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Alternative Introduction

We decided not to write a traditional foreword, but instead offer ten phrases with different answers to the question: what kind of book have we produced?

Here are these ten phrases:

1. This book is about the fact that the Trojans defeated the Greeks and not the other way around, as is commonly believed.

2. This book is about the fact that the well-known Greek religion, with its specific anthropomorphism, was artificially created for political reasons.

3. This book is about the fact that soft power, information warfare, and the falsification of history do not constitute innovations, but that they are the oldest essential characteristic of Western thinking.

4. This book refutes the conventional wisdom that "history is written by the victors". On the contrary, we have shown that the victors are those who have managed to write history.

5. This is a book about our postmodern world, where universals contradict each other, each of them entailing other universals as "my other" and we have shown the horizons in terms of solving the problem of post-modernism.

6. This book tells the story of an exciting journey to Troy — both to ancient Troy and to modern Troy.

7. This is a book that will be clear to everyone, and not only those educated in the humanities, because it is written in a way that is as bright, lively and interesting as a mystery thriller.

8. This is a book of science, which opposes the fashionable sensational historical fast food that has recently appeared on bookstore shelves under the anarchic banner “anything goes”.

9. This book is about the struggle for historical truth and justice, immersing us in the world, because without truth we are orphans.

10. This is a book about how history unfolds like a musical piece and we, by an audible note, wouldn’t be able to guess which note occurred previously or predict which one comes next or project the present into the past and the future. To hear the music of history, one must have the historical ability to hear.

---

Chapter 1. Mega-mall to megaron. Pilgrimage to the land of Homer

It takes half an hour to travel from Europe to Asia. This is the exact amount of time it takes for a car-ferry, connecting the Gallipoli peninsula with the Anatolian coast, to cross the Dardanelles. It takes about one hour from the fishing town of Gelibolu to reach our final destination. During this last stretch in our journey, we are overtaken with a special feeling. The road to Troy! This phrase is full of solemnity, and puts us into a poetic mindset. We echo Homer’s Zeus:

For of all cities beneath sun and starry heaven wherein men that dwell upon the face of the earth have their abodes, of these sacred Ilios was most honoured of my heart

Iliad. IV. 45-46.

The landscape outside the window, however, is at odds with the soul’s condition. Scant vegetated low hills alternate with sunflower and small pine wood plantations. Only a thin blue band on the horizon reminds us that we are coming to the centre of what was once a mighty marine state in ancient times. Behind a stunted cornfield, we turn onto a rural road. In other five minutes we arrive at the village of Tevfikye. Today is Ramazan, and Troy is opened for visitors only after one o’clock in the afternoon. In a cafe near the souvenir shop we have *that very* Turkish tea in small glasses and stare at the Greek tourists who have arrived here on a huge bus. Deciding to not wait for the opening, but instead to buy wooden horses and fridge magnets, they get on the bus and continue on their way to various battle sites related to the ancient Greeks’ glory.

Making a pilgrimage to these lands constitutes an extremely ancient tradition. Every pilgrimage itself represents a plot for an individual book and often even a key event in world history.
The Troad is the ancient name of the Biga Peninsula, where the infamous Troy is located.

In 480 B.C., while marching against the Greeks, Persian King Xerxes stopped his troops on the Hellespont coast. Two boat bridges were built across the narrow strait. Suddenly a storm occurred, destroying the constructions, which were fastened with papyrus ropes, after which the King commanded that the defiant waters be punished by lashes and that the builders be beheaded. Before a new ferry is built, Xerxes visits the legendary fortress. This is how Herodotus describes his visit as follows: “The King … wishing to examine the Kremlin of Priam’s city, climbed to its top. Having examined the Kremlin and listened to all the stories about what happened there, the King sacrificed 1000 bulls for Ilion Athena. Magi’s made sacrificial libation in honour of [local] heroes”\textsuperscript{2}. The generous hecatomb did not help Xerxes to break the Greek spirit down or to conquer Greece. Having suffered a few crushing defeats at the hands of the Greeks, having ceded them as part of his territory and having reduced the country to famine with his military adventures, Xerxes was murdered in the bedroom of his own palace.

In 334 B.C., the flotilla of another great conqueror entered the Hellespont waters. Having stopped his ship in the middle of the channel, Alexander the Great sacrificed a bull to Poseidon, the god of the seas. Then he approached the Troad coast and threw a lance onto the dusty ground. For the young king, this was a signal as to

\textsuperscript{2} Herodotus, Histories, VII, 43.
the beginning of the conquest of Asia: the “lance conquered” lands were considered to be a gift of the gods. Then he jumped off the ship and was the first one to go ashore. Since Alexander believed Achilles to be his ancestor, he laid a wreath on the grave of his great grandparent. He took the shield and weapon from Athena temple, which would soon bring him luck on the battle field. The first battle with the Persians took place on the Granicus River near Troy. The forty-thousand-strong army of Persian satraps was smashed in one fell swoop, after which groups of Macedonians penetrated the lands of the Asian continent like a knife …

Later, Alexander ordered to release Ilion from duties and to equip it with the necessary facilities, because he was seriously intent on founding the capital of his world empire there. His early death broke his plans, the great empire was cracked into parts, and the Troad lands, together with a larger part of Thrace, was passed to Alexander’s comrade Lysimachus to lead. Lysimachus built a high fence around the town, made local people settle at this site, and named it Alexandria³.

In 48 B.C. after the victory over Gnaeus Pompeius in the crucial battle at Pharsalia, Julius Caesar visited the Troad.

He is wandering about the ruins of famous Troy,
Looking for tracks of the great wall erected by Phoebe.
The depths of the dead forests and sponks are
Where the Assaracus palace was — and
The Divine’s temples can hardly stand on the ramshackle stones;
And all Pergamon is covered with thick blackthorn:
Even fragments died!⁴

Having traced his family tree back to Aeneas, he, like Alexander, pondered transferring the throne to Troy, which had been deserted.

Moreover, having visited Troy, Constantine the Great had also planned to found a new capital here until 330, when he changed his mind and instead chose to establish Byzantium on the shore of another channel connecting the Black and Mediterranean seas — the Bosporus. The Troad even seemed more preferable as the site for the capital: from there, it would be possible to control not only the narrow straits, but also the land roads of Asia Minor facing all the Ecumene⁵. However, the

---

³ Strabo, Geography, XIII, 26.
⁴ Lucan, Pharsalia, IX, 964-969.
⁵ Термин «ойкумена» употребляется для обозначения освоенной человечеством части мира. Введен древнегреческим географом Гекатеем Милетским (550—490 вв. до н.э.) для обозначения известной грекам части Земли с центром в Элладе.
The sea was already far from Ilion, and it had lost the key element of its existence — the harbour. The emperor gave this city on the Bosporus, which was fated to become the centre of this thousand-year empire, a significant name ‘New Rome’; however, within his life, he approved another name: Constantinople - ‘the city of Constantine’.

In 354, Constantine’s nephew Flavius Claudius Julian made a pilgrimage to Ilion. He was an antagonist of Christianity, which, became the national religion of the Roman state under Emperor Constantine, Julian was eager to find desecrated sanctuaries in Troy. To his surprise, he found that, in the Hector crypt and Athena temple, all the pagan rites were still being observed! Upon becoming sovereign emperor, he began to pursue the revival of paganism and the Hellenic spirit, due to which his contemporaries dubbed him with the nickname ‘Backslider’. However, Julian was fated to become the last pagan Roman emperor.

On May 29, 1453, the Turkish Osmands took Constantinople by storm, and Sultan Mehmet II turned the city into the state’s capital. The last vestiges of the great empire — Morea and Trapezus — fell under Turkish control in 1460 and 1461 accordingly. The Osman empire was preparing for further expansion; however, before sending its hordes into Christian Europe, Mehmet the Conqueror decided to visit Ilion. This happened in 1462. By then, the Troad has already been under Turkish control for about a century.

*The Mehmet II memorial in Istanbul.*
Turkish was spoken in the Troad for half a millennium. For new inhabitants of these lands, Troy was, first of all, a tourist attraction. Already in the XVI-XVII centuries, enterprising Turks showed Europeans visiting the eastern coast of the Dardanelles various ruins at rather arbitrary sites, and claimed them as remnants of ancient Ilion. Their tradition still continues today by modern-day guides, who translate the ancient legends, mixed up with the latest myths about the successful Heinrich Schliemann, King Priam’s treasure and the Greeks’ great victory, evidently confirmed by archaeological finds. The striking landmarks of the new tourism-oriented Troy include the false house of Schliemann in the village of Tevfikye, and a large wooden horse built in 1975, especially for tourists to take pictures, as well as fragments of antique buildings taken away by the locals for various economic needs. Here and there you can find a bench made of a Doric column capital, and the foundation for a fence created using a piece of an ancient memorial.

![A bench made of Troy artefacts in the village of Tevfikye.](image)

However, such a consumer attitude to ancient history is also typical for us modern Europeans who have gotten used to being fed historical fast food from beautiful boxes.
The consumer attitude to ancient history is typical for modern Europeans, who have gotten used to being fed historical fast food from beautiful boxes.

If you were to ask the average man what he knows about the Trojan War, you would hear a rather confused story based on children's books, at best, or about the myths of ancient Greece, Vysotsky's song Cassandra, a couple of films like the recent Hollywood release ‘Troy’, or information obtained in cliché block calendars about Achilles’ heel, the Trojan horse and the apple of discord. Even though these sources often contradict each other, the consumer’s brain compiles different facts into one consistent picture.

So the story goes that, once upon a time, King Priam lived in the city of Troy. After the birth to his son Paris, he heard a prophecy that Paris would bring the great empire to an end. Then Priam gave orders to kill the baby, but the tender-hearted servants disobeyed the king and left the boy on Mount Ida. There he was saved by a shepherd, who raised Paris and taught him the rudiments of his trade. One day, Paris, who was called Alexander during that time, was grazing sheep on the mountain, and there he saw three goddesses — Hera, Athena and Aphrodite. They asked the young shepherd to resolve their argument as to which of them is more beautiful. (Someone secretly put an apple designated “for the most beautiful” during a feast, and they could not come to the agreement about who that apple was intended for). Hera promised Paris power over people if he chooses her, Athena promised him wisdom beyond other mortals, and Aphrodite promised him great love. Paris thought it over and chose Aphrodite, who, in the water, showed him an image of the most perfect woman — his promised wife.

Then Paris went to Troy, where he was recognised as being the King’s son. One day Priam and his sons Hector and Paris went to Lacedaemon, the capital of Sparta, to meet with the local King Menelaus in order to conclude a new trade agreement. Having reached an agreement, the kings threw a sumptuous feast and Paris saw Helen at that event. Helen was the wife of King Menelaus, but Paris realised that she was that very same beauty he saw in the water and decided not to leave without her. The circumstances were the best for his solution. The following day, Menelaus left for Crete on business. As they say, while the cat is away, the mice will play. Charmed by handsome Paris, Helen sailed with him to Troy, where the lovers legitimate their marriage.
The abduction of one’s wife would be interpreted as an inconceivable insult in any epoch. In the Trojan era, it was casus belli. Upon returning to Sparta, Menelaus became furious. He summoned the kings of friendly states, and they decided to attack Troy with all their cumulative military power. They outfitted one thousand ships. Tens thousand soldiers in copper helmets with horse-hair combs believed they would engage in a blitzkrieg and reap good rewards. Among them were the heroes Achilles and Ajax, the artful Odysseus, old wise Nestor and Menelaus’ own brother, the ferocious King Agamemnon, who led them. But weather conditions did not favour their campaign — there was no tail wind, and then Agamemnon ventured upon an awful deed by killing his daughter Iphigenia as a sacrifice to the gods. Upon sprinkling her blood on the sacrificial stone, the wind changed and the vast Greek fleet headed towards the Trojan shore.

