we know, despite the lack of evidence, that Hittite hieroglyphs, as well as the prototypes of the Levantine, Cypriot, and Anatolian syllabic scripts, were developed before its arrival in Syria, about the beginning of the third millennium before our era, or before the full rise of the Sumerian-Semitic civilization, with its usual cuneiform script.

The Egyptian civilization was evidently founded on the rich pre-dynastic cultures of Upper Egypt and Nubia, whose African origin is undisputed. Moreover, the great extent of Mesopotamian influence, evident from the remains of the late predynastic period and the First Dynasty, leaves little room for doubt that the unification and establishment of dynastic Egypt, around 3250 B.C., was in some way prompted by developments in the East. The cultural mix was further complicated by the profound linguistic and, I believe, cultural

connections between Egypt and the basic Semitic component of the Mesopotamian civilization.

The miraculous fourth millennium was followed by the prosperous third millennium. The newly discovered archives from Elba in Syria, dated to around 2500 B.C., depict a confluence of wealthy, literate, and sophisticated states stretching from Kurdistan to Cyprus. From archaeology we learn that civilization at this time spread even further - to the Harappan culture that stretched from the Indus River to Afghanistan, and to the metalworking cultures along the Caspian Sea, the Black Sea and the Aegean. The Semitic-Sumerian civilizations of Mesopotamia were closely linked by a common script and culture. Those on the periphery, although equally 'civilized', retained their own languages, scripts and cultural identities. For example, on the island of Crete, there seems to have been a significant cultural influx from the Levant at the beginning of the Early Minoan I pottery period, at the turn of the third millennium B.C. Moreover, cuneiform did not become the dominant script, and Crete was never fully incorporated into the Syro-Mesopotamian civilization. So, apart from the distance itself, the most plausible reasons seem to have been the flexibility of the indigenous culture and the fact that the culture of Crete was somewhere between the Semitic and Egyptian spheres of influence.

This dual connection - with both the Levant and Africa - is reflected in archaeological discoveries. Many Syrian and Egyptian objects from this period have been found in Crete and elsewhere in the Aegean. Around 3000 B.C., as in the Near East, the mixing of copper with tin to make bronze began; the potter's wheel was introduced, and there are striking similarities between the fortification systems of the Cyclades and those of the same period found in Palestine. Archaeologists Professors Peter Warren of Brussels and Colin Renfrew of Cambridge insist on believing that these developments occurred independently, despite the fact that the same changes appeared somewhat earlier in the Near East, and despite the undoubted contacts between the two regions. In my opinion, this is highly implausible. It is much more likely that the progress of the

Aegean emerged as a result of contacts through Levantine trade and settlement, but also from local initiatives in response to these stimuli.

We know that most of the bronze-using world in the third millennium was literate, either using cuneiform or local scripts. However, there is no evidence of writing in the Aegean during this period. How seriously should we take the ‘argument of silence’ in this case? There are some compelling points to the contrary. In the first place, the climatic conditions in Greece and Anatolia were far less suitable for the preservation of clay tablets and papyrus than those of the Near East or northwestern India. Even in these arid regions, it is often difficult to find evidence. Until the discovery of the Ebla tablets in 1975, there was no evidence of any literacy in Syria during the third millennium B.C. We now know that Syria was at this time the scene of a cultivated class of literate people, and that people from the Euphrates travelled to study in the schools of Ebla.

Another point suggests that writing was present in the Aegean during the Early Bronze Age. Linear A, Linear B and the Cypriot syllabary, present from the second millennium B.C., seem to share a common prototype, they also show major divergences from each other which, by analogy with historically observed developments of scripts, take centuries to manifest. The evidence of ‘dialects’ and scripts therefore seems to indicate that the original form existed in the third millennium and that it began to develop in the fourth millennium, which, for the reasons given above, would be the likely period in which the process took place. Finally, I have argued elsewhere that the alphabet may have arrived in the Aegean by the middle of the second millennium at the latest. If this is correct, then it would be plausible to assume that the survival of syllabic scripts shows that they were already well established in the region. Therefore, the evidence thus points to their existence in the third millennium B.C.

The Early Bronze Age civilization began to flourish in the 23rd century B.C. In Egypt, it was designated as the First Intermediate Period. In

Mesopotamia, the Gutian invasion from the north took place. The entire civilized world was shaken by barbarian invasions and social revolt, which may have been caused by a sudden deterioration in the climate. It was during these years that Anatolia was the scene of an invasion by groups who, in my opinion, should be identified with people who spoke Phrygian and Proto-Armenian. On the Greek mainland, in this and later centuries, there were widespread destructions and also towards the end of the Early Helladic II period, which has been plausibly attributed to an 'Aryan' or 'Hellenic' invasion of Greece, but could also be the result of Egyptian incursions and colonies at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom. Three centuries later, another, though less devastating, destruction occurred at the end of Early Helladic III, around 1900 B.C., perhaps associated with the conquests of the Egyptian pharaoh Senwosret I, known to the Greeks as Sesostris.

Postulating such a degree of contact between the Aegean and the Near East in the third millennium B.C., it is likely that some of the words, toponyms and religious cults of Egyptian and Semitic origin discussed here were introduced into the Aegean at this time. On the Greek mainland, it is less likely that these aspects survived the upheaval of northern invasions or infiltrations. However, in Crete and the Cyclades, which were not subject to such disturbances and which are likely to have been predominantly Semitic-speaking, it is far more likely that these cultural elements continued to persist."

It stated: "Egyptian and Semitic origin." Their distinction follows.

So, the Sumerians and Egyptians were Whites with slanted eyes, and the Semites were Blacks.

““Labiovelars in Semitic and Greek’. Labiovelars are sounds like ‘qu-’, in which a velar (back palatal consonant) like ‘k’ or ‘g’ is followed by a rounding of the lips or ‘w’. It is generally accepted that such sounds existed in Proto-Indo-European, but there is no general agreement that this was the case in Proto-Semitic. However, labiovelars are common throughout the rest of the Afroasiatic and Semitic languages in



Ethiopia. Here I will argue that in many respects it is far more useful to reconstruct Proto-Semitic on the basis of some South Ethiopian Semitic languages rather than on the basis of Arabic, as is done today. In particular, I will argue – on the basis of evidence from these languages themselves – that Asiatic Semitic had labiovelars, and that West Semitic retained them well into the second millennium B.C. Since it is generally accepted that the Greek labiovelars were dropped during the middle of that period, I will argue that some borrowings from Semitic into Greek were made when both languages had labiovelars, some after Greek had dropped them but West Semitic still retained them, and some after they had disappeared from both languages. Therefore, by postulating significant contact between West Semitic and Greek culture before the drop of labiovelars—that is, before the middle of the second millennium B.C.—we can resolve a number of unexplained problems in Greek etymology that cannot be explained otherwise. It also reflects the fact that the Revised Ancient Model can achieve much better results by using the abundant Greek material to help reconstruct early forms in Egyptian and Semitic.”<sup>117</sup>

“We will later consider linguistic borrowings from West Semitic and Egyptian, and I will discuss them here. Some attention will be paid to syntax or word order, as in the example of the similar uses of the definite article in late Canaanite-Phoenician and Hebrew—on the one hand, and Greek on the other. Elsewhere, morphology or word modification is considered; but the bulk of material is devoted to the study of lexical borrowings or loanwords.”<sup>118</sup>

Here we begin with morphology, or word modifications according to number, gender, case, tense, etc. With the exception of Hittite, Greek is the earliest attested Indo-European language, and the extent of its morphological ‘decay’ is therefore quite striking. Although the original Indo-European verb system seems to be very well preserved in Greek,

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., p. 45.

nouns in Greek have only five cases, while Latin, first recorded over 1000 years later, had six; and Lithuanian, recorded only in modern times, contains all eight cases postulated for Proto-Indo-European. The morphological loss experienced by Greek suggests that there was intensive contact with other languages; this is consistent with the lexical evidence and weakens the Autochthonous Origin Model. However, it can be explained by both the Ancient and the Aryan models which, unlike the Autochthonous Origin Model, can account for just such contact.

However, the main interest here is in verb borrowings. As I have mentioned, the Indo-European component of the Greek lexicon is relatively small. For example, languages such as Old Church Slavonic and Lithuanian, which were first attested 2000 years later than Greek, possess a significantly higher proportion of roots with cognates in other Indo-European languages. Furthermore, the semantic range to which Indo-European roots appear in Greek is more or less the same as the range of Anglo-Saxon roots in English. These roots are the source of most of the pronouns and prepositions: most of the basic nouns and verbs of family—but not of political—life; and of subsistence agriculture, but not of commercial agriculture. In contrast, the vocabulary of urban life, luxury, religion, administration, and abstraction is non-Indo-European.

Such a pattern usually reflects a long-term situation in which speakers of the language or languages that are the source of the words of a higher culture control the users of the basic vocabulary - as in the relationship between Anglo-Saxon and French in English; Bantu and Arabic in the creation of Swahili; or Vietnamese and Chinese in the formation of modern Vietnamese. A less common pattern is present in Turkish and Hungarian, in which the conquerors took over the sophisticated vocabulary of the native population. However, in these cases, the Turks and Hungarians retained their Mongol words for military technology or organization. In Greek, however, the words for chariot, sword, bow, march, armor, battle, etc. are non-Indo-European...”

“Being Christian, the writers probably had unfavourable reactions towards Egypt. However, during this period, other Eurocentric writers, who were hailed as pioneers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, paid their respects to Egypt. The scholar Giovanni Battista Vico, who had been active in Naples since the early eighteenth century and whose romantic, Eurocentric, and historicist understanding of history made him a hero to nineteenth-century historians, was in many ways negative about the Egyptians. A devout Catholic, he excluded the Jews from secular history and linked their history to creation. He saw the Egyptians as only one of the earliest peoples after the Flood. Yet they played a central role in his thinking. Namely, he saw his sketch of three ages as based on Egyptian history as recounted by Herodotus: the three ages being the ages of the gods, the heroes and the men. To these three epochs he associated three kinds of ‘language’: hieroglyphic, ‘symbolic’ and ‘epistolary’. He spoke of and accepted the myth of Cadmus, connecting him with Egypt. And Montesquieu was forced to admit that ‘the Egyptians were the best philosophers in the world’.<sup>119</sup>

The mainstream modern opinion about Egypt in England and France seemed to have been – as the above quote from the French writer suggests – unequivocally positive. For example, one of the most famous English playwrights of the mid-eighteenth century was Edward Young, whose series of Egyptian plays – as might be expected – did not receive much attention in later centuries. In 1752, the fifteen-year-old Edward Gibbon showed his fascination with Egypt by writing his first historical essay on ‘The Time of Sesostris’.

This positive opinion, as well as the persistent conviction that Greek culture came from Egypt and Phoenicia, was transformed into a new, non-mystical doctrine. In 1763, the brilliant Abbot Barthélemy, who had deciphered the Palmyrene and Phoenician languages, submitted an article entitled ‘General Reflections on the Relations between the Egyptian, Phoenician and Greek Languages’. In that article, his first

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., p. 112.

correct assumption, for which he relied on Kircher – whose work he otherwise considered fantastic – was that the Coptic language was a form of ancient Egyptian. He also recognized the linguistic family that would later bear the name ‘Semitic’, and which he called ‘Phoenician’. On these two grounds, he established that Egyptian, although not a Semitic language, was related to the Semitic family. It is true that some of his lexical evidence may today be shown to be erroneous, since certain Coptic words were due to borrowings from Semitic into late Egyptian. However, no objection can be made to the main lines of his argument, which appeal to similarities between pronunciation and grammatical features. In this sense Barthélemy is a pioneer of what we would today call Afro-Asiatic studies.”

Cited was: “...an article entitled ‘General Reflections on the Relations between the Egyptian, Phoenician and Greek Languages’...”

“Barthélemy admitted that he could not see parallels between the Coptic and Greek languages. Nevertheless, he believed in the Egyptian colonization and civilization of Greece and considered it ‘impossible that in that exchange of ideas and goods the Egyptian language did not participate in the formation of Greek’. He then offered a list of etymologies from Egyptian to Greek, several of which – for example Coptic *hof*, Demotic *hf* <sup>120</sup> in Greek *ophis* (snake) – still seem plausible today.”

It has been confirmed that Koine was derived from Old Egyptian but only in Alexandria.

Since Barthélemy “could not see parallels between the Coptic and Greek languages”, it is confirmed that Old Egyptian and Koine were biracial languages of Whites and Blacks, and that Coptic and the Church languages were reformed without Semitic (Black) words.

---

<sup>120</sup> Demotic was Macedonian, with a Bitola dialect. So Coptic and Macedonian were one and the same.

“For a long time, and indeed quite justifiably, the Jews and the Phoenicians were considered to be closely related peoples and cultures. Long before the decipherment of the Phoenician script by Barthélemy in the mid-18th century, certain scholars like Samuel Bohart, who lived and worked a century earlier, were convinced that the languages used by the Jews and the Phoenicians were actually dialects of the same language...”<sup>121</sup>

### **BABYLON=BABYL=BAB IL-IL VRNE/THUNDER; BABA PLANINA, BABUNA**

Milan Budimir,<sup>122</sup> in the title Triplets Babuni and Babici Patarenski, wrote:

“Now let’s move on to the expression Patareni and the doublet babuni and babici. Enc. Jug. 268 s. Babunski zbor says about the variant babuni: ‘Bogomils in feudal Serbia were derogatorily called babuni’, and according to oral statements made by academician M.J. Dinić, members of the Bosnian church sometimes call them ‘babici Patarensni’ in documents from the Dubrovnik Archive. This means that in terms of the Bosnian Christians, both main Christian churches in the Balkans were in excellent agreement, because one calls them babuni and the other babici. Probably both are derivatives from the basic noun baba.”

“Now let us look up the word BABUN in the Dictionary of our Academy says I, 224: ‘babun, -una m. v. bogumil. - In Bosnia (...) the Babuns multiplied so much, that their like-minded Ninoslav finally took over, Zech. Mil. 2, 189). The main Bogomil communities were (...) around Babun. This is perhaps where the name Babuni comes from as another well-known designation for the Bogomils (Gjor. V. 5, 43)’.

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid., p. 218.

<sup>122</sup> Milan Budimir, Sa balkanskih istikačnja, Srpska književna zadruga, Belgrade, 1969-from the internet.

For the sake of order, let us also convey what is said under the name Babuna:

1. a mountain in Macedonia, between Prilep and Titov Veles;
  2. a river in Macedonia, right, a tributary of the Vardar;
  3. a region in Macedonia, in the basin of the Babuna River”.
- (Babuna=babina, R.I.) (Бабуна=бабина, Р.И.)

“It is clear from the words that both the Dubrovnik expression babica patarenska and toponomastic material from Macedonia unequivocally confirm not only a wide geographical area of this name but also its relatively deep antiquity, which is indicated by the rhymed pair Babun-Perun. Therefore it is understandable that L. Niederle, Manuel 2, 123, 157, emphasizes the demonic nature of the Old Russian term Baba and its use as pierre funeraire ‘stecqak’.”

“The aetiological character of this folk tradition is obvious, which undoubtedly proves the old pagan origin of the Russian and Balkan cult of Baba, which has already been pointed out earlier. That this cult is much older than Christianity is shown by the toponym Dajbaba near Titograd, where a church dug into a cave was found. The compound name Dajbaba cannot be separated from the more familiar name Dajbog without a special reason, which according to the traditional understanding arose from an imperative with the meaning give and from the noun god, and with a special, in this case with a constructed meaning: abundance, wealth. It is true that in the compound adjective ubog in Slavic meaning god, which is more likely to be a loan from the Old Iranian dictionary, on Olympus we have several compound names in which the other part of the compound is also god, e.g. Stribog, Belbog, Chernobog...”

“Therefore, it seems most likely that in these archaic names Da/j/baba, Da/j/bog, Da/j/mir there is a hidden lexical element that we find in the ancient Greek divine names Dōis, Dō-matros, Dōmatrios. These names refer to the goddess of fertility Demeter, who in the patriarchal social

order is governed by her companion, the deity of light. That companion of hers is called, as we all know, Zeus, and we also know that, beyond all other Indo-European peoples, no Slavic counterpart has been found for the Olympian Zeus from the same lexical group whose minimum is *dōi/dōi-* (light). The Slavic *daj* in the mentioned names coincides, word for word, with the ancient Greek *Dōis*, while in old Illyrian we have the normal base *Deipaturos*, as the name of the main deity, to whom the Latin *Jupiter* corresponds. If the name *Dajbog*, who must not be separated from *Dajbaba*, derived from the older form *Dazhbog*, as is usually done, we do not have to see in the first part of this compound name some archaic and singular imperative form, but simply an incomplete reduplication of the aforementioned base *doi-* (bright). This form is therefore *doidio* and is attested in the Old Norse *doi-d-o* (bright) (see Pokorniev's Etymological Dictionary, p. 183). In a word, *Dajbog* and *Dajbaba* are divine spouses known in all Indo-European religions as the personification of the heavenly father and Mother Earth.

While in both parts of the name *Dajbog* we are dealing with words of a higher rank, in the other part of the name *Dajbaba* we have a well-known expression appropriate for the mother. Because of these features, here we must count with constant repristination, but nevertheless the length of the first syllable is ensured. *Babuns*, therefore, as well as midwives, are related to the old *Pataren* the cult of the Mother Goddess, which was already richly documented in the central Balkans in the classical period, or rather in the area from which the modern homophone toponyms originate. In that area we find not only in the directory of the old *Brugi* the simple form *baba* as the name of a deity, but also in their later Anatolian homeland the cult of *Baba*, or Great Mother, better known under the name *Cybele*, sufficiently provided with epigraphic monuments. We have already been referred to that same area earlier because of the name *Patareni*, characteristic of the original cult of *Apollo* in *Patari*.

All this means that in the *Babunian* matters we have a cultic syncretism of Old Slavic elements with Old Balkan and Christian syncretism, on

which every sort of heresy has left its mark in the Orthodox Church of the East and West.

This is not the place to enter into a detailed exposition of the Baba cult among the Old Balkan and Old Anatolian Brugi, which obviously indicate a material, or matrilineal order of pre-classical Balkans. But we must nevertheless emphasize that Aryan-minded experts are always wrong when they consider Indo-European cults and religions only from the point of view of patriarchy and reject any trace that contradicts such an understanding, and so it was brought by the Adriatic Liburni from Anatolia, where it was supposedly the main seat of the matrilineal system. (Brugi = Brigi; Brigi = Phrygian, R.I.) (Бруги=Бриги; Бриги=Фриги, Р.И.)

Among the ancient Brugi the name Baba, as the main deity of fertility and the spouse of the heavenly father, appeared in a more complex form which is read as Kombaba, whose spouse is called Kombabos or Kubabos. Her priests led by Attis, were called Galli or Babakes. The name Babakes is nothing more than a derivative of the basic word Baba, formed in the same way as Novak, Greek, Nevaks etc. Among the Brugi that was the basic form. Baba comes from the shortened hypocrites Ba and Komba.

Both abbreviations, which are common in personal names, prove that in the directory of the old Bruges, from where it was taken in the Greek dictionary, the extremely widespread anthroponym of theophoric origin appears in the same function as the normal Baba, i.e., as a name for male and female persons. Therefore, Aeschylus' Ba would be more this theophoric name than, as modern linguists think, an abbreviation of basileus. As the Great Mother or Baba is among the old Bruges, as Matar is to the Romans, as was found on Roman inscriptions. Matar Kubila, is no doubt a reduction as both are reductions and Ba and Ma must be treated as reflexes of the old synonyms from the cult vocabulary of the Balkan Bruges.



It is more difficult to answer the question whether the attitude of the Patarenian midwife towards sexual life was of the same origin as is the case with the cult of Baba or Cybele among the Balkan-Anatolian Bruges, where Galli and Babakes together with Attis were subjected to castration before the assumption that this would increase the fertility of the Mother Goddess. It is difficult to answer because among the Babuni we must also consider Manichaeian influence. Their teaching about matter at the source of all evil left a trace in the Slavic translations of Ochenash, in which the original artos epiousios (bread designated for the coming day) is translated as 'bread dried', that is, as panis supersubstantialis in Manichaeian Latin. However, on the basis of the existence of Thracian monks called the Ktistai (who live without a wife) and towards the asceticism of the priests of Zeus in Illyrian Dodona, we must consider the factor that in the pre-classical Balkans he supported the cult of sexual abstinence. Sexual abstinence is also indicated in a certain sense by the famous verse from the folk song: 'Ni po greku stara stara dorodali' (greku vmesto greh). Such an understanding corresponds more to the old Iranian and Namichean science of good and evil after Christianity itself, so there will also be some trace of the old Balkan cult of the Great Mother here. (Baba-babin=babun- Babuna, R.I.) (Баба- бабин=бабун- Бабуна, Р.И.)

Babylon=babil=bab il on: ov-on-ot; il=Ilios=Helios, "Il vrne, il grme".

According to Harold Lamb <sup>123</sup>: "In the historical records in which Herodotus described the far east as far as the Caucasus, facts began to give way to legends. The most distant great city that Herodotus described at length was Babylon, whose terraced hanging gardens and skyscraper like towers were a wonder of the world. A Phoenician related that the name Babylon really meant Bab-il, the gate of God..."

---

<sup>123</sup> Harold Lamb, Alexander the Great, Culture, Skopje, 1989, p. 60.

In Brigium (Brsiakia) there is Baba Mountain. Then Bab  
il=Ilios=Helios. <sup>124</sup>

“He did not want... envoys from the merchant-traveling houses in Beirut brought gifts and an invitation to visit their garden city built opposite the mighty Lebanon - founded, as they said, by the sea nymph Beroea, or perhaps by the goddess Astarte, who appeared from the forest riding a lion. (Actually Beirut is a Semitic word and means Springs.)” <sup>125</sup>

Beirut=brut=vrit=vriet- from the spring the water comes out as if it were boiling=vriet =vrit. Lebanon=Lebanon - v = lian - n = lia=lie: Lebanon + t = Livant - n = livat - v = liat=liet. With v-n-t: - v = liant; - n = livat; - t =livan. Everything refers to pouring.

According to Branko Vukušić <sup>126</sup>: “The entire Slavic toponymy was covered with Slavic names. For example, in 365. B.C., Philip II moved his capital from the city of Philippi to the newly built one, which had a purely Slavic name, Izvori...”. (Source=from source=vir=vr + t = vrit=vriet + iz = izvriet..., R.I.) (Извор=из вор=вир=вр + т = врит=вриет + из = извриет..., Р.И.)

It is precisely Philip’s mother Euridice (Euridice=e vri dik a) who came from Linca, near the village Skochivir=skochi vir, from where the Pelasgian Lake flowed out.

## EMERGENCE OF THE ALPHABET

---

<sup>124</sup> In Demir Hisar Ilinska Planina and the village of Babino- next to it Zmejova Dupka=Peshtera Ege Iliada.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., p. 184.

<sup>126</sup> Branko Vukušić, O trojansko slovenskoj misteriji, Pešić i sinovi, Belgrade, 2003, p. 136.

According to Larousse: <sup>127</sup>“The emergence of the alphabet. • The scripts of the ancient East (cuneiform, Egyptian or Hittite hieroglyphs) were very difficult to learn due to the large number of signs, and therefore were the property of a small minority of literate people who found that in that complexity they could maintain their high position. They already used, as in Hattusa for example, a cuneiform script composed almost entirely of phonetic (syllabic) signs. Only the structure of the Semitic languages, where the consonants themselves constituted an unchanging framework of the root words, imposed a simplification of great importance. Namely, the vowels had to be thrown out, from the syllabic script (about a hundred signs) one would switch to writing only consonants (thirty signs). To write in this way, foreign scripts were first used. Then, since this proved to be very complex, those letters were replaced by linear signs.

Without a doubt, it took half a millennium filled with attempts made throughout Syria to finally find a solution. The most famous was the stage of the Ugaritic alphabet (15th-14th century) which used thirty-one cuneiform signs to record Ugaritic rites and myths (in West Semitic dialects). But the alphabet was definitely created with the invention of twenty-two characters (occurring at the beginning of the 10th century) which was usually called ‘Phoenician’, because it was preserved among that people. Since it was adopted very early by the Arameans, Arabs and Greeks, it spread over the entire Old World except for the areas under Chinese influence. In the countries that adopted it, it allowed many citizens to learn it because it was simple.”

Wherever the Whites of the Eastern Mediterranean reached, there was literacy.

“There is also disagreement about the nature of relations between the Hellenic peninsula and Crete, where, it seems, with the late Minoan II period (1460-1375) a new spirit appeared, which was especially

---

<sup>127</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, volume 3, p. 238.

represented by Knossos... Namely, the different types of ceramics could not be so easily distinguished. In the palaces of Knossos, tablets are found whose script is a Linear B transcription of a Greek dialect (Mycenaean) and which are completely similar to the tablets from the Mycenaean palaces (end of the 13th century)..." <sup>128</sup>

"In Pylos and in Mycenae - not to mention Knossos - tablets written in Linear B script have been discovered which date back to the period before the collapse of these palaces (around 1200). These are annual inventories written on tablets of fresh clay which were to be reused, but which were preserved thanks to the fire in which they were baked. The decipherment of these tablets allowed us to understand the basic features of society and religion..." <sup>129</sup>

"• On the way to the Middle East, the Mycenaeans established trading posts in Rhodes, Pamphylia and Cyprus. The case of Cyprus is somewhat exceptional. More apt to assimilate foreign cultures, this island, which had conquered the Assyrian culture of Ugarit and adapted the Minoan script to its own language (the Linear Cypriot script), also adopted the themes of Mycenaean art for its ceramics, which sold well in the East. For their part, the Mycenaeans undertook to sell the copper ingots from Alasiya far and wide." <sup>130</sup>

"Movement. When the Mycenaean world collapsed (13th-7th centuries), either as a victim of internal crisis or external attacks, a new branch of the Greek people, the Dorians and their brothers, peoples who spoke a northwestern dialect (Helicians, Acarnanians, Aetolians) conquered certain areas of Greece. These people did not bring any cultural novelty. Nothing is known about their origin, nor about where they came from. It is not even known whether it was a real invasion. But the linguistic map of the Greek world in the 1st millennium B.C. shows that the Dorians did conquer Greece. According to legend, the

---

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., p. 239.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., p. 239.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., p. 239.

Achaean and Ionian civilizations originated in the time before the invasion in the 12th century. Accordingly, the Achaean dialect, which turned out to be closest to the dialects of the Linear B script, was known in the 1st millennium only in Arcadia and Cyprus, two areas that had no contact with each other and which represented remains of the vanished kingdom...<sup>131</sup>

A new civilization. The new civilization is based on the Cretan-Mycenaean (the list of gods from classical Olympus is already almost complete on the Mycenaean tablets)..."

"• Cyprus is a unique case in the Hellenic community. The Mycenaeans, conquerors or refugees, who settled there in the 13th-12th centuries, maintained their tradition. On the other hand, relations with the East and Greece never ceased. Although there is a geometric style, already in the 8th century, under the influence of the East, ceramics with lush and complex decorations appeared. Since engaging in trade required knowledge of writing, the islanders used a syllabic script (derived from their linear script), which served to write Etheo-Cypriot (the local language) and Greek..."<sup>132</sup>

"• The cultural contribution of Syria, which achieved the synthesis of the culture of the Near East, seems, on the contrary, to be important, but the way in which the relationship between the Greek and Syrian civilizations came about has yet to be determined. The usual old opinion assigned an intermediary role to the Asia Minor states - Lydia and Phrygia - through which the other trade route from the Euphrates to the Ionian ports led. But new excavations have not provided any definitive evidence for this. The Phrygian kingdom was short-lived (775-c. 675). In the large tumuli of its capital Gordion, beautiful bronze objects have been found, on which a strong influence of Urartian or Assyrian art is observed, and graffiti written in an alphabet similar to

---

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., p. 245.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid., p. 246.

the Greek alphabet (8th century)...”<sup>133</sup> (Gordion=gord and on, R.I.)  
(Гордион=горд и он, Р.И.)

Russian archaeologist Gennady Grinevich<sup>134</sup> wrote: “This is no longer a hypothesis. It is a historical fact. Many archaeologists have confirmed that the ‘Slav speakers’ practiced reading and writing in vertical and horizontal lines. These lines were a pre-Cyrillic script. It was not an alphabetic script but a ‘syllabic’, a writing of pictures or lines, a script... the oldest example of writing in horizontal and vertical lines. It was found on an inscription on a spindle whorl dating from 348 A.D. It was found near the city of Iași in Eastern Romania. It read: ‘Neighbours, take this ring-shaped hoop to Solja’. This script was written on an ordinary spindle. This shows that reading and writing were widely used in the pagan era. This probably suggests that this writing was a source of ‘pre-Slavic writing’ which existed for a long time, going back to the previous millennium. But how much older could it be?

(Silbe=silabe=silave=silava=sila wa: sil=s il=Ил, R.I.)

(Silbe=silabe=силаве=силава=сила ва: сил=с ил=Ил, Р.И.)

This question was also of interest to me so I turned to the mysterious ‘Phaistos-disk’ for answers. From simple observation I could only guess because I was unable to get a clear answer but I certainly noticed obvious similarities between the letters. Had no one else noticed this? - I asked myself. I began to look at the writings on the disk one evening and concluded that it was an example of a ‘syllabic script’, similar to vertical and horizontal Slavic writing. There are many sources, which showed that the Pelasgians originally lived in the regions of the middle Dnieper (now in Ukraine)...later they abandoned their homes and goods and their idols and left; this took place in the 2nd millennium B.C.... The ‘Exodus’ coincided with the arrival of the Pelasgians in the Balkans and Crete during the pre-classical era. The Pelasgians were probably the mysterious Rusichs, mentioned in the ‘Faust Disc’. They

---

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., p. 246.

<sup>134</sup> Gennadi Grinevich, June 1986, SPUTNIK

came to Crete from the northeast, and mixed with the Minoan population living on the island. Scientists already have a large accumulation of data on the powerful civilization of the Cretans, which they consider the cradle of European civilization. According to Herodotus, the ‘father of history’, the Cretans were unparalleled in the eastern Mediterranean and were masters of the Mediterranean Sea. Suddenly, a catastrophe struck. The mammoth eruption of the Santorini volcano is assumed to have occurred around 1450 B.C. This eruption caused irreparable damage and marked the end of the Cretan-Mycenaean civilization. (“The Cretans were unparalleled in the eastern Mediterranean...”, R.I.)

Where did the people go? Where did the heirs of the ‘Sons of the Leopard’, who were beset by this tragedy, find refuge? In any case, in the period from the 8th to the 2nd century B.C., other ancient peoples, another civilization under a different name, appeared between the Arno and the Tiber, in Northern Italy. These people were the Etruscans, the Etruscan civilization which has remained mysterious to this day. The Etruscans called themselves *Resenii*. Stephen of Byzantium, a great historian of ancient times, wrote that these people were unreservedly classified with the ‘Slavs’, while the Greek historian Hellanicus proved that they were a branch of the Pelasgians. There are indications that the Etruscans also captured Rome in the 7th century B.C. and contributed to its construction; musical instruments, theaters, mines, land improvement, canals, herbal medicine, metalworking - all these things were gifts from Etruria.

Now experts can read and translate their writing using the Latin alphabet, but how the language sounded then remains unknown. From the 18th century to the present, scholars have maintained their opinion, which has never been challenged, that the Etruscans borrowed the alphabet from the Greeks and that the Romans in their time borrowed it from the Etruscans. This suggests that knowledge of Greek and Roman letters was easily passed on to the Etruscans, especially since that writing system seemed quite simple and unique to them. I think that

these letters were alphabetic with no less than 30 letters. The huge number of translations and their interpretations certainly led researchers to a dead end.

But what if traditional opinions are refuted and rejected? Probably, as in the example of the Phaistos disc, it was not alphabetic but symbolic writing? I began to analyze the Etruscan script and counted over 70 different types of symbols, too many for a literal alphabet. Instead, it was a syllabic writing. When I compared the Etruscan symbols with horizontal and vertical writing, I suddenly noticed a complete similarity between 80% of the two types of writing. The analyses showed that grammatically and vocally the pre-Cyrillic and Etruscan scripts were, without a doubt, very similar. Furthermore, I have found and confirmed the fact that the Etruscans did indeed call themselves *Resenii*". (The dashes and slashes were runes, written by Cyprien Rober, R.I.)

Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic,<sup>135</sup> in her works entitled "*De Illyricae linguae vetustate et amplitudine*" or on the age and spread of the Illyrian language, wrote the following:

"Along with Nenad Djordjevic, a historian, another researcher dealing exclusively with deciphering Etruscan inscriptions and texts. That Etruscan scholar is Sveto Bilbia, who around Christmas 1981 published his article, the title of which he formulated as if it were a response to Mr. Djordjevic's title: 'Rashians, not Etruscans'. The article was published in the Serbian newspaper 'Kanadski Srbobran'. We will quote here only a small but very telling excerpt from that article:

'Over the last two centuries, countless attempts have been made to discover the origin of the Etruscan language, and countless contradictory explanations have been given to that end. It was thought that if the secret of where the Etruscan language came from was discovered, the secret and origin of the Etruscans would be revealed by

---

<sup>135</sup> Olga- Lukovic-Pjanovic, Serbs...the oldest people, Dosije, Belgrade, 1990-taken from the Internet.



itself. That was a completely correct reasoning, but they, despite all their efforts, did not discover it. Western writers tried to find it, comparing the roots and words of the Etruscan language with 27 other languages and dialects, some of which were even from Central Africa. The British writer James Wellard in his book 'The Search for the Etruscans' mentions them all in order, but does not mention a single Slavic language...'. (A Conspiracy for the Slovenes, Dalmatians and other Slavs, R.I.)

But it is not only about that. Mr. Bilbia stated and proved that the Etruscan language can be deciphered (after all, he deciphered it completely) not only with the help of the Serbian language and exclusively with its help, but the deciphering can be accomplished only by applying the Cyrillic values of the Etruscan letters! There will be a lot of noise in the Western world about this, if the work of Mr. Bilbia were published..."

"Our writer quotes a testimony about the Etruscans by Marcus Porcius Cato in his work 'Origines', in which - among other things - he says that the last Etruscan city fell under the rule of the Romans in 295 B.C., but that even after later Roman supremacy, Rome was never able to impose its Latin writing system on Etruria."

J. Bleicken <sup>136</sup> wrote: "Since the Phoenicians wrote from right to left, at first the Greeks also followed their example. But soon (after several transitional methods, one of which was Bustophedon, in which one line was written from right to left, and the other from left to right, and so on alternately) they began to write from left to right, while - retaining the previous writing ductus - they wrote the signs upside down, as if in a mirror ... As far as is known, the Greeks took their alphabet from the Phoenicians around the beginning of the 9th century B.C. From that proto-alphabet, due to the different writing of the necessary new signs and with further separate development (each island adjusted the letters

---

<sup>136</sup> Bleicken, Die Weltgeschichte, Verlag Herder KG Freiburg im Breisgau-Naprijed Zagreb 1976, p. 202.

according to local needs), different alphabets arose, which (according to A. Kirchhoff) can be divided into four groups called by colour (green, dark blue, light blue and red); among the rest, the groups differed particularly in the writing of the so-called additional signs ζ, φ, ψ. Finally, in the 5th century B.C., the so-called Dark Blue alphabet, which was used in Miletus (Ionian alphabet), supplanted the others and became the common script of all Greeks. This contributed not only to the economy, but primarily to the undisputed cultural supremacy of Miletus as the capital of the Ionians of Asia Minor in the Archaic period. (Athens, which had previously used a light blue alphabet, adopted the dark blue in 403 B.C.)'. Today's Latin alphabet developed from the red one used in Chalkidiki and on the island of Euboea, and from there the colonists transferred it to Cumae, the northernmost colony in Italy. From there, it probably reached Rome via the Etruscans.

Next, we are going to talk about the Ionic script from Miletus - "dark blue 403. B.C."

According to Bleicken and others: "Pliny spoke of the passive consent of the people as the first reason for the use of the Ionic script."

In contrast to the Ionic script, there was another script like the one on the Rosetta Stone in Egypt. According to G. Grinevich the same signs with the same meaning was found in Russia, the Danube region, the Balkans and on the Rosetta Stone in Egypt. This means that the people in Russia, the Danube region, the Balkans and the Macedonians in Egypt were one and the same people - Macedonian authors deciphered it with the Bitola dialect of the 21st century.

## **WORDS (LETTERS)**

Ljubomir Domazetović<sup>137</sup> wrote: "It is unknown to what time depth of history the indicated alphabets belong. Similarities of the letters from

---

<sup>137</sup> Ljubomir Domazetović, *Antička istorija i poreklo Srba i Slovena*, Belgrade, 1995, p. 250.

the ancient alphabets to the letters used today in the Balkans is great, that is: among the Ionians, 15 out of 25 letters are similar; among the Chalcidians, 14 out of 21 are similar; among the Etruscans, 13 out of 26 letters are similar; among the Latins, 13 out of 20 are similar and among the Hellenes, 17 out of 22 are identical with today's letters, considering the Slavic alphabets, and especially the letters of the Old Illyrian or Old Slavic alphabet."

"First alphabet, according to the various Cretan scripts... The alphabet was improved over time in the sense of being supplemented with letters for all vowels. Only at the beginning of the 4th century B.C. was the general Hellenistic alphabet, the so-called Ionic type, adopted. <sup>138</sup>

The great antiquity of the Illyrian alphabet is indicated by the Lepenski Vir Alphabet, where the similarity of the letters is undeniable dating back to the deep ancient past of 7000 to 6000 years B.C. By comparing the letters (signs) from the Lepenski Vir Alphabet with letters from the Illyrian alphabet, it can be concluded that identity can be determined from the total number of alphabetic letters (signs): in Thera 3, Ionian 9, Chalcidian 7, Etruscan 5, Umbrian 4, Oscan 1 and Latin 5. A total of 24 letters, from the Lepenski Vir Alphabet are identical to the letters of the Illyrian people's alphabet. This similarity is much smaller in the alphabets of the Semitic peoples: Sinai 1, Ahiiram's sarcophagus 1, the name of King Mes 4 and the inscription of Sindrija 2.

All this indicates the great kinship of the primer with the Illyrian alphabet, except that over time the letters changed and the alphabets were supplemented with new letters.

Analysis of the Vinča script led to the conclusion that the Vinča culture, according to the current interpretation, is from 5000 to 4000 years B.C. According to my and some other research, it is much older, which does not mean that the settlement of Vinča itself was that old; secondly, the Vinča script is somewhat younger than the age of the Vinča culture, but

---

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., p. 254.

not younger than 4000 to 3500 years B.C.; thirdly, over time the so-called Vinča script with improvement of letters (signs) changed. The older Vinča script contained letters that modern science has identified. such as: vowels, consonants and ligatures. How many times it underwent changes is difficult to know. The new Vinča script contains somewhat modified letters; fourth, the similarity of the new Vinča script with the Illyrian alphabet is so obvious, any refutation must be unscientific. This is especially the case with the Ionian, Etruscan, and Chalcidian; fifth, the Latin script is a much younger script and was formed after the founding of Rome; sixth, the similarity of the Old Slavonic alphabet with the Vinča script and the Illyrian alphabet is obvious, which shows that there was great kinship between the Slavic people and the Illyrian ethnos.

Before I started writing this book, with particular pleasure, I read an article in *Politika* by Radivoj Pešić, entitled ‘Vinčansko pismo’, in which he interprets the origin of the Vinča script and its similarity to other scripts in a very beautiful and scientifically argued way. Of course, I do not share his opinion on everything, but I can say that he was the first to shed light on some dark areas of ancient events, which can be of help to ancient historians. Some hypothetical conclusions certainly confirm that for me. The similarity of the ancient Vinča script to the alphabets of various peoples is very clearly seen and analytically observed (*Politika*, September 12-16, 1995). Thus, the total number of letters in the Vinča script is identical to: Cypriot 9; Old Phoenician 10; Brahman 5; Cretan 4; Old Greek 12; Anglo-Saxon 4; West Semitic 8; Palestinian 7; Serbian Cyrillic 20; Glagolitic 7; and in the Etruscan all letters were identical to the Vinča script. However, Pešić, given his knowledge of this, understood that the Vinča script was discovered first and that it spread to the Euro-Asian spaces, which does not fit into the historical timeline of migrations of peoples in the overall depth of history, which was mentioned in the previous content of this book.<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> The Danube was bordered to the north by uninhabited areas without domestic animals and to the south by populated areas with domestic animals (cattle with blood

...one hundred percent similarity of the Vinča script with the Etruscan and a great similarity with the Cyrillic (20 letters), and the similarity with the Cypriot 9, Ancient Greek 12, is smaller because over time the alphabets were changed (improved).

This, however, should not create confusion...which also shows similarity in some letters in the Vinča script with the alphabets of some Asia Minor peoples, such as: Palestinian 7; Cretan Linear 4; Brahami 5; West Semitic 8 etc.”

“Considering that the Illyrian peoples, from the deepest historical depth, inhabited the Italian peninsula, they were the ones who first spoke the Illyrian language and used the Illyrian Alphabet. However, after the formation of Latium province in central Italy, named after King Latin, who ruled Latium during the Trojan War, the alphabet was accepted by Aeneas (a participant and hero in the Trojan War). During his time, the Latin alphabet was formed, from which later arose: Oxic, Umbrian, Falish, Messapian and other alphabets. The first Latin alphabet contained 21 letters, which (all letters) were of Illyrian origin but adapted to the phonetic needs of the Latin language. Thus, the Illyrian F is read f. The letter H is denoted by h, and the sign C is read as ks. At first, K was read as the sound k but later K disappeared, and a situation arose where ‘C’ (more correctly read as ‘G’) took over the role of the letter ‘K’ and was read as ‘k’, which remains today in the Latin and Croatian alphabets, and for ‘g’ a new character derived from C (G) was introduced. The letter V is taken from the Illyrian Y which simultaneously denotes both u and v. The letter Q is taken from the Semitic alphabet and is pronounced as k before u. Later, the Latin alphabet was supplemented with H and Z and contained 23 letters. This alphabet in the Latin language was retained until the end of the Roman Empire, regardless of the attempts of certain powerful people to carry out some reform.”

---

type A for cereals and legumes). There was no development period in the Danube Basin - it and the Black Sea belonged to the Aegean, an extension of the Levant.

“It has not yet been determined who was the author of the Cyrillic alphabet? Authorship is attributed to Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius, Clement, Constantine, Tsar Simeon the Great, etc., which is not necessarily correct because the alphabet so-called ustup existed earlier, and Cyril and Methodius may have adapted it and spread it with their enlightenment. The Cyrillic alphabet has been constantly improved and thus changed its original form. Thus, there are the following types of Cyrillic: ustup, as the oldest Cyrillic alphabet whose time depth of origin is not known, but can be assumed; half ustup or cursive, which arose from ustup during the writing of books. The office minuscule also appears as a separate Cyrillic alphabet.”

“On the other hand, today’s Greeks are a people of Illyrian origin, whose king was Helen, the son of Deucalion and Pyrrhus, after whom they were named in the 7th century, and the country was called Hellas. The name Greek was given by the Romans after the Graeci tribe in Epirus. Greece began to be settled starting from 1100 B.C., after the Trojan War, so-called Dorian invasion, when the Dorians, Ionians and Aeolians settled. The Greek language constituted a separate Illyrian language, and the Greek alphabet is actually the Illyrian alphabet, or rather the first Illyrian script, with which the ‘Iliad’ and ‘Odyssey’ were written. The alphabet was used by all Illyrian peoples, although the shape of the letters was not the same for all, but it was similar, regardless of which side it was written on, or the alphabet contained a certain letter more or less.

The Illyrian language has been divided into a large number of dialects and their local variants since ancient times. The literary languages used by ancient writers became four dialects: Aeolian, Ionian, Dorian and Attic. In the Illyrian and Hellenic spoken language there were four linguistic variants (dialects): Ionian-Attic; Arcadian or Achaean, Aeolian (including the Lesbian, Thessalian and Boeotian subvariants) and Doric which included subvariants: Dorian, Elis, Phocian, Locrian and Aetolian.”

“The so-called Hellenic alphabet is actually an Illyrian alphabet which over time merged into two branches: eastern, in the eastern part of Illyria and western, in the western part of Illyria. According to historical records, some characteristic differences can be observed between the eastern and western branches in the pronunciation of some letters, such as X and Ψ which in the east were pronounced as kh and ps, and in the west vice versa. The Ionian alphabet as a variant of the eastern branch became dominant and was later adopted by Athens (403/402 B.C.) as an official script, from where it spread throughout the entire area of Illyria”. (Brigs = Brsjacs without the x Hellas, R.I.)  
(Бригите=Брсјаците без x Елада, Р.И.)

“The oldest written and preserved works of Hellenic-Illyrian literature are certainly the ‘Iliad’ and ‘Odyssey’, written in the so-called dactylic heximeter, which has great similarities with the heroic poems of the Serbs. The language used is Ionian with admixtures of Aeolian, which indicates that Homer was Illyrian, and these languages and letters were Illyrian. The Illyrian-Hellenic alphabet was used in writing.”

“It should be reiterated that Old Illyrian was divided into two branches: eastern and western and into four dialects: Aeolian (spoken by Alcaeus and Sappho), Ionian (spoken by Homer, Herodotus, Hippocrates and Archilachus), Doric (spoken by Pindar, Alcamanes, Bacchylides and Simonides) and Attic (spoken by Plato, Aristotle, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Thucydides, Xenophon, Euripides and Aristophanes).

The modern Greek language probably belonged to the Attic dialect, since the new Athens was a prominent political and cultural center, and Attic developed into the literary language of the Hellenistic civilization, the so-called Koine which was previously discussed. The proto-linguistic heads J and V disappeared from the linguistic fund of the Attic dialect. Their disappearance led to certain linguistic changes. At the end of the Attic period, the so-called Greek language underwent major changes. These changes are visible in the vocalisms. Many former diphthongs el, ol, al, etc. become simple vowels. The

pronunciation of some vowels, such as n, c, has changed, so that the vowel fund of the Greek language has been reduced to five simple vowels a, e, i, o and u.

The phase of change in the Greek language lasted from antiquity to the end of the Middle Ages (the so-called Byzantine period) and is called the Middle Greek language. This time is characterized by two developed stages, where bilingualism began as early as the dispute between Koine and Atticism.<sup>140</sup> While in Greek literature...”

So without the Sclavini - Slavic on its own is a lie:

According to Ljubomir Kljakić<sup>141</sup>: “Budimir in Pelaso-Slavica said that he was the source of the ‘pre-Latin name of the eternal city, which had its own secret name’ among the Venetulani or Rutuli. The Venetulani are also said to be related to the Adriatic and central Balkan Veneti who, once again, represented the strongest evidence for the proto-Slavic connection with the pre-classical peoples of Anatolia. The story of Aeneas or Aineas, the legendary founder of Rome, who after the Trojan War wandered the seas for a long time until he settled on the Alenino Peninsula, does not point in this direction. Tradition and ancient sources suggest that this event took place in the 12th century B.C. These allegations are also confirmed by Tadej Volanski, who in the book ‘Pa’mjatniki avstruvosti Slav’yan do rizdva Hristovoga’, published in Moscow in 1854, found that an Aenean tombstone from the 12th century B.C., found in 1846 near Crecenta, had Etruscan writing in the Slavic language. In the same year, Volansky also published his analysis of the inscriptions on the terracotta from the 4th century B.C., found in the Minisis collection in Ferm. The terracotta was published by Theodor Mommsen in the book ‘Die Unteritalischen Dialekte’, published in Leipzig in 1850. Written in Greek script, the terracotta

---

<sup>140</sup> The language Koine is spoken of separately with Atticism. So it follows that Koine was only the Alexandrian language.

<sup>141</sup> Ljubomir Kljakić *Oslobađanje istorije I- III, Početak puta*, Arhiv Kljakić, Belgrade, 1993, p. 78.



read: 'Ierakleos Sklabenos', which Volansky translated as 'Heracles the Slav'. Radovoje Pešić was the first to draw attention to the Aeneas tombstone and the Slavic Heracles in our country. (Sklab[b/v] was from an old era – Slavs is a lie, R.I.) (Склуб[б/в] бил од стара ера-СЛОВЕНИТЕ лага, Р.И.)

It read: "Lerakleos Sklabenos", Volansky translated it as 'Heracles the Slav'.

Since the term Sclavina (=s klav in a) was a star, there were no Slavic peoples.

It follows that I distinguished between the so-called Slavs (Anti, Veneti and Sclavini) and Slavs. It had been confirmed by the evidence that Slavs as a people were not known by Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, Aristotle... Procopius (6th century) and others. And that is why Procopius wrote about the Sclavini. The Romans did not know the Sclavini until the 5th century and they appeared in the Balkans in the 6th century. They were only Polytheists with their Hora, identified with Horus and Krishna.

## **SLAVS ACCORDING TO THE WORD - THE WORD OF GOD**

It has been said that the writing of the Slavs was created by the Thessalonian Brothers Kiril and Metodi. However:

According to Branko Vukušić <sup>142</sup>: "There is much direct evidence in favour of Slavic literacy before Cyril. The philosopher Etik, of Scythian origin, born in Istria, in the 5th century A.D. created letters for the Slavs under the Romans. On an icon from the 6th century A.D. in Rome, the names of Peter and Paul were written in this Slavic script. The Arab writer Khorezm Fakhr-Edin in his 'History of the Khazars' wrote that

---

<sup>142</sup> Branko Vukušić, O trojansko slovenskoj misteriji, Pešić i sinovi, Belgrad, 2003, стр. 208.

the Khazars in the 8th century used the Slavic script <sup>143</sup> of 22 letters. The Scandinavian runes were also called ‘Vendic runes’. A stone inscription from the 3rd century A.D. in the Slavic language was found in Hungary.” (Slavic=Slavic language, R.I.)

There were Retskari and Slavs. The Retsk people were referred to as Retski (Reski, Rockski), the Retski=Reski=Roski people. The “Rockski people” (“Roski people”) were the Russians. Since the Russians adopted the Koine script, they first declared themselves Slavs in 860. Only the Patriarch of Constantinople Photius (860) wrote that the Russians declared themselves Slavs in 860. In order to hide this, the Russian authors copied everything from Nestor and Photius, except for the sentence of Photius, that they declared themselves Slavs in 860. By avoiding this, the Russians were not Slavs.

Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic, <sup>144</sup> in her work entitled “De Illyricae Linguae...”, wrote:

“Every paragraph here refers to John Dubrovius, whose work ‘De regno Bohemiae’ (‘On the reign of Bohemia, now the Czech Republic’) mentions Dolchi in connection to something above all interesting...”

“Now let’s get to know Dubrovius’s text more closely:

‘SLOVO, in Sarmatian means WORD as VERBUM means in Latin. This means that the Sarmatian nation at that time, even though it was scattered widely and for a long time in various kingdoms and regions, still had the same speech (language) and almost identical words; they called themselves by a common name - Slavs. Moreover, of the very word ‘GLORY’ (GLORIA), which they pronounced as SLAVVA, they were called SLAVITNI”’.

Ivo Vukčević <sup>145</sup> wrote: “SLOVO APUD SARAMAS

---

<sup>143</sup> In the 8th century there were no Slavs but only Sclavini, according to sklavina with the meaning of region-Oblasnici.

<sup>144</sup> Olga- Lukovic- Pjanovic, Serbs...the oldest people, Dosije, Belgrade, 1990-taken from the Internet.

From the premise that the Sarmatians were Slavs, and the Slavs were Sarmatians, numerous medieval and later other historians mentioned the history and language of the Slavs. According to the history of the Czech Republic, the word “Slav” itself was coined in the middle of the 16th century, by Johannes Dubravius, the learned bishop of Olomouc, who said that it was derived from the Sarmatian word *slovo*, which he explained had the same meaning as *verbum* in Latin: ‘*Id enim Slowo apud Sarmatas, quod verbum apud Lationos personat. Quoniam igitur omnes Sarmatarum nationes late jam tunc, longeque per Regna et Provincia sparsae unum nomen eumdemque sermonem, atque eadem propemodum verba sonarant, se uno etiam cognomina Slovanos appellabant. Ab ipsa praeterea gloria, quae apud illos Slava dictur, Slaviti dicti.*’ (*Histoirae Regni Boemiae*, 1552.)”

Translated from Latin: (For that is *Slovo* among the Sarmatians, how the word sounds among the Latins. Since therefore all the Sarmatian nations, already then scattered far and wide through the Kingdoms and Provinces, had one name and the same language, and almost the same words, they also called themselves by one surname, Slavs. Furthermore, from the glory itself, which is called *Slava* among them, they were called *Sklaviti*.’ (*Histoirae Regni Bohemiae*, 1552)”)

According to Ljubomir Kljakić <sup>146</sup>: “It is interesting that in The Penguin Atlas of World History (translation of a German original from 1964), it literally said: ‘The Slavs (Slovene from *s l o v o* = word), a major branch of the Indo- European family of peoples’ <sup>147</sup> or, in translation: ‘*Sloveni (Словен од с l o v o = rech), главна бранка на индо-Эровпоровско пемеје на народи*’. As is known, the word ‘*slovo*’ in our country also refers to the written word, to a certain element in the

---

<sup>145</sup> Ivo Vukcevic, *Slovenska Germanija*, Pešić i sinovi, Belgrade, 2007., p. 89.

<sup>146</sup> Ljubomir Kljakić, *Oslobađanje istorije I- III, Početak puta*, Arhiv Kljakić, Beograd 1993, стр. 85.

<sup>147</sup> Hermann Kinder and Werner Hilgemann: *The Penguin Atlas of World History I- II*, Penguin Books, (first edition in German 1964; first edition in English 1974), London 1978, vol. I, p. III.

alphabetic system, so this German-British interpretation can also be understood as an argument in favour of the factor and theory of ancient Slavic literacy.”

There is a distinction between the reference of ‘Slavs’ to the ‘letters’ and that of the so-called Slavs of the people (Antes, Veneti and Sclavini).

In the preface of Herodotus’ book it was said: “...Every prose work at the very beginning among the Ionians was called simply ‘logos’, which means ‘telling’, ‘narration’, ‘word’...” And only the similarity for the same thing follows: Logos = Speech = Letter = Word. (Логос = Речь = Слово.)

The connection was with the Platonic and Christian logos, the “Word” which “already was, the Word dwelt with God, and what was God, the Word was also, the Word was then with God in the beginning, and through him all things came into being...” The word of God.

According to Risto Ivanovski <sup>148</sup>: “Aramaea referred to Syria...in which there was no Word of God from which the term Slavs arose...Bruce points out in footnote 69: ‘It seems that in the second century the only voice of dissent came from people who did not like the doctrine of the Logos (‘the Word’) of the prologue, and therefore denied the authorship of the apostle, attributing it to Keringus, a heretic who appeared towards the end of the first century’.” So, logos is translated word (speech) and letter.

The word Slav did not refer to the people (Anti, Veneti and Sclavini) the so-called Slavs. It referred to the letter, word, speech.

---

<sup>148</sup> Risto Ivanovski, *The Greeks- Descended Sclavini and Slavs*, 2004, Bitola, p. 8.

According to Stjepan Antoljak,<sup>149</sup>: “The official language in Tsar Samuil’s state was Slavic, as evidenced by the monuments he erected and which are cited from his time.”

But of course, in the imperial court, in addition to Slavic, Greek (Koine) was also used as a diplomatic language.

In connection with that empire, church literature continued to develop, which had its basis starting from Clement. Here we should also mention Cosmas’s ‘Sermon’, and the Bogomils themselves had their own literature in both Slavic and Greek (for example, fables, apocrypha, ritual books), of which very little has been preserved and saved.”

D. Obolensky,<sup>150</sup> on p. 144, wrote: “Before leaving Constantinople, Constantine, with the help of the new script and for the needs of the liturgy, translated a selection of lessons from the Gospel. In the Byzantine Church, the evangelist began with the first verses of the first chapter of the Gospel of John, which was read during Easter liturgy: ‘In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God.’ Constantine and his medieval biographer were well aware of the symbolic applicability to the upcoming work of baptizing the Slavs in their own language.” (Baptism by the Word - The Word of God, R.I.)

According to H.G. Wells<sup>151</sup>: “The decline of the glory of the Umayyads began at this time... Many adherents of Islam could not find what constituted the essence in the Koran. This may explain why the Persian and Indian adherents of Islam fell in love with the Shiite sect. They did this on the basis of a dispute, which at least they understood with reason and emotion. A strange theology was developed on the basis of the same effort to bring the new subject into connection with old prejudices. A dispute quickly arose as to whether the Koran had always

---

<sup>149</sup> Stjepan Antoljak, *Medieval Macedonia*, Mislal, Skopje, 1985.

<sup>150</sup> Dimitri Obolenski, *Byzantine Commonwealth, Eastern Europe 500-1453*, Slovo, Skopje, 2002.

<sup>151</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 348.

existed, simultaneously with God.<sup>152</sup> We would be astonished by this idea, if we did not recognize in it the well-intentioned attempt of an educated Christian, converting to Islam, to Islamize himself in this way with the words of the Gospel: ‘In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and God was the word.’<sup>153</sup> ”

It has been confirmed that Slavism came with Christianity. People of the same word and of the same religion coincided with the Christian mission of the Thessalonian Brothers - the Russians from Retskar wrote in Retski to the “Rotski people”, according to the Slovo. It has been said that they declared themselves Slavs (meaning people of the word) for the first time in 860, which was written by Photius (860) Patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>154</sup>

So the Russians were Retskars and became Slavs in (860). They were also Illyrians (Nestor 11-12).

According to Martin Bernal<sup>155</sup>: “The key reason...The evidence comes from a text commonly called the Memphite Theology, dated to the second or third millennium. The theology described a cosmogony according to which Ptah, the local god of Memphis, and his emanation Atum, were the original beings. Ptah created the world in his heart, the seat of his mind, and actualized it through his language, the act of speaking. This, although Father Festusier and Father Boylan are quick to deny, seems strikingly similar to the Platonic and Christian logos, ‘the Word’ which ‘was, the Word dwelt with God, and what was God, the Word was, the Word was with God in the beginning, and through him all things were made...’.”

---

<sup>152</sup> Sir Mark Sykes.

<sup>153</sup> According to John, ch. I., 1.

<sup>154</sup> And no one before Photius (860) wrote that the Russians were “a people who considered themselves Slavs.”

<sup>155</sup> Martin Bernal, *Black Athena*, Tabernacle, Skopje, p. 94.

According to Ivo Vukčević <sup>156</sup>: “It was not the Word of God”, which he explains with the following text:

“According to this view, Judeo-Christian theology is nothing more than a confused distortion of ancient wisdom and cosmic truth: ‘The Bible is not the ‘word of God’, but stolen from pagan sources. Its Eden, Adam and Eve were taken from Babylonian writings; its Flood or Deluge is nothing more than a fragment of about four hundred accounts of the flood; its Ark and Ararat have their equivalent in the mythical versions of the Floods; even the names of Noah’s sons were copied; so is the sacrifice of Isaac, the wisdom of Solomon and Samson’s feat of crushing the pillars, Moses is modeled after the Syrian Misesa; his law was modeled after the code of Hammurabi. Its Messiah was derived from the Egyptian Mahdiya, the Saviour, some verses are literal copies of Egyptian manuscripts. Gerald Massey found 137 similarities between Jesus and Horus the Egyptian god, while there are hundreds of similarities between Christ and Krishna.’

By confusing the laws of nature and processes with the will of God, Judeo-Christian theology, according to Graham, confused Hell with Heaven. He wrote: ‘The will of God! The will of God!—that is the well-known cry of every mass murderer.’”

One and the same people lived in the Balkans and Asia Minor. The region was only religiously divided - the polytheists worshipped Hora, and the Christians worshipped Jesus Christ.

## **THE SAME PEOPLE LIVED IN THE BALKANS AND IN ASIA MINOR**

According to Larousse <sup>157</sup>: “Not everyone agrees on the nature and relations between the Hellenic peninsula and Crete, where, it seems, a

---

<sup>156</sup> Ivo Vukčević, Slovenska Germanija, Pešić i sinovi, Belgrade, 2007, p. 24.

<sup>157</sup> General Encyclopedia LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 239.

new spirit appeared with the late Minoan period II (1460-1375), which was especially represented by Knossos... Namely, the different types of ceramics cannot so easily be distinguished. Tablets were found in the palaces of Knossos whose script is Linear B, a transcription of a Greek dialect (Mycenaean). These tablets are very similar to the tablets from the Mycenaean palaces (end of the 13th century) ...”

“Movement. When the Mycenaean world collapsed (13th-7th centuries), either as a victim of internal crisis or external attacks, a new branch of Greek people, the Dorians and their brothers, peoples who spoke a northwestern dialect (Helicians, Acarnacians, Aetolians) conquered certain parts of Greece. This people did not bring any cultural novelty. Nothing is known about their origin, nor about where they came from. It is not even known whether this was a real invasion or not. But the linguistic map of the Greek world in the 1st millennium B.C. shows that the Dorians did conquer Greece. According to legend, the Achaean and Ionian civilizations originated in the time before the invasion in the 12th century. Accordingly, the Achaean dialect, which turned out to be closest to the dialects of the Linear B script, was known in the 1st millennium only in Arcadia and Cyprus, two areas that had no contact with each other and which represented the remains of the disappeared kingdom. In Europe, the Ionian dialect was still spoken but only in Attica and the northern Cyclades. The peoples who spoke Doric and the northwestern dialect (Corinthians, Argives, Laconians, Messenians, Eligians) truly surrounded Arcadia. In the rest, there was also an Aeolian dialect (Thessalian, Boeotian), in which the northwestern drift mixed with the old foundation. Tradition explains even better the settlement (new or reinforced) on the western coast of Anatolia. Those who escaped the invasion founded the Aeolian states in the north, and Ionian cities in the middle. The victors, who captured Crete and the southern Cyclades, built Doric fortifications in Asia. <sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., p. 245.



A new civilization. The new civilization is based on the Cretan-Mycenaean kata (the list of gods from classical Olympus is almost complete in the Mycenaean tablets)..."

It was said: "In addition, there is also an Aeolian dialect (Thessalian, Boeotian)."

According to Branko Vukušić <sup>159</sup>: "Giving thanks...Hesiod spoke of the largest Pelasgian sanctuary in Dodona, he said that it was 'the place of the Pelasgians'. Hecataeus Pelasgius was the king of Thessaly. According to Aeschylus and Sophocles, Argos was in the Peloponnese is 'Pelasgian land...' (Peloponnese =pelo[white] po[po-lu] nes [island: nesto = nest...], R.I.) (Пелопонес = пело[бело] по[по-лу] нес [острово: несто=гнездо...], Р.И.)

So, Macedonia was Thessaly's neighbour – the Thessalians and Macedonians are one and the same people.

Without anything Hellenic - Helen originated from Thessaly, Macedonia's neighbour.

According to Dionysius <sup>160</sup> : "The language used by the Romans was neither completely barbaric nor absolutely Hellenic, but represented a mixture of the two. The greater part of that language was identical with the Aeolian dialect..." And the Romans are the same.

According to Larousse<sup>161</sup>: "• The cultural contribution of Syria, which achieved the synthesis of the culture of the Near East, seems, on the contrary, to be important, but the way in which the relationship between the Greek and Syrian civilizations came about has yet to be determined. The usual old opinion assigns an intermediary role to the Asia Minor

---

<sup>159</sup> Branko Vukušić, O trojansko slovenskoj misteriji, Pešić i sinovi, Belgrade, 2003, p. 62.

<sup>160</sup> The historian Dionysius (60 BC-7 AD) was from Halicarnassus - the Romans were Barbarians = Pelasgians.