They mistakenly counted on an immediate victory: the Trojans avidly defend their city tooth and nail, refusing to surrender the abducted queen. The siege of this city continued for nine years, with no side able to gain the upper hand. But in the
tenth year, a quarrel occurred between Achilles and Agamemnon and that became the turning point in the course of this war. During one of the raids on a suburb of Troy, Agamemnon captured the daughter of the priest Chryses. The grieving father asked the King to release his hostage, and upon refusing to do so, the father pleaded with Apollo to curse the Greek army with pestilence, which Apollo did. The terrible illness took down the Achaean and Achilles, on behalf of the public, demands that their leader return Chryseis to her father. Chryses gathered his treasure, and Agamemnon received Achilles’ prisoner Briseis as compensation. Achilles feels hurt, gets angry and refuses to participate in battles and asks Zeus to take revenge upon Agamemnon for this loss by allowing the Trojans to score a military success. Zeus complies with his request and the Trojans, led by King Priam’s son Hector, manage to make their way to the Greek vessels and to start a small fire. Patroclus, Achilles’ best and only friend, engaged in battle with Hector and is killed. Broken hearted, Achilles puts aside all his nonsense and villainous acts and starts to take revenge. Having taken out thousands of Trojans on his way, he forced his way towards Hector, summons him to fight, and kills him within view of Priam, who was watching the combat from the fortress walls. And then the enemy’s body was tied to a chariot and dragged three times around the fortress walls.

At night, Priam quietly came to Achilles’ camp and begged the protagonist to give him his son’s body. Shocked by the old man’s courage and overtaken by a sense of guilt for his friend’s death, Achilles agrees to his request.

However, the death of Ilion’s best warrior put the Greeks at no advantage, especially since they also lost their best fighter very soon after that: Paris managed to
strike Achilles down with an arrow that penetrated his only weak point — his Achilles’ heel. Then Odysseus, the King of Ithaca, devised an artful trick. He proposed building a huge wooden horse — supposedly as a gift for the Trojans, which would be filled with his best Greek soldiers, then remove the fleet from view of the fortress’ defenders. After the Trojans awoke, they would see the horse and, for certain, they would drag it into the city, after which the soldiers in this special squad would leave this structure, kill all men, have their way with all the women and burn everything else they see.

Trickery managed. Despite protests by Paris’ sister Cassandra and the admonition of priest Laocoön (“Fear Greeks bearing gifts!”), the Trojans dragged the monstrous construction into the city. And, for this purpose they even had to dismantle a part of the fortress walls because the Greek gift was so great. Everything was over that very day. Priam and Paris were killed, Helen was returned to Menelaus, and the city was wiped from the face of the earth. Only a few survived and, led by the Dardian King Aeneas, they left their native land in search of a new mother land, and, after many years of wandering and encountering dangerous adventures, they ended up in Italy on the bank of the Tiber River.

This is the history that is being transmitted through art films and documentaries, articles in popular magazines, and even school textbooks - together with stories that are obligatory for banal erudition, involving arsenal tales about the Troy gold (‘that very Schliemann’), and the perfidious Stalin having secretly removed the treasure from prostrated Berlin, in addition to stories of blind Homer with a lyre in his hands. However, the more erudite audience tends to clarify the details of this picture based on so-called scientific evidence.

It appears that the main books of Homer narrate only a small fraction of the above-mentioned events. Only fifty days in the ten years of the siege of Troy was worthy of attention by Homeric bards. ‘The Iliad’ starts with a description of Achilles’ anger about being deprived of his legal prey — Briseis. The poem ends with Patroclus’ funeral, followed by Hector’s funeral. To a large extent, despite an abundance of battle scenes, this poem is not about war but about a quarrel between the leaders of two powerful tribes — the Mycenaeans and Myrmidons — and about the fatal consequences of that quarrel for the union of Achaean states.
Despite an abundance of battle scenes, the poem Iliad is not about war but about a quarrel between the leaders of two powerful tribes — the Mycenaean and Myrmidons — and about the fatal consequences for the union of Achaean states.

The Iliad tells you about the whining nature of invincible Achilles, who cannot hold back his tears while complaining about Agamemnon to his mother; about Paris’ cowardice as he ran away from Menelaus, like as a hare, on the battle field; about Helen’s peevishness while shaming her husband for his fear of laying down his life in an unequal fight against one of the best Greek soldiers:

_Thou hast come back from the war; would thou hadst perished there, vanquished by a valiant man that was my former lord._

_Iliad. III. 428—429._

Homer again tells the story about the wooden horse in another poem — the ‘Odyssey’. By the way, this clarifies that the Trojans nearly fought amongst themselves when making decision about exactly what to do with the horse.

_either to cleave the hollow timber with the pitiless bronze, or to drag it to the height and cast it down the rocks, or to let it stand as a great offering to propitiate the gods..._

_Odyssey. VIII. 507—510._

Apparently, the Trojans didn’t perceive the horse as a gift to the city (for whatever reason), but rather as a sacrifice to Poseidon, left behind by the Greeks, before departing from the field of death. Thus, they decided to drag home their trophy (or souvenir, using modern terminology). Shouldn’t present-day visitors to Troy act in the same way after making a difficult journey from Istanbul or Izmir? What do the wooden horses hold inside, and exactly what are tourists letting into their homes?
All other events of the Trojan War - from Helen’s abduction to the Exodus of Aeneas — are described in the surviving fragments and retellings of the so-called Cycladic poems, as well as in the works of later writers such as Aechylus, Sophocles, Herodotus, Thucydides, Virgil, etc. From these additional sources it is possible to find out that the fate of Iphigenia’s fortune was not so tragic: at the moment that she was to be sacrificed, she was saved the goddess Artemis, who, having turned the girl into a cloud, took her to Tauris and made her a priestess. The reader also learns that the wooden horse was created by Epeius, not Odysseus, and that there were three thousand men inside. One can also learn, for example, that during the Trojan War, there was only something like a holographic image of Helen in Troy and that she herself lived in Egypt during those years, remaining faithful to her husband\(^6\).

\(^6\) Pseudo-Apollodorus, Bibliotheca, Epitome, III, 5.
By the way, not ten but twenty years passed from the date of Helen’s abduction until the end of the Trojan War, but for all twenty years (the Greek troops were strongly delayed on their way to Ilion, which we will speak about later). This is recalled by Helen herself while mourning over Hector:

For this is now the twentieth year from the time when I went from thence and am gone from my native land.

Iliad. XXIV. 765—766.

It turns out that, towards the end of the war, Helen, “a person who set thousands of ships afloat”, was already a quite elderly lady for that time. And if, given this context, Paris’ faithfulness is only deserving of delight, his compatriots’ patience, on the contrary, is perplexing: to suffer hardships over years for the sake of a fading foreign matron? For pity’s sake! Those Trojans were nearly saints!
Such a legend of Troy exists in the mind of even the most informed intellectuais and their circle is terribly narrow! But the circle of those who went through the trouble of reading Homer’s poems in full and attentively, rather than skimming through them. “I’ve read the catalogue of ships up to the middle,”\(^7\) admits Osip Mandelshtam. However, it should be noted that the relevant song “Beotia or the Catalogues of Ships” is a really wonderful remedy for insomnia. The best known among Russian translations of Homer’s ‘Iliad’ is that of Nikolai Gnedich, Pushkin’s contemporary. Extremely beautiful but heavy and archaic, this version has sent several generations of readers into sound sleep. Vikenty Veresaev’s and Pavel Shuisky’s translations are not as popular; they are more modern and better accord to the letter of the original, though this cannot be said of its spirit. Therefore, maybe this is why their versions are not so popular.

For Homer’s contemporaries, the style of the ‘Iliad’ and the ‘Odyssey’ sounded similarly peculiar as Gnedich’s style is for us. It fuses the dialectical features of the language of the Aeolians and that of the Ionic Greeks, who, by the X century B.C., began to colonise the Aegean Region and the northwest part of the coast of

Anatolia, and the archaisms of rhapsodies of the Mycenaean epoch, whose poetic tradition extended to Homer from the distant past. “That language was clear to listeners, who, since childhood, were used to the songs of Homeric bards — the creators and performers of Greek epos — although, in real life, nobody spoke that language. The singularity of the language emphasised the singularity of the events that the Homeric bards described, and helped listeners to be transferred to the world of the heroic past, where people were considerably stronger and braver in every respect. Even if any expression turned out to be beyond comprehension, this even redoubled the Homeric bards’ authority, who seem to be knowledgeable about things that simple people did not know about”8.

It is noteworthy that things in the West go as such: academic circles there still accept the old “classical” translation by Homer, although, for the purpose of public enlightenment, they issue condensed versions of the ‘Iliad’ and its brief narrations, and even comics. In its time, the novel by Alessandro Baricco Homer Iliad9 became a box office project. Here, the Italian writer tries to interpret the classic poem in a new way, purified of everything connected to the gods, fate and other empyreans that would be incomprehensible for the modern reader.

We can say that, even in the book-related XIX century, the ‘Iliad’ was not considered to be pleasure reading. In 1884, maybe the greatest Homer specialist of that time, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, wrote the following: “Now Homer is no longer a widely read poet… Even most philologists largely know him as poorly as they know the Holy Bible”10. We hope to make reference to Mr. Wilamowitz in our work again and again. Now we simply state that most of the people living today, just like the generation of our grandparents, have not read Homer in detail and thoughtfully pose the following basic questions:
1. Did Troy exist in reality or did this city fully exist in myths, and is it useless to look for it on the transitory Earth?
2. Did the Trojan War really take place, or it is a poetic fabrication intended to make people think about the nature of force and weakness, bravery and cowardice, anger and generosity, about boredom of immortality and the greatness of death?
3. Did the Greeks win that war, as Homer and the whole antique tradition insisted, or have we been captivated by false ideas for a few thousand years, unintentionally or intentionally formed for us by writers of the distant past?

9 Baricco, Alessandro. Omero, Iliade. — Collana Economica Feltrinelli, Feltrinelli, 2004
4. Above all, what lessons can we learn from this history for our lives today, and more specifically, what lessons can be derived for us Russians?

Now we are in Troy to try answer these questions.
Chapter 2. The Adventurer Toppled Troy

A real cult of Heinrich Schliemann exists in the Troy archaeological reserve. Portraits of the international adventurer look at us literally everywhere: in souvenir shops, guide books, informational fixtures, and even from the above-mentioned mock-up of the archaeologist’s house, prepared by German television for the documentary’s shooting. Almost 1.5 centuries ago, Schliemann opened for the locals something that was not a gold vein but, at the least, provided an opportunity to always have a cup of tea and plate of fish (“chay bardak, balyk tabak” - the Turkish language is quite associative to the Russian language!) on their table. Those who do not work on still regenerative excavations are involved in the tourist industry: they let rooms, sell fridge magnets, and work as guides. We met two country boys on one of the dusty streets of Tevfikye. Catching sight of visitors from afar, they hold out their sunburned arms in hope for alms: a habit formed over many generations. We give them one lira. What can a man do? Youth …

The false house of Schliemann, located in the village of Tevfikye, was built by the Germans.

During the formation of the Schliemann cult, Heinrich Schliemann himself played the lead role. A master of self-promotion, he has composed a number of legends about himself, the majority of which are still alive.
Most modern biographies of Schliemann are based on his curriculum vitae, which was considered as a rather doubtful source long before that. You can see, for example, Schliemann’s frequently reissued and perceived classic biography of Schliemann, written by German historian Heinrich Alexander Stoll11.

According to one of them, Heinrich Schliemann was born in a poor German family and became keen on Troy when he was eight, after he had received the illustrated *History of the World* by Georg Ludwig Jerrer for Christmas. The book contained a print depicting Ilion aflame with its huge walls and gates, through which Aeneas fled burning Troy with his father on his shoulders. Not wishing to believe that Troy is not a real city, but rather a fairy tale invented by Homer, the boy decided to find the legendary city by any means. It is commonly believed that Trojan guides insist on this very version that Schliemann was the only man all over the globe who trusted the historical reality of the Trojan War. Using geographic hints from Homer’s poems, he found and excavated Troy! Since that time, everything written by Homer began to be taken as the absolute historical truth.

“The only one who believed”… If it is possible to call an outright lie a stretch, let’s do so. But before that, we shall tell you about the kind of person that Schliemann was.

Heinrich Schliemann grew up in a problematic family (his father, a Protestant priest, was a profligate and embezzler of state property), and he had to earn a living from the age of fourteen. For five long and boring years, he had been working as an errand boy in a grocer’s before making the decision to change his life. So he began working as a sea cadet on a schooner sailing to Venezuela. The vessel ran into a storm and, Schliemann, in his own words, was among the few survivors. According to the newspapers, there were no victims in that shipwreck, so why is it necessary to spoil a wonderful story with the truth? It is much more interesting to imagine yourself like Robinson Crusoe setting foot on Dutch land with a slipped torn blanket over his shoulders. Anyway, having found a job in one of the trade houses of Amsterdam, Schliemann started studying languages. Schliemann’s gift for languages is an authentic medical fact. He mastered fifteen languages, including Russian, which, according to the legend, he studied on the basis of pornographic poems by Barkov.

The “Schliemann” method of language study is rather popular today; its essence lies in the oral narration of a foreign language’s text fragments. Step-by-step memory gets used to a new language and the receptivity to new speech increases.

It is interesting that adherents of this method, for the most part, do not know how

Heinrich Schliemann spent his spare time.

Knowledge of Russian allowed Schliemann to enter Russia as a commercial representative. Already within one year, in 1847, he accepted Russian citizenship. The newly-made “Andrei Aristovich” founded his own company and quickly grew rich based on the supply of indigo dye and Chilean saltpetre. He was into any business that promised profit. Of course, at the time of “gold fever”, Schliemann was in America, where he bought gold sand from gold diggers for a song and doubled his fortune. During the Crimean War, Schliemann sold weapon to both sides, but he made a greater profit supplying cardboard-soled boots to the Russian army. Before the abolition of serfdom in 1861, Schliemann bought up the paper necessary for printing large posters with the manifest, and then he resold it to the Russian government at an exorbitant price …

In 1864, having left his Russian wife Ekaterina Lyzhina and three children in St. Petersburg, Schliemann traveled around the world. He visited the ruins of Carthage in Tunis, remnants of Pompeii in Italy, ancient temples in India and Ceylon, the Great Wall of China, and the Aztec ruins in Mexico. Shocked about what he had seen, he began taking courses at Sorbonne and, for some time, listened to lectures on antique history and archaeology. In 1868, Schliemann carried out his first excavation on the Greek island of Ithaca, which lasted for only two days. Having found a couple of shards in the ground, Schliemann, without a shadow of a doubt, passes them off as items belonging to King Odysseus. The businessman then visited Mycenae and the Asia Minor coast of the Dardanelles, where, upon arriving too late to catch a ship to Istanbul, he became acquainted with American consul Frank Calvert. Schliemann published the journey results in his book *Ithaca, Peloponnesus and Troy*, for which he manages to obtain a doctoral degree for himself from the third-rate Rostock University, which was conferred on him in absentia: the competitor was visiting America to deal with issues about obtaining American citizenship and divorcing his Russian spouse 12.

The scientific community in Europe, however, did not take his research seriously and Schliemann decided to submit more evidence, having dug out an ancient city or, as least, something that could possibly pass off as the traces of an ancient city …

Whether Schliemann was a pioneer in the search for the ancient Ilion in northwest Turkey, as it is often represented, is questionable. By no means was this

---

12 Under Russian law, Heinrich Schliemann and Ekaterina Lyzhina remained married.
the case. Even the laurels of the first explorer of Hisarlik are his but not by right.

As represented now, it was not difficult to find Troy: supposing that it was the city mighty enough to fight against the unified forces of all Greece, it controlled the main trade ways, and, accordingly, should have been in a prominent location. Moreover, “nature abhors a vacuum” — if the city stands on a crossroad of trade routes, it will be revived after any route. It means that some city today is engaged in the same business as Troy was in due time, monitoring routes and growing rich.

It is not necessary to be as wise as Solomon to guess that it is Constantinople-Istanbul, which controls the straits from the Black and Marble seas into the Aegean and Mediterranean Seas. There are two straits; Istanbul is located on the Bosporus and its great forerunner stood, apparently, on the Dardanelles. The geographic details in Homer’s poems point towards them. At the same time, as noted by Constantine the Great, the location on the Hellespont is even more favourable — here not only sea-gate but also land-gate between Europe and Asia are in one’s hands. It is impossible to find the best place for cities.

After it becomes clear, it is necessary to estimate and consider how far the sea had moved over three thousand years after the described events, and to look for some hills and fortress ruins neighbouring the Dardanelles entry, as well as the legends of local residents…

The first scientific attempts to determine the precise position of Troy date back to the XVIII century. In 1742 and 1750, Englishman Robert Wood made two trips to the Troad and explained his impressions in the book An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer. Despite his belief in the senselessness of searching for Troy, due to the fact that it had been destroyed to the ground, Wood was the first person to suggest the idea that, since antiquity, the place where Troy laid had changed for the worse, noting that the harbour had become silted and the rivers had changed their flow. Robert Wood’s book was reissued five times in four languages and made a large resonance within the scientific world.

In 1768, one year before Robert Wood’s book was issued, Baron Johann Hermann, a student of glorified thinker Johan Winckelmann, who was the founder of modern ideas about antique art, travelled around the Troad. The visit resulted in him being the first person to voice the hypothesis that ancient Troy must have been in the area of the Hisarlik Hill, located several kilometres from the coast. German cartographer Frantz Kauffer (1793), mineralogist Edward Clark (1801), who later became a Cambridge University professor and Charles McLaren (1822), the author of The Theses on the Topography of the Trojan War, also identified Hisarlik as the location of ancient Troy.

Jean-Baptiste Lechevalier, a French archaeologist, put forward another
hypothesis. In 1785, he walked all the way from Hellespont to the Ida Mountain Range with the ‘Iliad’ in his road bag and Wood’s book as a guide. Lechevalier became convinced that Homer quite accurately described the geographic features of the peninsula. The French scientist specified the location around the village of Bunarbashi (Pinarbashi) in the Scamander River Valley.

In 1864, Austrian diplomat and traveller Johann Georg von Hahn decided to test Lechevalier’s hypothesis in practice. Having started an excavation near Bunarbashi, von Hahn discovered the traces of some settlement. However, it was later clarified that these chippings from ancient buildings dated back to a much later period — the VII-V centuries B.C.

In one year, Frank Calvert led a similar excavation in Hisarlik. Already two generations of his family had lived near the Troad, and Calvert knew the sites very well. But the real revolution in his world vision happened after 1849, when he met with the famous Russian scientist Pyotr Chikhachev. Chikhachev, better known in Russia as the pioneer of the Kuznetsk coal basin, had authored about 100 scientific works on the geology and palaeontology of Asia Minor, and the most detailed map of the Troad was made based on his topographic studies. By accompanying Chikhachev on his expedition, Calvert gained invaluable experience and knowledge in the field of archaeology and geology, but, most importantly, he began to believe the Russian scientist’s statement that it is necessary to search for Troy in the depths of Hisarlik, a part of which he later acquired.

Calvert came to believe that it is necessary to look for Troy in the depths of Hisarlik from the famous Russian geographer Pyotr Chikhachev, whose role in the discovery of this ancient city has still not been acknowledged by the progenies.

Chikhachev’s role in the discovery of Ilion has gone unnoticed by the progenies, and all laurels passed to Schliemann who, in his turn, would claim them for himself rather than Calvert. The man who identified Troy’s location will be undeservedly forgotten, as, alas, frequently happens in history. Today only an Altaic mountain range is named after him and a commemorative plaque in Gatchina recalls this scientist.
While digging out Hisarlik in 1865, Calvert came across traces of the Athena temple and the city wall that was raised by Lysimachus. There the diplomat’s financial capabilities became exhausted. Calvert had hoped to continue the search after meeting with conceited millionaire Schliemann, believing that the ruins of Troy were located in the local site where Lechevalier had identified them - in Bunarbashi. Later Calvert affirmed this in a letter to the newspaper *The Guardian*: “When I first met Doctor [Schliemann] in August, 1868, the Hisarlik and the Troy location were new subjects for him”\(^{13}\). Schliemann denied everything and even launched a full-scale war in the press against Calvert, charging him with lying. There is no document dating before 1868 that testifies to Schliemann being engaged at all in the Trojan issue. According to historian Andrei Strelkov, Schliemann simply “fell over Troy” during one of his travels\(^ {14}\). However, the businessman introduced the events as if he had been looking for Troy all his life, and selected Hisarlik as the site to excavate the ancient city, based on Homer’s hints. To eliminate any mention about Calvert from the history of Troy’s discovery, Schliemann concocted a story about his children's

\(^{13}\) Толстиков В.П. Генрих Шлиман и троянская археология // Сокровища Трои. Из раскопок Генриха Шлимана. Каталог выставки. М.: ГМИИ им. А.С. Пушкина; Леонарде Арте, 1996. — С. 18.

dream and a book with pictures\textsuperscript{15}, and introduced himself as a man really possessed by Homer’s epos, naming the children born of his new Greek wife Sophia Engastromenos\textsuperscript{16}, Agamemnon and Andromacha.

But it was later, and then in August, 1868, Calvert receives the dear visitor in his house on the coast of the strait and convinces him to join the excavations certifying: “All my land [on the Hisarlik Hill] is at your disposal”\textsuperscript{17}. Having felt the scale of profit in case of success, Schliemann agrees to take part in the project. Already in December he starts consulting with very skilled Calvert about organisation of excavations, up to quantification of mattocks and shovels for works. Simultaneously he negotiates with the Turkish government for a license for archaeological activity. At last, on October 11, 1871, Heinrich Schliemann, having employed workers in the near villages, starts earth excavations. Calvert tried to prevent his comrade from making hasty decisions and advised him to first carry out the sounding of cultural beddings, appearing more than seventeen metres in depth. However, Schliemann, being sure that the Homer’s Troy is the most ancient of everything possible, decided to dig down to the very continental plate.

Long trenches up to seventeen metres in depth and width ruthlessly cut up Hisarlik Hill until Schliemann dug out an ancient settlement, erasing everything on his way the he didn’t find interesting and shining under the sun. Schliemann pronounced that he had discovered the ruins of Priam’s city.

The merchant’s barbarous approach to excavations deprived future scientists of the most valuable archaeological information and also resulted in breaking down traces of the old city. Left to the mercy of fate in an aggressive environment, they began to crumble and become weathered, suffering from tree and bush roots. They managed to halt the destruction process only in 1988, when expedition participants began to preserve the walls of the ancient citadel by their own efforts, under the leadership of Tubingen University Professor Manfred Korfmann.

The thickness of the cultural layer at seventeen metres, though accumulated for some thousands of years, seemed improbable, until we learned about their origin. “Fires often occurred, caused by the wood and straw applied in construction [during the bronze century],” explained Professor Carl Blegen, who excavated Hisarlik Hill in 1932-1938, “When a house burned down, its roof ell and its walls were scattered...


\textsuperscript{16}Seventeen year old Sophia Schliemann was practically bought for 150 thousand francs from her uncle, a Greek bishop Teokletos Vimplos.