<sup>161</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, volume 3, p. 246.

states - Lydia and Phrygia - through which the other trade route from the Euphrates to the Ionian ports led. But new excavations have not provided any definitive evidence for this. The Phrygian kingdom was short-lived (775-c. 675). Beautiful bronze objects have been found in the large tumuli of its capital Gordion, on which a great influence of Urartian or Assyrian art is observed, and graffiti written in an alphabet similar to the Greek alphabet (8th century). The Phrygian civilization, surviving the kingdom, which was destroyed by the Cimmerians, fell more and more under Greek influence, but the princely tombs of the 6th century were influenced by Hittite art. In the 7th century, the Lydian Kingdom, founded by Gyges (687-652), took over Anatolia. This kingdom outlived its founder, who was killed by the Cimmerians. The Lydian rulers, great admirers of Hellenic culture, were satisfied only when they had subdued the Greek cities on the coast. Croesus (560-546), the last Lydian king who always consulted the Greek oracles, spoke Greek, as did the elite of his subjects. The Greek alphabet began to be used in his kingdom, to write in the local languages (Lydian, Lycian and Carian, 6th century). In Sardis, the capital of Lydia, royal mounds were erected over tombs in which the Mycenaean or Anatolian tradition seemed to have been continued. We would say then, that the Anatolian kings began to merge local traditions with Eastern and Greek ones rather late. However, they did not bring anything important to the Hellenes.”

It has been said: “Graffiti written in an alphabet similar to the Greek alphabet (8th century) has been found in the large tumuli in Gordion... Croesus (560-546), the last Lydian king who always asked the Greek oracles for advice, spoke Greek, as did the elite of his subjects. In his kingdom, the Greek alphabet began to be used to write the native languages (Lydian, Lycian and Carian, 6th century).”

So, the above-mentioned people spoke the same barbarian=Pelasgian language, in their own dialects.

“The largest councils (panegyries-panadours) were organized on the occasion of the post-Cranic or Panhellenic festivals. Even in the Dark Ages, Delos, an island dedicated to Apollo, received delegations of Ionians, Lycians, sometimes Aeolians and Dorians during the spring festivities, which were accompanied by musical and monastic competitions. In the Archaic period, the prestige of these festivities surpassed the games intended for all Greeks, such as the Pythian in Delphi, the Isthmian near Corinth, the Nemean in the north of the Peloponnese and the Olympics...”<sup>162</sup>

The above were one and the same barbarian=Pelasgian people with one and the same language.

The Etruscans had the same language with Perun and their own runes like the Russians: Kievo and Kiev.

## **THE ANCIENT EUROPEAN LANGUAGE AND THE ETRURANIAN SCRIPT**

According S.S. Bilbija<sup>163</sup>: “The language spoken today by Serbs, Croats and Slovenes,<sup>164</sup> was the same language spoken by the Rasan tribes in Italy who left that language recorded on their written monuments in which they called themselves Rasi, and Rasani, not Etruscans as the Romans called them. The Rasan tribes, which lived in today’s Slovenia, Istria, Croatia and Serbia, were called Illyrians. (According to Bilbija, the Etruscans had Perun as their god and so did the Russians, R.I.)

With the passing of difficult times, conquerors, masters and faith changed, wars came and went but the people always remained on their own land, preserving their heritage, traditions and language. In the

---

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., p. 247.

<sup>163</sup> S.S. Bilbia, *Staroevropski jezik i pismo Etruraca*, Chicago, 1984, in Serbian, p. IV.

<sup>164</sup> For the author, there were no Macedonians, although the Russian and Serbian languages were case Church Slavonic.

document presented here under the title 'Rašanski akvar i chitanka', whose letters were cast in bronze three thousand years ago, were found in the areas of Padua Venice,<sup>165</sup> revealed that the language spoken then was the same language spoken today by Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

So Serbs, Croats and Slovenes should not have any difficulty being able to read the inscriptions on Etruscan, Lydian and Lycian monuments. The Etruscan and Runic script, came to European soil from cultural centers in Asia Minor, where the written script originated from Cretan pictographic signs.

The Latin script was formed from the Etruscan one at the time when Rome began to create its own individuality, destroying everything that was Rashan. The reformed and newly arranged Latin script eliminated several basal letters with their phonetic value from the Rashan alphabet, which led to the fact that it was never possible to correctly read and understand the Etruscan inscriptions with the help of the medieval Latin language and script. Therefore, it was futile to try to solve the mystery of the Etruscan script by using the Latin letters used today by the Croats and Slovenes, who are of recent origin, when the Latin script completely failed in this.

Due to a completely different concept from the adopted one about the origin of the Cyrillic alphabet, this work will encounter controversy and criticism, which is desirable and useful to get to the truth about this important and sensitive issue and the unresolved problem.

In the dictionary, which is an integral part of this discussion, there are about 750 words that were used in the Rashan, Etruscan, Ligurian and Lycian inscriptions. Among these words there are also many words that were thought and claimed to be so-called Turkisms in the Serbo-Croatian language. Here we would like to correct this error because these are not Turkish words left over from the Ottoman occupation, but

---

<sup>165</sup> Venice=Venetia according to Venet=so-called Slav. The Veneti were in the Illyrian territories: Venet=Illyrian.

Etruscan, Lydian and Lycian words that were incorporated into the vocabulary by the conquerors of the Serbian peoples in Asia Minor<sup>166</sup> such as the Persians, Arabs and Turks. The Ottomans did not bring them to the Balkans. They were always in the speech of the Balkan peoples. If the Lydian or Lycian written monuments in particular were read and interpreted correctly, the number of these so-called Turkisms would be much greater.<sup>167</sup>

I am still working on this project because I have not been able to master all the grammatical and syntactic details in presenting the processed material. I hope and expect that other experts will also do this. Especially because I have prepared for publication the full text of the canvas of the Zagreb mummy.

A large number of unread and uninterpreted written monuments, in addition to the ones from the Etruscan in Italy, Lydian, Lycian, Carian and Phrygian, covered with thick dust still exist in the museums of Constantinople and other places in Turkey. They are eagerly waiting for someone to start to analyze them, which until now has only been done by foreigners.”

“Among the languages of the ancient peoples who have left their speech recorded on monuments that are still undeciphered, monuments written in the Etruscan script occupy a prominent place. The Etruscans, who lived in the center of Italy, wrote with this script. They laid the first foundations of European civilization, which the Romans later spread throughout the world.<sup>168</sup>

Much has been written about the Etruscans, especially in the last two hundred years, when their numerous monuments began to be discovered. Biographer Lopez Peña has listed over 700 works by

---

<sup>166</sup> Since the term Serb was in the Baltic...Balkans...Syria...Egypt, Serbs were according to srp=mower...

<sup>167</sup> Turkisms in Turkey are Macedonianisms; Turkey=Phrygia=Brigia; The Ottomans Komnenians Macedonians.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid., p. VI.

writers in various languages about the Etruscans and their cultural legacy, scattered throughout all museums. However, not much has been written about the problems of the Etruscan language until now.

Since their written monuments, despite all efforts, could not be deciphered, the mystery of the Etruscans grew. Because of this, some scholars came to the idea that the Etruscans were on the stage of historical events like the Hittites, Phoenicians and Carthaginians,<sup>169</sup> and simply disappeared, and only their written monuments testify that they existed.

In science, the opinion has long prevailed that the Etruscan script was created after the Greek. The graphic similarity of some of the Etruscan letters with the Greek ones was the main reason why the Greek alphabet was searched for a phonetic value for those Etruscan letters that did not resemble Greek. When they could not be found there either, a search was made in the Semitic script, but some writers-philologists gave them arbitrary phonetic values.

I must admit that my interest in the Etruscan language and script was not accidental. It all started in Italy, after the Second World War. It was an episode that I need to mention, because it led me on the path of the Etruscan problem that has lasted for a long time.

Every time my wife and I visited museums and galleries, we both noticed the Etruscan monuments, written in the Etruscan language. My wife used to say that the Etruscan script was reminiscent of the Serbian Cyrillic. And at first glance it really was. I brought that thought of hers with me to Chicago, where we started a new life. (Serbian Language and Script from the Church Language, R.I.)

In my daily struggle to make a living, there was no time to waste, so my interest in the Etruscans began to wane and gradually pass into oblivion. And yet, after many years, I returned to it.

---

<sup>169</sup> The Carthaginians were Phoenicians with the so-called Olympian Gods, and they were Veneti with only the Pelasgian language.

In a bookshop, where I bought a large number of old books, there were four books by G. Micalia, in which topics were written about the history of Italy before Roman rule. I immediately noticed that there were many words printed in the Etruscan script, a good part of which I read, using letters from the Serbian Cyrillic alphabet. My wife's name, Elena, was also written in those inscriptions. That was just the beginning; I did not stop there.

During a visit to my home, I showed my friends what the Etruscan script looked like and how I was able to read it, noting that it should be read from right to left. Then they all tried reading and, without difficulty, were able to read a dozen or so Etruscan words. None of them had ever seen the Etruscan script before, and their knowledge of the Etruscans was insignificantly small.

However, it was clear to all of them that by assuming the script was written in Cyrillic letters, regardless of who wrote it, where and when it was written, they could read it.

For me, it was an unusual experience and gave me incentive to renew my interest in the Etruscans, in particular, their script and their language. From then on, I began collecting materials, reading and researching, and most of my free time was spent on uninterrupted visits to the two Chicago libraries, stocked with rich bibliographic material and documents in the field of Etruscanology.

Of course, from the very beginning, an important question arose that demanded an answer: who were these people who lived in the center of Italy almost three thousand years ago and wrote their thoughts and feelings on monuments whose letters resembled the letters of the Serbian alphabet.

It did not take me long to realize that the scientists who worked on the problems of deciphering the Etruscan language never used the Cyrillic alphabet. That was the first and surest conclusion in that research.

In all previous attempts to decipher the Etruscan script, only individual words were understood, and only those that were often repeated. These were mainly inscriptions of two to three words, or just one word on tombstones. These words were often repeated, so they could not provide any information about the Etruscan language, so scientists went around in circles ‘around the fortress that they could not penetrate’, as the Etruscan scholar B. Nogara vividly described it.

When I began to delve deeper into the Etruscan scholarly study of the Etruscan language and script, it became clear to me that previous efforts and endeavours to understand the Etruscan texts failed only because they were never read correctly. In other words, the Etruscan secret was hidden in the Etruscan letters, as the Etruscan scholar Stanislav Jakubowski wrote about a hundred years ago.

Since then, as I concluded, the question of the origin of the Etruscan or Cyrillic alphabet in the Greek alphabet has been raised more generally, but the origin and literacy of the European white man should be sought elsewhere.”

The author about Lepenski Vir, on p. 1, wrote, the beginning started on the Danube River. However, the developmental stages of literacy and language in the Danube region was missing because it belonged to the Aegean region, which was part of the Levant with its Eastern Mediterranean from where the white race acquired its building skills (pyramids) and literacy and took them... not only to China but also to Japan, verified by the findings on the island of Okinawa = okin var-race ainu + v + l + k = vlakinu.

“Based on the examination of known assumptions in literature and science, according to my findings, the origin of Etruscan literacy should be sought on the island of Crete. This was already emphasized immediately after the discovery of traces of the extinct Cretan civilization, which British archaeologist Sir John Evans had already presented to the world (at the end of the last century). His life’s work was continued by his son Arthur Evans, an archaeologist and writer,



who in his works “Scripta Minoa”, presented both his own and his father’s findings, which for the most part relate to the origin and development of Cretan literacy.”

The Levant is located between Crete, Asia and Africa an area submerged by sea water, etc.

“After finding numerous objects inscribed with the pictorial writing used by the Cretans, the most significant was the discovery of tablets inscribed with some signs, which could be a syllabic form of writing. This was a significant step in the development of general literacy. In science, this discovery is known under the name ‘Cretan script’ or ‘Cretan letter’.

But, as in the case of the Etruscans, the question of the origin of the Cretans immediately arises. So to this day, their origin remains unexplained, where did the people who came to Crete originate, when did they settle there, what language did they speak, and when did they begin to give expression to their significant civilization?

The Cretans were from the Levant - the white race lived there during the Ice Age.

“The archaeological discoveries at Lepenski Vir, (on the lower course of the Danube River where it enters the Iron Gate, Djerdap, northern Serbia) in 1965, for which there is scientific literature, which was first brought to the attention of The National Geographic Society, have confirmed the earlier assumption that the Danube and the river systems that flow into the Danube could be the earliest known areas where the civilization of the European white man was born and developed.

Thanks to the discoveries at Lepenski Vir, the civilization of the Danube fundamentally refutes earlier claims that everything that was achieved in Europe was brought from outside. On the contrary, Lepenski Vir does not lead us to believe that everything that was achieved in Europe came from outside. It could have been developed internally with some influence from the outside.

Therefore, the settlement of the island of Crete could have occurred primarily from the Danube and the Morava (with a system of smaller tributaries that flow into the great Morava). People starting in these areas, even in prehistoric times, could have moved into Europe, the Black Sea regions, western Asia Minor, Greece and all the islands in the Aegean Sea and settled there.

All these migrating people brought with them their skills, traditions and language in all the places,<sup>170</sup> where they stayed for a longer or shorter period of time, or settled there permanently, and continued to speak their native language. That language could never be lost and it was orally passed on to all peoples all this time, to this day where it continued to live in the languages of all European peoples.

The finds in Lepenski Vir were already developed, whose beginning was in the Levant.

In the Danube, as in the Aegean, there were similar structures but those in the Aegean were older.

“Therefore, the ethnic origin of all European peoples, with the exception of the Mongol admixtures among the Hungarians, Finns and Estonians, is one and the same.”

The White race from the Eastern Mediterranean reached China... Again, from the East.

Asians the Mongols migrated west to the Caucasus and also to Europe where they found Whites.

“There was no clearer evidence for this claim before, but today, through the Etruscan written monuments, we have learned that the Etruscan language did not disappear, but continued to live on and develop in all European speech branches: Slavic, Romance and Germanic-Norse.”

---

<sup>170</sup> In the Mediterranean Sea there was the island of Karpathos, and today there is also the Carpathian massif: only from south to north.

So-called Slavs = Pelasgians, Romanians biracial and Gothic triracial with Goths = Tatars.

“Of course, after that confirmation, the only thing that remains to be examined is in which speech group the forms and words of the Etruscan language, written in the Etruscan script, were most preserved.

There is no longer a mystery surrounding the writing on Etruscan monuments because they are the oldest written monuments of a European people in general.

An extensive description is given in the chapter on the Origin of the Cyrillic script in this treatise, which is basically a new theory about the origin of that script and the role that Constantine the Philosopher played in editing and publishing that script, in such a way that it became an organized script for the Slavic peoples, through whom they would accept Christianity. But before Constantine modernized that script, it was used by the tribes of the Kievan Russians who gravitated around the Black Sea.

In the chapter in this treatise entitled ‘The Cretan Origin of the Script’, an extensive description is given, with a graphic representation, on how the Cretan pictographic signs in western Asia Minor cultural and national states gave rise to a basis for the formation of writing, which we use today and how it spread from these centers to all parts of the Mediterranean, Europe and the northern Black Sea regions.

There is a striking graphic similarity between the Etruscan script, Cyrillic script and Runic script, which indicates that they come from a common source. Therefore, it is possible to draw a conclusion that the writing on Etruscan, Lydian and Lycian scripts can be deciphered using letters from today’s Cyrillic alphabet which previously could not be deciphered.

After these findings, it was possible to organize a system for deciphering Etruscan writing on monuments, which later extended to Lydian and Lycian monuments.

This method, unfortunately, has not been applied so far, so I have called it the method of transferring the sound values of Cyrillic letters to Etruscan, Lydian and Lycian letters. In relation to the reading of only Etruscan records, it can be called the Etruscan-Cyrillic method.

Using the etymological and morphological method in processing each word, I found the meaning of words, or their root, in the Dictionary of the Serbian Language by Vuk St. Karadžić, or in other Slavic dictionaries for 80% of Etruscan words.

For the remaining 20% of Etruscan, Lydian and Lycian words, I found corresponding meanings, or basic roots in other non-Slavic languages, primarily in modern Italian and medieval Latin. The words thus found and translated into Serbian fully corresponded to their meaning, significance and position in the sentence construction.”

“In my research, it was possible to reach conclusions about the refugees and emigrants from Asia Minor to Italy who brought, in addition to the innate way of writing, developed linguistic expressions and words, which had not been present in the speech of the Rashan tribes in Italy until then. The Vlosi tribes were particularly susceptible to this influence, one part of which separated, namely the one that lived in the area of today’s Latium, receiving even the name from the refugees from Lydia.

When the Lats or Latins began to settle en masse in the new settlement of Rum, or Rome, organized by the Rashans, they, after a hundred years of rule by the Rashan boyars, took over the leadership of the city, began to give it their own character and characteristics, which were actually a practical expression of cultural and political ambitions inherited from the Lydians, abolishing and changing everything that bore the Rashan seal.

Among other things, they rearranged the Etruscan script, removing from it characteristic signs that represented phonetic letters: Ж, И, Ч, ’, III, IIIЧ, CT, replacing them with combinations of diphthongs and

triphthongs, which were later found in all Romance languages, including Italian.

Until that time, if there had ever been a Latin script that, like Ossan or Osco, resembled Etruscan, then that Latin script was phonetic and had the same phonetic value as Ligian, identical to Etruscan. To date, no such written document has been found. The reference to the inscription on the golden Prenestine cockerel must be completely rejected because, from my way of reading and interpreting that record, which is presented in this discussion, it can be concluded that it was written in the Rashan language and script.

Many words, originating from the emigrants and refugees from Asia Minor, enriched the speech of all the Rush tribes in Italy. Later, these words, through the reformed Latin script and the Roman dialect, entered the dictionaries of today's Romance and Nordic nations.”

There is talk of migrations from Asia Minor but not from the Danube region, about which Herodotus did not know... Procopius... It was buried and unknown until it was dug up.

Latin was the successor of Koine, and therefore it was not understandable to the people.

“These peoples, in the long process of linguistic and graphic assimilation, and under the influence of the Roman occupation and later Christian domination, threw out of use a part of the runic characters, replacing them with Latin letters. These peoples, seeking a way to express sound values in their language, resorted to word and syllabic combinations, similar to the process to which the formation of Italian literacy was subject. And when they abandoned the runic script, they simultaneously abandoned the phonetic way of writing.

The fact is that 20% of Roman-Latin words and expressions were not in the Slavic languages, and especially not in the Cyrillic scripted monuments. That means that 80% of all Etruscan, Lydian and Lycian

words and expressions are not in Latin but in modern Serbian and other Slavic languages.

The number of Lydian and Lycian scripted monuments which have been correctly deciphered to this day is small, but confirm some important factors:

- 1) A single linguistic origin of the peoples who came from the Danube region,<sup>171</sup> which was proven by the fact that Lydian and Lycian scripts written on Etruscan monuments can be read in Cyrillic and can be understood by Slavic speaking people, especially Serbians.<sup>172</sup>
- 2) The peoples of Asia Minor, who used Cretan pictographic signs, shaped the literal and phonetic way of expression and writing as the only alternative to any type of literacy.
- 3) They also enabled the unlimited and free spread of literacy from their Asia Minor cultural centers. The literal and phonetic literacy thus arranged was suitable for all European peoples, and its spread was not limited only to the Mediterranean.

While searching for an expression, which should, for technical and historical reasons, most fully mark and express the process of shaping literacy, I believe that for the time being, until a better name is found, the term Serbitsa can be used. This is a term that has been used before.

Justification for this name is found in two basic factors:

First, the name Sorabi, Sorbi, Serbi and Srbi, in the oldest times applied to all the peoples in the western part of Asia Minor, who spoke the same language.

---

<sup>171</sup> The Danube region had the same structures as the Aegean - it belonged to the Levant with structures, literacy...

<sup>172</sup> The modern Serbian language was the successor of the case-based Macedonian Church Slavonic language.

Since the term Serbs was used from the Baltic Sea to Syria and Egypt, whose central place was the Levant, the term had the same meaning - srb = srp (sickle) for srpchii = žneaci = kosaci - the name Serbs was used where cereals were grown.

“The name Serbs was carried to the area of the Balkans and the northern region of Europe, up to the North Sea. It was especially retained in the areas where the Kievan Rus tribes had always lived. Later, this name was a comprehensive name for all who spoke the Slavic language, until it was, much later, replaced by the name Slavs.”<sup>173</sup>

So, the migrations took place from the Eastern Mediterranean through Asia Minor and the Balkans.

“Secondly, in addition to the largest number of words found in the Etruscan, Lydian and Lycian languages, the modern Serbian language also preserved the roots of many other Slavic and non-Slavic languages.

More and more settlements in present-day Italy came from the Balkan Peninsula. They originated from the Danube region, whose inhabitants were of the same origin, tribe or race, after which they were named Rasans, or Rasi. The Rasan tribes that previously settled in Italy came by land across the subalpine terrain, which today belongs to the geopolitical space of northern Italy, southern Switzerland, western Austria and Yugoslavia.”

The Danube region was of no importance for the settlement of Europe - part of the Levant.

“Those northern Rasans, who spoke the same language as the original Romans, later were called Tusci or Trusci, from which the name Etruscans was derived. It is quite possible that those northern Rasans called themselves Trusci among themselves, before they crossed the Apennines into central Italy, because the word ‘rasa’ or ‘trsa’ in the

---

<sup>173</sup> Herodotus did not know Slavs...Procopius...-only Sclavini=so-called Slavs and Slavs (Russians 860 AD).

Serbian language has an identical meaning. Until now, only the name Rasani, Rasi was found written on the numerous Etruscan, or Rasan monuments, and not Trusci, Tusci or Etruscans.”

Trus...Trsa = t[a-a] rsa=race: Thessalonika=t-aa Salonika; Mars=m ars=Ares...

“As the name Etruscans and the adjective Etruscan entered science, literature and in general usage, here we will use both names, giving priority to the usual Etruscans in science, which is not important in this discussion.

In this discussion, the central place is occupied by the descriptions, analyses and original scripts written on Etruscan monuments, which are known to Etruscanologists, but which have not been properly deciphered and interpreted to this day. The presented content of each individual monument is accompanied by an analysis of each word and expression with explanations in Serbian.

All the rest refer to the descriptions that should be explained and confirmed by my findings which fully justify the method I used in deciphering and interpreting the above-mentioned texts.

Of the Asia Minor written texts presented in the original form, two Lydian and two Lycian texts have been deciphered and interpreted. Of these, one is dedicated to the battle of the fallen Lycian horsemen, who were called Valkyries. We do not know of anyone who has deciphered and processed the content of that monument script. The other scripts on the monuments have been incorrectly deciphered and interpreted.

Now, when the veil has truly been lifted from the Etruscan mystery, thanks to their written words and language, it is possible for us to learn their secrets and our ancient European past. We could not learn this before, because the chain, in which the Etruscans or the Rashani were a link, was broken in the course of historical events. Understanding and realizing what they wrote about themselves, and not what others wrote



about them, we have learned about the most beautiful part of our, European past, unknown to this day.

The written Etruscan word is not only an interpreter of history, it is at the same time of enormous and priceless value for all of Europe, for all European peoples, especially for the Serbs – a heritage and a definite scientific truth.

“Quoting Stradona, writer and historian Matteo Guarnaci wrote: ‘...It should be noted that the Lydians did not adopt or modify the language of the Etruscans, which further confirms that they had one language, or a similar one.’ He also mentioned Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who spoke of the Lydians who came to Italy, and said: ‘...that it differs little from the language spoken by the Etruscans, and what is more, until his time, was a mixture between the two peoples.’”<sup>174</sup>

The fact that the so-called Slavic languages were avoided as a possible source for deciphering the Etruscan language, has to do with a centuries-old conspiracy against the Slavs. A lie called “the Slav mass migration of the 6<sup>th</sup> century AD”, when in fact there is no archeological evidence of such a mass migration. The Slavic speakers, for practical purposes, always lived where they live today.

The white race was one and the same people who were in the Levant during the Ice Age.

Its language was barbarian = Pelasgian = so-called Slavic, and Illyrian = Slavic.

## **THE SO-CALLED HOMERIC LANGUAGE WAS SLAVONIC = SO-CALLED SLAVIC**

Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, Aristotle...Procopius... did not know Slavs. This was only because such a people never existed by that name.

---

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

It follows that Procopius spoke only of Sclavini, and sclavina referred to a region. The Romans did not know the Sclavini until the 5th century, and the Slavs appeared (were created) in the Balkans only in the 6th century. They were Polytheists (Pagans) and the Romans were Christians. So the references made about these people were religious, not ethnic.

According to H.G. Wells <sup>175</sup>: “These primitive carts were drawn by oxen. The early Aryans did not ride or harness horses; they had little to do with horses. The Neolithic Mongols were horsemen and the Neolithic Aryans were cowherds. They lived on beef. It was not until many centuries later that they began to use draft animals...”

“The Aryan nobleman... thus rejoiced and drank. And whether he first began to use leaven (like yeast) to make bread, or to make his drink boil, we do not know. <sup>176</sup>

After these feasts, individuals gifted at ‘playing fools’ appeared. They did this without any doubt to cheer up and make their friends laugh; but, there was also another type of people, an important type for their time and even more important for historians. These were certain singers who sang at events and told stories. These bards (guslars) were found among all the peoples who spoke Aryan. They acted as a consequence and as a further factor in the development of spoken language, which in the Neolithic era represented the most important success for human progress. They sang or ‘told’ stories from the past, or stories about some living chieftain and his people. They also told other stories that they invented themselves. They even memorized jokes. They discovered, appropriated and began to perfect rhythm, imagery, alliteration and such similar possibilities that lie hidden in a language. They probably did a lot to develop and consolidate grammatical forms. They were perhaps the first great artists with regard to hearing, just as the later Aryan wall painters were the first artists with regard to sight

---

<sup>175</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 136.

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 137.

and hand. No doubt they used many hand movements or gestures. They probably also learned appropriate gestures when learning songs. But their first concern was for order, pleasantness and the power of language.

These bards made a significant step forward in the power and scope of the human mind. They supported and developed in human consciousness the sense of something greater than themselves, for the tribe, and for that life that was far in the past. They remembered not only old hatreds and struggles but also old friendships and mutual vows. The exploits of the dead were revived and the dead were made into heroes. The Aryans then began to relive in their minds their people's events that preceded their birth, and those that would occur after their death.

Like most human things, this bardic tradition developed at first slowly, then quickly. And in the age when bronze began to appear in Europe, there was not a single Aryan people without a bard and without their tradition. In their hands, language became as beautiful as it could ever be. These bards represented a living book, a living history, they were the guardians and creators of a new and more powerful tradition in human life. All the Aryan people were indebted to poetry, which preserved their experience in this way until our time. They had their sagas (Teutonic), their epics (Greek), their Vedic narratives and poems (from old Sanskrit), etc.

At that time there was no writing. When writing first spread in Europe, as we will see later, it must have been slow, sluggish and lifeless. People were used to listening to bards to be entertained and obtain their information. This was how brilliant and beautiful treasures of human memory were recorded. Writing was first used for calculations and tangible things. Bards and rhapsodists flourished long after the advent of writing. And they, indeed, held their own as minstrels (folk singers) in Europe until the Middle Ages.

Unfortunately, the bard tradition was not always consistent. Bards often changed and reworked their works, they had their moments when it was spoken aloud as well as when things were forgotten. All that however, was eliminated when writing came into use. What is written remains consistent and can be accurately rewritten and as such oral literature will remain a medium of prehistoric times.<sup>177</sup> One of the most interesting and informative things about prehistoric Aryan compositions was the Iliad. An earlier form of what was written in the Iliad was probably orally transmitted about a thousand years before Christ, and it was not until perhaps seven or six hundred years before Christ that the epic was first written down.<sup>178</sup> Many people dealt with it as writers and editors. It was probably the Greek tradition later which attributed all those stories to a single blind bard named Homer, to whom the Odyssey was also attributed, in a very different form, spirit and appearance. It is possible that many of the Aryan singers were blind men. According to Professor J. L. Myers, the bards were blinded specifically to prevent them from separating from the tribe. G.L. Lloyd saw a musician of a band of native players in Rhodesia, when his chieftain blinded him for the same reason. The Slavs gave their bards the name of slepecs. ("that epic was first written down" during the 6th century B.C., R.I.)

The original version of the Iliad was older than the Odyssey. 'The Iliad as a complete poem is older than the Odyssey,' says Professor Gilbert Murray, 'though the material in the Odyssey, representing mostly primeval folklore, is older than any historical material in the Iliad'. Events reflected in the works in the Iliad and the Odyssey, describe the way of life and the spirit that belonged to the last centuries of prehistoric times. These sagas, epics and Vedas provide, in addition to

---

<sup>177</sup> The Iliad was a work of borrowed foreign traditions. It was composed by the Editorial Board of Pisistratus.

<sup>178</sup> The Editorial Board of Pisistratus (6th century B.C.) composed the Iliad in three parts: with donkey and saffron Egypt and Mesopotamia, with cattle and horse Brygia in Pelagonium with its lake and the Adriatic islands.

archaeological and philological evidence, provide a third source of information about those bygone times.

These epics have revealed to us that the early Greeks did not yet have knowledge of iron, nor the art of writing, before they founded their cities in this country which they recently had conquered. They were spreading south from the region where the Aryan cradle was located. They seem to have been a white-skinned people, and newcomers to Greece, newcomers to the land which had been held by the Mediterranean and Iberian peoples.<sup>179</sup>

And at the risk of repeating ourselves a little, let us be quite clear. The Iliad presented us with how primitive Neolithic life was in that Aryan land. It showed us a kind of life lived which was on its way to a new state of things. Between fifteen and six thousand years before Christ, the Neolithic way of life, with its forests and lush rain-fed vegetation, had spread over most of the old world, from Niger to Huang-hu, and from Ireland to southern India. And now, as the climate was moving again over most of the world towards drier and more open conditions, the earlier and simpler Neolithic life developed in two opposite directions. One direction led to a wandering life, to the end of a permanent nomadic life between summer and winter pastures, which we call nomadic. The other began in certain sunlit river valleys, and moved towards a life in which water was managed and the land was irrigated. Here people began to gather together first in villages and then in cities where they created the first civilizations. We have already described the first civilizations and their susceptibility to successive conquests by nomadic peoples. We have already noted that over many thousands of years there was an almost rhythmic renewal of nomadic conquests of old civilizations. And here we have to note that the Greeks, as the Iliad tells us, are neither simple Neolithic nomads nor enlightened people. They are nomads in a disturbed state, for as soon as they came into

---

<sup>179</sup> The Hellenes, according to Helenus mythologically, spoke the same language as the Macedonians - there were many languages.

contact with enlightenment, they saw in it the possibility of war and strife.

These early people of the Iliad were tough soldiers but undisciplined. Their battles were a mess of individual clashes. They had horses but no cavalry. And horses, which were a fairly recent innovation among the Aryans, were used in battles to pull crude war chariots. The horse was still a novelty, yes, and therefore almost a horror. And for the ordinary pulling of chariots, as can be seen from the Iliad, oxen were also used.”

Since the cattle and horses in Anatolia were of Brygian origin, the so-called city of Troy was also Brygian.

“We have already mentioned the Lydian kingdom... These Aryan peoples completely conquered some areas, becoming the main population and retaining their Aryan speech. Such were, for example, the Phrygians, a people whose language was almost as close to Greek as the Macedonian. But the Aryans did not prevail over other regions... <sup>180</sup>

Nor was their religion Aryan. They worshipped the goddess Great Ma-ku. The Phrygians retained their language, which was similar to Greek, but they too were carried away by their mysterious faith; and many of those mysterious beliefs and mysterious rites, which prevailed in the later period in Athens, were of Phrygian origin (if not Thracian).”(Athens “by its Phrygian origins” - the Brigians who existed during Philip II’s time were Macedonians, R.I.)

According to Lidija Slaveska <sup>181</sup>: “Comparative research... A comparative analysis between the ancient language of Homer’s epics and the modern Macedonian language shows that there are preserved words which form large families-chains, interconnected on a functional basis or, simply, they are built according to the law of functional etymology. Part of this lexical fund also entered the Greek language, but most often in a deformed, modified form or ‘stand alone’ without a

---

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., p. 150.