\textsuperscript{17}Толстиков В.П. Генрих Шлиман и троянская археология. — С. 18.
Since, in those times, there were neither bulldozers nor graders, nobody tried to clear the site of the fire or to remove the waste. It was much easier to level the site, covering the not completely burnt fragments of the building with a thick layer of waste (hence the noticeable growth of the cultural layer), and then build a new house on that site. In Troy, such things happened rather often, and every time the ground level rose by 80-100 centimetres. The steady growth of the cultural layers on the hill also occurred due to other factors. For example, the floors in all dwellings, except for palaces and magnificent private residences, were made of earth or compacted clay. In those times, it was not accepted to collect domestic and kitchen wastes at certain special sites. So all waste, including bones, food waste, and broken utensils were left on the floor in the dwelling or discarded immediately outside. Sooner or later, the moment would come when the floor appeared to be covered with the bones of animals and waste in such a quantity that even the most not fastidious hosts understood that it is necessary to do something with it. Solving the issue was simple and rather effective: the waste from the floor was not cleaned out but covered with a thick layer of fresh clay, which was then pounded. During the excavation, the archaeologists often dug out houses where, that process was repeated many times until the floor’s layer appeared so high that, for normal living, it would eventually be necessary to lift the roof and to remake the entrance.”

---

Schliemann continued excavations for three seasons, and finally, on May 31, 1873, at the surrounding wall near the southwest gate, at a depth of 8.5 metres, he came across some real treasures. Here is how he describes these events:

“Going along this surrounding wall and opening it closer and closer to the ancient building and to the northwest of the gate, I came across a large copper subject of the most remarkable shape, which attracted my attention because I thought there was some gold behind it… To save this treasure from my workers and to save it for archaeology, I had to wasted no time; and though it was early for breakfast, I immediately announced païdos. This word is of unknown origin; it came into the Turkish language and is used instead of the Greek ἀνάπαυσις, meaning rest time. While the people were having their meal and resting, I dug out the treasure with the help of a large knife. It took huge efforts and involved risk since there existed the danger that the fortress wall, under which I had to dig, could fall down on me at any moment. However, the view of so many subjects, every one of which was of great value for archaeology, made me fearless and I did not think about any hazards. But I could not obtain the treasure without the help of my dear wife, who stood near me, ready to put the things I cut out in her shawl and take them away”\(^{19}\).

In the niche discovered by Schliemann, a set of 8830 precious metal articles were found, including necklaces, diadems, rings, brooches and bracelets. Owing to Calvert’s brother Frederic, it was possible to take the treasure away from Athens. Having placed it in a bank, the businessman told journalists that he had found — nothing more, nothing less — than the treasures the Trojan King Priam. This sensational news covered newspapers’ front pages and the photograph of Sophia Engastromenos in “Helen’s attire” was replicated. Schliemann published pictures of these treasures in his book \textit{The Trojan Antiquities}, issued in 1874 by renowned publisher Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus.

The scientific community, which previously paid no attention to the dilettante’s entertaining claims, launched a squall of criticism against him. Professional archaeologists were shocked with the barbarity by which Schliemann literally lay waste to the cultural layers of the ancient hill and destroyed most of the more recent constructions.

Sophia Engastromenos in the “Great Diadem” from the Priam treasure (1874).

Many questions also arose in relation to Schliemann’s story looking like a plot from an adventure novel. As it was clarified later, based on Sophia’s correspondence with her husband, she could not participate in the treasures’ transportation, as she was at that time in Athens at that time\(^{20}\). Besides, the composition of the treasure was also doubtful. So, for example, the gold bulb for drinks in 23 carats suspiciously resembled a sauceboat of the XIX century and, in light of Schliemann’s to an Athenian agent on May 28, 1873 with the request to find a reliable jeweller, this claim began to be taken as evidence of the falseness of the “Priam treasures”. According to another version, the “treasure” could be composed of items that were earlier bought either in Istanbul markets or found at different times during excavations in Hisarlik\(^{21}\). By and large, the treasures could not belong to the legendary Priam, as they were found in the cultural layer one thousand years older

\(^{20}\) Actually, it was with the publication in 1950 of his epistolary heritage that the perception of Schliemann’s personality began to change. Comparing data from Schliemann's letters and his autobiography, the researchers found that "the great archaeologist" lies at every turn.

than “Homer’s Troy”\textsuperscript{22}.

The treasures found by Schliemann could not belong to the legendary Priam, as they lay in the cultural layer one thousand years older than “Homer’s Troy”.

Sublime Porte read the newspapers too and, having learned about Schliemann’s unprecedented smuggling, sued him for ten thousand francs. Smug within himself, the millionaire reimbursed the damage, added an extra forty thousand and declared himself the full owner of the treasures. Further, Schliemann several times attempted to place them in museums in London, Paris and Naples, but they refused to take them due to political and financial motives\textsuperscript{23}. In 1881, Schliemann eventually presented the “Priam treasures” to the city of Berlin, having received (following Chancellor Otto von Bismark) the title of the “honourable citizen of Berlin” in exchange. The treasures remained there until 1945, when Professor Wilhelm Unverzagt, in accordance with contribution conditions, transferred the Trojan finds to the Soviet commandant's office. For a long time, the collection was considered to be lost but it was actually stored in strict confidence in Moscow’s Pushkin Museum (259 items, including the "Priam treasures”) and in the State Hermitage (414 copper, bronze and clay items). Only in 1993, the Yeltsin government declared that the most valuable part of the Trojan treasures are kept in Russia. On April 15, 1996, the trophies were exhibited in the Pushkin Museum for the first time\textsuperscript{24}.

After finding the “Priam treasures”, Schliemann did not cease his exploratory activity and continued to dig out Mycenae, Orchomenos, and Tiryns. He returned to the works on the Hisarlik Hill tree times. While Schliemann’s activity is viewed differently by different people, it is noteworthy that his adventures not only peaked scientific interest in the history of Troy, but also resulted in the discovery of the previously unknown Aegean civilisation. Schliemann never learned about it and died in certainty that all his finds were only related to the Trojan War era.

Already after Schliemann’s death, in 1893-1894, his friend and colleague Wilhelm Dörpfeld reassessed the stratigraphy of the archaeological layers of the

\textsuperscript{22} It was only later, during excavations in 1882 Schliemann was pointed out this fact by architect Wilhelm Dörpfeldw who was invited to reconstruct urban planning of different periods of the Troy history. After having spent four days in his tent in silence, Schliemann acknowledged his colleague was right.

\textsuperscript{23} In 1876, Russian archeological society was trying to buy Schliemann's collection. However, the price was unaffordable.

\textsuperscript{24} After the exhibition, several countries expressed their claims for "treasures of Priam" - Germany (who received it as a gift), Turkey (where they were found), and even Greece (where they have supposedly originated).
Hisarlik Hill and determined that, on that site, nine cities replaced each other sequentially during the course of nearly 4 ½ millennia. Accordingly, the periods of Troy’s existence were numbered I to IX. In Dörpfeld’s opinion, Homer’s Ilion lied in the sixth layer (Troy VI), which Schliemann ruthlessly destroyed during his first excavations. Dörpfeld arrived at this conclusion, even despite the fact that no traces of military operations were found in relation to the destruction of Troy VI.

In 1932, Dörpfeld’s business was continued by an expedition by Cincinnati University, headed by renowned American archaeologist Carl Blegen. Blegen corrected his predecessor and demonstrated that Troy VI (1800-1300 B.C.) perished due to an extremely strong earthquake. Blegen divided the Troy VII epoch into three periods and proposed considering Homer’s Troy as existing in the VIIa period (1300-1100 B.C.), with apparent signs of a siege and damages.

Carl Blegen’s proposed diagram of the sequence of the existence and destruction of ancient settlements on the Hisarlik Hill became a classical one.

According to Dörpfeld and Blegen, the Trojan settlement represents a kind of a layer cake. Image by Nika Tya-Sen.

Troy I (3000-2500 B.C.) dates back to the pre-Greek culture, as ancient as most ancient civilisations, such as the Egyptian, Sumerian, Aegean and Indus ones. The inhabitants of Troy I had no gold, but lived in quite good houses, called
megarons, used metal tools, and bred small cattle.

Troy II (2500-2200 B.C.) was a large city of the Minoan culture with walls four metres thick, cobbled streets and gates. The basic activity of its inhabitants was agriculture: manual grinding mills were found in practically every house of this city. They used a potter's wheel to make utensils. Troy II traded fabrics, wool, ceramics and timber in the huge territory spanning from Bulgaria and Thrace up to Central Anatolia and Syria, which became the reason for the noticeable growth of its material well-being, visually demonstrated by a great many items of gold and silver found in this cultural layer, including the “Priam treasure” found by Schliemann.

The city was destroyed by sudden fire, and local inhabitants had no time to collect their precious utensils. However, according to Blegen, the catastrophe “did not cause any significant damage to the settlement’s cultural development. Given the retention of the former civilisation and the absence of obvious traces of alien influence, the culture of Troy II was gradually and steadily developed until its successor Troy III picked up the baton”\(^\text{25}\).

The southwest (Scaean) gates where Schliemann dug up the “Priam treasure” dates back to the Troy II (2500—2200 B.C.) period.

Troy III (2200-2050 B.C.) and Troy IV (2050-1900 B.C.) arose on the site of the burnt-down capital, had defensive walls and occupied a large area. Despite the rather primitive (even compared to Troy II) culture in general, the population of these cities improved upon cooking methods and notably diversified their diet.

\(^{25}\) Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
Troy V (1900-1800 B.C.) was a city with a quite high culture given the samples of fine ceramics and building art found. Compared to the previous periods, the manners and habits of the city dwellers had changed a lot. “One of the novelties exhibited in Troy V (which archaeologists very strongly regret) was the transition to new, more effective ways of house cleaning. Now they swept the floor and cleaned it from the rubbish accumulated during the day; therefore, nowadays archaeologists are only able to make rare finds like animal bones, various small items that were discarded and lost, as well as whole or broken ceramic vessels”\textsuperscript{26}. Like the previous cities based on Hisarlik Hill, that Troy was destroyed, although the cause for this remains unknown: there are no traces of a big fire in the ruins of buildings, and nothing speaks about the city being captured by enemies.

Troy VI (1800-1300 B.C.) was already a really great city of units with 5-metre thick walls and four gates, along with squares and palaces. Its population consisted of people of other traditions; they apparently came here from another place and brought their own culture with them. They tamed horses, established a custom of cremation of the deceased, and perfected the art of producing weapons. Already at the beginning of the Troy VI period, there occurred a virtually complete change in the range of pottery wares. This city was levelled by an earthquake, as evidenced by the cracks typically exhibited on the building walls.

According to the legend, Ilion was founded by Ilus, son of Tros. Then the power passed to Ilion’s son Laomedon. During the time of its existence, Troy achieved might and established control over Asia Minor, Propontis (the Sea of Marmara), and the straits. Laomedon erected a “city on top of the hill”, the walls of which were built by Poseidon, who, by Zeus’ will, ended up a slave to Zeus, together with Apollo (who was ordered to pasture Zeus’ oxen). For their assiduous work, Laomedon promised to pay the gods, but changed his mind and, in the end, just expelled them from the country, threatening to cut their ears off (Ilus. XXI, 440-458). Then Poseidon sent a sea monster to Ilion to devour all the people. Heracles appeared here and killed the monster, getting into the monster’s belly and hacking all its entrails. For this feat, Laomedon promised him magic horses but once again did not keep his promise. It was unavoidable that Heracles had to destroy the city, to kill Laomedon and shoot all his heirs to death by bow and arrow, and to give the king’s daughter Hesion\textsuperscript{27} to his friend Telamon. At the same time, Hesion was allowed to release one of the captives. She chose her younger brother Podarces and paid for him with her headscarf. Since then, Podarces began to be called

\textsuperscript{26} Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
\textsuperscript{27} Etymologically, the name ”Hesion” associated with the word ”Asia”. ”Hesion” - ”asiyka”, a resident of Anatolia. (См. Гиндин Л.А., Цымбурский В.Л. Гомер и история Восточного Средиземноморья. — М.: Восточная литература, 1996. — С. 53).
Priam, meaning “redeemed”. This makes it evident that the legend refers to the times of Troy VI, and the earthquake destroying the city is interpreted as Heracles’ anger.

That's what Troy VI looks like to our contemporaries. Image by Nika Tya-Sen.

Who were the founders of Troy VI, who were so noticeably different from the cities of previous periods? Blegen was sure that they were Greeks; however, he could not confidently know about their place of departure for new lands. He wrote, “They did not manage to define whether they roamed from the north to the shore of the Aegean Sea, or sailed from the south of Russia across the Black Sea and along the Bosporus and Dardanelles, or whether they arrived in Greece by sea from the West or the East. There are no hints left by either ceramics, artefacts, or horse bones.”

---

28 When she became the wife of Telamon, Hesion bore Teucer, who thus became the half-brother of Ajax Telamonid.
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Troy VII refers to the period 1300-1100 B.C. The Trojan War is considered to have taken place during that period. There exists a set of calculations based on widely differing methods, but most of them put this era at between 1220 and 1180 B.C.

The ancient writers could only estimate the dates of the Trojan War, according to the approximate number of generations up to the first Olympic Games, epical tradition, etc. And they arrived at different results, ranging from the XIV to XII centuries B.C. Other methods also existed, including the study of archaeological artefacts, epigraphy, etc.

The original method was applied in 2008 by American Rockefeller University physics and mathematics professor Marcelo Magnasco, and astronomer Constantino Baikouzis from Argentina’s La-Plata Observatory\textsuperscript{30}. They took note that, according to Homer, during the time that Odysseus was beating the grooms, seeking to marry his wife Penelope.

... And full of ghosts is the porch and full the court, of ghosts that hasten down to Erebus beneath the darkness, and the sun has perished out of heaven and an evil mist hovers over all (Odyssey. XX. 356-357) and they decided that this text pertains to a solar eclipse. The dates of solar eclipses, both in the past and future can be easily calculated. Having compared these dates with other astronomical data indicated in the text, scientists concluded that King Odysseus’ return to Ithaca happened on April 16, 1178 B.C. According to Homer, Odysseus’ wandering after the Trojan War took about ten years. Thus, the Trojan War, under

Magnasco and Baikouzis, can be narrowed down to within the chronological framework of 1188-1198 B.C.

After the earthquake, the city was built up again. There were no traces of people in the ruins of Troy VI, and Blegen concluded that the population survived and, immediately after the earthquake ended, returned to the city and started to recover their dwellings. In due course, the city became more populated, as the streets became more compact and the houses became smaller. However, traces of imported goods and wealth vanished. As a whole, Troy VII did not resemble the majestic “rich in gold” city that Homer had described.

The city relating to the first phase of Troy VII, deemed as VIIa (1300-1260 B.C.), was destroyed by fire. The territory of settlement once again appeared, covered with a huge mass of stones, mudbricks, and various burned out and half burned rubbish. The human body fragments found in this layer point to a violent death. Thus, according to Blegen, the destruction of Troy VIIa was connected to the city’s capture and the loss of lives. “The crowding of numerous small houses everywhere that it was possible to find a free place points to the fact that the fortress walls should have covered many more of the city dwellers than previously. The installation of numerous uncountable capacious vessels for food and water storage under the floor in virtually every house and room demonstrates the need to accumulate the maximal amount of food and water in the case of extraordinary situations. What situations might this refer to other than an enemy siege?”

Upon analyzing the Mycenaean pottery discovered in the cultural layer of the burned city pursuant to the chronology of ceramics of Arne Furumark, Blegen realized that most of these samples would be referred to type III B dated from the first half of the XIII century B.C. The earlier type III A is sparsely encountered in this layer, and there are no items of the later type III V. On this basis, Blegen concluded that Troy VIIa was destroyed in approximately 1260, two generations earlier than the decline of the Mycenaean civilization. “Most large Mycenaean cities in continental Greece (perhaps with the exception of the cities of Attica) were destroyed in the late period of the production of type III B Mycenaean pottery… By approximately 1200 B.C., Mycenae’s might had been shaken; the large cities, the population of which the Catalogue of Ships indicates formed the backbone of Agamemnon’s troops while marching against Troy, lay in ruins, and the survivors faced an even more difficult struggle for survival. The period, when type III V pottery was used in everyday

31 Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
practice was characterised by people’s impoverishment and decline of the culture, and only memories remained of Mycenae’s former glory. The Mycenaean kings and princes were still not capable of uniting and leaving to capture other lands. That was possible much earlier, when the Mycenaean civilisation was at the height of its political, economic and military power, when splendid emperor’s palaces hospitably met dear guests in their entire splendour. The fortress was seized and burned before the mid-XIII century B.C., which is when type III B Mycenaean pottery was introduced during prosperity in Troy VIIa and type IIA pottery fell to the wayside.

Carl Blegen affirmed that Troy VIIa was seized and burned in the mid-XIII century B.C. and argued this on the basis of the prevalence of type III B Mycenaean pottery in its cultural layer. Image by Olga Aranova.

Thus, Troy VIIa must have been the mythological Troy, the fortress with the sad fate, whose seizure attracted the attention and awoke the imagination of its contemporaries — poets and narrators whose stories about the heroes of that war passed by word of mouth from generation to generation. There is no doubt that, in due course, some details of those stories have been forgotten and omitted, and that some other things were invented. This happened until such legends reached the ears of the genial poet. He collected these different stories and wrote two epical poems which survive until our day”.

---
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Carl Blegen identified Troy VIIa as Homer’s Ilion. Troy VIIa came to an end as a result of its capture by the enemy after a continuous siege. However, there is no cause to believe that it was captured by the Greeks.

The results of excavations of the next cultural layer, relating to the phase of Troy VIIb (1260-1190 B.C.), indicate that many inhabitants of this burned city survived. Soon after the conquerors left, the city dwellers returned and built new houses directly on the ruins and, as a result, the city rose by approximately one metre compared with the former ground level. However, the once great city could not return to its former greatness. The population became impoverished and left the city after some time. At the same time, the fortress wall was not damaged, as had happened before. “You get the impression,” wrote Blegen, “that everything happened quietly enough: they simply turned the dwellers out of their houses, and new tenants moved in”\(^{34}\). The tribe who settled here brought with them coarse pottery, made with no potter's wheel, which became a kind of business card for Troy VIIb. According to some explorers, the modelling of “pottery with outgrowth”, like some other primitive bronze items of daily use found in the same layer, bears an obvious relationship with similar articles found in depositions of the late Bronze Age in Hungary.

The next devastation to the city caused by fire marks the completion of the history of ancient Troy. For four centuries, the city stood empty — it is possible that its inhabitants found another quieter place for living. New Troy — Troy VIII (700-85 B.C.) — already wholly belonged to the Greek world. It is known under the name of Ilion, though many scientists specialising in antiquity have categorically rejected its connection with Homer’s Ilion\(^{35}\). This city was not as mighty as it had changed states several times. In 480 B.C., King Xerxes visited that very city around 480, and Alexander the Great also did so in 334 B.C. After his empire collapsed, the city was transferred to Lysimachus, who exercised his “special concern for the city,” according to Strabo.

\(^{34}\) Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
\(^{35}\) Strabo, Geography, XIII, 25.
Then Ilion became part of the Roman Empire, and bathhouses, temples and theatres were built there. However, in 85 B.C., due to conflicts with Rome, the city was again plundered and destroyed — this time at the hands of the troops of Roman vicar Gaius Flavius Fimbria, capturing the city during the war against Mitridate Eupatore.

When Fimbria began boasting that he captured the city on the eleventh day, whereas Agamemnon did it only in the tenth year with great difficulties and having a fleet of one thousand vessels, and the whole Greece helping in the campaign, one Ilion resident noted: “Yes, but we did not have such an defender as Hector”36.

Troy IX, which relates to the period 85 B.C. - 500A.D., was restored by Lucius Cornelius Sulla, who routed Fimbria. Then it actively built up under Julius Caesar and Octavianus Augustus. By 400, the city appeared to be deserted, and all geostrategic advantages had been gained by Constantinople. In due course, Troy turned into a hill that, 1.5 thousand years later, would be dug up by Heinrich Schliemann into historical oblivion.

---

36 Strabo, Geography, XIII, 27.
The Roman odeum of Troy IX (85 B.C. to 500 AD).
Chapter 3. The War for Troy, twentieth century

A Trojan archaeological reserve tour starts at the Eastern gate, relating to the period of Troy VI. It seems that it is not coincidental: upon entering the area of the great city, you immediately feel its mighty walls and involuntarily identify yourself with its defenders. The path, marked with coloured ribbons (anything can happen to the tourists!), goes near the northern bastion with a wonderful view point, the Athena temple Franc Calvert discovered in 1865, an ancient citadel of mudbrick and megaron houses built a thousand years before the Trojan War, and the Schliemann’s trench looking like an avulsed wound on the body of the grey hill…

If you do not take pictures of every stone or stay at the information stands for very long, the entire passage of the tourist path takes ten-fifteen minutes. The mighty fortress is only two hundred metres in diameter.

Two hundred multiplied by two hundred amounts to four hectares, which approximately matches the ground space of five football fields or one modern not-so-large megamall. How was it possible to accommodate fifty thousand defenders of Troy here as Homer had written? Let’s assume that most of them were located outside the bastion. In the early 1990s, Helmut Becker and Jorg Fassbinder, employees of Manfred Korfmann’s expedition, made a discovery with the help of a magnetic survey: In the XIII-XII centuries B.C., the Trojan citadel was surrounded
by a big downtown protected with two outer circles of walls and a ditch, cut off in the rock half a kilometre away from the fortress. Thus, Troy’s territory extended about five times further — now it covers approximately the same floor space of the Moscow Kremlin. Nevertheless, there were fifty thousand people, who had to sleep a bit more comfortably than in standing position and to maintain cattle, battle horses, and chariots! In such an area, it is only economically justified for no more than five thousand people to live here, as Margaret Thatcher would say. Korfmann estimates seven thousand persons. Let it be so, but surely no more than that!

However, the figures provided by Homer were related to poetic exaggerations used long ago - 29 empires in the Achaean coalition, 1186 ships filled with soldiers (50 to 120 people on every ship, more than a hundred thousand totally!), and a 10-year siege…

But many questions still remain with no definite answers, including the damage done by Schliemann. Who were the Trojans? What was their nationality? What language did they speak? Why did most of them have Greek names? Who did the Trojans pray to, and why did some Greek gods help them? If the Greeks really captured Ilion, why they did not use the victory advantage and capture the country or even leave their vicar here? Was there was ultimately a real great Trojan War, or is this just a poetic image involving the compression of many separate military campaigns, forays and sieges happening during dozens or even hundreds of years?

Such questions began to be asked at that very time when the legend about the Trojan War, apparently, was completely affirmed by finds made by Schliemann, Dörpfeld and Blegen.

**Doubts about the historicity of the Trojan War were revived when the legend about it seemed to be completely affirmed by finds made by Schliemann, Dörpfeld and Blegen.**

A kind of Renaissance of views of the late XVIII–early XIX centuries happened, when doubts about the historical reality of both the Trojan War and Troy itself were very popular.