<sup>181</sup> Lidija Slaveska, *Makedonska genesis*, Matica makedonska, Skopje, 2008, p. 57.

Greek etymological basis or functional connection. The connection between the attested Homeric lexical fund and the modern Macedonian language is established on the connection through the ancient Pelasgians, whose numerous tribes lived in the Balkans (known as Macedonians, Thracians, Illyrians) and in Asia Minor known as the Brygi-Phrygians, Lydians, and in the west, in central and northern Italy, known as Etruscans, Veneti, etc. When the Greek tribes settled in Southern Europe at the end of the third and beginning of the second millennium B.C., as we have previously pointed out, they found the Pelasgians as natives in the Balkans and remained a 'great and strong people' after uniting, first with the Pelasgians, but also with other barbarian peoples... The Pelasgians 'were always referred to as a barbarian people who spoke a barbarian language.'<sup>182</sup> The lexical similarities between the language of Homer and the eastern group of Slavic languages (Czech and Slovak) were identified as far back as 1800 by the German linguist Ludwig Franz Passow, based on the oldest preserved manuscripts of Homer's 'Iliad'. Most of the words that were not preserved in the Greek or Latin language were identified by Passow as Slavic words..."

Lidija Slaveska<sup>183</sup> continues: "In the context of the issues raised in this way, we will need to pay great attention to language as one of the most significant attributes of the nation, that is, the people, because as P. Kretschmer once pointed out: 'No cultural wealth is as permanent and long-lasting as language. The names of places are especially unchangeable and permanent, even when the population has changed.'<sup>184</sup> Therefore, we will again review the significant scientific knowledge about the existence of the closeness of the modern Macedonian language to the Homeric language, that is, the Macedonian branch of

---

<sup>182</sup> Herodotus I, 57.

<sup>183</sup> Lidija Slaveska, *Macedonian Genesis*, Matica Makedonska, Skopje, 2008, p. 129.

<sup>184</sup> P. Kretschmer, *Prehistory of the Balkans in the Mirror of the Language*, 21.

Dispute. The Longevity of the Toponyms of the Peloponnese with Slavic Origin, which Max Vasmer talks about, *Die Slaven in Griechenland*, Berlin, 1941.

the so-called Slavic languages to the language of the older lexical layers in Homer's epic the "Iliad". This was once confirmed by the German linguist L.F. Passow back in 1815,<sup>185</sup> and again in 1845 in his work on Homer's vocabulary which was translated into English by H. George and published in New York. In his work, Passow<sup>186</sup> established that a large layer of Homer's vocabulary in the "Iliad" belongs to the vocabulary of the Slavic language tree. Since the Macedonian language belongs to this tree, and according to several researchers, ancient Macedonian existed during the same period as Pelasgian which was the oldest Balkan language. So, it can justifiably be concluded that Homer's language is indeed close to the modern Macedonian language in certain lexical elements that are preserved in the older editions of the 'Iliad'... According to Lidija Slaveska<sup>187</sup>: "In the context of previous knowledge... I. Chashule's research on the Burushanski language contains serious indications of a certain linguistic closeness of this language spoken by the population of about 50,000 individuals in northeastern Pakistan (regions: Hunza, Nadjar and Yasin), with words characteristic of all Slavic languages.... The contact between this population and modern Slavic languages could have occurred no later than 1,000 years ago. In doing so, the author established, in addition to lexical and grammatical similarities, typological features that are parallel to the processes in the Balkan linguistic union."<sup>188</sup>

Since ancient Macedonians were ethnic Macedonians, ethnic Macedonians are indigenous.

---

<sup>185</sup> The authors spoke about the year 1800, and here the female author stated the year 1815 - a difference of 15 years.

<sup>186</sup> L.F.Passow, *Lexicon of the Greek Language*, 1845. (Pasov, not Pasof, R.I.)

<sup>187</sup> Lidija Slaveska, *The Macedonian Genesis*, Matica Makedonska, Skopje, 2008, p. 190.

<sup>188</sup> I. Chashule, *About the Burushan Language*, "Nova Makedonija", 15.11.1995, Skopje: Reactions.



Also, according to Lidija Slaveska <sup>189</sup>: “In one such view... Chronologically, the Maenad from Tetovo belonged to the 6th century B.C., or, more precisely, it was made during the time of the ninth Macedonian king Amyntas I (547-497 B.C.). In the literature about the Maenad it is written: ‘it was modeled by a Greek artist in some city in southern Italy or Sicily as if in rapture she is dancing a Doric dance and probably represents a Maenad from the entourage of Dionysus who in the literature about the Tetovo Maenad is noted as the Thracian and Greek god of vegetation and the resurrection of nature’... Đurić also wrote the following verbatim: ‘However, the Orphic religion was part of Dionysism, which came to the Hellenes from Thrace and Macedonia’, which would mean that he included Macedonia in that religious circle. Then he quotes Plutarch according to whom: ‘all Macedonian women have adhered to Orphic rites since time immemorial and festivals in honour of the god Dionysus and for that reason they are called Klodoni and Mimaloni. They behave very similarly to the Edonians and Thracians around Hem, and from them I would say the Hellenic *θηρησκεύειν* <sup>190</sup> which denotes the origin of wild and orgiastic religious rites. <sup>191</sup>

Since Dionysus was not celebrated in Scythia, the Macedonians did not come from Scythia.

It has been confirmed that the so-called Slavic language was the language of the indigenous people of the Balkans - it was the so-called Homeric language. According to German linguist Pasow (1815), the Iliad was written in the Slavic language. This was even confirmed by the Hellenic (so-called Greek) linguist Choulkas (1907). He wrote that

---

<sup>189</sup> Lidija Slaveska, *The Macedonian Genesis*, Matica Makedonska, Skopje, 2008, p. 211.

<sup>190</sup> Dispute. In the Macedonian language: TRESKA, TRESKOTI but also treskot etc. The tradition of the word “treska” for the Orphic games is also preserved in the name of the women's dance “Tresenica”. Hence the name of this dance is directly connected with the Orphic games in honour of the god Dionysus, when women fell into a “treska”-trance, dancing in a pekstatic ecstasy in his honour.

<sup>191</sup> Plutarch, *Alexander* 2, 58.

the Slavo-Macedonians in Lerin spoke the Early Homeric language. The Cretans also spoke a similar language. This was the reason why the Cretan language was called Slavic. And that was precisely why the Cretans, before Greece became a country in 1832, understood the official language of Bulgaria but not the Hellenic language the Katharevousa, which originated from Koine, official only since 1868. It follows that the Cretans wanted to join Bulgaria but not Hellas. In order to change the situation, Bulgaria was forced to give up the island of Crete. This is evident from Article 5 of the Bucharest Treaty (1913), which required Bulgaria to give up the island of Crete, and what had happened. And finally, Falmerer (1830) wrote, in Hellas there were no Hellenes who spoke Koine, but Slavs with their own Slavic language. So, Koine was a Christian language, and only the so-called Slavic language was a popular mother tongue, a language of the people.

Following that the so-called Slavic language was barbarian=Pelasgian-the idea of a Slavic people is a lie.

### **BARBARIAN=PELASGIAN=SO-CALLED SLAVIC LANGUAGE**

Barbarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic language was the language of the white (Pelasgian) race.

Many authors have written about the Indo-European proto-language, the so-called Indo-Germanic language (Franz Bopp). Since the Indians were dark, and the Europeans, including the Germans, who survived were white, then their proto-language was Pelasgian=Slavic in modern terms. Then it is only logical to assume that the so-called Slavic language of today which identifies with the so-called Homeric language of the past, the so-called Plato language, etc., has its roots in the Pelasgian language.

Merrit Ruhlen (1994), "The Origin of Language", John Wiley & Sons-New York, on p. 29, wrote: ...Jones mentioned that there was a strict affinity "in the roots of verbs and forms of grammar" between the

various Indo-European languages. “Furthermore, as ‘t’ denotes the third person singular ‘he’, the first person ‘I’ is represented by the ending – ‘m’ and the second person ‘you’ by the ending – ‘s’. Thus we have a complete verbal paradigm reflected to varying degrees in different languages, as suffixes are added to the verb root to denote the first three persons”... “In Sanskrit the three forms were: bhara- mi (I carry), bhara- si (you carry), bhara- ti (he carries)”. In the collection of Sir William Jones, who first recognized the Indo-European family (1786, in India) there is an evolutionary hypothesis for the origin from a common ancestor. (+ t = carries, R.I.) (+ т = носит, P.I.)

It is evident that this m-s-t has survived in the present-day Macedonian language: I am, you are, he is. Since the -t voice has been dropped, only the -e voice exists. Therefore, the third person with the t is most important here. This form when the verb ends with -t third person singular, for example he is looking for + t = barat (run-t=run, carry=carry...), has survived to this day in Brjakra (Demir Hisar) with Ohrid, with their interspace Prespa..., where the Brigians came from (Brig=Brij=Brzh=Brz + jak = Brjak), which coincides with Herodotus’s statements. This is when comparing Brigia, which was Europe, with so-called Troy, and with the current situation. It follows that what was in the proto-language, survived in the Brigian language.

(Оваа форма кога глаголот завршува со- т трето лице еднина, на пример тој бара + т = барат (трча-т=трчет=трчит, носи = носит = носет...), до денес опстоил во Брзјакија (Демир Хисар) со Охридско, со нивниот меѓупростор Преспа ..., од каде биле Бригите (Бриг=Бриж=Брж=Брз + јак = Брзјак), што се совпаѓа со наводите на Херодот.)

So the Old Persian language was only a barbarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic language.

Herodotus, I-110, said: “...Mithradates lived with his wife who was also a slave like him. The woman he lived with was called Kino in the

Hellenic language, and in the Median, Spako because the Medes call a dog 'spak'..."

It follows that Kino - n = ki., i=u, ku-kuja; ku + t = kute, t=ch, dog; spak=s pak=pas...

Well, the "pasot" (dog) serves to guard the sheep that graze on grass. However, in Macedonian speech it is also used to guard the child - to pay attention to it. Meaning to guard.

"139. There is another phenomenon present there, which the Persians did not notice, but it catches our eye. The names, which otherwise correspond to the body and the degree of gratitude, all end in the same letter, which the Dorians call 'san', and the Ionians 'sigma'. If, therefore, one pays attention to this, one will find that the names of the Persians end in the same way, and not some like this or others like that."

"148. ...It turns out that the holidays of all the Hellenes, not only the Ionians, all end similarly, with the same letter, like the personal names of the Persians. They are Ionian cities."

The names ended in s, as in Demir Hisar: Dukos + ki = Dukoski.

Speaking of the Ionians, Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic,<sup>192</sup> in her works entitled 'DE ILLYRICAE LINGUAЕ...', wrote: "Let us return to Dubravius...Laonicus Chalcocondylos, whose text he quotes on page 13, VI, taking it from Chalcocondylos's book III which bears the title 'De rebus Turcicis'.

'Sarmatarum lingua similes est illyriorum Jonium ad Venetos usque accolentium ...' in his, that is, book 'On Turkey', Chalcocondylos took the opportunity to also speak about the Sarmatians, who he said have the same language as the Illyrians from the Ionian Sea all the way to

---

<sup>192</sup> Olga Lukovic- Pjanovic, Serbs...the oldest people, Belgrade, Dosije, 1990- Internet without pages.

Venice. In addition, he points out that there are people among the Illyrians who pride themselves on the antiquity of their language...”

As a feature of the language of the white race, there was the dark vowel. The dark vowel was present in Mesopotamia up to Egypt... So it is said that the Jews, the Arabs... wrote only consonants, but not vowels. So the replacement for the samogas was the dark vowel. It has remained Pelasgian=so-called Slavic to this day - the Brigians use it less often.

It follows that Brig=briž=brž=brz + jak (Jak strong animal of the Himalayas) = Brzjak.

Since we are talking about the “Iliad” here, according to some authors, it was located in Asia Minor, and according to others it was located in Brigia, an example is given, with the south of the so-called Troy, with the city of Miletus(os): Miletus=mil et or Milit=mil it. It has been confirmed that the language in which the “Iliad” was written was Pelasgian with the first person m, second person c and third person t as et=it which to this day is Brygian=Brzyac: imam, imash, imat...

To confirm the evidence, it has been said that Homer wrote the “Iliad”. In fact, he was called Omer, because h was a newer sound, and therefore the Brzyacs never pronounced the h as in ajduk, ajvar, otel, armonica, etc. Since the Brygians created Phrygia, a comparison is made with the Brygian Omer and the Phrygian Omir=o mir. It follows Smyrna =s mir na, today Izmir=iz mir- something to be reconciled with peace. The allegations prove that in Asia Minor and Ionia the same people lived as in Brigia, Macedonia and south of it in all of Hellas and Athens which were 100% Pelasgian=so-called Slavic.

Since we are talking about Homer and his “Iliad”, it was added that it was Elias who was 100% Pelasgian=so-called Slavic. As for “ila”, Macedonians say: “Il virni” (it rains), “Il grmi” (it thunders) etc. So Ila was Elias from the Bible - proof with Elizabeth=Elisabeth=eli savet, where eli=helios=Helios=Ilios was the so-called Olympian Zeus - he

was identified with Perun, even in Peru, with the deity of lightning, thunder and rain.

Robert Flasselier <sup>193</sup> wrote: “Let us imagine the ancient Greek peasant... up there, on the mountain peaks, Zeus lived gathering clouds, hurling lightning bolts and sending rain. He was a powerful god... Thunder was a sign of his power and his presence, and sometimes his anger.

(Σ=force=s il a, il: il vrne..., R.I.) .(Σ=сила=с ил а, ил: ил врне..., Р.И.)

And the language itself confirms the influence of religion: the ancient Greeks did not say: ‘it rains’ or ‘it thunders’, but ‘Zeus rains’ or ‘Zeus thunders’”. (“God rains”..., R.I.) („Боже врне”..., Р.И.)

However, there was never any Omer- it was the work of the Athenian tyrant Pisistratus (6th century B.C.), whose Editorial Board compiled his “Iliad”. It was written only in runes, and the runes were Venetian, and Venea was Russia with its runes and its Perun. The same was true of the Pelasgian=so-called Sloenian Etruscans, in whose runes there were also so-called Cyrillic letters.

According to H.G. Wells <sup>194</sup>: “The Sanskrit epic tells us a story similar to that which served as the basis for the Iliad, the story of a white people, who fed on beef - and only later acquired terrible qualities - and who came down from Persia to the plains of northern India and gradually conquered their way to the Indus. But, if they spread, they received much from the conquered dark Dravidians. They seem to have lost their bardic traditions. The old verses, says Mr. Bass, were transmitted, mainly by the women in the households.”

Anthony Brayer and others <sup>195</sup> wrote: Here the stories of gods and heroes were most interesting. These legends, whose central figure was Gilgamesh, were very reminiscent of the Homeric epics. Gilgamesh’s victory over the celestial bull sent by the goddess of love Inama to fight

---

<sup>193</sup> Robert Flasseljer, Greece in the Time of Pericles, Mislal, 2002, p. 207.

<sup>194</sup> Herbert George Wells, History of the World, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 142.

<sup>195</sup> Anthony Brayer and others, “Old World”, Belgrade, 1984.

him because Gilgamesh had rejected her and clashed with his former king Kish.

They spoke of as “very reminiscent of the Homeric epics” - in the Iliad

Thucydides, <sup>196</sup> I, 3, wrote: “Not less...until before the Trojan War Hellas...before Helenus son of Deucalion, and the regions were named after separate tribes, mostly after the Pelasgians. It was only when Helenus and his sons had established themselves in Phthiotis and the other cities began to call them for help, then those tribes, as a result of communication with them, began to call themselves one after another by the name of Hellenes, which for a long time could not be imposed on all. The best proof of this is Homer. He lived much later than the Trojan War and he wrote about everything, nowhere did write that all the participants in the war were called by a common name, and he called Hellenes only those who came with Achilles from Phthiotis. They were the first Hellenes; the rest he calls in his poems Danaans, Argives, Achaeans. Homer did not mention the name of barbarians either, because as it seems to me, the Hellenes themselves were not yet qualified under a single name, opposite to the name of barbarians. And so the tribes were separate and lived in their city-states, but understood each other. They were later called by the name Hellenes...”. (Hellenes was a new term - with Homer, R.I.)

In the Iliad, the name barbarians was not used and therefore there were no Hellenes and barbarians.

II-68: “The Ambricians have mastered the Greek (Hellenic, R.I.) language, which they speak today...The rest of the inhabitants of Amphilochia were otherwise barbarians...”

Herodotus, I, wrote: “This is an exposition of what Herodotus of Halicarnassus has investigated. The purpose of the work is not to allow the passage of time to fade away, and what people, in general, have

---

<sup>196</sup> Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, State Publishing House of Science and Art, Sofia, 1979.

done and not to leave unknown the great and wonderful works created by both the Hellenes and the barbarians, and other things, including the reason why they fought among themselves.” (Barbari = Varvari, R.I.) Hellenes are with a capital h, and barbarians with a small v - barbarians was only a general term.

According to Plato <sup>197</sup>: “The barbarians were older than the Greeks (Hellenes, R.I.)”, “the Greeks took the first words from the barbarians.”

The Encyclopedia Britannica connects the name Pelasg with the Macedonian region called Pelagonia.

According to Ion Arginteanu <sup>198</sup>: “The banks of the Erigone (Black) River together with the Prilep Field (of course, the Bitola Field, b.n.) were called Pelagonia. The name of this field comes from the Pelasgians, the oldest people in these regions, from whom the Thracians, Illyrians, Latins and Greeks originated.”

According to Diodorus of Sicily <sup>199</sup>: “...Propanides, Homer’s teacher, also wrote in Pelasgian letters”, “Timothy wrote in Pelasgian letters and spoke Pelasgian”, “the stories from mythology that speak of the Atlanteans, the Argonauts, the Amazons were taken over by Homer’s contemporaries who wrote their works in the Pelasgian language and in Pelasgian letters.”

Justin (2nd century AD) said: “Macedonia...Emathia is...by people Pelasgian” (lib. VII. 1.1)””; “The Macedonians were originally a Pelasgian people”.

---

<sup>197</sup> Plato, in “Cratilo ch. 421c., ch. 425e.”.

<sup>198</sup> Ion Arginteanu, History of the Armenian Macedonians (Vlachs), Bucharest, 1904, p. 17.

<sup>199</sup> Diodorus of Sicily, in “lib. -III- c.67,4”.



Milan Budimir,<sup>200</sup> in his works entitled “Balkan roots of European literacy”, wrote:

“On the basis of these coincidences in European dictionaries, the French linguist A. Mayet determined...in fact, that the spiritual representative of Athenian democracy and its literary creators were Aristophanes and Thucydides. The Greek language had the conditions to develop simultaneously in both directions in spiritual activity, and in science and art. Its exceptional ability, which it inherited from its Indo-European ancestors, lies in the fact that it can create and combine new words without limits, and always in clear and concise compounds, the likes of which cannot be imagined in the Latin literary language. Only Plato’s vulgar speech is somewhat of an exception in this direction. In addition to this exceptional ability to create compound words, the Greek language could - thanks to the use of the article - not only precisely determine the value of individual words in a sentence, but also with the smallest phoneme or morpheme independence with the help of that same article. We must again mention Plautus and his vulgar Latin, in which, under the influence of the Greek, i.e. Balkan originals, the article begins to appear, which was later adopted by all Western European languages.” (Vulgar = folk, R.I.) (Вулгарен=народен, Р.И.)

Koine and Latin are spoken of, as opposed to the “vulgar speech” which was considered barbaric.

Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic,<sup>201</sup> in her works entitled “Claudius Ptolemaeus...” wrote:

“In the area of the Balkan Serbian lands, therefore, the name Siberia was repeated for a long time! But that is not all! About the same subject, Stephen of Byzantium wrote:

---

<sup>200</sup> Milan Budimir, With Balkan Sources, Serbian Literary Association, Belgrade, 1969-from the Internet.

<sup>201</sup> Olga- Lukovic- Pjanovic, Serbs...the oldest people, Dosije, Belgrade, 1990-taken from the Internet.

‘Sybridae, Erechteidis tribus. Locatia ex Sybridis, in Sybridis.’

‘Sybrids, the Erechtheian tribe. Locally from Sybridis, in Sybridis...’

This name is certainly a metathesis between ‘B’ and ‘r’. Moreover, it is a very old tribe... Erechtheus, namely, was the legendary founder of Athens after the flood. And Herodotus brought two things in connection with Athens and Attica

- that the people of Athens and Attica were Pelasgian;
- that a Thracian claimed in a conversation with an Athenian that they were brothers of the same blood in the past...”

In the title Greek and Latin - languages that emerged in Europe from the Pelasgian or Plato to Indo-European myth, the author wrote:

“If we move from Schneller to Georg Denkovski, we will again find the same theme, only directed in a different direction. Oti- Dankovski devoted his entire life to proving the priorities, which concerned the old age, as he regularly wrote about the ‘Slavic language’. His works remained in the dusty corners of the library because such is human gratitude towards people with exceptional learning, who wanted to pass on the brightest part of their mind to others and leave it for the future.

To analyze the work of this professor of Greek and librarian of the royal library in Pressburg, volumes of several thousand pages would have to be devoted to it! We are primarily concerned here with two of his works: ...

- Homer wrote in a famous dialect of the Slavic language, as was shown by the very Homeric hymns...
- The Greeks have been shown to be tribal and linguistic relatives of the Slavs, historically and philologically...”

“In the first of these two parts, we will find, as the completed title says: ... (Latin text, R.I.)

‘The first book of the Iliad, verses 1 to 50, which sound the same in Slavic and Greek, with the addition of the new Latin translation with Greek-Slavic comments.’

And this means - first of all - that Dankovski, which was probably still a common case in his time, spoke both Greek and Latin! That his knowledge was so deep, he could translate them into verses in parallel, trying regularly to reconstruct the ‘Homeric language!’ We know that Homer’s teacher knew the Pelasgian language and the Pelasgian script! It is also known, and this is confirmed - first of all - by Plato, that the Greeks did not understand the Iliad at all for a long time, but had teachers who interpreted it... There are countless problems in this regard, which we cannot even mention on this occasion! But, let’s move on to the other mentioned work by Dankovski ‘The Greeks as Tribal and Linguistic Relatives of the Slavs’, we will find on p. 18 his claim: ... (German text, R.I.)

‘It is clear that in Homer’s time no distinction was made between the Thracian and Greek languages.’

‘Hecataeus of Miletus, who lived 500 years before the birth of Christ, testified on the basis of the aforementioned era, that in ancient times all of Greece was inhabited by barbarians. Attica, he said, was owned by the Thracians...

The Athenians are therefore originally Thracians (Slavs) and according to Herodotus’ testimony they only later became Greeks, retaining their language (Thracian, i.e. Slavic)... (Greeks=Hellens, R.I.)

Strabo found this phenomenon quite normal. The Thracians and Epirusians, he says, lived to this day (19 A.D.) alongside the Greeks, and how much more so than today Greece must once have been inhabited by them, since the barbarians still occupy the greater part of Greece... Thus the Thracians possessed Macedonia...’

We cannot emphasize enough the extent to which Dankovski confirmed all the documentation presented in the course of this study. It is not

possible for us to go into all its details, because that would in many ways be a repetition of things said completely independently by him. And this agreement goes so far, that speaking - a little after the mentioned text about the Getae, about the inhabitants of Moesia, about the Dacians, who spoke the same language...”

In the subtitle a) Conclusions on the origin of the letters..., the author wrote:

“The man who works, he believes... It will be that this is the same letter, which is mentioned in the VI song of the ‘Iliad’: which is mentioned in Euripides’ ‘Alcestis’, where the ‘Thracian tablets’ are mentioned, associated with the name Orpheus, the Thracian king. Judging by what Plato has preserved for us in the ‘Critia’ about the language of the ‘barbarians’, who even in his time spoke a ‘barbarian language’, on the territory of Greece, and especially women, as greater guardians of traditions, judging by what he once said about it more fully about the common language of the Greeks and the ‘Barbarians’, that language is not unknown to us even today... It was the language of those, whose name the Greeks and Romans extended as ‘Pelasgians’, who – according to many writers – were the true teachers of the Hellenes, having taught them agriculture, the exploitation of ore, architecture, the construction of sewers, epic singing and, as the old books say – literacy. In support of this idea, the factors that we will present in the continuation of this chapter speak clearly, uniquely and with full sense and logic.”

In the subtitle e) Ancient Testimonies, the author said:

“Let us return to what Diodorus Siculus said in the same book. III, ch. 67... Diodorus said that Timothy, son of Timothy and grandson of Laomedon, who lived in the time of Orpheus, made a great journey, crossing many places on the earth’s surface, such as the Western coast of Libya, all the way to the ocean. Thus he reached the city of Nicaea on the coast of the ocean, from whose inhabitants he heard the whole story of Bach, which set forth ‘all the circumstances of his life’. On the

basis of what he heard, Diodorus Siculus further said that Timothy wrote a poem ‘Phrygia’ and that in an ancient way - both in language and in writing, i.e. in the Pelasgian language and in the Pelasgian script. Here is the quote: ...(Koine text, R.I.)

‘Using the ‘signs’ of the first Pelasgians and (using) the Pelasgian speech.’”

In the Appendix, about the Serbian name and about the age of the Serbian people, it was said:

“In this connection we note that English professor H.D.F. Kitto <sup>202</sup> ...”

“About Herodotus this English historian said:

‘...he (i.e. Herodotus) considered the Greeks in Ionia to be a barbarian people, who were Hellenized.’”

It follows that the Hellenes in Ionia were barbarians. So the Macedonians were also barbarians, etc.

According to Larousse <sup>203</sup> “• Sculpted in stone were depictions of idols or holy figures, which are now emerging. This little-known age has left behind only heavy wooden idols or slender terracotta figurines. It is a novelty that the Cretan school, the so-called ‘Daedalian’ (7th century), produced statues that are rigid and elongated, in which the geometric taste is still prominent: the goddess of Gortyna and Prinia, the ‘Lady of Auxerre’. The heirs of this technique, craftsmen from Corinth, Sicyon and Argos, created, at the beginning of the 6th century, a somewhat heavy type of kouros (young man), naked, strong with schematic musculature (the Argive twins of Delphi)...”

“Greek culture on the eve of the Persian Wars... The influence of Ionia is particularly evident in sculpture, where the old and severe statues

---

<sup>202</sup> The Greeks, Made and printed in Great Britain, Edinburgh, 1951.

<sup>203</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 248.

replaced the statues of girls (kora) and youths (kouros) with more slender and graceful lines...”<sup>204</sup>

The term kur(os) is the male sexual organ in every so-called Slavic language. So, the people of Bitola would say that he plowd the girl (ko ora = bark, like mixing) (Па битолчани велат тој ја куроса девојката која како ора (ко ора=кора, како меша). Mixing itself is turning, and plowing is turning over the soil. Even the bark of a tree is circular.

Ljubomir Domazetović<sup>205</sup> wrote: “The above examples of the genetic connection of words support the previously presented hypothesis about the similarity of Slavic languages with the Homeric language. Thus, the German linguist Ludwig Franz Passow, back in 1800, based on preserved manuscripts of Homer’s ‘Iliad’ (English edition), produced a dictionary from which cannumerous related words are extracted, which Passow has connected to the Slavic language, joining the functional etymology. Academician Petar Ilievski pointed out that Byzantine sources recorded numerous Slavic names that are also widespread in the Greek Peloponnese and Crete, such as Belica, Bistrica, Gorica, Orahovica, etc. He said that the once famous Polish Slavist from the Czech University Zbigniew Golomb analyzed one hundred and fifty Slavic place names in the Peloponnese, from the 1st century to the settlement of the Slavs as recorded by Byzantine authors, where he concluded that they contained South Slav linguistic features, although there were no Slavs at that time, which indicated common features of the language and script. These common features were reinforced by the settlement of the Slavs in the present areas of Greece and Macedonia.”

Dimitri Obolenski,<sup>206</sup> on p. 57, wrote: “Finally...Thessaly, Epirus and the western parts of the Peloponnese were densely populated by Slavs.

---

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., p. 253.

<sup>205</sup> Ljubomir Domazetović, *Antička istorija i poreklo Srba i Slovena*, Belgrade, 1995, p. 269.

<sup>206</sup> Dimitri Obolenski, *Byzantine Commonwealth of Eastern Europe*, Slovo, Skopje, 2002.

Only the cities that had access to the sea - Athens, Corinth, Patras, Monemvasia - retained Byzantine garrisons for some time. On the harsh eastern coast of the Peloponnese, the Greek population did not give in. But the rest of it was outside direct Byzantine supervision for almost two centuries...Isidore of Seville wrote without any exaggeration that at the beginning of the reign of Heraclius, 'the Slavs took Greece from the Romans'. Between 723 and 728 the pilgrim Willibald, on his way from Western Europe to Palestine, stopped in Monemvasia, on the southeastern tip of the Peloponnese, a city which, as his biographer informed us, lay 'in the land of the Slavs'. And Constantine Porphyrogenitus, describing the Peloponnese shortly after 934, said that during the great plague of 746-747, 'the whole country was Slavized and became barbaric'. (Not Slavs but only Sclavini, R.I.)

The Avars, like the Mongols, suffered greatly from the plague, not the Slavs - the indigenous people.

"With the exception of...the Slavs...Their status is concisely defined by the Greek Monemvasian Chronicle (probably from the ninth or tenth century): according to it, the Slavs of the Peloponnese 'are not subjects of the Roman emperor, nor of any other'." <sup>207</sup> (Sclavini=Polytheans and Romans=Christians, R.I.)

"In parallel...The most determined work was done in the Peloponnese...The main centers of missionary work in this area were Patras, Corinth, Argos, Sparta, Monemvasia and the Mani peninsula, which was baptized by the most famous missionary of the Peloponnese, St. Nikon the Deceased (died around 998)." <sup>208</sup>

Stjepan Antoljak, <sup>209</sup> on p. 19, wrote: "A very important document on the issue of the settlement of the Peloponnese is the so-called Monembassy Chronicle, i.e. the chronicle of the founding of

---

<sup>207</sup> Ibid., p. 59.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>209</sup> Stjepan Antoljak, *Medieval Macedonia*, Mislal, Skopje, 1985.

Monembassy. This short work by an unknown author seems to have been created towards the end of the 10th or the beginning of the 11th century, and some of the data we find in it was taken, among others, from Menander, Theophylact Simocat and other writers. This chronicle serves as a reliable source for the Slavs in Greece, whom he calls Avars”.

“Of course, the Macedonian Sclavini, like the rest of the Sclavini, were for some time in a certain dependence on the Avars. From this Asian warlike people...”<sup>210</sup>

Avars = Avars (Mongols) and Sclavini = Sclavini (Whites) - their eyes did not deceive them.

The Romans were Christians, and the Sclavini (so-called Slavs) were only polytheists.

Koine was the official language of the Christians.

When the Avars came to the Peloponnese, there they found the Sclavini=Polytheists.<sup>211</sup>

As the Sclavini were Christianized, only in this way did they become Romans.

Max Fasmer<sup>212</sup> claimed that there were Slavic toponyms in Hellas before the invasion of the Slavs. Therefore, the conclusion is inevitable that in Hellas, the Slavic toponyms were there from the time of the Pelasgians. The Pelasgians were the barbarians who spoke the Pelasgian language, which according to the already mentioned authors, was Slavic. Plato, etc., also wrote in this language.

---

<sup>210</sup> Ibid., p. 130.

<sup>211</sup> Risto Ivanovski, Sklavinite=so-called Slavs native to the Peloponnese, 2012.

<sup>212</sup> Max Vasmer, Die Slaven in Griechenland, Berlin 1941, Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.



Fallmerayer (1830) and Sylvester (1904) wrote that there were no Hellenes but Slavs.

The Hellenes were reborn with the Katharevousa and Dimodiki, derived only from the Koine.

Since there was and never will be any material evidence/found of Slavs - there is no plant, animal, means of transport, cart, part of a cart, stake, part of a stake, money, vessels or anything from them, the Slavs were just a simple lie.

During the time of Fallmerayer there were only Romans speaking the Slavic language, and not Hellenes with the Christian language Koine of Alexandria - Koine was Apostle Paul's language.