While antiquity thinkers considered Homer to be not only the most skilful poet but also the greatest scientist, and his poems as the source of the truest information about history and geography (according to Strabo, “Homer surpassed all people of the ancient and new time, not only due to the high dignity of his poetry, but …
knowledge of the conditions of public life"), the science of the new time completely subverted his authority. Not only was the information about the events described in The Iliad and The Odyssey considered to be unreliable, but the very existence of Homer was put into question. Scientists’ scepticism reached the point that, for some time, even the belief in the possibility of the existence of some considerable culture in Aegis prior to the I millennium B.C. was considered madness. According to their judgments, all these “rich in gold Mycenae”, “blossoming Corinthes” and “magnificently arranged Troy”, inviting envy by their riches, even amongst Greeks of the classical epoch, are only fantastic cities populated with fantastic characters — the descendants and relatives of the Olympic gods Agamemnon, Achilles, Diomedium, and Priam. At the same time, there have always been scientists, who trust in Homer’s word and are ready to defend their point of view.

At the turn of the XVIII-XIX centuries, Homer “caused” rather harsh battles. Those doubting this included, in particular, Englishmen John McLaurin, publishing Treatise in evidence, that Troy was not captured by the Greeks (1788), and Jacob Bryant, who published Treatise concerning to the Trojan War and expedition of the Greeks as it was described by Homer; demonstrating that such an expedition was not ever held, and that such a city of Phrygia did not exist (1796). The latter violently polemicised about the historicity of Troy with archaeologist Lechevalier, the very person who first localised Ilion in the Bunatbashi area. Cabinet critics heatedly argued about trifles — the location of the Greek ships and even the probable number of children born by camp whores.

At the very height of the scholarly battles, the great romantic Byron visited the plane off the Hellespont coast. The atmosphere of these places assured him of the historical truth of Homer’s poems. In eleven years he wrote in his diary the following: “In 1810, every day for one and a bit months, I visited the field [near Hisarlik] and there was villain Bryant, who poisoned my pleasure because he was in doubt… I continue to revere the great original and to consider it true to history (in fact in issue) and place. Otherwise I could not enjoy it. When I sat to have a rest on the huge burial ground, what could convince me that there is no hero slumber under it? The modesty of the stone spoke about it. People do not construct monuments to the contemptible and paltry dead. And why are they not Homer’s heroes?”

37 Strabo, Geography, I, 2.
40 Lord Byron, Journals, jan. 11, 1821.
Despite such poetic arguments by Byron, the belief that the Trojan War was only the fiction of a blind Homeric bard remained popular among scientists for another half century until Schliemann’s excavations assured the scientific community of the historical value of great cities described in The Iliad, such as Troy, Mycenae, Tirynthos, and Orchomenus. Some of the amateur archaeologist’s finds, on the face of it, accurately correspond to the items described by Homer. For instance, the blade of a bronze dagger found in Mycenae depicted the famous tower shield; in The Iliad, such an item belonged to Ajax. Other items found include the remains of a helmet of wild boar’s fangs, depicted in the tenth rhapsody of the poem, etc. All this seemed to be conclusive evidence as to the reality of the Trojan War. And Homer himself already seemed to be a rather younger contemporary of his heroes than an immediate witness of the events he described. “Homer’s step-by-step information assumed the nature of a kind of “guidebook” for studying the Aegean culture of the Mycenae epoch”41.

However, Schliemann’s romantic epoch ended rather quickly. Already in the late XIX century, serious studies occurred, demonstrating that the material culture and housekeeping of the Homeric heroes did not correspond to the cultural environment of the Mycenae civilization and should be associated with a later

41 Гордзиани Р.В. Проблемы гомеровского эпоса. — С. 162.
Arming his characters with the iron weapons and darts known in the Bronze Age, Homer ignored all typical signs of the Mycenaean culture, not paying mention to any cobbled roads with bridges nor to water lines and water drains in the palaces, nor fresco paintings. Even written language, the existence of which already existed before the XII century B.C., was demonstrated by clay plates found by Arthur Evans at the beginning of the XX century during the Knossus excavations on Cyprus. Thus, it appeared that, at the moment of writing The Iliad and The Odyssey, the Mycenaean civilisation was already forgotten. Doubts were once again cast in the veracity of Homer’s testimonies.

Harvard philologists Milman Parry and Albert Lord poured oil on the flames as they, in the late 1920s — early 1930s, studied Homeric style features. To clear up the technique for creating, learning and transferring oral legends, they undertook some expeditions to the Balkans to study live epic tradition. Having collected and studied a huge amount of folklore material, they found that the life of the epos in centuries is based on transfer rather a set of ready texts used for a song creation: plots, canonical images, and stereotyped word-and-rhythm formulas, which the singers used like language words, rather than using ready texts. In particular, this allowed performers to reproduce (more precisely, to create in the course of a performance) poems consisting of thousands of lines. The song is improvised every time, but remains a form of collective creativity.

The folklore nature of Homer’s poems was proven in such a way, for which there was exactly such a formula style (more than 90 percent of The Iliad text was comprised of such formulas — a staggering number, especially upon considering the refinement and intricacy of the Greek hexameter). There is no question of folklore to mirror exact historical reality.

Authoritative historian Moses Finley insisted on that. In his book The World of Odysseus (1954), he affirmed that searching through Homer’s works for authentic testimonies concerning the Trojan War, its causes, outcome and even composition of coalitions is equal to studying the history of Huns in the V century according to the Song of Nibelungs or to appeal to the Song about Rolland to reconstruct the course of

---

42 Perhaps the first guess about the difference between time of the world of Homer and the time described in Iliad was made at the beginning of the XVIII century by Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico (Cm. Vico, Giambattista. The New Science, III).

43 During his expedition Parry had written down a poem of a Bosnian Avdo Međedović The Wedding of Meho Smailagić that had more than 12 thousand lines, that is, equal to the volume of The Odyssey. (Lord, Albert B. The Singer of Tales. — Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1960). This was the proof of the possibility of a similar volume of works in the unwritten culture.

44 Lord, Albert B. The Singer of Tales.
the Battle of Roncevaux Pass. Finley grounded his doubts on both the data for comparative philology and the results of the study on the economic history of Homer’s society with the help of the model proposed by French anthropologist Marcel Mauss.

In his famous book The *Gift* (1925), Marcel Mauss studied the mechanism of the operation of conventional society’s economy based on the gratuitous expenditure principle. According to Mauss, an archaic economy does not push advantages. At its bottom there is the potlatch (a holiday held for the distribution of all the tribe’s property; however, another tribe receiving the gifts thus has to make an even greater, more generous potlatch. From here, the circulation of the wealth accumulated and spent for the prestige of some and enjoyment of others arises

By reconstructing the system of exchange in the Hellenic world, Finley determined that the socio-economical relations mirrored in Homer’s poems were close to those existing under eastern despotism and that they were absolutely uncharacteristic for the Mycenae society during the Trojan War period (XIII-XII centuries B.C.). The Iliad and The Odyssey somewhat restored the reality of the X-IX centuries B.C. (i.e. the epoch of the Dark Ages). On this basis, Finley directly stated that the Trojan War depicted by Homer should be razed from the history of the Greek Bronze Age.

*American historian Moses Finley calling on the “deletion” of Homer’s Trojan War from the history of the Greek Bronze Age. Image by Olga Aranova.*

---

Moses Finley wrote his book before Michael Ventris and John Chadwick has published on deciphering the so-called linear writing B — the most ancient syllabic letter, the samples of which were found on artefacts of Mycenae Greece. The Ventris and Chadwick article Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives provoked a chain reaction in the scientific world. One by one, the studies appeared, reconstructing the Crete and Mycenaean period of ancient history. According to Chadwick’s testimony, in the period 1953-1958 alone, 432 articles, brochures and books by 152 writers from 23 countries appeared. These studies demonstrated that linear writing was popular in all big centres of Mycenaean Greece as the official writing, and therefore, as a factor combining in a uniform cultural space of politically different societies. Most importantly, these studies indicate that, on the Aegean islands of the II millennium B.C., there existed a high culture and developed political life.

“The texts discovered in Knossos, Pyllos, Mycenae, Phebe, etc., made it possible, at last, to reconstruct the everyday life of the contemporaries of the Trojan War and even that of a few generations of their forerunners since the XIII century B.C.,” asserted influential French historian Paul Fort. “Due to this, peasants, seamen, handicraftsmen, soldiers, officials once again began speaking and acting. And the golden masks of the Athenian museum were already not simple masks of the dead.”

---

46 Palace at Pylos, where they found the tablets with texts written by this type of writing, was opened in the early 1950s by Carl Blegenom.


The results of decrypting ancient written sources, together with an analysis of archaeological finds, served as an additional argument in favour of Finley’s and his predecessor’s hypothesis that the author of The Iliad did not realise the customs and everyday life of the Hellenes in the XIII-XII centuries B.C.

**The results of decrypting the Mycenaean written language, together with an analysis of the archaeological finds, demonstrated that the author of The Iliad did not realise the customs and everyday life of the Hellenes in the XIII-XII centuries B.C.**

In the Greek theocratic monarchy in the times of the Trojan War, the kings were seen as living gods who were unapproachable by mere mortals and controlled their empires with the help of a developed bureaucratic apparatus. According to Homer, the kings were quite close to the people and not alien to democratic methods of rule.\(^50\)

The Mycenaean people worshipped the small idols housed in small chapels or home altars. The heroes of The Iliad prayed in majestic temples\(^51\) decorated with full-length statues of gods.

In the XIII-XII centuries B.C., the aristocrats of the Greek poleis were buried in mine tombs decorated by gold and jewels, together with utensils and clothes. Murdered Homeric heroes were incinerated on ritual fires, and urns with ashes were buried under burial mounds\(^52\).

The Mycenaean people used bronze weapons and were practically unfamiliar with iron — the Greeks started to smelt it in noticeable amounts only in the X century B.C. (i.e. in the epoch of the Dark Ages). The heroes of The Iliad fight with iron cudgels and pole axes, and equipped arrows with ferrous tips.

“Homer and archaeology are quickly pared,” Moses Finley notes. “As a whole, he knew the whereabouts of the flourishing Mycenaean civilisation, and his heroes lived in large palaces of the Bronze Age, which were unknown in the times of Homer. And, in fact everything he knew about the Mycenaean epoch, whereas the list of his mistakes is extremely long”\(^53\).

---

\(^{50}\) The leader of the Achaean Agamemnon makes key decisions not in an authoritarian way, but at the council. See example at the beginning of the 2nd song *Iliad*. (Iliad, II, 50-444.)

\(^{51}\) Just check out the description by Homer of Temple of Athena in Troy!

\(^{52}\) See burial of Patroclus in the 23rd song of *Iliad*. (Iliad, XXIII, 110-257.)

Apart from numerous anachronisms in Homer’s poems, doubts about the validity of the available information on the Trojan War also resulted in the more detailed study of the archaeological data obtained by Carl Blegen.

As we have seen, one of the major arguments for Blegen in favour of the idea that Troy was captured and incinerated by the Greeks in the mid-XIII century B.C. was the predominance of samples of Mycenaean type III B pottery in the cultural layer of Troy VIIa, from the only city identified on the Hisarlik Hill that perished due to an enemy attack. This argument was contested by a participant in Korfmann’s expedition, Bonn-based Nuclear Physics Professor Hans Mommsen. Applying the method of neutron activation, he discovered that the “Mycenaean” pottery was of regional origin.

“Each deposit contains a typical set of microelements. To identify them, the studied item plant is placed in the nuclear reactor and irradiated with neutrons. Under these conditions, any chemical element releases gamma rays, the energy of which can be measured with a detector. In such a way, it is possible to discover microscopic concentrations of elements: for example, one foreign atom that is typical only for the given deposit per billion common atoms”54.

Rumours about the scale export of pottery to Asia Minor from Mycenae appeared to be strongly exaggerated. On the contrary, the Trojans actually exported their utensils to Mycenae.

Thus, the archaeological data collected by Carl Blegen and his forerunners could no longer be considered convincing evidence of Troy’s capture by the Greeks in the late Bronze Age.