Celibacy = celivat, kiss biblically - only so-called Slavs, Helladci Christians. (Целибат=целиват, целувка библиски- само тн. Словени, Еладци Христијани.)

The Christian language was that of the Apostle Paul. And so was the Alexandrian Koine.

The Apostle Paul did not know Ionic. Then Koine became the so-called Byzantine language.

Jacob Philip Fallmerayer wrote, "The Hellene race in Europe was destroyed [...] and not a single drop of noble and pure Hellenic blood flows through the veins of the Christian population in today's Greece."  
213

According to him, in Hellas there were no Hellenes who spoke the Hellenic Koine, but Slavs, with an accent. Max Fasmer wrote, The Slavs in Greece (Hellas), with a dark vowel - it remained only the so-called Slavic. Later Hellas was only the so-called Slavic.

---

<sup>213</sup> "Das Geschlecht der Hellenen ist in Europa ausgerottet [...] Denn auch nicht ein Tropfen edlen und ungemischten Hellenenblutes fließt in den Adern der christlichen Bevölkerung des heutigen Griechenlands". (Jakob Philipp FALLMERAYER)

H.S. Watson <sup>214</sup> said: “Now that there is a Greek state, a Greek nation had to be created. This process was hindered by the already mentioned division between traditionalists and Westerners. A further complication arose over the question of language. Korais intended to create a new language, enriched with elements of the ancient past, in which he was initially supported by the liberals, while the traditionalists opposed him. In the new state, the new artistic language was soon accepted by the entire educated upper class, both progressives and conservatives. This ‘pure’ language (kathairevousa) was, for the most part, incomprehensible to the people, and they continued to use the ‘demotic’ speech. The difference between the two languages turned into class differences, and further emphasized the division of the nation; or, to put it better, by dividing the Greek population, it slowed down the creation of the Greek nation. In the second half of the 19th century, progressive Greeks began to advocate for the use of Demotic, and the division between Kathairevousa and Demotic, which had earlier intertwined with the left and right in politics, began to coincide with it. In artistic literature, Demotic prevailed, but in journalism and in official documents, the ‘pure’ Katharevousa gained priority. The controversy lasted into the third quarter of the twentieth century, with Demotic growing steadily.

The confusion arose only with the Alexandrian Ptolemaic language Koine, originating in 300 B.C. It, as a Hellenic language, became Christian with Apostle Paul. It was also the so-called Byzantine language - it survived until the 19th century. The authors (...Fallmerayer (1830)... and Sylvester (1904)...) thought that the Hellenes spoke Koine. However, they were convinced in Hellas that the people did not speak Koine but spoke the Slavic (Pelasgian) language.

The language of the Balkans was barbaric=Pelasgian=so-called Plato=so-called Slavic.

---

<sup>214</sup> Hugh Seton-Watson, Nations and states, Globus, Zagreb, 1980.

## KOINE DID NOT EXIST DURING THE TIME OF ALEXANDER OF MACEDONIA

The ancient authors, who wrote about Alexander of Macedon, did not know Koine (so-called Ancient Greek) - it was still pronounced in Macedonian as Koine=Koine (коине =којне), compared to Duden (1971...), where it said: Koine не. (стои: кој не)

Here is the proof in Macedonian: The question was asked who came? The answer is - who did not come, meaning, everyone came. And it follows that 'who did not', to this day, in Macedonian means, in my mother and father's Brsjak dialect – "everyone". That is exactly what all means in general, in common, for use by everyone. The Ptolemies were Macedonians who spoke in the Bitola dialect with which the Rosetta Stone was written - Egypt and others. (Еве го македонскиот доказ: Се прашува кој дојде? Се одговата- кој не дојде, со значење, сите дојдоа. И следи кој не до денес означува на македонски, на мојот мајчин и татков брсјачки говор- сите. Токму тоа сите означува општо, заедничко, за употреба за сите. Птоломеите биле Македонци со битолски говор со кого бил напишан Каменот од Розета- Египет а и другите.)

According to Eugene N. Borza <sup>215</sup>: "The literary information on the life of Alexander we possess today is scanty at best. We have relied almost entirely on five biographical and historical sources, plus one novel originating from ancient times. In chronological order, the writers are as follows: Diodorus, a Greek from Sicily, from the middle of the first century B.C., who wrote a general history in forty books, of which fifteen are preserved, and one of them (the seventeenth) is entirely devoted to Alexander. Quintus Curtius Rufus was a Roman or Latin author from the middle of the first century A.D., of whom only the scholarly work 'History of Alexander' in ten books is known, of which a larger number are preserved. Probably the most famous of the ancient

---

<sup>215</sup> Ulrich Wilken, Alexander the Great, Mislal, Skopje, 1998, p. 19.

authors on Alexander was the moral essayist and biographer Plutarch, whose book 'Life of Alexander' was written in the early second century. Also from the second century we have the abridged version of Alexander in Justin's works which, however, is nothing more than an epitome of the early general history of Pompey Trogus. Unfortunately Trogus was lost, so Justin has considered it to be a poor reflection of the original. Finally, the book 'The Military Success of Alexander' by Arrian, written in the middle of the second century, is fully preserved, and is the most complete and accurate source in existence. Also noteworthy is the version of the popular novel about Alexander from the beginning of the fourth century. Also interesting is the classical novel about Alexander, in which one can find a little something like serious history.

It should be mentioned here that among the earliest known sources, that of Diodorus, was written almost three centuries after Alexander's death, and the best version is by Arrian, which was written about two centuries later or five centuries after Alexander's death...

The original source for Alexander's campaign in Asia was Callisthenes of Olynthus, who, being the grandson of Aristotle, was recommended to Alexander. Callisthenes had secured a place as a famous historian for Greece in the fourth century B.C. and participated in it with great desire, becoming Alexander's historian; the chronicler of the ambitious young king. The task given to him by Alexander had two objectives: to keep an official history of the campaign in Asia, that is, to keep notes and when he returned to publish them in Greece. But the Macedonian ruler was not on the best of terms with the Greeks. Although they had a desire to support Alexander in Asia, where he would be less of a problem for them, they did not really like or want him. Thus, Callisthenes' task was to make Alexander more acceptable to the

Greeks, to publish reports of the king's activities that would convince the Hellenes that their ruler was not a primitive Macedonian peasant.<sup>216</sup>

Over time, however, the relationship between king and historian changed after Alexander adopted some ceremonial customs from Asia, a feature of court life that even the flatterer Callisthenes was against. Callisthenes' death in 327 B.C. had a strong impact on the transmission of the story of Alexander...

Other Hellenistic traditions were based on memory. Alexander failed to nominate a successor...Moreover, when the war was over, some of the generals who fought on Alexander's side began to write their memoirs (generals did not refrain from writing at all times). The most important of these writings was that of Ptolemy, who served Alexander and succeeded to the throne of Egypt, where he founded a race of rulers whose rule in the land of the Nile ended three centuries later with the death of Cleopatra. Ptolemy's account of Alexander contains military events, which are mainly favourable to the king and defend his legitimacy. Much more is preserved from Ptolemy in the works of Arrian, the best source of information for that time.

Also, more information appeared at the same time...

However, all agree that Arrian provided the most accurate information from that time...

Of the other four sources, Justin can be dismissed as being 'quoted poorly' and, in Wilken's words, with regards to Alexander, Justin can prove to be valuable in future efforts to reconstruct history from his sources. Plutarch's 'Alexander' is captivating and complex. It is especially important for reconstructing the intrigues in the Macedonian court leading up to Philip's death and Alexander as his successor. On the whole, Plutarch's narrative is favourable to Alexander, sometimes even moving, derived from numerous sources, some of which he

---

<sup>216</sup> A barbarian (a nomad - a herdsman) with a rural (herdsman) life and a Hellenic (a sailor) with a city life.

names. Judging by the number of other writers he quotes, Plutarch was one of the most widely read authors in antiquity. No one has succeeded so much in forming the traditions of his 'Alexander'. His chosen mode of composition seems to make this possible.

Diodorus presents even greater problems. Nowhere in his book on Alexander does he mention sources and data, although he has much in common with both Plutarch and Arrian. Diodorus's narrative is usually pale, often confused in its answers to questions of chronology and geography, and lags behind in the identification of a great theme or motif in Alexander's life, behind the role that Fortune plays in determining the course of human actions. He is an author who provides much better material, but who must be used with caution until his methods and the traditions he followed are explained."

"Curtius Rufus gives us the most colourful historical data preserved. His History of Alexander is highly rhetorical, riddled with impossible language, and contains well-defined unflattering traditions. The contents of his book also provides information about a number of events, recorded in different places, although it is often difficult to determine the extent to which such accounts are reliable. The nature of Curtius' History is such that it has led modern critics to doubt that his main source was Cleisthures, a very popular author who probably wrote in the third century B.C., and whose falsehood about the significance of Alexander's exploits may have been most widely known in the classical world.<sup>217</sup> Moreover, Curtius even mentions Cleisthures' name on two occasions, and if Curtius did indeed rely on Cleisthures, for whom classical antiquity has a poor reputation as a reliable historian, then Curtius' source is questionable.<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>217</sup> No fewer than 19 different ancient writers mention the name of Climarchus.

<sup>218</sup> The traditional view that Curtius relied heavily on Climarchus is ambiguous. Since Curtius mentions Climarchus' name twice, it is not evidence that he actually used him as a source. He may have relied on Climarchus through some indirect source, or through a collection of rhetorical speeches that contains some quotations from Climarchus. Moreover, Climarchus remains (36 fragments) and the vaguest

Such is the state of the literary information on Alexander's life. Interpretations of his career rely only on this small group of sources. Alexander's biographers differ depending on which source they have chosen: Curtius is accepted here, or Arrian is rejected there, Diodorus is accepted here, Plutarch is rejected there, etc. ..."

Pierre Briand <sup>219</sup> wrote: "In this connection the first case broke out, the trial of Philotas. This important person, the son of Parmenion, had been the leader of the cavalry from the beginning of the campaign. In 330 B.C., in the capital of Drangiana, he was accused of instigating a conspiracy to assassinate the king (Alexander). The case was examined by the king and his council, in which Craterus, a personal enemy of Philotas, played an important role. Alexander then convened a military assembly, in accordance with Macedonian law, which required that trials for high treason be conducted by the king but judged by the assembly of the people (inside Macedonia) or the assembly of the army (outside Macedonia). During the dramatic session Philotas defended himself with inspiration. At the end of the session the king subjected Philotas to torture in order to 'force him to confess'; the next day a second assembly sentenced him to death and proceeded to the scene of stoning.

The case is dark and complicated. However, a dispassionate reading of the ancient accounts immediately leads us to think that Philotas was not at all guilty of the conspiracy for which he was accused: especially Quintus Curtius Rufus, who does not hide that he does not believe much in the speeches of the prosecutors..."

---

assumptions about the content of his works are established. There are many opinions and criticisms of Cleitarchus by ancient writers, but if more is known about what Cleitarchus wrote, then it is dangerous to make comparisons with some modern authors. In the end, the highly rhetorical style of Curtius may, above all, be prompted not by Cleitarchus, but by the style of Curtius' time.

<sup>219</sup> Pierre Briand, *Alexander the Great, Historia antiquae Macedoniae*, Skopje, 1996, p. 84.

Then follows an explanation: “It must be pointed out that Quintus Curtius Rufus is not one of the most reliable ancient authors.”

In Quintus Curtius Rufus’s works<sup>220</sup> it was stated: “The works about Alexander the Great, who two centuries after his death received the flattering nickname the Great (Nepos, De regibus 2), have been the subject of interest and admiration among many historians and biographers since the time of antiquity, and this interest has not subsided even to this day...”

“Even during his lifetime, all his actions, military or political, were recorded by people who accompanied him on his campaigns, i.e. ‘scribes’, who made daily notes of his every move. All events were recorded in the so-called Ephemerides (Diary) written under the supervision of Eumenes of Cardia and Diodorus of Erythraea on the one hand and Callisthenes of Olynthus on the other. After his death, some of his contemporaries and comrades-in-arms, such as Ptolemy, the son of Lagus and Aristobulus, based on the information of Callisthenes, described his campaigns. Unfortunately, all these records, as well as the records of some other historiographers who lived a century or two later, have been almost completely lost, of which only some fragments remain, which C. Muller collected and published in the edition of Arrian in 1864 in Paris. The data from these records was included in the works of several later historiographers, who are considered today the main sources for studying the life and works of Alexander the Great. These are Diodorus Siculus, Curtius, Justin, Attianus and Plutarch. While four of these authors took their information from various later sources, Arrian is considered the most reliable, because the basis of his account of Alexander’s campaigns are Ptolemy, Aristobulus and the Ephemerides of Callisthenes, who were contemporaries of Alexander and should be believed to be the most reliable, although they certainly contained many subjective observations and depictions of events.

---

<sup>220</sup> Quintus Curtius Rufus, *History of Alexander the Great*, Patrija, Skopje, 1998, in the Preface.



Quintus Curtius Rufus, author of the publication ‘The History of Alexander the Great’, is among the five ancient historiographers, who set out to describe the events related to the famous campaigns of Alexander the Great, based on the sources available to him; it seems that his main source was the Alexandrian author Cleantarch, who was also used by the author of the ‘Historical Library’ Diodorus of Sicily, a contemporary of Caesar.

As for the person and the time in which the author of this edition of ‘History...’ lived, it is still ‘sub iudice lis est’ (The case is before the judge.). Namely, historians still cannot determine with certainty who Quintus Curtius Rufus was and when he lived, because he does not give us any information about himself. Several manuscripts of his work have been preserved, but none are older than the 9th century A.D.; they all originate from a very old, incomplete manuscript; namely, in all the preserved manuscripts the first two books are missing, and in the rest we have larger or smaller gaps in several places. The best are considered to be the Codices Bernensis (B), Florentius (F), Leidensis (L), Parsinus (P) and Vossianus (V). The full name Quintus Curtius Rufus was restored by Hedicke, based on the notation of the author’s name in several manuscripts, not completely, but either as Quintus Rufus or as Curtius Rufus, to obtain the final designation as Quintus Curtius Rufus, as the name is found in the late republican and early imperial period. Namely, Cicero in a letter to his brother Quintus (Ad Quintum fratrem, lib. III, ep. 2) mentions and praises a good and learned young man named Curtius (laudat bonum et eruditum adolescentem); also, the Roman historian Suetonius, in the list of famous rhetoricians, includes a Quintus Curtius Rufus; such a person is also mentioned by the great Roman historian Tacitus <sup>221</sup> in his Annales (Annales, XI, 20) and Pliny (Epistulae, VII, 27). However, it remains strange that Quintilian, in his Institutio oratoria, in the list of rhetoricians that he recommends for reading to the youth, nowhere mentioned is the

---

<sup>221</sup> The first to doubt the existence of Tacitus was Voltaire, while Hartius as early as 1709, etc.

name of Curtius, although he adds that there are other rhetoricians that the youth should read, among whom may have been our Curtius, although he is not mentioned by him, if he lived in a time before Quintilian. It is very interesting that scholars still cannot agree when he lived and their assumptions range from the time of Augustus, up to the reign of the Christian emperor Theodosius. Namely, scholars base their assumptions on a few meager pieces of data that Curtius himself provided in the Tenth Book, Chapter 9, of his: 'History...' about the time in which he lived: The place in 'History...', from which one could get a sense of the time in which Curtius lived, is the following: '...(text in Latin)...('But fate had already brought the civil war of the Macedonian people closer. For royal power is indivisible, and many desired it. So, first they joined forces, and then they dispersed; when the body became heavier from a greater burden than it could bear, its parts began to weaken. The kingdom that could be held firmly under one collapsed when held by many. Therefore, the Roman people deservedly and rightly acknowledged that they owed their salvation to their princeps, who lit us up like a new star in the night, which we considered to be the last. For Hercules, he not only restored the light of the rising sun of the world, wrapped in fog, whose parts trembled with discord, because it had no head of its own. How many torches did he then put out? How many swords did he sheathe? What a storm did he break with sudden serenity! The kingdom not only grew stronger, but also flourished. Only let evil remain far away, let it flourish for centuries and may happiness forever have a long-lasting offspring'). This is how Curtius described the time in which he lived.<sup>222</sup> So, what exactly can be concluded from this? Namely, that the author of the book 'History...' lived in a time of some 'princeps', that this princeps returned the light to the world, wrapped in fog, that he restored peace and harmony to the kingdom, which before that seemed to be experiencing its last night, that during his rule the kingdom became strong, even flourished. The

---

<sup>222</sup> The oldest manuscript was from the 9th century, and the book was printed in the 15th century - written in an impossible language.

question arises which princeps could this be? It is here that scholars differ and so far they cannot agree on which princeps he actually meant? According to some, it could be Octavian Augustus, according to others, Tiberius; some think that it refers to the time of Claudius, others to Vespasian, Trajan, Constantine the Great, and even Theodosius. So, according to the researchers of Curtius' works, he could have lived in the period from the first century B.C. to the fourth century A.D.<sup>223</sup> The arguments of all have their major flaws, so that none of the proposed datings of the time in which Curtius lived can withstand serious scrutiny. This is especially true of the time of Tiberius and Claudius; namely, no matter how flattering our author was, it is difficult to believe that he could write about either of the latter that 'like a star he illuminated the night' which was considered to be the last of the Empire. Namely, the former inherited the Empire from Augustus in full power and flourishing, because Augustus had long since pacified all civil discord and with the long-lasting peace, it was so well established that, for the time when Tiberius reigned, it cannot be said that it was 'revirescere or florer' (to revive or flourish) at that time. Indeed, during his reign there were rebellions in Illyricum and Germany, but he was not the one who extinguished these 'torches', but left that to others; in fact, those rebellions arose, not because the state was beheaded, but because there was a change in the principus, and the army did not participate in his election.

He himself is also known for his unparalleled cruelty, so much so that, as soon as he took power, he killed his own brother Agrippa Postumus, so that there would be no rival in the government. Those scholars who consider that the princeps mentioned by Curtius is Claudius, are mistaken. and that they completely ignored what Suetonius and Cassius Dio wrote about him. Namely, his mother Antonia herself declared that she did not give birth to a man, but a monster, which nature only conceived, and did not complete. Suetonius (Claudius, 2) testified that

---

<sup>223</sup> The author has Epirus - introduced by Nero; and even Greeks - only from the 9th century with Charlemagne...Othon I.

he was a laughingstock of the entire imperial family and Rome. Both of them, therefore, did not extinguish any torches, nor did they sheathe their swords, nor quell any rebellions within the Empire. And those scholars who located the life of Curtius in the time of the emperor Vespasian, although he himself deserved the greatest praise as a ruler, nevertheless, if we look more closely at the time in which he assumed power, we will see that at that time at least ‘discordia rei publicae membra trepidabant sine suo capite’ (discord of the public affair made the members tremble without their leader.), because Vitellius was elected emperor by the legions, who were wintering in Germany, and after Otho committed suicide, he was greeted and accepted as emperor by the terrified senate, and was even recognized as such by Vespasian himself; therefore, it is clear that the state was not without a leader, because Vitellius, just like Vespasian later, was not immune from the desire to rule, because, incited by Mucianus and convinced by prophecies, he provoked a civil war to suppress Vitellius. Therefore, it is difficult to accept that he sheathed his swords and extinguished the torches of civil war. To this should be added that Curtius could not have written that in his time the city of Tyre ‘Multis ergo casibus defuncta est, post exidium renata, nunc tamen, longa pace cuncta refovente, sub tutela Romanae mansuetudinis acquiescit’ (Therefore, in many cases it died, was reborn after destruction, but now, with a long peace fostering everything, it rested under the protection of Roman gentleness.) (History..., Book IV, Chapter 4) because in the time of Vespasian in Syria, where this city was located, it could not have been spared from military disasters during the war of the Jews (See Josephus, Bell. Iud. II, 19, *possim*).<sup>224</sup>

Could our author have lived in the time of Emperor Trajan, as some scholars believe? Difficult. For although Trajan himself deserves all the praise with which Curtius exalts him, this adopted son of Nerva, although he calmed the fury and rebellion of the army, nevertheless, in

---

<sup>224</sup> Alexander the Great did not know Jews – they were known only from Alexandria as Hellenes.

his time there were no civil wars; moreover, he had no offspring, neither natural nor adopted, to whom he would have left the kingdom, namely, although some consider that Hadrian succeeded Trajan by adoption (*iure adoptionis*), nevertheless, Eutropius informs us that ‘*defuncto Traiano, Aelius Hadrianus creatus est princeps sine aliqua voluntate Traiani, sed operam dante Plotina, Traiani uxore. Nam eum Traianus, quamquam consobrinae filium, vivens noluerat adoptare*’ (‘When he died, Aelius Hadrian was elected princeps, against the will of Trajan, but with the intervention of Plotina, Trajan’s wife. Namely, Trajan, did not want to adopt him, although he was the son of his cousin’). (Eutropius, VIII, 3); therefore, it is difficult to believe that Trajan is the prince to whom the good wishes of Curtius ‘that his house may have a long-lasting offspring’ refer. It is difficult not to believe that Theodosius could also be the same, for he shared power for six years with Gratian, who, when he felt that he could not cope with the Goths and Triballi, who had conquered Thrace and Dacia, and the Roman Empire was threatened by the Huns and Alans, proclaimed Theodosius the emperor; the latter immediately attacked and after many battles defeated the Alans, Huns and Goths. Therefore, he mainly waged wars with external enemies; it is difficult to say about him ‘what storm he broke with sudden calm’, because even when he ruled alone, after the death of Gratian, there was internal unrest and disagreements in the Empire until his death.

There are scholars who believe that Curtius’ reporting on the time in which he lived also refers to the reign of Constantine the Great, but even this opinion can be seriously criticized; namely, can it be said that he ‘suddenly calmed down such a storm’ if it is known that this ‘calm’ in his time occurred after 17 years of warfare?”

Since Curtius Rufus is spoken of in terms of centuries, such a person could not have existed.

“Even today, the time in which our author (Curtius) lived remains uncertain and decidedly undetermined, although in the most recent

statements regarding this problem the opinion prevails that it was the time of the Roman emperor Claudius (41-53 A.D.). However, this opinion seems to us the least convincing, because Curtius's report on the princeps of his time could at least refer to Claudius, if we take into account the sanctities of Suetonius <sup>225</sup> regarding the personality of this Roman emperor. On the other hand, we see no serious reasons not to accept the reports of Cicero, Tacitus <sup>226</sup> and Suetonius as credible about the existence of a person named Quintus Curtius Rufus. After all the language in which the 'History...' is written undoubtedly belongs to the 'aurea Latinitas' (golden Latinity), close to that of Livy and Cicero. <sup>227</sup> We are therefore more inclined to believe that the 'princeps' mentioned by Curtius in the quoted passage refers rather to Octavian Augustus than to any of the other emperors mentioned. However, as we indicated at the beginning, we will allow the question to remain 'adhuc sub iudice' (under trial).

'The History of Alexander the Great' by Quintus Curtius Rufus is the first of the five ancient sources relating to the history of ancient Macedonia, translated in full from the original into the Macedonian language. Our translation is based on the editions: O. Curtii Rufi; De rebus gestis Alexandri Magni, <sup>228</sup> cum supplementis J. Freinsheimii, Parisiis MDCCCXXII and the edition History of Alexander, Loeb Classical library. We used the first edition, because it integrally included the addition of the first two irretrievably lost books of the original, which was prepared in the 17th century by the scholar of Curtius' work, J. Frensheim. <sup>229</sup> He filled in the gaps in the manuscripts

---

<sup>225</sup> Suetonius is 100% in the so-called Slavic language - it was barbaric = Pelasgian of the Romans (Dionysius).

<sup>226</sup> In the 18th century, many doubted the originality of Germany, as did Becker of Ratzenburg...

<sup>227</sup> As with Tacitus, the forgery occurred in the second millennium, the same could have happened with the language of K. Rufus.

<sup>228</sup> Rome introduced the nickname Great in order to erase everything Macedonian. The same continues to this day.

<sup>229</sup> In no ancient author does the Koine language exist. Only Frensheim makes a forgery about Koine.

of the original text, based on data taken from Arrian, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, and Justin.

The first printed edition, based on Curtius' manuscript, was published in Venice in 1470, and two years later, in 1472, the second edition was published in Rome. The first edition with Frensheim's supplements was published in 1648 in Strasbourg, and another such edition was printed in 1670. The following Latin editions mainly contain the additions of Frensheim,<sup>230</sup> and in the translations they are either given in full, in an abbreviated form, or were omitted, and only the text from Curtius was translated, as it is preserved.

'The History of Alexander the Great' by Quintus Curtius Rufus is the oldest extensive source, written in Latin, for the study of the life and work of the great conqueror Alexander the Great. In the absence of older sources, especially those composed by the contemporaries of Alexander the Great, Curtius' work, although in a certain sense an indirect source, nevertheless does not lose its value, because it is written on the basis of records available to the author, which have not reached us, and were written either by Alexander's contemporaries, or by those who lived close to the time in which he lived and acted..."

I- 1: "Most Greeks speak of the life and work of Alexander..."

The names Greeks and Greece were not used before the year 800 A.D., when Charlemagne was proclaimed emperor. The name Greeks as Greiki = Newcomers to Southern Italy was used by Otto I - he asked the Macedonian dynasty of Rome to cede Southern Italy to him, because there were talks... So the offensive name Greiki was not accepted.

12: "Since he did not attack King Sirm, Alexander turned the attack to the Getae, who lined up four thousand horsemen on the other bank..."

---

<sup>230</sup> In addition to introducing the Koine language, he even mentions Germans and Jews - there were none.

Then the envoys from the neighbouring flames and from King Sirm came to him, with gifts of what was considered valuable to them. Also the Germans, who inhabited the area from the source of the Danube River to the Adriatic Sea, sent envoys, because the Danube rises in Germany and they themselves called it Danubius in their native language. Alexander, amazed by the greatness of their bodies...”

Alexander the Great knew only Celts, no Germany and Germans.

II-11: “When he had sorted out these matters...”

“On the contrary, the princes of Syria, who, because of their fierce and frequent disagreements with the Jews, followed Alexander and punished their enemies...”

Alexander knew no Jews - they came to be known in Alexandria.

12: “After he had conquered the narrows by the Pamphylian Sea, Alexander, on his way to Perga, met the envoys of the Aspendians, who were the leaders of the state. They begged him not to force them to accept garrisons, and promised him fifty talents of pay for the soldiers, and as many horses as they gave as tribute to the Persian king. From there the king went to the Sidetes, who lived around the river Melana. These too were of the Aeolid family, but they spoke a barbarian language, for they had become unaccustomed to Greek, not because of the length of time, as is usually the case, but because their ancestors, when they arrived in these parts, suddenly forgot their native language, and remembered the sound of a new language that had not been heard before. After taking Side, which was the capital of Pamphylia, he went to Sinai, a city safe by the nature of the place and well fortified with strong troops, composed of foreign soldiers and local barbarians. Because of all this, and since it was announced that the Aspenids had rebelled again him, he diverted his troops and took them to Aspend. Terrified by the sudden attack of the Macedonians...”

The above writing was not corroborated with any of the works of the ancient authors - it was without any basis: the barbarian language was



Pelasgian, and the Pelasgians were the Hellenes and Macedonians. In Hellas and the Macedonian royal court the Ionian language with the Ionian script from Miletus was official from the time of Archelaus...Philip II, Alexander the Great.... It was there before... It did not just appear after Alexander the Great's death, from 300 B.C. onward.

What the author said "what usually happens but because their ancestors, when they arrived in these parts, suddenly forgot their native language", was not possible. How could someone "suddenly forget their native language?" This author's statement is without a basis - it was 100% a lie. This was confirmed by the evidence that how could they then "remember what the new previously unheard language sounded like"? After 300 B.C.?

IV-5: "Almost at the same time a letter was brought to Alexander from Darius, written from a king. Darius demanded that Alexander marry his daughter named Stagira..."

"The kings wrote like this... Isthmian Games, which were celebrated with the gathering of all of Greece..."

However, there were not Greeks then, only Hellenes and Hellada without Greece.

V-11: "And Parton, the leader of the Greeks... Parton replied that he really wanted to talk to him, but alone, without witnesses. Darius ordered him to approach him closer without an interpreter, because Darius knew the Greek language..."

"Bes, although he did not know Greek, but because his conscience was not clear, believed that Parton had betrayed him; when the translator conveyed to him the words of the Greek, all doubt disappeared..."

13: "When Alexander heard that Darius had departed from Ecbatana...". "Darius knew the Greek language and thanked the gods..."

The Persian language was from 515 B.C., and the Alexandrian Koine from 300 B.C. The language spoken was Ionian, which Darius and others knew, etc.

VI-9: “Then the king went out before the assembly in mental anguish...”

“Then he ordered Philotas to be brought in, his hands tied behind his back...

When Philotas was ordered to speak...When the king saw him, he said to him: ‘Now you will be judged by the Macedonians; I ask you, will you address them in your native language?’ Philotas said: ‘Apart from the Macedonians, there are many present here, for whom I think they will understand what I am going to say more easily if I speak in the same language that you use, I believe, not for any other reason than that the majority may understand my speech.’ Then the king said: ‘Look, do you see, has Philotas come so far that he abhors his native language? Namely, he alone despises even learning it. But let him speak as he pleases, and you remember that he has become equally alienated from our customs and our language.’ Then he left the assembly.”

10: “Then Philotas said: ‘It is easy for an innocent man to find words...

I really do not see what I am guilty of...

Now I will have to turn to the one, true criminal...

I swear by Hercules...I am being accused of refusing to speak in my native language, of being disgusted by Macedonian customs. So, in this way I am threatening the kingdom by despising it. Even earlier, the native language was abandoned in communication with other peoples, so both the victors and the vanquished had to learn a foreign language...”

So it is only about the official Ionian language with the Ionian script and the native language.

X-1: “At about the same time Cleander and Sitalcus arrived...

The king considered the charges...

A little later, Nearchus and Onesicritus arrived...

The king, inflamed by the desire to learn more, ordered them to sail again to that country, until they reached the mouth of the Euphrates, and from there, upstream, to come to Babylon. He himself, overwhelmed by the thought of infinity, decided, after conquering all the coastal regions of the East, to head from Syria to Africa, because he was angry with Carthage, and from there, after crossing the desert of Numidia, to head for Gad (because it was said that the Pillar of Hercules was there) and then to go to Hispania, which the Greeks called Iberia, after the name of the river Iber, to come and cross the Alps and reach the coast of Italy, from where the road to Epirus was short..."

According to R. Graves, the term Epirus originated from the time of Nero.

The region was named Epirus after the Macedonian king Pyrrhus:  
Epirus = is a pyre, pyri = mountains...

Also, in the book of Rufus it is said that Alexander would go west to Rome...

H.G. Wells <sup>231</sup> wrote: "Historians have somehow become accustomed to speaking with the greatest awe about those battles. Especially of Julius Caesar who was presented as some bright phenomenon in the history of mankind... Not even Alexander the Great himself was so famous and adapted to worship by readers who did not think or have their own standard... Thus, e.g. they speak of how Alexander intended to subjugate Rome and Carthage and finally conquer India, and only his premature death prevented him from realizing that plan. However, we also know reliably about him that he only conquered the Persian state and during his further campaigns never penetrated very far beyond the borders of those conquered great states..."

---

<sup>231</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 253.

This kind of writing could only be valid in 1054, when Christianity was divided. There is also a so-called Byzantine author - who wrote about Alexander going west, to Rome...

The only deviation was with Quintus Curtius Rufus, whose oldest manuscript was only from the 9th century, and the book was printed in the 15th century. The Koine language that existed during the time of Alexander was the work of a forgery in the 17th century.

Since the first two books were missing from the book of Quintus Curtius Rufus, those two books were a German forgery: "the first edition with the supplements of Frensheim was published in 1648 in Strasbourg and another such edition was printed in 1670..." The most important evidence is also provided in the appendix: the Macedonians in Pakistan, the Hunza and the Kalash, with their god Ares, who was Brygian=Brsian, and did not speak Koine, but a language, the language of the Brygians with a multitude of today's Brsian words and traditions.

It is concluded that Koine did not exist during the time of Alexander the Great. This was also confirmed by the evidence that the language of Homer, Thucydides, Plato... had no connection with Koine. Here is the most important evidence - Homer wrote in the Slavic language (German linguist Passow - 1815, Hellenic linguist Choulikas - 1907...), and the Iliad was first translated into Koine in Alexandria only in the 3rd century B.C., which was true for all the works of the aforementioned authors Homer...Plato... According to H.G. Wells, Apostle Paul was familiar with the Koine language, but not familiar with the official language of Athens, etc. So what was that Koine language then? In Egypt, the official language was Old Egyptian. It was replaced by Koine. For the Old Egyptian to be replaced by Koine, Koine had to be derived from it, otherwise it would be too difficult for Egyptians to use, and Koine could not be as intelligible as Old Egyptian.

During Alexander the Great's time, there was no Koine, but the official Ionic.

The following was written in Wikipedia about the Koine language: “Koine...(‘common dialect’) was a popular form of the Greek language that developed in the postclassical period, that is, between 300 B.C. and 300 A.D. This language is also called Alexandrian, Hellenistic.” So, the Koine language, at the earliest, started out in Alexandria in Egypt around 300 B.C.

## **KOINE (SO-CALLED ANCIENT GREEK) HELLENIC LANGUAGE FROM ALEXANDRIA**

So, the Larousse encyclopedia ends with Macedonia before it starts covering the Roman Empire, long after the death of Alexander the Great. The Hellenistic period continued in Alexandria; there Koine was created and writings about Hellenization were produced.

According to Larousse <sup>232</sup>: “After Alexander’s return he died of a sudden illness when he was thirty-two years and eight months old (June 31, 323). In less than fifteen years he became the absolute master of Greece and Asia; his work remained unfinished, but it was enormous. He founded colonies that became hotbeds of Hellenic culture...”

### *“Great Hellenistic Monarchies*

Origin. The period from the division of Alexander’s empire to the great Roman conquests is called by historians the Hellenistic period. It lasted a little more than two centuries. Three monarchies emerged with this division, existing side by side. Internal, often fierce conflicts inevitably occurred. Given their origin, these states had certain common features: these were, first of all, warlike monarchies forced to constantly control the conquered territories, both in Greece, where the cities constantly tried to regain their freedom, and in Asia, where the common kingdoms were prone to disintegration, and finally Egypt, which was never

---

<sup>232</sup> Opšta enciklopedija LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, volume 3, p. 259.

completely conquered. In addition, the Seleucids <sup>233</sup> and the Lagids (Ptolemies) began a bloody struggle for supremacy in the eastern Mediterranean (Syrian Wars), because the Ptolemies wanted to subjugate a large part of the islands and coasts so that maritime trade would remain in their hands. In these struggles both opponents were exhausted. Weakened, the Seleucids could not prevent some of their provinces from seceding from the empire, both in the west in Asia Minor, where, among others, the Hellenistic state of Attalids was created in Pergamum, and in the east, where the Parthian Kingdom was founded. As for the Lagids, they pushed themselves into ruin by calling for help from the Romans who eventually conquered their entire kingdom”. <sup>234</sup>

“Egyptian kingdom. Of all the Hellenistic kingdoms, Egypt reached the greatest power. The Lagid (Ptolemeic) dynasty, which was in power, had gathered what it inherited from Alexander, whom they buried in Alexandria. After the Macedonians (Ptolemies) were accepted and allowed to be Egyptian pharaohs, the Egyptians recognized them as their gods who had their own cult and their own priests... Alexandria was truly the largest, richest and most magnificent Hellenistic city...

Hellenistic culture. The Macedonian phenomenon had fundamentally changed Egyptian culture.” (There was nothing Greek about it, only Hellenistic, R.I.)

“Spiritual culture and art. This expansion of the world led to changes in the field of thought and art. In the foreign world, in the sea of natives, the Macedonians were forced to stop their disputes and preserve only what united them. This new unity was very clearly reflected in the adoption of a common language, koine, which was cleansed of dialectal differences. Far from their homeland, cut off from the city limits, facing the wide horizon, the Macedonians and Greeks, who had lost their

---

<sup>233</sup> Seleucus = sele uk; Glaucus = gla uk - education, science, teaching...; Glaucus = gla uch - teach, learn...; Bigla=bi gla etc.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid., p. 260.

peace and were looking for salvation, were no longer satisfied with the old beliefs and the numerous deities. They preferred to turn to abstract gods, mystical beliefs, or accept the morality that, as an animal, Epicureanism and Stoicism provided as a rule.”

The “common language, koine” was adopted only in Alexandria.

“Finally, the Macedonian rulers contributed to the flourishing of Hellenistic culture, by their court providing gifts shared by the cities, as well as with protection and sponsorship provided for scientists and artists. Science achieved unprecedented levels at that time. The mathematician Euclid and the geographer Eratosthenes spread their knowledge all throughout Alexandria; because the Hellenistic cities, with their wide and monumental perspectives, built by great architects, were the centers of this culture; in Alexandria there was a ‘museum’ in which writers and scientists gathered, with a rich library of 700,000 books, while the library of Pergamum had 300,000 books; although more poorly equipped, the smaller cities, thanks to their schools and gymnasiums, were centers for the spread of knowledge.

The importance of Hellenistic culture also extended to distant lands, to eastern Iran and to northern India, where the Hellenistic artistic tradition was very clearly expressed in the Greco-Buddhist sculptures of Gandhar (today’s Afghanistan). But this influence was also felt especially in the West thanks to Rome, whose victorious conquests in the Mediterranean area allowed this culture to expand its sphere of influence.

The geographical position of Rome at the home of Magna Graecia, and especially Sicily, where a citizen of Syracuse at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. founded a Hellenistic-type monarchy, enabled the city to more easily accept the Greco-Macedonian heritage.

H.G. Wells who covered practically all of history, including that of Alexander the Great’s rule, never mentioned Koine until after

Alexander's time. In given history there is no mention of Koine anywhere - it was only mentioned after Alexander's time.

Heinz Kreissig<sup>235</sup> wrote: "According to our understanding, 'Hellenism' encompasses the historical period between the conquest of parts of the Near and Middle East by the army of Alexander III of Macedon ('the Great') in 334 B.C. and the final fall of Egypt, the last 'Hellenistic' empire, under Roman rule (30 B.C.). In a spatial sense, 'Hellenistic' refers to, on the one hand, all the areas where the Greeks lived, apart of course from the Greeks themselves, the coastal areas of the Aegean, Black and Ionian Seas, and on the other hand, those Asian and African areas that the Macedonians conquered and then, according to many scholars, 'Hellenized': Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Iran, Bactria, Syria and Egypt.

In this sense, the term 'Hellenism', in relation to the historical period within the defined historical- geographical area, was first used by Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-1884). Three volumes of his 'History of Hellenism' bear the titles 'History of Alexander the Great', 'History of the Diadochi' ('Alexander's Successors') and 'History of the Epigoni' ('The Successors of the Diadochi')..."

Hellenism was spread after Alexander's death with Koine, adopted by the Jews.

H.G. Wells<sup>236</sup> wrote: "Thus, to give an example, the Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV succeeded in capturing Jerusalem... In contrast to these narrow-minded Jews there were Jews with broader views, the 'left-wing' Jews, inclined to Hellenistic culture. To this other trend belonged the Sadducees, who did not believe in immortality. These Jews were always more or less willing to mix with the Greeks<sup>237</sup> or with the Hellenized peoples, or at least to adapt themselves in their views. They

---

<sup>235</sup> Heinz Kreissig, *Povijest Helenizma*, Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1987, p. 5.

<sup>236</sup> Herbert George Wells, *Istoriju sveta*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 288.

<sup>237</sup> There were never any Greeks, only Hellenes - English authors write Greeks instead of Hellenes.



were willing to receive disciples from the ranks of other peoples, and thus to share with all humanity their god and his promise. However, as much as such Jews gained in generosity and largesse, they also lost in originality. They were world citizens, internationalists. We have already mentioned earlier that the Hellenized Jews in Egypt had forgotten the Hebrew language, and had to translate the Bible into Greek.”<sup>238</sup>

Ulrich Wilken<sup>239</sup> wrote: “The spread of the Greek language...The Jews in the community very quickly adopted the world language and so intensively that in the third century in Egypt the Holy Scriptures had to be translated into Greek, because in the public service of the faithful the Jews could not even understand the original Hebrew language. Thus, the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, appeared in the third and second centuries, and also Hellenistic Jewish literature...” (Hebrew Syriac Aramaic, R.I.)

According to Kosidovsky,<sup>240</sup> “The Hellenists and the Jews, that is, the Nazarenes, with the difference that the former were Jews from the diaspora who spoke Greek, and the latter the Jerusalemites who knew only the Aramaic language. The linguistic difference was so sharp that both had separate temples, although they belonged to the same Nazarene community led by the twelve apostles. Thus the ‘Hellenists’ absolutely defeated their Jerusalem antagonists, probably because they, as richer people, brought more to the community than the Jerusalemites. The so-called ‘Hellenists’, known for their liberalization of religious issues, had no priests in their synagogues, anyone could come forward to speak. That was the time when the Jews enjoyed their discussions very much, when Judaic thought experienced a deep ferment. Even more: in emigration the Pharisees prevailed, to a certain extent with their beliefs close to the Christians. In such conditions Paul, finally like

---

<sup>238</sup> There was never a Jewish language for Jews, but Syriac Aramaic. Not Greek but Koine.

<sup>239</sup> Ulrich Wilken, *Alexander the Great*, Mislal, Skopje, 1988, p. 336.

<sup>240</sup> Zenon Kosidovski, *Biblijski legendi*, Beograd, 1992.

other ‘literate’ travelers should not have experienced any particular inconveniences.”

In the scheme of things, the only languages mentioned were the Syrian Aramaic language in Jerusalem and the Macedonian Koine in Alexandria. As a result, the Jews in Jerusalem were Syrians, according to their language, and the Macedonians with the Hellenic Koine language in Alexandria, called themselves Hellenes.

Pliny wrote: “...The first works that were written in the Hellenic language date back to the 4th century B.C...”<sup>241</sup>

All ancient works were written and translated into the Hellenic Koine language after 300 B.C. So, it was then that the first grammar and the first dictionary of the Koine language were compiled.

## **KOINE WAS THE ALEXANDRIAN LANGUAGE - IN ATHENS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE WAS IONIAN**

Ulrich Wilken,<sup>242</sup> on p. 47, wrote: “Even in these politically dark days of the fourth century, the Greek civilization continued in its great traditions of the fifth century and was in full bloom. In both the intellectual and artistic spheres it achieved remarkable results that remained eternal. Not resisting its political ruin at the end of the Peloponnesian War, Athens in particular still maintained the leading central position it had acquired in the fifth century in Ionia. If the Attic civilization assumed a Panhellenic character, the Attic Empire of the fifth century, despite its short life, contributed a great deal in that direction. From Athens, the head of an empire of a hundred vassal cities, a broad river of Attic civilization flowed into Hellas on the islands and in the coastal parts of the Aegean Sea: Attic laws and Attic institutions, Attic speech and costumes spread far and wide, especially in Ionia. But this influence was not limited to the Empire. As soon as

---

<sup>241</sup> Plin., Nat. Hist. Lib. I. B. p. 29.

<sup>242</sup> Ulrich Wilken, *Alexander the Great*, Mislal, Skopje, 1988.

Athens, with the port of Piraeus, became the economic center not only of the allies but of the entire Greek world, it also, as the center of civilization, attracted prominent intellectuals and artists from all parts like a magnet. The Sophists found their center in Athens, worked in Attic speech and even helped to create an artistic Attic prose style, even though there was hardly a Sophist who was born in Athens.”

“The further expansion of the eastern border of Macedonia, which under Alexander I reached the Strymon (Struma) river, was stopped by the great development of Athens, which was at the head of the Delian League. Athens, as a state, also established itself on the northern coast of the Aegean, including the Macedonian coast. It subjugated the cities of the Halidiki peninsula, and eventually captured the colony of Amphipolis, near the Struma mountain, from which it gained great prosperity. But when the terrible disaster in Sicily (413) caused Athens to lose its status as a great power, Macedonia founded new territories. Archelaus, who then took the Macedonian crown, using his position, gave his state increased military and political importance. He built fortresses and roads of a military nature and thoroughly reorganized the Macedonian army, paying special attention to equipping the infantry. According to Thucydides, Archelaus alone did more than his eight predecessors combined. His involvement in the conflicts with the Thessalian nobility testifies to the Macedonian’s increased striking power. Archelaus is also credited with introducing Greek culture to his country, even more so than Alexander I, the Philhellene. He managed to develop a rich intellectual life in his palace in the capital city Pella, inviting the most famous poets and artists of the time. Euripides spent the last years of his life with him and there wrote the work ‘Bachateki’, and in honour of his royal patron the work ‘Archeldes’. Timotheus, the great and famous musician and poet, was also one of his guests. He allowed the palace in Pella to be decorated with drawings of Zeus. At Dion in Pieria under Mount Olympus, where there was an old cult of the Muses, he put on a stage performance in honour of Olympian Zeus and the Muses. It is not known what the attitude of the Macedonian

court was towards the introduction of Greek culture from their king, which is reminiscent of the last courts of the Diadochi (Alexander's successors). It was probably not easy for them to come to terms with the intrusion of Greek, a foreign culture into their home. But history has showed that the seed was not sown in vain.”<sup>243</sup>

According to Ulrich Wilken “If this were done now, and Philip II was king, he would be seen as one of the great rulers of world history, not only because he laid the foundations for the exploits of his even more illustrious son Alexander, who with his own genius built a new world, but also as a man of far-reaching views and achievements. There is not enough space here to explain in detail how Philip II, starting from the small state he inherited, gradually enlarged it during his rule; in the west he defeated the Illyrians and gained influence over Epirus, in the east he fought against the Thracians, in the north he reached the Danube and in the south, by struggle, he secured the coast of the sea which was essential for Macedonia's development. Not to mention the development of the Halic peninsula, the conquering of Thessaly, and his resolute involvement in Greek affairs. All these undertakings, which show him in a kaleidoscopic pattern, active here and there, are only a reflection of a great idea which he desired much earlier, perhaps from the beginning, to make his Macedonian people masters of the entire Balkan Peninsula. This imperialist program was raised to the highest degree in his policy by a more complete introduction of Greek culture, transforming Macedonia into a truly civilized state. This was what strongly stimulated his ruling character. The example of Archelaus was followed by Perdikkas, who at court associated himself with the Platonist Euphros and learned geometry and philosophy from him. Philip II attracted many prominent Greeks to his court. He successfully realized the idea, inviting Aristotle to educate the heir to the throne and took steps for a major adaptation of Hellenic culture in his own country: he introduced the language of Athens in the supreme court, as well as in the administration, and in the formation of his militaristic system he

---

<sup>243</sup> Ibid., p. 58.

followed Greek models. Although only a few results of these efforts are known, they clearly indicate his main intention: to intensify the Hellenization of his country.<sup>244</sup>

“Philip II, Alexander’s father, was the son of the Macedonian king Amyntas, while Philip’s mother, Eurydice, was an Illyrian princess. Probably in later life, under the influence of her Hellenistic upbringing in the Macedonian court, she learned to read and write in Greek, wanting to give her children a higher education, but by blood she remained a pure barbarian, the daughter of the Illyrian prince Iras...”<sup>245</sup>

“His self-confidence...The historian was Callisthenes of Olynthus, a nephew and student of Aristotle, who recommended him to the king for this work. Callisthenes was already known in Greek history with the work ‘Hellenica’ which appeared at that time... Callisthenes made the first literary description of the Asiatic campaign and, by then, under the control of Alexander, Callisthenes had adopted the panegyric language...”<sup>246</sup>

“This accommodation of Macedonians and Greeks, coming together from the most diverse parts of the Greek world to live permanently side by side in the cities Alexander founded and the Seleucids, Ptolemies and other Macedonians ruled, naturally had great influence on all the people. The differences of race which in their countries were strongly expressed in language, religion and customs, were eventually removed in this accidentally mixed world. This process was most visible in language. The local dialects gradually disappeared and the ground was prepared for a common language. In a papyrus document from the time of Alexander III, Dorisms and Atticisms were present in the then predominant Ionic text, while in a great number of documents from the third century onwards no such mixing of dialects or dialectical forms appeared. Nothing other than the so-called ‘common speech’ has been

---

<sup>244</sup> Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>245</sup> Ibid., p. 85.

<sup>246</sup> Ibid., p. 111.

found.<sup>247</sup> The result of the progress of culture in the fifth and fourth centuries led to the Attic language, Ionized in words and idioms, being regarded as if it were a universal language of the world. The spread of the Attic language was influenced by Philip III's adoption, as indicated earlier, in his supreme court, and was later adopted by Alexander III. Soon the common speech was also used in literature and prevailed during the Hellenistic period until the beginning of the empire when it was supplanted by Atticism."<sup>248</sup>

Ionic was spoken during Alexander's time, and Koine was spoken after him in Alexandria.

"In spite of these contrasts and the numerous superiority of the Orientals, Alexander's ideas for the spread of Greek culture in the East were realized with great success by his successors in Asia and Europe. The brilliance with which Greek life developed in their capitals has already been shown. In another way too the cities built by Alexander and his successors maintained themselves as centres of Greek culture. Greek language and life also spread in the various settlements of the Ptolemies. But, regardless of religion, the Hellenization of the Orientals in the cities which were as a rule formed by the union of the Oriental settlements which already existed, was gradually limited by the Oriental population living side by side with the newcomers. On the contrary, where no Greeks lived, the Orientals retained their own way of life."<sup>249</sup>

Outside of the local Egyptian languages, Koine alone was the language of administration in Egypt - it was the Alexandrian Ptolemaic language.

"The spread of Greek among the educated upper class of Orientals in the newly established cities of the East was probably influenced by the fact that Greek became the official language of the empire, the language used by the judicial administrations in their proclamations. The

---

<sup>247</sup> Ionic was barbarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic, and Koine in Alexandria a biracial language.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid., p. 333.

<sup>249</sup> Ibid., p. 336.

exception was when, in the interest of the state, all subjects had to sign documents which were translated into the local language and printed alongside the Greek text, as was observed in Egypt. Accordingly, the upper circle of Orientals, who were in close contact with Greek officials, or were ambitious of making a career for themselves, soon learned Greek as an addition to their mother tongue, without giving up their own. For example, in Egypt the priests at first used Greek when dealing with officials, because it was the official language.

Undoubtedly, oriental merchants and craftsmen immediately began to learn the official language for commercial reasons. The Jews in the community very quickly adopted the world language and so intensively that in the third century in Egypt it was necessary to translate the Holy Scriptures into Greek, because in the public service the believers could not understand the original Hebrew. Thus, the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, appeared in the third and second centuries, and also Hellenistic Jewish literature. But this Hellenism was only an external facade. In fact, the Jews remained Jews, faithful to their law and confronted the pagans, regardless of the exaltation of the Maccabean movement. Later there were conflicts in many places between Jews and Greeks.

Even in the second generation after Alexander one could find some prominent orientals who were so completely Hellenized that they wrote books on Greek literature in Greek. One was Berossus, a priest of Marduk in Babylon, who dedicated a book of Old Babylonian history to Antiochus I, which he wrote in Greek, using cuneiform traditions. Another was Manetho, an Egyptian priest who, during the period of Philadelphus, wrote Egyptian history in Greek, based on the traditions of Egyptian temples. These books of Berossus and Manetho are very interesting evidence of the victory of Hellenism, for earlier neither the Babylonians nor the Egyptians, although they left valuable chronicles and the like, thought of writing a history of their country in the same way like the Greek historiography.”

“Even before the national reaction of the Sassanids against Hellenism, the Romans had dealt a mortal blow to Eastern Hellenism with the shameful destruction of the Greek city Seleucia on the Tigris River, which they burned to the ground in 164 during the war at Verus with the Parthians. With this great misfortune the Greeks lost their stronghold beyond the Euphrates River. The Greek language was on the point of disappearing, and Aramaic, which was already widely spoken under the Achaemenids, was becoming more and more widespread.”<sup>250</sup>

And elsewhere, too, the Oriental languages, which had never existed in the country outside of Greek cities, eventually supplanted Greek. In Syria, the Aramaic language was so strong throughout the Seleucid period that under the empire it was known as Syriac and became an important literary language, found especially in the service of the Christian churches, and which also left behind secular works such as the Syro-Roman Code, from which it is seen that in Syria, in addition to Roman, Greek law had its place. The loss of Hellenism was marked by the fact that Macedonian names disappeared. Thus, Aleppo and Aco took on their old names, and their Hellenistic names Beroea and Ptolemy were forgotten.”

In the preface of the ‘book of Herodotus’, the following was written about Herodotus’s work: “What Herodotus investigated and expounded (namely, he initially presents his work as an ‘exposition of the investigation’) was divided into nine books not by the author himself, but by one of the great Alexandrian philosophers. This division, according to the number and names of the Muses, turned out to be rather unnatural because it separated descriptions and events that, according to the content, should be combined into one part and, on the other hand, connected those that did not constitute an organic whole.”

In the section Word-two this is what was said about this translation: “This is the first translation of Herodotus’s history... This is... a work,

---

<sup>250</sup> Ibid., p. 348.



translated from the ancient Hellenic language, from which, from that forest of data, something can be drawn about the history of ancient Macedonia as well...”

According to Larousse <sup>251</sup>: “Spiritual culture and art. This expansion of the world leads to a change in the field of thought and art. In the foreign world, in the sea of natives, the Greeks are forced to stop their disputes and preserve only what unites them. This new unity is very clearly reflected in the adoption of a common language, koine, which is cleansed of dialectal differences...”

It is only in Alexandria that the “common language, koine” was adopted.

H.G. Wells <sup>252</sup> wrote: “Philip was an ancient king, half king, half leader, the first among his dukes, of the old North-Aryan type. The army which he founded in Macedonia consisted of a generally recruited infantry and a tribal cavalry detachment called ‘comrades’. The people consisted of farmers and hunters, and were somewhat prone to drink, but suited to discipline and good for war. If the people were a little simple, the state administration was both intelligent and agile. The court language was Attic (Athenian) Greek through several generations. The court was sufficiently enlightened to be able to provide shelter and entertainment for great men, such as Euripides, who died there in 406 B.C., and the artist Zeuxis. Moreover, Philip, before ascending the throne, had spent several years as a hostage in Greece, and had at his disposal such a good education as could be had in Greece at that time. ... “. (Not Greece but Hellas, R.I.)

In Athens, the official language was not Attic but Ionic, with the Ionic script from Miletus.

---

<sup>251</sup> General Encyclopedia LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-for Yugoslavia Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, volume 3, p. 260.

<sup>252</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 176.

Here it is important to ask the question ‘why are the Greeks today still struggling to translate the text from Pella (near Philip’s tomb), and why do they bring world-renowned linguists to Pella to help them? So, the question is: If Alexander the Great and his father Philip II were Hellenes and spoke and wrote in the Hellenic language, then why can’t the Greeks today translate this text?

Because the text was written in the Ionic language (not Koine), which was official in Athens and Macedonia from the time of King Archelaus, to the time of Alexander the Great... But Ionic was no longer spoken in modern Athens. The modern Athenians speak the Koine language that came from Alexandria. It became the language of administration only from 300 B.C. This should also explain why the so-called Greeks had difficulties understanding so-called Katharevousa. The Hellenic languages (Katharevousa and Dimotiki) are not the same. The Ionic script is different from the Koine script written on the Rosetta Stone.

“In the Ptolemaic, Macedonian and Greek rulers in Egypt created a government far more beloved and more relatable than any of the earlier ones they had encountered after losing their self-governing kingdom. And it seems more likely that the Egyptians had won politically and annexed the Ptolemies, but that the Macedonians ruled Egypt. Here again the Egyptian political understanding was stronger than the attempt to Hellenize the administration. Ptolemy became pharaoh, a divine king, and his administration continued the old tradition of Pepi, Thutmose, Ramses and Neco. Alexandria had a constitution and Greek cities under the supreme supervision of the pharaoh. The Attic language became the court and official language. Greek became the general language of the educated world in Egypt, and the Jewish community there found it necessary to translate its Bible into Greek, since they were no longer able to understand Hebrew.<sup>253</sup> For many centuries

---

<sup>253</sup> Just as there was nothing Greek, there was nothing Jewish-Syrian Aramaic, the so-called Jewish language.

before and after Christ, Attic Greek was the language of all educated people from the Adriatic to the Persian Gulf.”<sup>254</sup>

In reality however, Attic was not the “court and official language” but Koine, not in Athens and all of Hellas, also not in Macedonia. However, the only time Ionic was official in the Macedonian court was from Archelaus’s reign to that of Philip II and Alexander III...

“Interesting...And in the world starting from 300 B.C. onward there was no longer anything but Koine.

Around 300 B.C. Alexandria created its first grammar and first dictionary...”<sup>255</sup>

Following that Koine was codified in Alexandria around 300 B.C., and was different from Attic, is confirmation that Koine was not an Attic language or creation.

“The Latin language did not possess sufficient intellectual values, it did not encompass sufficient original literature... A language that wants to spread at the expense of others must be an inexhaustible source of rich gifts. From this point of view, the Greek language had a huge advantage over Latin. When the separation of the Eastern and Western empires occurred, the Greek language again gained momentum in the East and, although in a somewhat diminished form, revived Hellenic traditions. However, the center of Hellenism was no longer Greece but Alexandria. Its mentality no longer corresponded to the free spirit and speech of Aristotle and Plato...”<sup>256</sup>

However, the “free spirit and speech of Aristotle and Plato” was expressed in the Ionic and not the Koine language.

“Soon, another great teacher appeared, who many modern scholars consider to be the true founder of Christianity: Saul of Tarsus or

---

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., p. 193.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid., p. 195.

<sup>256</sup> Ibid., p. 284.

Apostle Paul as known to Christians. It seems that Saul was a Jewish name, and Paul a Roman one. He was a Roman citizen and seemed to have been a man of higher education, but in some respects of a limited spirit, than Jesus. He was probably born a Jew. True, some Jewish writers deny this. He certainly studied a lot with Jewish teachers. He was well-versed in Alexandrian Hellenic theology, and he used the Greek language. Some scholars of the classics found that his Greek was quite imperfect. He did not use the Greek language, as it was spoken in Athens, but Alexandrian Greek, and he mastered this easily and completely. Long before he heard of Jesus of Nazareth, he was already working as a religious theorist and teacher. In the stories of the New Testament he appeared from the beginning as a fierce critic and opponent of the Nazarenes.”<sup>257</sup>

The Alexandrian and Athenian languages are different: the first is Koine, and the second is Ionic.

This is what was said in the preface of the book of Herodotus: “In that scheme... The world of ancient civilizations of the East and the West is revealed before the reader, in which the author penetrates with an insatiable curiosity, characteristic of the Ionian Hellenes, thanks to which Ionia gave many geniuses in the field of sciences...”

“From the aspect of artistic value... Herodotus was greatly influenced by oral folk art but he was also influenced by the Ionian literary tradition, namely that genre, which in antiquity was called ‘Miletic tales’...”

“The novelistic style of Herodotus... The author separates himself from Ionian science and takes a religious stance... As for language, Herodotus appears as a representative of the Ionian dialect, an artistic style by adding Old Ionian elements from Homer, but also other poetic expressions and some Atticisms.

---

<sup>257</sup> Ibid., p. 297.

Herodotus wrote in Ionian, with “a genre that in antiquity was called ‘Miletian tales’...”, but not Attic, which was not written to (Lucian) - it was written in Ionian and Koine.

Lucian of Samosata, “How History Should Be Written”, written in 165/6, under 21. says: “And the following error is not small, so I think it deserves to be noted. The historian simply struggles to write in a pure Attic dialect, to purify his language, and he found it necessary to rewrite even the Roman names into Hellenic...” So there was only the Hellenic language (Koine) and the Attic speech, but nothing Greek.

The above statement confirms that in the 2nd century, only the Attic language was in use in Hellas, which was only barbaric=Pelasgian=so-called Homeric=so-called Platonic=so-called Slavic.

Furthermore, in Roman times, people wrote in the Pelasgian=so-called Slavic language. Arrian also wrote in Pelasgian in the Ionic dialect (2nd century A.D.). He wrote the “History of India” in the Ionian dialect, although he knew Koine and Latin. So Koine had no connection with any Hellas.

During the reign of Justinian, the state language was Latin and Christian Koine. However, the Ionian language did exist and was used in Plato’s Academy in Athens until Justinian shut it down in 529 A.D. because it taught Hellenic polytheistic (Pagan) ideas. The Ionian language still remained active in Athens in 529. It was not replaced by the Christian Koine.

K.K. Rufus <sup>258</sup> wrote: “V-11: “And the leader of the Greeks, Parton...Parton replied that he really wanted to talk to him, but in private, without witnesses. Darius ordered him to come closer without an interpreter, because Darius knew the Greek language...”

---

<sup>258</sup> Quintus Curtius Rufus, History of Alexander the Great, Patria, Skopje, 1998, in the Preface.

“Bes, although he did not know Greek, but because his conscience was not clear, believed that Parton had betrayed him; when the interpreter conveyed to him the words of the Greek, all doubt disappeared...”

13: “When Alexander heard that Darius had set out from Ecbatana...”

“Darius knew the Greek language and thanked the gods...”

The Persian language was from 515 B.C., and the Alexandrian Koine from 300 B.C.

The language spoken which Darius and others knew was Ionian, not Koine.

VI-9: “Then the king went out before the assembly in anguish of spirit...”

“Then he ordered Philotas to be brought in, his hands tied behind his back...

When Philotas was ordered to speak...When the king saw him, he said to him: ‘Now you will be judged by the Macedonians; I ask you, will you address them in your native language?’ Philotas said: ‘Apart from the Macedonians, there are many present here, for whom I think they will understand what I am going to say more easily if I speak in the same language that you use, I believe, not for any other reason than that the majority may understand your speech.’ Then the king said: ‘Look, do you see, has Philotas come so far that he abhors his native language? Namely, he alone despises even learning it. But let him speak as he pleases, and you remember that he has become equally alienated from our customs and our language.’ Then he left the assembly.”

10: “Then Philotas said: ‘It is easy for an innocent man to find words...

I really do not see what I am guilty of...

Now I will have to turn to the only, real crime...

I swear by Hercules...I am accused of refusing to speak in my native language, that I have been abhorred by the lovers of the Macedonians. So, I threaten the kingdom by despising it. Even earlier, that native language was abandoned in communication with other peoples, so that the victors and the vanquished had to learn a foreign language...”

Two languages are identified here. The official Ionian language with the Ionian script and an un-named native Macedonian language unique to the Macedonians which the others did not speak.

H.G. Wells <sup>259</sup> wrote: “In the Eastern Empire, too, there was a disruption in the educational order. Only here it was not so much a reason for social unrest; it was primarily a consequence of religious intolerance. Justinian closed (in the year 529) the Athenian school; however, he did so primarily for the reason of freeing the rival of the new school he had opened in Constantinople, which was flourishing under the direct influence of the emperor...”

So Plato’s Academy was Polytheistic (Pagan) which taught in the Ionian language, and Christianity in the Christian language has been around since the time of the Apostle Paul.

Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic <sup>260</sup> In the Appendix, On the Serbian Name and the Age of the Serbian People, wrote:

“In this connection, we note that the English professor H.D.F. Kitto <sup>261</sup> ...”

“About Herodotus this English historian said:

‘...he (i.e. Herodotus) considers the Greeks in Ionia as a barbarian people, who were Hellenized.’”

---

<sup>259</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 313.

<sup>260</sup> Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic, *Serbs...the oldest people*, Belgrade, Dosije, 1990- Internet without pages.

<sup>261</sup> *The Greeks*, Made and printed in Great Britain, Edinburgh, 1951.

It follows that the Hellenes in Ionia were barbarians. So the Macedonians too were barbarians, etc.