**The archaeological data collected by Blegen and his forerunners could no longer testify to Troy’s capture by the Greeks in the late Bronze Age.**

But, they maybe they took another city instead?

In due time, Blegen then considered the fact that, in Homer’s poems, Priam’s city has two names at once — Troy and Ilion — rather strange. There is a version that the city itself was named Ilion, and that the surrounding area in its vicinity was Troy. “However,” Blegen argues, “in Homer’s poems, such a difference is not traced, and both names are used to identify the same city”55. The scientist provides the following facts: the name of Ilion appeared in The Iliad 106 times, while Troy appeared only 50

55 Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
times. It is the contrary in The Odyssey: Troy is mentioned 25 times, and Ilion 19 times. Homer’s epithets, identifying city or another, are also very different: “Troy is a “widely stretched city”; “with spacious streets”; “it is enclosed by fortress walls with beautiful towers”; “in the walls there is “a big gate”; it is a “great city”, “the city of Priam”, and “the city of Trojans”. Besides, there was “good fertile soil” in the city. Ilion is “sacred”; “unique” and “inimitable”; “dreadful”; but at the same time it is a “well built” city that is “comfortable for living”, though there are “strong breezes”. It is “beautiful” and famous with “good foals”. Only one steady definition is used in relation to both cities — euteicheos (behind the powerful fortress wall). “This is the only exception, and, in other cases, descriptions of the same city are never used given the characteristics of the other - and this is despite the existence of close descriptions about their essence”.

Blegen draws no conclusions from the comparisons, but it is hard to avoid doing so. What if, in Homer’s poems, the stories about the long siege of two different cities were aggregated? The question remains whether it was only during the prosperity of Byzantium that the war coincidentally took on the name Trojan, while antiquity sources refer to it as the Ilion War? In the opinion of Leo Klein, a Russian researcher of Homer, it is possible to explain alternative definitions of Ilion and Troy and other absurdities by the fact that “at least for Homer (as a conditional writer of the final text of The Iliad), this was the same city and, in Homer’s folklore sources, in those legends which he used and treated, they were different cities. This entails the contamination of different legends — about Ilion and Troy, and these legends belonged to the different ethno-cultural traditions of the Greek world and, maybe, to different epochs.”

It is interesting to connect the change in this with the fact that the Odyssey was written much later than the Iliad. The trend of replacement of "Ilium" with "Troy" will continue with later writers. In the Aeneid of Virgil (1 century BC.) the city is called “Troy” 20 times and only twice - "Ilium". And in Postgomerike of John Tsetses (XII century) the term "Ilium" is not used at all.

Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
This hypothesis also cannot offer a confirmation in Hittite sources. The discovery of the Hittite civilisation became one of greatest scientific sensations of the XX century. As it was revealed, the legendary Bible people did not simply exist in history, but also constructed one of the mightiest empires of their time, the territory of which extended from the Euphrates Valley to the Aegean Sea. The Hittites spoke what is the most ancient of Indo-European languages known to us today, they were the first to use iron tools and horse chariots, and the first in history to make their own constitution and to conclude the first peace treaty. Due to the decryption of the cuneiform tables found in Bogazköy, it was possible to understand that the Hittite empire had tight links with Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria, as well as with an empire known as Achaea.

Moreover, according to the chronicle of Hittite King Tutthalias IV (1250-1220 B.C.), by that time, Achaea was already an active Asia Minor city-state and had carried out military operations in western Anatolia:

1) “(...) the river Seha country again assaults the frontiers.
2) (the people of the river Seha country spoke): “His Majesty Grandfather did

---

60 “Constitution of the Hittites” is the decree of the king Telepinu (XV century BC.), who reformed the system of transfer of the throne and divided authority between the branches of government: the king, tulia(council of elders) and pankus (warriors counsel).
61 Signed by the same Telepinu with the kingdom Kizzuwatna (Cilicia). This new instrument of international policy turned out to be very effective; stopping the “war of all against all”, it provided the impetus to the gradual rise of the Hittite kingdom.
62 From the same plates one concluded that the Turkish city Boğazköy is nothing more than an ancient Hattusa, the capital of the Hittite Empire.
not conquer (us) with a sword.

3) (when) he conquered countries of Arceva,

4) (he did not conquer us) with a sworn, we...... him”

5) (So the river Seha country ...) unleashed a war, and the King Ahhijava retreated.

6) (Now, when...... he) retreated, I, Grand Prince, attacked...”

From this fragment it is possible to note that the conflict of interests between the Hittites and Ahhijava did not cause a war between them — the Hittites attacked the country of the Seha River only after the exodus of King Ahhijava.

In 1924, Swiss orientalist Emil Forrer identified Ahhijava as the country of the Achaeans (Homer “Achaioi”)64, having begun a discussion that would last for a few decades. In 1932, Forrer was answered by heavy artillery — Ferdinand Zommer’s fundamental work Documents of Ahhijava (Die Ahhijava Urkunden), which was dedicated to contradicting the Mycenae hypothesis. Zommer and his supporters insisted that the likeness of the names “Ahhijava” and “Achaioi” is a chance coincidence appealing to the variability of phonetic similarity and other philology. The polemic proceeded with varying success until the 1980s, when studies by Hans Guterbock and Margaret Finkelberg completely tilted the balance in favour of Forrer’s concept65.

The comparison of data on wars, trade and diplomatic contacts of the leading countries of that time eloquently demonstrates the legitimacy of identifying Ahhijava with the Achaean Empire. It would be surprising if the Hittites had not noted the activity of the Greeks at their western boundaries, who had begun to colonise the coast of Asia Minor from the mid-XV century B.C. (the first Asia Minor colonies of the Achaeans were Crete and Miletus). The documents demonstrate that, in the XIII century B.C., the Hittites saw a real force in Ahhijava, which was necessary to face. From here, in particularly noteworthy is Emperor Hattusili’s famous letter to Achaean King, dated approximately 1260 B.C.66, where he addressed him as “brother of mine” — he did not honour even the ruler of powerful Assyria with such an address.

63 Цит. по: Гордезiani R.В. Проблемы гомеровского эпоса. — С. 181.
66 According to the legendary chronology, the addressee of Hattusili could be either Agamemnon or his father Atreus.
Having recognised Mycenae Greece in the Hittite Ahhijava, Forrer took a step further and announced that he had discovered mentions of Troy in the Hattusa archives. Simultaneously with Forrer, Austrian philologist Paul Kretschmer announced the revelation of Trojan traces on the Hittite plates. There was a document in good condition from the early XIII century B.C. — a contract in which one King Muwatalli obligated the ruler of Wilusa, Alaksandus, to help him with “infantry and chariot troops” in case of war or revolt, God forbid. So, Alaksandus was to repay Muwatalli his debt — the Hittite King sheltered him in a time of trouble and then helped him return to power. According to Kretschmer, Alaksandus is none other than Trojan Prince Alexander (Paris), and Wilusa is a country of Ilus, or Homeric Ilion. This is supported by a legend, which VI century historian Stephen Byzantine cited in the “Ethnic” geographic lexicon. According to this legend, on the way from Sparta to Ilion, Paris and Helen visited the Asia Minor city Samilia, where the local ruler Motil received them. In Motil, Kretschmer recognised Muwatalli, who had sheltered Alaksandus.

The name “Wilusa” figures in a lot of the documents of the Hittite “MFA”

---

68 Iliad mentions a visit of Paris and Helen by Sidon (Iliad, VI, 289-292.)
including, mention in the chronicle of Tudhalia IV of the composition of Assuva — a union of Asia Minor states opposing the Hittites, and, what is interesting, in the neighbourhood of Taruisa, or Truia according to another writing. Independently of each other, Forrer and Kretschmer both recognised it as Homeric Troy.

Thus, in Hittite sources, both Troy and Ilion are fixed. And these titles obviously refer to different geographic places. Incredibly, Priam’s city ended up doubling in size!

**In Hittite sources, Troy and Ilion are fixed according to the names Wilusa and Taruisa. And these names obviously refer to different geographic places.**

Explorers have tried to explain this phenomenon a number of different ways. Denis Page, agreeing with the identity of Taruisa and Troy, disclaimed the coincidence of Wilusa and Ilion. John Garstang and Oliver Gurney proposed considering Wilusa as a country, and Taruisa as a city… “It is strange,” Klein expressed surprise, “that nobody tried to proceed from the apparent fact and, having recognised the identification, to accept the indication of the Chronicle according to the direct sense of its formula: in the late XIII century B.C., Wilusia (Wilusa) and Tarusia (or Troia) were different states. The first was known to the Hittites since the XVII century, and the second (probable new formation) was only known since the XIII century: those two different states are Ilion and Troy. They entered the Greek heroic epos (likely later) in the same order: first Ilion, then Troy. By the VIII-VII century (the period of The Iliad’s composition), legends about wars with them overlap. The images of cities coincided, the names became equivalent, and the relevant epithets were saved as rudiments of the far past. This coincidence happened based on the singers’ acquaintance with the real Ilion when the site of the real Troy and its independence has already been forgotten”

Ilion was discovered on the Hisarlik Hill, beyond doubt. Inscriptions on the building fragment, numismatic data and historical memory itself testified to that. Ilion’s destruction was caused by earthquakes, and while it was seized and captured by the enemy, there is no indication that it was captured by the Greeks. The Iliad provides a narration about that very city.

But where, in such a case, is Troy located? According to calculations by historian Leo Klein, Troy-Truia-Taruisa could be in the direct neighbourhood of the

Ilium Empire — the Troad, on the southern coast of the Marble Sea, in the region of Cyzicus, Ophni Lake and the Tarsi River\textsuperscript{70}.

The question now arises as to why archaeologists have not discovered any ruins of the ancient city to date? You see that Ilium was only rather recently dug out under the historical measurement. And the discovery of the great Hittite civilisation happened only one hundred years ago. The spirit of enlightenment has prepared a number of strange discoveries for scientists of the future. There are many anonymous hills within the grey-haired Propontis. It is possible to discover the great Troy in virtually each of them.

But now we return to the Hittites. As we have already noted, scientists obtained the most detailed information on the diplomatic, political and military activity of the empire from the Bogazköy inscriptions. Both Troy and Ilium were in Hattusa’s sphere of influence, and before entering the Assuva coalition, they were allies of the Hittites. It is natural to suspect that the ten-year war between any of these cities and Mycenaean Greece would have not gone unnoticed by the Hittite chroniclers. However, there are no distinct mentions of this event in the Hittite annals. “Hittite sources do not give any information on significant acts of war in the period before 1300 B.C.,” affirms Rismag Gordeziani, a known Soviet expert on Homeric history. “It is amazing, moreover especially as the Hittites held great influence upon all of western Anatolia by that time, and the tribes occupying this area were even allies of the Hittites in the war against Egypt prior to 1300 B.C. In a similar situation, of course, the Hittites could not be indifferent to the Trojan War”\textsuperscript{71}.

Later Hittite sources do not describe any large military campaigns in the Troad region. Despite this, Gordeziani nevertheless attempted to demonstrate the Trojan War’s historicity. In his opinion, it could have taken place during the gap between the Tudhalia IV campaign against the Assuva states (mid-XIII century B.C.) and the battle of Per-Ir between the Libyans and Egyptian King Merneptah (1230-1220 B.C.), by which time Assuva had already ceased to exist. Comparing the composition of the Assuva military alliance and Libya’s list of allies in its war against Egypt, Gordeziani concluded that the Assuva defeat could have resulted from a large war covering the northwest and western regions of Anatolia. “This was probably the Trojan War”, supposes the scientist\textsuperscript{72}.