Justin (2nd century A.D.) wrote: “Macedonia...is Emathia...according to the Pelasgian people” (lib. VII. 1.1); “The Macedonians were originally a Pelasgian people”.

## KOINE (SO-CALLED ANCIENT GREEK) DEVELOPED FROM ANCIENT EGYPTIAN

Since Koine did not exist during Alexander the Great’s reign, it was created after Alexander the Great’s death. Since Koine was created in Alexandria, which replaced Ancient Egyptian, Koine was derived solely from Ancient Egyptian. On the contrary, Koine could in no way have replaced Ancient Egyptian. Official Koine was an Ancient Egyptian language, etc.

Martin Bernal <sup>262</sup> wrote: “Along with the long-term drying of the Sahara... the Sumerians came as newcomers to Mesopotamia from the northeast, at the beginning of the fourth millennium B.C. In any case, from the earliest texts that have been written - the Uruk texts from about 3000 years B.C. - we now know that there was quite a noticeable bilingualism in the Semitic-Sumerian language.”

H.G. Wells <sup>263</sup> wrote: “Shishak probably also subdued Philistia. It is to be noted that from this period onwards the Philistines lost their importance. They had already lost their Cretan language, and used the language of their conquered Semites. Although their cities remained more or less independent, they gradually disappeared into the general Semitic population of Palestine.”

The Cretan language was spoken of as being so-called Homeric, as was Sumerian.

---

<sup>262</sup> Martin Bernal, *Black Athena, Tabernacle, Skopje*, p. 17.

<sup>263</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World, 1929*, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 130.



Martin Bernal <sup>264</sup> wrote: “In 1975...I began to look at ancient Jewish history, and - since I was myself placed on the periphery - at the relations between the Israelites and the peoples who surrounded them, especially the Canaanites and Phoenicians. I had always known that the Canaanites and Phoenicians spoke Semitic languages; but it was quite a shock to discover that Hebrew and Phoenician were mutually intelligible languages, and that serious linguists considered them dialects of a single Canaanite language.

During this period, I began to study Hebrew and discovered what seemed like a number of obvious similarities between it and Greek...I now see that Hebrew/Canaanite was not just the language of some small tribe, isolated in the mountains of Palestine, but that it was spoken throughout the Mediterranean - wherever the Phoenicians sailed and settled. Therefore, I saw no reason why the large number of important words with similar sounds and similar meanings in Greek and Hebrew - or at least the vast majority of words that did not have Indo-European roots - should not have been borrowed from Canaanite/Phoenician into Greek.”

“For a long time, and indeed quite justifiably, the Jews and Phoenicians were considered to be closely related peoples and cultures. Long before the decipherment of the Phoenician script by Barthélemy in the middle of the 18th century, certain scholars of the type of Samuel Bohart, who lived and worked a century earlier, were convinced that the languages used by the Jews and the Phoenicians were actually dialects of the same language...” <sup>265</sup>

H.G. Wells <sup>266</sup> wrote: “To understand... We think there can be no doubt that Judaism was approached by the Phoenicians scattered throughout the Mediterranean region, whose language was closely related to the

---

<sup>264</sup> Martin Bernal, *Black Athena, Tabernacle*, Skopje, p.3.

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 218.

<sup>266</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 286.

Hebrew language, and who, as a result of these changes, were left without political rights...”

According to Aldo Masso, in his book “The Phoenicians”, they worshipped the gods of Mount Olympus, with Zeus as their chief god. Breyer et al. wrote: “Here the stories of the gods and heroes were the most interesting. These legends, whose central figure was Gilgamesh, were very reminiscent of Homer’s epics.” According to Kosidovski, the Phoenician religious epics vividly resembled Homer. This is also confirmed by Polybius, according to whom, in the treaty of alliance concluded in 215 between Hannibal and Philip V, the gods of the Carthaginians had Pelasgian names (Zeus, Hera, Apollo, the Daimon of the Carthaginians, Heracles, Ares, Triton, Poseidon, Helios, Selene, Gaia and others). The text was a literal translation of the Punic text of the treaty. Only one follows: Pelasgians.

The ancient Egyptian language was a hybrid of Whites (Pelasgians) and Blacks (Semites), who lived in Egypt and Mesopotamia. The Sumerians were whites with slanted eyes like the Egyptians with Akkadians “black-headed foreigners”. As an ancient Egyptian hybrid, it was a Syrian-Aramaic language. From Aramaic came the New Persian language from 515 B.C., and from Ancient Egyptian came the Koine language from 300 B.C. This was followed by a reformation of Ancient Egyptian and the creation of Coptic, the language spoken by the pharaohs before the inclusion of the Ancient Egyptian language. Since the Egyptians and Sumerians had the same origin from the Levant, they were one and the same white people with the same language. Aramaic-speaking Judaism appeared in their territories.

H.G. Wells <sup>267</sup> said: “In the course of their victorious campaign, the Arabs came into contact with Greek literature. At first, however, they became acquainted only through Syrian translations of Greek writers...”

---

<sup>267</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 352.

The works of Aristotle were accessible to them, either in the Greek original or in Syrian translations...”

From Syrian came Aramaic, and ancient Egyptian Koine. So Syrian Aramaic and ancient Egyptian were biracial: Koine and Arabic are also biracial.

Harold Lamb <sup>268</sup> wrote: “He already had a means of communication with the people; <sup>269</sup> the Greek language which, with the common trade language Koine, was understood in the east as far as Babylon. From Babylon to the east, Persian, the language of the courts and the trading centers, was the general means of communication. And the scholars who accompanied the army discovered similarities between the two languages. Now the Macedonian leaders used Greek in everyday conversation. Some younger officers like Pevcestes quickly mastered Persian. They could read the Avesta, the sacred writings in the Zend or Old Persian language, which told of cosmic battles between two forces, those of good and evil, in which each individual had to fight for salvation...”

“In Ecbatan Alexander at first allowed people from the East to address him as ‘Great King, Only King among many - King of all the lands of the world’. Someone told him that this title was carved on a yellow rock not far from Ecbatana, by order of the first Darius, and here Behistun is written in the universal language Zend.” <sup>270</sup>

The Koine language was Ptolemaic, similar to the biracial New Persian language - it arose only from Aramaic - used in Babylon - and Old Persian.

“The Greek language became the language of the court of the heirs, replacing the Macedonian dialect, just as Koine became the jargon of

---

<sup>268</sup> Harold Lamb, *Alexander the Great, Culture*, Skopje, 1989, p. 274.

<sup>269</sup> Koine was only after Alexander’s death - the first two books by Kurt Ruf are by J. Frensheim - 17th century.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 275.

the merchants, so that as time passed the heirs aspired to become rulers of separate states, associated with the Greek culture that would rise above the Asiatic. The Macedonian-Iranian fusion that Alexander strove for changed imperceptibly in Greco-Asiatic society, dominating what was known as the Hellenistic world.” <sup>271</sup>

Koine “became the language of the court of the heirs”, which happened only after the death of Alexander the Great, “replacing the Macedonian dialect”. It is on the Rosetta Stone in Egypt that the same text appears with hieroglyphs, Koine and Macedonian speech. So the “Macedonian-Iranian fusion” was also in the language: New Persian and Koine.

Both languages were biracial, of Whites and Blacks. Two races lived in Egypt and Mesopotamia: white and black. At first, they wrote separately, then together. Finally, biracial languages were composed: the Syrian Aramaic language and the ancient Egyptian language.

Martin Bernal <sup>272</sup> wrote: “For four years I worked along these lines and remained convinced that as much as a quarter of the Greek vocabulary could be of Semitic origin. This, together with the 40-50 percent that seemed Indo-European, still did not offer an explanation for a quarter to a third of the Greek vocabulary. I hesitated whether to view this irreducible part conventionally as ‘Pre-Hellenic’ or to postulate some third external language, Anatolian or—as I preferred—Hurricane. However, when I looked at these languages, they offered me almost no promising material. It was not until 1979, when I glanced through a copy of Czerny’s Coptic Etymological Dictionary, that I was able to extract some sense from the Late Antique Egyptian language. Almost immediately, I realized that this was the third external language. Within a few months, I became convinced that the remaining 20-25 percent of the Greek vocabulary I could find plausible etymologies in the Egyptian language, as well as for the names of most of the Greek gods and many toponyms. Putting together the Indo-European, Semitic and Egyptian

---

<sup>271</sup> Ibid., p. 421.

<sup>272</sup> Martin Bernal, Crna Athena, Tabernakul, Skopje, p. 4.

roots, I now believe that - with further research - we could offer plausible explanations for 80 and 90 percent of the Greek vocabulary, a proportion which is high in relation to present hopes for any language. Therefore, there was now no need for the ‘pre-Hellenic’ element at all.

“However, the situation took its most extreme form in the areas of language and names. Starting in the 1840s, Indo-European philology, or the study of the relationships between languages, was the core of the Aryan model. Then, as now, scholars of Indo-European and Greek philology were extremely resistant to seeing any connection between Greek on the one hand and Egyptian and Semitic, the two major non-Indo-European languages of the ancient Eastern Mediterranean, on the other. There is no doubt that if Egyptian, West Semitic and Greek were the languages of three important neighbouring tribes in the modern Third World, there would be extensive comparative study, after which most linguists would conclude that they might be quite distantly related to each other, but that significant linguistic and probably other cultural interactions certainly took place with borrowing between the three nations. However, given the deep respect felt for the Greek and Hebrew languages, this kind of crude comparative work was considered inappropriate.”<sup>273</sup>

The connection of ancient Egyptian with Macedonian Koine (so-called Greek) is mentioned.

“‘Labiovelars in Semitic and Greek’ is the subject of the ninth chapter. Labiovelars are sounds like ‘qu-’, in which a velar (back-palatal consonant) like ‘k’ or ‘g’ is followed by a rounding of the lips or ‘w’. It is generally accepted that such sounds existed in Proto-Indo-European, but there is no general recognition that this was the case in Proto-Semitic. However, labiovelars are common throughout the rest of Afroasiatic and Semitic languages in Ethiopia. In this chapter, I argue that in many respects it is far more useful to construct a reconstruction

---

<sup>273</sup> Ibid., p. 13

of Proto-Semitic on the basis of some South Ethiopian Semitic language rather than on the basis of Arabic, as is done today. In particular, I argue—on the basis of evidence from these languages themselves—that Asiatic Semitic had labiovelars, and West Semitic retained them well into the second millennium B.C.E. Since it is generally accepted that Greek labiovelars were abandoned during the middle of that period, I argue that some borrowings from Semitic into Greek were made when both languages had labiovelars, some after Greek had abandoned them but West Semitic still retained them, and some after they had disappeared from both languages. Therefore, postulating significant contact between West Semitic and Greek cultures before the abandonment of labiovelars—that is, before the middle of the second millennium B.C. - we can resolve a number of inexplicable problems in Greek etymology which cannot be explained in any other way. It also reflects the fact that the Revised Ancient Model can achieve much better results by using the abundant Greek material to aid in the reconstruction of early forms in Egyptian and Semitic.”<sup>274</sup>

“Chapters ten and eleven consider linguistic borrowings from West Semitic and Egyptian, and I will discuss both chapters together here. In both, some attention will be paid to syntax or word order, as in the example of the similar uses of the definite article in late Canaanite - Phoenician and Hebrew - on the one hand, and Greek on the other. Elsewhere, morphology or word modification is considered; but the bulk of the chapters are devoted to the study of lexical borrowings or loanwords.”<sup>275</sup>

“This positive opinion, as well as the persistent conviction that Greek culture came from Egypt and Phoenicia, was transformed into a new, non-mystical doctrine. In 1763, the brilliant Abbot Barthélemy, who had deciphered the Palmyrene and Phoenician languages, submitted an article entitled ‘General Reflections on the Relations between the

---

<sup>274</sup> Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>275</sup> Ibid., p. 45.

Egyptian, Phoenician and Greek Languages’. In that article, his first correct assumption, for which he relied on Kircher – whose work he otherwise considered fantastic – was that the Coptic language was a form of ancient Egyptian. He also recognized the linguistic family which would later bear the name ‘Semitic’, and which he called ‘Phoenician’. On these two grounds, he established that Egyptian, although not a Semitic language, is related to the Semitic family. It is true that some of his lexical evidence may today prove to be erroneous, since certain Coptic words are due to borrowings from Semitic into Late Egyptian. However, no objection can be made to the main lines of his argument, which appeal to similarities between pronunciation and grammatical features. In this sense Barthélemy is a pioneer of what we would today call Afroasiatic studies.”<sup>276</sup>

It was cited: “...an article entitled ‘General Reflections on the Relations between the Egyptian, Phoenician and Greek Languages’...”

“Barthélemy admits that he cannot see such parallels between the Coptic and Greek languages. Nevertheless, he believed in the Egyptian colonization and civilization of Greece and considered it ‘impossible that in that exchange of ideas and goods the Egyptian language did not participate in the formation of Greek’. He then offered a list of etymologies from Egyptian to Greek, several of which—for example, Coptic *hof*, Demotic *hf*<sup>277</sup> in Greek *ophis* (snake)—still seem plausible today.”

It is confirmed that only in Alexandria did Koine derive from Ancient Egyptian.

Since he “cannot see such parallels between the Coptic and Greek languages,” it is confirmed that Ancient Egyptian and Koine were

---

<sup>276</sup> Ibid., p. 112.

<sup>277</sup> Demotic was Macedonian, with a Bitola dialect. So Coptic and Macedonian were one and the same.

biracial languages of Whites and Blacks, and that Coptic and the Church languages were reformed without Semitic (Black) words.

“For this perceived inequality between the two ‘original races’... Bunsen, believing that his framework corresponds to the new information from Champollion’s work, saw undeniable connections between Egyptian and Semitic languages and significant connections between them and Indo-European.”<sup>278</sup>

Following this, the ancient Egyptians had a connection with the Semitic and Indo-Europeans. So, with the language of the white and black races - from it arose the Koine. Since Champollion deciphered the text in the Coptic language, the Egyptian language was also of the Whites. Or in other words, the ancient Egyptian and Koine were biracial, and the Coptic and the Church as reformed ancient Egyptian and Koine were only monoracial Pelasgian languages.

So it was precisely Aramaic and ancient Egyptian that were Pelasgo-Semitic languages.

The ancient authors who wrote about Alexander the Great did not know the Koine (so-called ancient Greek) language - to this day it is pronounced in Macedonian as Koine = Koine, compared to Duden (1971...), where it says: who did not. Here is the Macedonian evidence: It is asked who came? It is answered - who did not come, with meaning, all came. And it follows that who does not to this day means in Macedonian, in my mother and father’s Brsjak dialect - all. That is exactly what all means in general, in common, for use by all. The Ptolemies were Macedonians who spoke the Bitola dialect with which the Rosetta Stone was written - Egypt and others.

The only deviation was with Quintus Curtius Rufus, whose oldest manuscript was from the 9th century, and the book was printed in the 15th century. The Koine language, claimed to have existed during the

---

<sup>278</sup> Ibid., p. 160.



time of Alexander the Great, was the work of a 17th century forger. Since the first two books were missing from Quintus Curtius Rufus' book, those two books were a German forgery: "the first edition with the supplements of Frensheim was published in 1648 in Strasbourg and another such edition was printed in 1670..." The most important evidence is also cited in the appendix: The Macedonians in Pakistan, the Hunza and Kalash, with their god Ares, who was Brygian=Brsian, do not speak Koine, but the language of the Brygians with a multitude of present-day Brsian words and traditions.

Even from that we can conclude that Koine did not exist during the time of Alexander the Great. This is also confirmed by the evidence that the language of Homer, Thucydides, Plato... had no connection with Koine. Here is the most important evidence - Homer wrote in the Slavic language (German linguist Passow - 1815, Hellenic linguist Choulkas - 1907...), and the Iliad was first translated into Koine in Alexandria only in the 3rd century B.C., which was true for all the works of the aforementioned authors Homer...Plato... According to H.G. Wells, the Apostle Paul knew Koine, but not the official language of Athens, etc. So what was this Koine language? In Egypt, the official language was Ancient Egyptian. It was replaced by Koine. For Ancient Egyptian to be replaced by Koine, Koine had to be derived from it, otherwise it would be too difficult to use, and Koine could not be understood as Ancient Egyptian was.

During the time of Alexander the Great, there was no Koine, but the official Ionic.

H.G. Wells <sup>279</sup> wrote: "Philip was an ancient king, half king, half leader, first among his dukes, of the old North-Aryan type... If the people were a little simple, the state administration was both intelligent and agile. The court language through several generations was Attic (Athenian) Greek. That court was sufficiently enlightened to be able to provide

---

<sup>279</sup> Herbert George Wells, History of the World, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 176.

shelter and entertainment for great men, such as Euripides, who died there in 406 B.C., and the artist Zeuxis...”

In Athens, the official language was not Attic, but Ionic, with the Ionic script from Miletus.

Here it is important to mention why the Hellenes (today’s Greeks) are still struggling to translate the text from Pella (near Philip’s tomb), so they bring world linguists to Pella to help them, the question is this: If Alexander the Great and his father Philip were Hellenes, spoke and wrote in the Hellenic language, then why can’t the Greeks of today who claim to speak the ancient Greek language, translate this text?

The text was in the Ionian language, which was official in Athens and Macedonia from the time of King Archelaus, which was also the case with Alexander the Great... Since it is no longer spoken in Athens but only by those who reformed from Koine (Alexandrian = Ptolemaic language, only from 300 B.C.), the Hellenes (so-called Greeks) with the so-called Hellenic languages (Katharevusa and Dimotiki) can no longer understand the text. The Ionic script was different from that of the Rosetta Stone in Egypt with the Bitola dialect, deciphered by Macedonian authors.

“In the Ptolemaic world, the Macedonian and Greek rulers founded in Egypt a government far more beloved and more relatable than any of the earlier ones... Alexandria under the supreme supervision of the pharaoh had a constitution and Greek cities. The Attic language became the court and official language. Greek became the general language of the educated world in Egypt, and the Jewish community there found it necessary to translate its Bible into Greek, since they were no longer able to understand Hebrew.<sup>280</sup> Attic Greek was the language of all

---

<sup>280</sup> Just as there was nothing Greek, there was nothing Jewish-Syrian Aramaic, the so-called Jewish language.

educated people for many centuries before and after Christ, from the Adriatic to the Persian Gulf.”<sup>281</sup>

The Macedonian Koine (so-called Greek) was not Attic but an Alexandrian biracial language of Whites and Blacks - it arose from a biracial language, ancient Egyptian. Since the first books of the Bible were in the Syrian Aramaic language, which was also biracial, the Jews in Alexandria easily switched to the biracial Koine.

Since Koine was the language of the educated and of trade it was not a people’s language.

“Interestingly... In the world before 300 B.C. there was nothing similar to Koine.

Alexandria had just created its first grammar and first dictionary...”<sup>282</sup>  
It follows that Koine was there starting at 300 B.C. It has been confirmed that Koine was not Attic.

“The Latin language did not have sufficient intellectual value, did not include sufficient original literature and science... The center of Hellenism was not Greece but Alexandria. Its mentality no longer responded to the free spirit and speech of Aristotle and Plato...”<sup>283</sup>

Herod...Plato, Aristotle... wrote in the Ionian language – at that time there was no Koine.

“Soon, another great teacher appeared, whom many modern researchers consider the true founder of Christianity: Saul of Tarsus or Paul. It seems that Saul was a Jewish name, and Paul a Roman one... He was well-versed in Alexandrian Hellenic theology, and used the Greek language. Some researchers of the classics find that his Greek was quite imperfect. He did not use the Greek language, as it was spoken in

---

<sup>281</sup> Ibid., p. 193.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., p. 195.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid., p. 284.

Athens, but Alexandrian Greek, and he mastered this easily and completely...”<sup>284</sup>

It is confirmed that the Alexandrian Koine had no connection with Athens, nor with Attic...

Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato... wrote in Ionian. So their works were translated into the Hellenic Koine only in Alexandria, and only after 300 B.C.

“In world history, the figure of Emperor Constantine... He was comparatively poorly educated. He knew little or no Greek...”<sup>285</sup>

It is confirmed that both Latin and the vernacular were official, and only Pelasgian.

“It seems that Constantine...since he knew Greek poorly, was content with following the gestures, mood and accent of individual speakers...confused, he turned to interpreters to ask them what had caused such a commotion.”<sup>286</sup>

“Western European writers...the extent of the Eastern Empire in the sixth century, and if one also bears in mind that there the Greek language finally became the official state language, it will be clear to him that it was only in name a breakaway part of the Roman Empire. In fact, this is a Hellenic Empire, of which Herodotus once dreamed, and which Alexander the Great founded. True, that empire was called ‘Roman’, and its inhabitants were called ‘Romans’, just as even today modern Greek is called ‘Roman’. It is also true that Constantine the Great did not know Greek, and that Justinian spoke it with a foreign accent...this state was Hellenic...”<sup>287</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> Ibid., p. 297.

<sup>285</sup> Ibid., p. 303.

<sup>286</sup> Ibid., p. 305.

<sup>287</sup> Ibid., p. 314.

The official language was Latin, and the church language was Koine. Koine only later became the state language. The vernacular language was barbarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic. Constantine...Justinian...Priscus, Procopius wrote in barbarian...

“While in the west...It will be that in Justinian’s veins, as in Constantine’s, Slavic blood flowed...”

All this has confirmed that the Great Slav Migration to the Balkans was a myth: a 100% lie.

H.S. Watson <sup>288</sup> wrote: “Now, therefore, there is a Greek state, but what remains is for a Greek nation to be created. A process hindered by the division between traditionalists and Westerners. Further complications arose around the question of language. Korais insisted on creating a new language...”

Korais reformed the Macedonian koine in Paris and from it created a new language, Katharevousa – and so it became official in Greece in 1868 with the Greek peoples’ consent.

## **THE ROMANS LIKE THE HELLENS AND THE MACEDONIANS WERE ALL PELASGIANS**

Hellenization took place in Alexandria after Alexander the Great died.

According to Larousse <sup>289</sup>: “Rome had to adapt to the situation created by its conquests... However, a particularly great influence on Rome was exerted by the Hellenic culture and the the Hellenistic monarchy. Hellenism penetrated Roman society during the wars when the cities of Magna Graecia, Sicily and finally the kingdom of Syracuse fell under Roman rule. From this contact arose a Latin principality that was immediately adopted by the literary genres of classical Greece. Livy

---

<sup>288</sup> Hugh Seton-Watson, Nations and States, Globus / Zagreb, 1980, p. 124.

<sup>289</sup> General Encyclopedia LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-for Yugoslavia Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 262.

Andronicus translated the Odyssey and tragedies; Aenius composed a history of Rome in epic verse, and Plautus entertained his contemporaries with comedies inspired by the Greek theater. The Greek gods and cult of mysteries were also introduced to Rome at that time.

And so even before it set out to conquer the Hellenistic world, Rome was already imbued with Hellenism.”

“Hellenization of the Roman world. The result of the Roman conquest of the Hellenic world was the Hellenization of the Roman world. Since then, a very rich mixture of Greek-Latin civilization had arisen, which created a spiritual force - the foundation of the unification of the Mediterranean peoples with Rome, despite their ethnic, political, social, economic and cultural differences...”<sup>290</sup>

“The inevitable Hellenic • After the crisis that occurred during the Second Punic War, the gap between Greece and Rome deepened. However, such a situation did not exist before, as Latin historians and moralists would have us believe: from the very beginning, Rome breathed the climate of Hellenism - the climate of classical Greek civilization. It could be said that Rome was the most Hellenized non-Greek city in Italy. Rome’s negative attitude towards Hellenization was caused by Rome’s war with Carthage, against Hannibal, the student of Greek strategists, as well as the rebellion of Italy’s Greek allies. Although victorious, Rome could only be angry with Hellenism, but could not renounce it. Rome became the capital of the Hellenistic world. It succeeded Alexander by taking up his ideal and defeating the barbarians.

• Two figures are the bearers of this transformation: Cato...With Scipio Aemilianus and Scipio Africanus the Elder. This century was truly the century of the Scipios and represents the fulfilment of Roman

---

<sup>290</sup> Ibid., p. 268.

aspirations and Hellenistic understanding of the world, thus justifying Rome's supremacy..."

"Literature and art. The way of life the ancient Romans lived can be characterized as very aristocratic. The term civility (*urbanitas*) from the word *urbs*, or as we say 'civilization' or 'civilization' from the word *civis*, would be a vivid expression for the spirit and way of life of that era. Literature and art, which were supported by official patrons, among whom was the most famous Maecenas (about 69-8 B.C.), contributed more to the beautification of the city, the refinement of its spirit, than did the services of the emperor. We have already mentioned architecture, sculpture and applied art. And how can we forget the well-known architect, Vitruvius... Also, we cannot deny the monumental state services for imperial art. In the field of literature, a teacher, like Quintilian (1st century A.D.), taught methods of rhetoric that reached their peak with Pliny the Younger (Panegyric of Trajan, 100), or with Fronto (2nd century) [Praise of Smoke and Dust]. The theater disappeared and was replaced by crude forms of art, circus games and, when they were not available, then mime or pantomime came onto the scene. Although philosophy, from Seneca to Marcus Aurelius, had several famous names, the novel and history surpassed them. The Satyricon (Petronius, 1st century A.D.) or The Golden Ass (Apuleius, 2nd century), are still novels that delight people even today. From Titus Livius (59 B.C. - 17 A.D.) to Suetonius (2nd century), history reached a high point in its development. It reached its peak during Tacitus's (c. 55 to 120) time, the greatest Roman historian.<sup>291</sup> Poetry at that time was largely at the service of Rome's rulers. This is especially the case with Virgil (70-19 B.C.), Horace (65-8 B.C.), and Ovid (43 B.C.-17 A.D.),

---

<sup>291</sup> The first to doubt the existence of Tacitus was Voltaire, while as early as 1709, Hartius claimed that "Germania" arose in the Middle Ages. All historical literature mentions only the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, and it should be noted that the title *Rex Germaniae* was first adopted by Maximilian I in 1508 (L.G. Geise). In the 18th century, many doubted the originality of Germania, such as Becker of Ratzenburg, while Grimm and Ebel claimed that it was written by monks on the orders of Frederick II, etc.

whose works supported the imperial policy of respecting religious and national traditions, praising old legends and Roman piety. This was not the case with the poetry of social satires, which in the 1st century A.D., was especially celebrated by Juvenal (c. 65/- 128 A.D.). Artists contributed to making the city and city life more attractive. They were the pillars of that civilization of respectable citizens, but a much broader foundation than that created by the interested minority was not needed. At the same time many poor people and slaves lived in the empire, especially in Rome, who did not enjoy the benefits of this civilization. It was the same with the proletarians from the interior, who were called peasants and 'barbarians'.<sup>292</sup>

It is evident that Roman literature was a legacy of the Hellenic-koine.

In contrast to the citizens who spoke Latin, there was also the peasantry who spoke a folk-barbarian language.

If there was an older Latin language, then there must be traces of it before 240 B.C...

According to Larousse<sup>293</sup>: "Latins and Romans. The Tyrrhenians with a city civilization conquered their neighbours and vassals, as a result we have a small number of Latin people with an Indo-European language..."

Since the Indians were dark, the Europeans white, the language was of the Whites.

The Hellenic language was not biracial of Whites and dark skinned people. This speaks of a biracial language. Its successor was the Latin language, and therefore it was also a biracial language.

---

<sup>292</sup> Ibid., p. 273.

<sup>293</sup> General Encyclopedia LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Jugoslavija Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 250.



Ulrich Wilken <sup>294</sup> wrote: “Alexander’s influence on the spread of Greek culture was not limited to the East. The victorious march of Hellenism to the West should not be understood outside his life’s work. Although he did not carry out his last plans, which were directed at the West, <sup>295</sup> nevertheless, by laying the foundation for the worldwide spread of Greek culture in his Eastern Empire, Alexander created the conditions for its expansion also to the West, beyond the political boundaries of his kingdom. Even before Alexander’s time, Greek culture had made a certain expansion further to the West; but Hellenism penetrating Rome is what is valuable in the history of the world – which would never have taken place like it did, without the conditions being created for it. Since Rome became a kingdom many elements of Greek culture were taken from the Greek cities of Lower Italy, first the alphabet, then the cult of the gods, art and some legal norms - yet this was only a drop in the bucket, by which, to a large extent, from the middle of the third century B.C., Greek culture overshadowed Roman society. The beginning of this process began in 240 B.C., a year after the victorious end of the First Punic War, when Livius Andronicus of Tarentum first made a Latin translation of a Greek work of art for the Roman games. There are two things characteristic of Rome in this sense. First of all, the Senate ordered whose were works to be done. It is important to note that this step came officially from the government. It was also the Senate which twenty years earlier initiated the use of silver coins with which Roman trade was introduced into the Hellenistic trade zone. It is significant that the same Senate now ordered the translation of the Greek works. This justified the existence of a cultural program parallel to the economic program. Now a connection with the Hellenistic world was sought through the intellectual sphere. It therefore seems legitimate to say that the Hellenization of Rome recreated Alexander’s life’s work. If Greek culture had not achieved a world wide position, the Senate would not have perceived it and introduced it to Rome.

---

<sup>294</sup> Ulrich Wilken, *Alexander the Great*, Mislal, Skopje, 1988, p. 340.

<sup>295</sup> Alexander the Great advocated East-West in Curtius Rufus, from the 9th century, printed in the 15th century.

Secondly, it was a high achievement to see a Greek play performed in Latin. It was an important moment for future European history that the Romans, after taking over Greek literature, adopted Latin, that is, their native language.<sup>296</sup> This independence that the Romans maintained against foreign culture distinguished them from the oriental peoples, and corresponded to their strong and proud national self-consciousness, in which lay the secret of their extraordinary power. But since the beginning Greek poetry remained in Latin, Latin prose was not yet developed and the first imitations of Greek prose literature in Rome were in Greek. Fabius Pictor was the first Roman who intended to write Roman history, - a Roman copy of Berossus and Manetho - at the end of the third century wrote his work 'Chronicle' in Greek, and so did his followers. Cato the Elder in the second century was the first who compiled a Latin history in his work 'Originality'. From then on, the Romans wrote their prose only in Latin."

It has been confirmed, Latin was not a spoken language but only an official one -it was a new language.

"This is not the place to describe how this Hellenization, solemnly introduced by the Senate, the representative of the ruling aristocracy, spread strongly throughout Roman society in the following centuries, especially in the circle of the Scipios in the second century. It is only necessary to say that in language, as in other things, and especially in art, the Romans, in the face of all Hellenization, constantly defended their own special character, so that the result was a Greco-Roman mixture, the quality of which, although determined by the Greek component, nevertheless possessed a specifically Roman tone. In Cicero and the poetic circle of Augustus this Greco-Roman mixture of culture reached a height that raised it much higher than the decadent Greek culture of that time. For the entire course of later European history down to the present day, it has been of immense importance that

---

<sup>296</sup> The Romans spoke only a barbarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic language. Latin was officially-dead.

the Romans have consistently succeeded in spreading this Greco-Roman culture to the West of the continent, especially in Spain and Gaul. They laid the foundation of the Romance nations and their culture and decided that Latin should be the language that would be used in the West, as Greek was in the East. It should also be noted that the Greco-Roman culture which developed a Greco-Roman art at the beginning of the imperial era, had a second effect in the East now under Roman rule, especially in Syria, where the Romans built great buildings in Balbeck and Palmyra. The essential independence and importance of this Greco-Roman mixed culture forced the Hellenistic period to be interrupted with Augustus, and with him to begin a new epoch of ancient history, which was the Roman Empire.

Latin was the successor of Koine, to the “Greco-Roman mixed culture”.

Plutarch, <sup>297</sup> about Marcus Tullius Cicero, under I-4, wrote:

“Apollonius, he says, did not understand Latin, so Cicero asked him to deliver a speech in Hellenic. He listened to him very gladly, because he thought that in this way the correction would be easier. When he finished the speech, the listeners were amazed and stood up to compete with each other in praise. But Apollonius, who had listened attentively, after his lecture, thought and sat in silence for a long time, and when Cicero felt almost offended by this, he said: ‘You, Cicero, I praise you and admire you, but I pity Hellas for her fate, seeing how the only glory that remains is being passed on to the Romans: education and eloquence.’”

It was cited: “Apollonius, he says, did not understand Latin.”

It follows that Latin was not a vernacular language, but only an official one, and is still a dead language today.

Many Roman emperors were of Balkan origin. Such were Diocletian, Aurelian, Maximinus Thracian, Galerius, Constantine the Great... Many

---

<sup>297</sup> Plutarch, *Glorious Characters I*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1990, p. 206.

of them spoke with a pronounced ‘barbarian’ accent, and some could not completely eliminate numerous ‘barbarian’ words from everyday use. It has been confirmed that Latin was not a vernacular language, but only an official language.

Since Latin was poor in words, about 10,000 more words were added to it, which are said to be of Koine (Greek) and Latin origin.

H.G. Wells <sup>298</sup> wrote: “Nero (54 to 68 A.D.)...a revolt broke out in Britain against the Romans...(61 B.C.)...The Roman population by its nature clearly betrayed the Etruscan blood that flowed in its veins... Nero... committed suicide (68 A.D.).”

“With the death of Marcus Aurelius...It is enough if we mention only a few emperors of that age, who seem to have been more capable than the other rulers of that age, and such emperors were, for example, Septimius Severus, Aurelian and Probus. Septimius Severus was a Carthaginian. His sister did not learn Latin in her whole life. In the middle of Rome she managed her domestic servants in the Punic language; Cato the Elder certainly turned in his grave. The other emperors of that age were adventurers...” <sup>299</sup>

Latin was not a vernacular language but a barbarian one - this was the language of the Phoenicians.

Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic, <sup>300</sup> under the title “Franciscus Maria Appendijni...” wrote: “So, if we return at this moment to Ovid’s imprecise explanations in his letters, sent in the form of poems in Rome to his friends, known under the name ‘Tristia’, that he learned to speak and even to write poems in the language of the ‘Barbarians’, which he now calls Thracian, now Dacian, now Getic, Scythian, or Sarmatian, we can still draw one sure conclusion from such an explanation, and that is:

---

<sup>298</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 261.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 264.

<sup>300</sup> Olga- Lukovic- Pjanovic, *Serbs...the oldest people*, Dosije, Belgrade, 1990-taken from the Internet.

Ovid, a man of the pen, could not have learned five different languages, in which he wrote new poems, but he always used the individual names in the singular, i.e. either he sent news to his friends that he sang in Getic, or he used some other name, but always in the sense that it was about one single ‘barbarian’... Accordingly, one thing is certain: regardless of what name the poet used, it was always about one single language, because if it were not so, he would somehow have made it known that five different names denoted five different speeches. So, on the Black Sea coast, only one language echoed everywhere, and a French travel writer claimed that he heard the same language everywhere around the Black Sea, in the Danube region and further from there as early as the third century after Christ... We talk about that French travel writer and diplomat in the chapter on Ovid, and here we will only underline his claim that it was about the same Slavic speech that he heard on the Balkan Peninsula. Thus, the French ethnologist Millet of the last century wrote, carried away by some kind of amazement: ‘And that’s something! They forgot that they are brothers, but from the Black Sea to the Adriatic you will be greeted with good day in the Serbian language!’

“now Thracian, now Dacian, now Getian, Scythian, or Sarmatian” was Pelasgian.

Titus Livius (59 B.C. - 17 A.D.) cited the decision of the Roman Senate: “The Macedonians should remain free”, because “the Romans felt a kindred spirit with the Macedonians”.<sup>301</sup>

The Macedonians were Pelasgians with a Pelasgian language. Then they were also barbarians.

A barbarian language was a vernacular language that was Pelasgian. Pelasgian was spoken by ... the Hellenes, the Aeolians, the Macedonians, the inhabitants of the Apennines with the Romans.

---

<sup>301</sup> Titus Livious, *Ab urbe condita libri*, ed. “Weissenborn- M. Müller”, XI.V.Lipsiae, 1906, 29, 4.

According to Dionysius <sup>302</sup>: “The language used by the Romans is neither completely barbaric nor absolutely Hellenic, but represents a mixture of the two. The greater part of that language is identical with the Aeolian dialect.” <sup>303</sup> From this it follows that the Romans spoke “the greater part of that language is identical with the Aeolian dialect”. It is seen that the language was an Aeolian dialect which was Hellenic, and Hellas was Pelasgian. To this should be added what Herodotus said: “The Aeolians were and were called Pelasgians”. <sup>304</sup> Since the Pelasgian language was barbaric, here only three dialects of the Pelasgian (barbarian) language are involved, which were mutually intelligible as dialects. It is strange here why the term barbarian is used for a dialect. The same happened with the term Pelasgian. This shows that gradually the old dialects were suppressed, and replaced by others. Since there were no unifying nations at that time, their languages were dialects. This was an occasion for them to differ from each other in various dialects. The most important thing here is that the Latin language was only an official one. So it was a dead language, and the people spoke the so-called Homeric (so-called Slavic) language.

The Romans spoke the so-called Slavic. This is exactly what European authors hide.

Udal'tsov and others <sup>305</sup> say: “when we observe the structure of one of the Germanic languages - German, we find in it about 30% of the linguistic composition that cannot be explained on the basis of the Old Germanic language and which is a remnant of the old, pre-Indo-European (Japhat) stage of development of this language, which is also indicated by other relics in that same language. Accordingly, the idea of

---

<sup>302</sup> The historian Dionysius (60 B.C.-7 A.D.) was from Halicarnassus - the Romans were Barbarians = Pelasgians.

<sup>303</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, book “I. 90”. (N. Densunsianu, *Dacia praistorica*, Bucharest, 1982, p. 717).

<sup>304</sup> Herodotus, *History*, book VII ch. 95.

<sup>305</sup> A.D. Udal'tsov, J.A. Kosminski and O.L. Weinstein (1969): “History of the Middle Ages”, I, Scientific Book.

a special ‘Aryan character’ of the Indo-European peoples, which would go through a development that supposedly has nothing in common with the development of other languages, is not true.”

The Old Germanic language was 100% Indo-European (Aryan = Pelasgian = so-called Slavic), and the Gothic language was 100% Mongolian. Today’s German language contains 70% (so-called Slavic) and only 30% Semitic and Turkish words of the Mongolian=Gothic race: Watson, Hungary with 5% Hungarians-with its own Hungarian composition.

West of Germany biracial, east of France triracial Gothic languages. For the Gothic languages, Beijing was Peking=pe (city) king-kenig (ruler), Viking, ing...

So with those biracial and triracial languages, the Europeans are descended from the so-called Slavs.

H.G. Wells <sup>306</sup> wrote: “One of the immediate consequences... They began to write books for the people. With the fourteenth century the history of European literature in the true sense of the word really began. Individual local dialects soon gave way to the common and general literary languages of individual peoples (nations).

Uniform and pure literary languages developed: Italian, English, French and Spanish, and somewhat later the uniform German language. <sup>307</sup> All these languages, with use, gradually became refined and perfected in terms of clarity and conciseness of expressions. Finally they reached a level where in philosophical discussions they were able to replace Greek and Latin in every respect.”

---

<sup>306</sup> Herbert George Wells, *History of the World*, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 427.

<sup>307</sup> In Germany, mainly due to the political divisions of countless states and statelets, dialects in literature were preserved somewhat longer than in other large nations of the West. Luther’s translation of the Holy Scriptures is usually considered the basis of today’s New High German literary language. Note transl.

Since “Individual local dialects soon gave way to the common and general literary languages of individual peoples”, the official languages were not vernacular. The vernacular language was barbarian=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic. And it was also that of the Romans.

Since Koine and Latin were biracial, and Germanic triracial, everything is clear.

## **THE COPTIC LANGUAGE WAS PELASGIAN = SO-CALLED SLAVIC LANGUAGE**

According to Larousse <sup>308</sup>: “Aton’s prophet. The official god Amon during the 15th century favoured the popular piety that sees in him the protector of every person... Amenophis IV’s court decided to react, so a special honour was given to the cult of the Sun in the form of Aten... Under his influence, Egyptian culture underwent a radical change. Following the example of the hymn composed by the king, the scribes replaced the Egyptian literary language with the spoken language...”

It was emphasized: “they replaced the Egyptian literary language with the spoken language.”

A transition from the language of the pharaohs to the official Egyptian language followed.

P. DU Bourguet S.J., <sup>309</sup> on p. 5, wrote: “The people who created this art are not unknown. They can be traced back to their illustrious ancestors and show first-class gifts and creations. The Copts come directly from Egypt in the Pharaonic period. The designation ‘Coptic’ is an abbreviation of the word ‘Aigyptios’, which allows the first diphthong to be dropped. Also ‘Aigyptios’ is undoubtedly a Greek

---

<sup>308</sup> General Encyclopedia LAROUSSE, Paris 1967-za Yugoslavia Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade, 1973, vol. 3, p. 237.

<sup>309</sup> P. DU Bourguet S.J., Die Kopten, Holle Verlag • Baden- Baden, 1967.



derivation of the Pharaonic word ‘Het-ka-Ptah’, ‘the house of the ka (soul) of Ptah’, by which the sanctuary at Memphis was designated. The expression was modified by the Arabs, whose written language knew neither vowels nor initial letters...” (Procopius = Pro Copt + t = Copt-he Copt, R.I.) (Прокоп=про коп + т = копт- тој копат, Р.И.)

“The Coptic language was used by narrow circles. It was written and spoken by the Egyptians until the 13th century. Then it had to give way to Arabic, but until recently it remained the liturgical language of Christians of Egyptian origin. With new administrative and religious conditions, enriched with linguistic treasures, it formed the last phase of the Pharaonic language. Instead of using hieroglyphs, enriched with seven of their own (Coptic) letters, they made the Greek alphabet available; thus, it was of great help to Champollion in deciphering Egyptian hieroglyphs. His knowledge is still indispensable for Egyptologists, who are busy with philology.”<sup>310</sup> (Copt kopat=rezhit... bukki=bukka-va, R.I.) (Копт копат=режит... букви=бука-ва, Р.И.)

Since Champollion deciphered the hieroglyphs in the Coptic language, which arose from ancient Egyptian, the so-called Coptic language was only the vernacular language of the pharaohs.

It follows that the connection of the Copts can be traced back to the time of the pharaohs. This indicates that this language belonged to the pharaohs. So, to the people - the Egyptians, and they were Caucasians.

It is concluded that the Coptic language of the Egyptians was Pelasgian=so-called Slavic.

However, the confusion was created only by the ancient Egyptian language, which was biracial.

---

<sup>310</sup> Ibid., p. 6.

Andreas Heine <sup>311</sup> pointed out: “Coptic arose from the ancient Egyptian language of the Egyptian people. This language, spoken in many dialects on the earth, developed into a literary language already in the 2nd/3rd century.”

Follow the language of the pharaohs before the existence of ancient Egyptian, there was a spoken language with many dialects. With the reform of ancient Egyptian without Semitic words, the spoken language returned to several dialects from which a literary language emerged.

Ljubomir Domazetović <sup>312</sup> wrote: “The discovery in Egypt of a so-called Coptic manuscript from the 3rd century B.C. with preserved text written in an ancient language once spoken by Christians living in Egypt, shows complete identity with the Alphabetic script, as can be seen from the found Coptic script.

This script unequivocally indicates a kinship with the Old Slavic language, in other words, a kinship with the Illyrian script and language. Considering the historical depth of the use of the Coptic script in Egypt, scientists have established that it began to be used as early as the 8th century B.C...”

“Coptic alphabet and old Coptic from the 4th century B.C. The script was used in Egypt from the 8th century B.C. Certain words in the text can be easily understood by members of the Slavic peoples...” <sup>313</sup>

Martin Bernal <sup>314</sup> wrote: “This positive opinion, as well as the persistent conviction that Greek culture came from Egypt and Phoenicia, was transformed into a new, non-mystical doctrine. In 1763, the brilliant Abbot Barthélemy, who had deciphered the Palmyrene and Phoenician languages, submitted an article entitled ‘General Reflections on the

---

<sup>311</sup> Andreas K. Heyne, *Wenig bekannte Hochkulturen*, Editiones Roche, Basel, 1993, p. 95.

<sup>312</sup> Ljubomir Domazetović, *Ancient History and Origin of Serbs and Slavs*, Belgrade, 1995, p. 257.

<sup>313</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 291.

<sup>314</sup> Martin Bernal, *Black Athena*, Tabernacle, Skopje, p. 112.

Relations between the Egyptian, Phoenician and Greek Languages'. In that article, his first correct assumption, for which he relied on Kircher – whose work he otherwise considered fantastic – was that the Coptic language was a form of ancient Egyptian. He also recognized the linguistic family that would later bear the name 'Semitic', which he called 'Phoenician'. On these two grounds, he established that Egyptian, although not a Semitic language, is related to the Semitic family. It is true that some of his lexical evidence may today prove to be erroneous, therefore that certain Coptic words are due to borrowings from Semitic in late Egyptian. However, no objection can be made to the main lines of his argument, which appeal to similarities between pronunciation and grammatical features. In this sense Barthélemy is a pioneer of what we would today call Afroasiatic studies.

Following the Coptic language had no Semitic basis - it was not the language of the black race.

“Barthélemy admits that he cannot see such parallels between Coptic and Greek. Nevertheless, he believed in the Egyptian colonization and civilization of Greece and considered it ‘impossible in that exchange of ideas and goods that the Egyptian language did not participate in the formation of Greek’. He then offers a list of etymologies from Egyptian to Greek, several of which - for example, Coptic *hof*, Demotic *hf*<sup>315</sup> in Greek *ophis* (snake) - still seem plausible today.”<sup>316</sup>

Since he “cannot see such parallels between Coptic and Greek”, it is confirmed that ancient Egyptian and Koine were biracial languages of Whites and Blacks, and that Coptic and Church languages were reformed without Semitic (Black) words.

Ulrich Wilken<sup>317</sup> wrote: “In Egypt too the native language eventually triumphed over Greek. The last Greek papyrus text – Arabic-Greek

---

<sup>315</sup> Demotic was Macedonian, with a Bitola dialect. So Coptic and Macedonian were one and the same.

<sup>316</sup> Ibid., p. 113.

<sup>317</sup> Ulrich Wilken, *Alexander the Great*, Mislal, Skopje, 1988, p. 349.

bilingual – belongs to the tenth century. Since the oldest papyrus dates from the time of Alexander, and that is a long period – about 1300 years – the effects of Alexander’s life’s work can be traced in the continuity of the Greek language in the Nile Valley. The Egyptian language prevailed during that period. Despite the complete success of Hellenization, the old Egyptian language survived forever among the masses, and after they became Christians, i.e. ‘Copts’, a literature developed which, like Syriac, was predominantly Christian, including secular literature, as a Coptic version of Alexander’s vision. It may be considered as the last triumph of Hellenism that from the third century A.D. the Egyptians transcribed this Coptic language, which is nothing but a developed Old Egyptian language, with a Greek alphabet, with a few additional demotic signs, and later they rejected the hieroglyphs and the demotic script.<sup>318</sup> The Coptic language, as opposed to the Arabic, that is, of the new conqueror, continued until the eighteenth, and in a few cases until the nineteenth century. The Coptic Bible is still read in Coptic liturgy, although it is not understood. But in Central Asia the Arabic language was the real conqueror.”

Ancient Egyptian was reformed, and without Semitic words, there was a language of the white race, Coptic=Pelasgian=so-called Slavic, which was spoken by the white Egyptians before the Old Egyptian language was included - the biracial of the white and black races.

Since the Egyptians were reborn with the biracial Arabic language, which was only vulgar Aramaic, today there are only Arabs with the Arabic language - in North Africa.

## **THE CHURCH LANGUAGE, A HERITAGE OF KOINE**

The church language was a reformed Koine- without Semitic (Black) elements.

---

<sup>318</sup> The Rosetta Stone contained hieroglyphs, Koine and Macedonian text with Brygian=Bitolian speech.

Martin Bernal <sup>319</sup> wrote: “Here we begin with morphology, or the modifications of words according to number, gender, case, tense, etc. With the exception of Hittite, Greek is the earliest attested Indo-European language, and the extent of its morphological ‘decay’ is therefore quite striking. Although the original Indo-European verb system seems to be very well preserved in Greek, nouns in Greek have only five cases, while Latin, first recorded over 1000 years later, had six; and Lithuanian, recorded only in modern times, contains all eight cases postulated for Proto-Indo-European. The morphological loss experienced by Greek suggests that there was intensive contact with other languages; this is consistent with the lexical evidence and weakens the Autochthonous Origin Model. However, it can be explained by both the Ancient and Aryan model which, unlike the Autochthonous Origin Model, can precisely explain such contact.

However, the main interest of these two chapters is in verb borrowings. As I mentioned, the Indo-European component of the Greek lexicon is relatively small. For example, languages such as Old Church Slavonic and Lithuanian, which were first attested 2000 years later than Greek, possess a significantly higher proportion of roots with cognates in other Indo-European languages...”

Gustav Weigand <sup>320</sup> wrote: “That’s how it came about... But we very clearly notice the influence of Greek syntax..., because the first translators of the Holy Scriptures came from Thessaloniki, the Brothers Cyril and Methodius, their Greek model translated with such careful accuracy, so as not to change the holy word of God...”

The above confirms that the so-called Old Church Slavonic was only a Koine successor.

---

<sup>319</sup> Martin Bernal, *Crna Athena*, Tabernakul, Skopje, p. 45.

<sup>320</sup> Gustav Weigand (1860-1930), *Ethnographie von Makedonien*, Leipzig, Friedrich Brandstetter, 1924, p. 15.

Just as the Coptic language, which was Pelasgian = so-called Slavic, came from ancient Egyptian without Semitic elements, the same was done by Constantine the Philosopher. He removed the Koine the Koine Semitic elements of ancient Egyptian, and it led to the barbaric = Pelasgian = so-called Slavic - it was so-called Homer, popular with the Romans.

It is stated that Constantine the Philosopher created the Slavic letters. However, in Vita Constantini the verb 'creates' is not used for something new, but only 'composes' or 'assembles' something old, which existed for millennia before the Thessalonian Brothers. So, the Slavic letters were not created but reassembled from a pre-existing alphabet.

Olga Lukovic-Pjanovic, <sup>321</sup> subtitle c) Symprien Robert for the Cyrillic alphabet...wrote:

"Immediately after that, C. Robert continued his presentation, claiming...

'But someone will tell me...didn't the learned monk Hrabri from the tenth century say:...

'The first Slavs had no letters, but they read divination with the help of lines and cuts (chertamni i ryezami). They could not clearly mark the runes (characters).'

This type of writing, continues Cyprien Robert, immediately after the above statement...

With a sensitivity that - after Cyprien Robert - seems to have not been lacking among Serbian scholars, he tried at all costs to prove the existence of Slavic and Serbian literacy before the Christian era. To that end, on p. 230. in 'Slovanski svet', he mentions:

---

<sup>321</sup> Olga- Lukovic- Pjanovic, Serbs...the oldest people, Dosije, Belgrade, 1990-taken from the Internet.

‘a scholar Ilir-Solaric, who left an unpublished manuscript under the title ‘Hieroglyphics of Slavs’, in which he collected all the known testimonies, in order to prove that Slavic hieroglyphs existed before Christ.<sup>322</sup> We can doubt, says Cyprian Robert, that the Slavs had a complete hieroglyphic system, but they knew the Amaranth runes, and if there are only a small number of inscriptions of this type, it is the fault of the winters and frosts, which for more than two thousand years passed over the walls and the graves of the ancient Slavic heroes.’”

The various runes in the whole of Europe were with a multitude of so-called Cyrillic letters.

Since the so-called Cyrillic letters were the so-called Slavic ones, Europe was the so-called Slavic with its dark vowel which to this day is present in all languages in France, Portuguese, etc.

H.G. Wells<sup>323</sup> pointed out: “Already in due time...And again general uncertainty arose in Europe. The Semites rose up against the Aryans, so Hellenism in all of Western Asia as well as in Egypt was suppressed by Arab education...”

A distinction is made between Pelasgians (Whites) and Semites (Blacks). Hellenism follows with the Hellenic language, which was biracial in Asia, and Egypt was suppressed by Arab education with the Arabic language, which arose from the Aramaic language. This was the reason for the rebirth of the Egyptians, whose national language was the one spoken by the pharaohs before the existence of ancient Egyptian, from which Coptic arose. The same happened with the resulting church language - the people spoke only their national language.

---

<sup>322</sup> It is assumed that Cyprian Robert is referring to Pavle Solaric, who lived from 1779-1821. Solaric was a proofreader in the printing house of the Greek Theodosius in the Venetians. Literature is considered. Without any great value. However, his “Geography” is interesting: he also wrote works with a historical tendency: we think that among them is “Hiegoglyphika Slavska”.

<sup>323</sup> Herbert George Wells, History of the World, 1929, Narodno delo, Belgrade, p. 432.

Just as the Egyptians lost their own language with Arabic becoming the language of Islam, the Phrygians lost their language to that of the Ottomans, which was developed by Sultan Mehmed Karaman (13th century) - he introduced Tatar-Turkish words, spoken by Tatar and Circassian soldiers, into the Persian language using Persian script. There was also a Circassian unit in the army. Thus, the Phrygians' language was gradually lost to the Ottoman language with Mongolian words, as well as words from the languages of the Tatars and Circassians. The same happened with the Brygians = Brsjaks, and the Albanians (Shkiptars) were also Brygians - Brygos was Durres. They were 100% under the Ohrid Archbishopric, with the church language. The Shkiptar language contained all the so-called Slavic sounds, the so-called Slavic dark vowel, the Macedonian l', the Brigian dative u of surnames and the final t of the third person singular, as well as the non-use of the first x (h) like the Brigites (harmonica, ajvar, ajduk...). According to Ami Bue, the Shkiptar language was new and was being created in his time (19th century). This is also confirmed by Vuk Karadžić - the Shkiptar language contains all the so-called Vuk sounds, and Karadžić created it in the 19th century. For Gustav Mayer, the Shkiptar language contained Tatar-Turkish words, only Mongolian. The Shkiptai make mistakes in our so-called Slavic genders.

Besides the 100% Slavic so-called Slavs, for the Shkiptars as Muslims=Turks the church language was no longer needed, but rather Arabic and the language of the Ottomans. In the 19th century, about 1 million Asians colonized the region between Vranje and Shar Planina, and they multiplied greatly... Only after the Crimean War, 100,000 Tatars and 500,000 Circassians (G. Weigand - 1924). So they are the Ghegs: Ghegs are 90%, and Tosks = Shkiptars 10%. As proof that the Ghegs and Tosks are two different peoples, they do not understand each other, do not communicate and do not intermarry. They were connected by Islam. Then followed their unification with the Shkiptar language, the first schools of which were opened by Austria and Italy in 1924. The unification was in the SFR Yugoslavia with the Shkiptar language



since 1972. As proof that the Tosks and Ghegs were not the same people, in 1997 the same Tosks in the south fought against the wild Ghegs to divide Shkiptaria into southern Tosk and northern Gheg. This was prevented by Austria, Italy and others.

## LITERATURE

The title of this book is based on the works of several authors. Parts of the author's books were also used for this book:

1. "The Mediterranean, the Homeland of the Europeans", A5 format.
  - a. first edition August 1998, pages 354 (10)
  - b. second edition March 1999, pages 519 (10)
  - c. third edition May 2007, pages 621 (9)
2. "New Alexander the Great" (so-called Skanderbeg Georgi Kastriot)
  - a. first edition March 2001, pages 159 (9)
  - b. second edition June 2003, pages 334 (9)
3. "Revival of the Macedonians", August 2001.
4. "Revival of Ancient Macedonia", April 2002.
5. "Caucasian-Black Sea Albanians-Arnauts", June 2002.
6. "Vlachs-so-called Slavs", September 2002.
7. "Conspiracy against the ancient Macedonians", October 2002.
8. "Greeks-an artificial people", April 2003.
9. "Cattle feed", May 2003.
10. "Slavs-German forgery", June 2003.

11. "Germans and Macedonians-one and the same", July 2003.
12. "Europeans originated from the Balkans and Asia Minor", March 2004.
13. "Greeks-degenerate Scлавenes and Slavs", June 2004.
14. "Macedonian Comnenus Albania", August 2004.
15. "Homeric Troy of the Natives - the so-called Slavs", January 2005.
16. "The Jews - the so-called Slavs", April 2005.
17. "Homeric = the so-called Slavic Macedonia", October 2005.
18. "Albanian Colonists in Macedonia", January 2006.
19. "Atlantis - a Forgery of Solon and Plato", December 2006.
20. "The Brigittes and the Brzyacs were Older than the Egyptians", March 2007.
21. "The Albanians Descended from the Brzyacs and the Miacs", May 2007.
22. "The Bulgarians were the Tatars and the Arnauts", May 2007.
23. "Homerovites. Slavic Moravians=Greeks", August 2007.
24. "From Macedonian Orthodox to Turkish Muslims", November 2007.
25. "The Whites, a People with One Language", in German, 319 pages, 07.03.2008
26. "Macedonian Georgi Kastriotis, so-called Skanderbeg", 15.04.2008.
27. "Hellas", in German, 148 pages, 14.06.2008.
28. "Slavs forgery", 250 pages, 18.09.2008.

29. "The Hellenes and the Greeks, a forgery", 199 pages, A5 format, 13.11.2008.
30. "Pre-Danubian Macedonia", 296 pages, A5 format, 21.01.2009.
31. "Ethnography of Macedonia", in German, pages 81 A4 format, 24.02.2009.
32. "Who we became", pages 256 A4 format, 18.05.2009.
33. "European Crimes Against Macedonia", pages 104, 17.06.2009.
34. "Greeks, Albanians and Vlachs Artificial Nationalities", pages 175, 05.08.2009.
35. "Greeks with a Biracial Language of Whites (Pelasgians) and Blacks (Semites)", p. 318, 09.10.2009.
36. "Macedonians with a single-racial language of Whites (Pelasgians)", Jewish..., pages 73, 18.11.2009.
37. "For Procopius of Caesarea (6th century A.D.) there are no Slavs", pages 100, 15.12.2009.
38. "Europe only Macedonian, Venetian = Slav = so-called Slavic", pages 121, 12.01.2010.
39. "Russians were not Slavs", pages 74, 29.01.2010.
40. "Serbs were not Slavs but Tribals, Thracians", pages 142, 08.03.2010.
41. "Monotheism - a crime against humanity", p. 241, 27.04.2010.
42. "Whites, one people with the same symbolism", pages 118, 05/28/2010.
43. "Ancient = ethnic Macedonia", pages 226, 08/09/2010.
44. "Alexander the Great of Rufus - a forgery", pages 311, 10/04/2010.

45. "The Bulgarians were Macedonians", pages 288, 11/23/2010.
46. "Brigid Shambhala", pages 178, 01/03/2011.
47. "Brigid mythology moved to the south", pages 115, 01/25/2011.
48. "There was never a Jewish ethnic people", pages 99, 02/17/2011.
49. "Europeans and traditions from across the Balkans", pages 117, 10.03.2011.
50. "Masonic history - a forgery", pages 117, 07.04.2011.
51. "Europeans race-unconscious - with multiracial languages", pages 122, 10.05.2011.
52. "Macedonian haters against Macedonians", pages 85, 31.05.2011.
53. "Egyptians with Slavic mythology", pages 139, 14.07.2011.
54. "European history - a forgery", p. 119, 10.08.2011.
55. "Albanians a bicontinental and biracial so-called people", p. 122, 05.09.2011.
56. "Without ethnic peoples", p. 84, 28.09.2011.
57. "Germans Brigs and Macedonians - doubly Macedonian", p. 100, 25.10.2011.
58. "Herodotus's History only in the so-called Slavic language", p. 142, 28.11.2011.
59. "Turkey Phrygia = Brigs", p. 98, 21.12.2011.
60. "Macedonians - natives", p. 102, 10.01.2012.
61. "Greeks only Slavic speech and accent", p. 54, 08.02.2012.
62. "Macedonians only with indigenous traditions", p. 62, 29.02.2012.
63. "The Danube - without population", p. 62 (12), 22.03.2012.

64. "Albanians - Muslim colonists", p. 124, 25.04.2012.
65. "Albanians - fascists", p. 98, 16.05.2012.
66. "Slavicization. Slavs indigenous to the Peloponnese", p. 62, 26.05.2012.
67. "Macedonians and Non-Macedonians", p. 137, 14.07.2012.
68. "Biblical Jews unknown in history", p. 212, 11.09.2012.
69. "The Slavs - the biggest historical lie", p. 66, 01.10.2012.
70. "The Germans with British - Macedonian traditions", p. 192, 04.12.2012.
71. "The so-called Slavic Polytheists - Germanites are Christians", p. 86, 26.12.2013.
72. "Without an ethnic German people", p. 190, 18.02.2013.
73. "The Germans were born so-called Slavs", p. 115, 19.03.2013.
74. "The Goths were Mongols", p. 150, 29.04.2013.
75. "The Iliad - a forgery", p. 130, 11.06.2013.
76. "The Albanian colonists - the Macedonian hostages", p. 135, 16.07.2013.
77. "The Germans were only Slavinites. Slavs", p. 134, 19.08.2013.
78. "Ancient Macedonians were Pelasgians (so-called Slavs)", p. 138, 23.09.2013.
79. "Europeans of Eastern Mediterranean Origin", p. 325, 11.12.2013.
80. "Grigor Prlichev and the Asian Arnauts", p. 192, 30.01.2014.
81. "European Balkan Illyrian Slavs", p. 114, 26.02.2014.

82. "So-called non-Slavic Europeans with multiracial languages", p. 119, 03.04.2014.
83. "Mavro Orbini (1601) - The Slavs are just a forgery", p. 249, 09.06.2014.
84. "Brigian = Brzyak - the proto-language of the Whites", p. 110, 02.07.2014.
85. "Albanians in the Republic of Macedonia - only since 1780", p. 182, 29.08.2014.
86. "The Hellenes (so-called Greeks) in 1904 were only so-called Slavs", p. 208, 01.12. 2014.
- A. "About Macedonian affairs - articles from FB - pages", p. 215, 02.06.2015.
- B. "Corrupt judiciary, anti-state prosecution and non-national ombudsman", pages 232, 04.06.2015.
87. "Macedonian natives - without Slavs and in "Veda Slovena"" , p. 162, 31.08.2015.
88. "Atlantis - a story about the sinking of the Levant", p. 132, 08.10.2015
89. "The vernacular language of the Europeans was Pelasgian. Slavic", German, p. 153, 05.01.2016
90. "During the time of Alexander the Great there was no Koine (so-called ancient Greek)", p. 190, 07.03.2016
91. "Levantine blood group A older than Plato's Atlantis", p. 106, 09.04.2016.
92. "The Hebrew language like the Phoenicians and Venetians ancient Slavs", p. 150, 27.05.2016.

93. "The Romans spoke so-called Slavic - the Vlachs descended from so-called Slavs", p. 170, 07.07.2016.
94. "The language of the Macedonian Vlachs originating from Genoa", p. 186, 22.08.2016.
95. "The origin of the so-called Slavs - only theses and theories", p. 150, 15.10.2016.
- C. "On Macedonian affairs - articles from FB - pages 2", p. 236, 31.10.2015.
96. "The Romans (so-called Byzantines) = Christians - The Slavs (so-called Slavs) = Polytheists", 260, 18.01.
97. "The Thracian and Illyrian languages Macedonian dialects", p. 204, 30.03.2017.
98. "The Bi-racial Albanians", in German, p. 102, 01.06.2017.
99. "There was no real Troy", p. 96, 03.07.2017.
100. "The Macedonians older than the biblical Ezra - Jews", p. 212, 04.09.2017.

NOTE: Books under 25, 27 and 31, which are in German, can be found on the Internet: [www.brigien.com](http://www.brigien.com). And this applies to Zmejova Dupka, which is mentioned in the "Iliad" by the Crna Reka, in Demir Hisar, between the villages of Dolenci and Babino. The same applies to books under 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38...and 100 in Macedonian. And this 101st book is also included on the Internet.