\textsuperscript{70} Клейн Л.С. Анатомия Илиады. — С. 49.
\textsuperscript{71} Гордезiani Р.В. Проблемы гомеровского эпоса. — С. 191—192.
\textsuperscript{72} Гордезiani Р.В. Проблемы гомеровского эпоса. — С. 194.
In the opinion of Rismag Gordeziani, a known Soviet expert on Homeric history, the Trojan cycle could mirror the events of a great war covering the west of Anatolia in the period 1260-1220 B.C. However, the annals have provided us no information on either the war’s participants or its main battles, including the siege and capture of Troy. Image by Olga Aranova.

It is noteworthy that the composition of Assuva — an anti-Hittite coalition of Asia Minor states - wholly coincides with Troy’s allies as listed in Homer’s The Iliad. In this relation, the version dividing many scientists is interesting in that the name “Assuva” could have become the future name of the “Asia” continent. Thereby — and here we cannot bypass unscientific allegories — the hypothetical war of the union of the Achaean states and Assuva seems to have been the war of the Mycenae Europe against young Asia.

According to the Catalogue of The Iliad, the Trojan union included: 1) the tribes occupying the Troad — inhabitants of Troy itself, Dardanii, Trojans from Zelia — a city at the foot of Ida, Adrastians, Percorian etc.; 2) Pelasgi from Anatolian Larissa; 3) Thracians; 4) Cicones; 5) Paëans; 6) Paphlagonians; 7) Galizonians; 8) Mysians; 9) Phrygians; 10) Meonians; 11) Karas occupying Miletus; 12) Lycians occupying the region currently known as Antalia. (Iliad. II. 816-877). Apart from them, the Leleges and the Caucones battled on the side of the Trojans (Iliad. X. 429).

Now is the time to return to the question about the language spoken by the Trojans and the people they belonged to? Following Homer, it is possible to consider the Trojans to be the Greeks. They worship the Hellenic gods, have Greek names and

undergo hardship in terms of dialogue with invaders. The same Paul Kretschmer, having recognised Homeric Alexander as being Hittite Alaksandus, considered this as evidence of the Achaean presence in Troy and, probably, dynastical links with the Mycenaean Greece. However, Ferdinand Zommer refuted his colleague and pointed out that the name Alaksandus is primary and Hittite by origin. They were Greeks who adapted it according to their pronunciation and gave it a new etymology. In this connection, well-known Russian experts on Hellenistic affairs, Leonid Gindin and Vadim Tsymbursky, pay attention to one important nuance: “After the Trojan War, this name practically left live Greek anthroponomy for 800 years, and came back during the epoch of Macedonia’s prosperity. The earliest Alexander known in Greek history is the king of Macedonia ruling in 498-454 B.C. Only in the IV century B.C. did this name fall beyond the limits of Macedonia and occur in the adjacent Greek states: Epirus and Thessalian Fera. After the campaigns of Alexander the Great, who was surrounded by a number of Macedonians of the same name, this becomes one of most popular names in the Greek world, but in the period of The Iliad, Greeks could learn it only from tradition”74.

The belief that Homeric Troy was populated by ethnic Greeks dominated in the field of historical science for a long time. As we saw earlier, Carl Blegen followed this point of view too and affirmed, following the appearance of a kind of pottery in a proper archaeological layer, that the Greeks were the founders of Troy VI75. Some scientists, including Albrecht Goetze, without a moment's hesitation, identified Troy VI as a Greek colony. James Mellaart’s concept suspects that the Greeks settled on the lands of the Troad already in the III millennium B.C., having come here along the Southeast Balkans and further through Hellespont and having superseded the Luwians from Troy II76. This hypothesis was also followed by Russian scientists Gindin and Tsymbursky77.

In the Bronze Age, Troy was part of the central Anatolian civilisation rather than the Mycenaean one, a kind of outpost of Asia hanging over Europe.

The version about the Trojans’ “Asian” nature was considered marginal until

75 Blegen, Carl. Troy and the Trojans.
77 Гиндин Л.А., Цымбурский В.Л. Прагреки в Трое (Междисциплинарный аспект) // Вестник древней истории. — 1994. № 4.
Manfred Korfmann began to conduct research on the Hisarlik Hill. Korfmann proved that various features are rather typical for the Hittite culture but not for the Greeks: city planning (an acropolis where the ruler’s family live, and a downtown where the other townspeople live); the architecture of the fortress walls, expanding from top to bottom and decorated with toothing and cupolas; and the cult towers at the city gate. According to the scientist, “in the Bronze Age, Troy was part of the central-Anatolian but not the Crete-and-Mycenaean civilisation. Troy was more an outpost of Asia hanging over Europe rather than a large European city of the Bronze Age”\textsuperscript{78}.

In October 1995, during excavations headed by Korfmann, a bronze seal with Anatolian hieroglyphs was found in the layer of Troy VII\textsubscript{b2} — the only written document of Homeric Troy. These hieroglyphs were used in the Hittite Empire along with cuneiform, in particular, on seals and memorial inscriptions, but were put into the Luwian language. With respect to the Hittites, this was the most ancient language of Lydia.

An analysis of this seal allows us to conclude that the Luwian language was the official language of Homeric Troy\textsuperscript{79}. It is probable that the Trojans spoke it in their everyday life.

\textit{Inscriptions on bronze seal from the XII century B.C., found in the VII layer, were made in the Luwian language.}

Another interesting find from Korfmann’s expedition was a man-made grotto

\textsuperscript{78} Цит. по: Рябцев В. Троя. Крушение мифа? — С. 24—25.
carved in the rock for supplying the city with source water. Homer likely wrote about this stone water pool:

And there hard by the selfsame springs are broad washing-tanks, fair and wrought of stone, where the wives and fair daughters of the Trojans were wont to wash bright raiment of old in the time of peace, before the sons of the Achaeans came.

Iliad. XXII. 153-156.

The radioactive test of stalactites allowed determining the grotto’s age at about five thousand years. Thereby, by the time of Troy VIIa, the source had existed already for one thousand years. In the Hittite documents, this water pool is mentioned as a cult cave of the god Kaskal Kur — the lord of water and the entire underworld. The same god was mentioned in the contract between King Alaksandus and Mutawalli, and the god Apaliunas was identified with the Greek Apollo and, by everything, being his prototype (there is no Apollo among the gods of the Mycenaean pantheon)80. Here is another interesting parallel! As we know, Apollo in The Iliad was the patron of Paris. And according to the cyclic poem The Ethiopica, he sent the Trojan Prince’s arrow to penetrate Achilles’ heel.

The artificial grotto, built in the III millennium B.C. by inhabitants of Ilion; the Hittite annals mentioned this as a sanctuary of the god Kaskal Kur.

Whether the inhabitants of Ilion were Luwians or even Hittites — it is too early

---

80 Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff insisted Asia Minor origin of Apollo even before deciphering Hittite tablets.
to say. The evidence, as they say, is insufficient. It is only clear that they did not belong to the Greek culture, although they borrowed a lot from it. It is too difficult to speak about the scale of their military confrontation against the Achaeans. But it is suitable to mention here another hypothesis that is speculative, though not deprived of grace, in relation to the Trojan War, pronounced by Russian experts on the Hittites Alexander Volkov and Nikolai Nepomnyashchy. In their opinion, the Trojan War described by Homer might well have been the Greek-and-Hittite war.

In the XV century B.C., Greeks began to actively colonise Asia Minor. They first captured Crete, then Miletus, having turned it into a foothold for further expansion. With reason, the Hittites perceived the Achaeans colony as a potential threat to their western boundaries and, in the late XIII century B.C., King Tudhalia IV decided to eradicate this danger centre. The archaeological finds prove that, exactly at that time in Miletus, a change of power took place: the city was captured by Hittite protégés. Having lost their advanced post in Asia Minor, Ahhijava undertook an attempt to conquer a foothold in another part of the peninsula, namely in Troy. “This rich, blossoming city attracted their notice for a long time. They began a campaign. Probably, the Hittite army moved towards them”81.

Historians give some lines from The Odyssey where the King of Ithaca tells Achilles about his son Neoptolemus’ battle against Eurypylis. It is surprising, but this is the only place in Homer’s works where he mentioned the Hittites — the major political force in Anatolia in the Bronze Age.

*but what a warrior was that son of Telephus whom he slew with the sword, the prince Eurypylus! Aye, and many of his comrades, the Ceteians, were slain about him*

*Odyssey. XI. 519-521.*

“In these verses, the “Ceteans” are the Hittites,” affirmed Volkov and Nepomnyashchy, “and their leader Eurypylis is the son of Telephus, whose name was popular with the Hittites, and Astioha is the sister of Trojan King Priam. So, these lines mean that the nephew of the King of Troy commanded the Hittite army and was killed while defending the city. Who else would be capable of heading the army if not a Hittite? Who is his uncle Priam then? A Hittite or a local king became related with the Hittites through his sister. Among the "Ceteans", mostly all Greeks knew the inhabitants of Wilusa-Troy. Therefore, they could call all Hittites “Trojans”, just as

nowadays Americans call all expatriates from the former USSR ‘Russians’”

So, if the results of archaeological excavations could not provide us convincing proof of the historicity of the Trojan War, the ancient Oriental documents convincingly demonstrate this possibility. The Achaeans really undertook military campaigns in Asia Minor, colonised its coast, and were at war against the Hittites and even the Egyptians. And on short-distance lines of the central Anatolian civilisation, two strongholds — Wilusa and Taruisa — were able to fully deter their super active force.

Chapter 4. They came back ignominiously…

82 Волков А.В., Непомнящий Н.Н. Хетты. — С. 263.
Modern Troy is rich in terms of tourist attractions. Those who get bored studying ruins and constantly comparing them with the information stands and Korffmann’s guidebook can still gain many unforgettable impressions by taking part in fancy-dress show or climbing in the belly of the two-storied wooden horse. Almost nobody neglects the last amusement, however. Wouldn’t everyone like to feel like a brave warrior ready to bring the fury of his sword down on the sleeping opponent all fury of his sword?

The wooden horse is a favourite attraction for visitors to the Trojan archaeological reserve.

Perhaps, the wooden horse is the most popular character of the Achaean Victoria. Even those who confuse Odysseus with Jason\(^{83}\) know that this horse helped the Greeks to capture the unapproachable Troy. This is the elementary truth: the sun rises in the east; the Volga runs into the Caspian Sea, Homer’s The Iliad glorifies the famous victory of the Hellenic weapon. Nothing is so simple, is it?

Let’s begin with the fact that The Iliad describes neither the capture, nor the destruction of Ilion. The poem ends with Hector’s funeral. The Greeks’ coming victory is mentioned briefly and only in the sixth song, where Hector shares his presentiment with his wife Andromacha:

For of a surety know I this in heart and soul:

\(^{83}\) In the Crimean stores you can buy a movie about Balaclava, in which the "Odysseus stayed with his Argonauts on their way to Colchis."
the day shall come when sacred Ilios shall be laid low.

Iliad. VI. 448-449.

In the twelfth song, where Poseidon and Apollo decide to destroy a defensive wall the Achaeans had erected around the camp:

And the city of Priam was sacked in the tenth year, and the Argives had gone back in their ships to their dear native land, then verily did Poseidon and Apollo take counsel to sweep away the wall, bringing against it the might of all the rivers that flow forth from the mountains of Ida to the sea.

Iliad. XII. 15-19.

and indirectly in the fifteenth song, where Zeus assures Hera:

... until the Achaeans shall take steep Ilios through the counsels of Athene. But until that hour neither do I refrain my wrath, nor will I suffer any other of the immortals to bear aid to the Danaans here, until the desire of the son of Peleus be fulfilled

Iliad. XV. 70-74.

As proof that the tragic fate of Ilion was preconceived, they often give the explanation of the soothsayer Calchas, with predictive signs of dragon devouring sparrows:

Even as this serpent devoured the sparrow's little ones and the mother with them—the eight, and the mother that bare them was the ninth—so shall we war there for so many years, but in the tenth shall we take the broad-wayed city.

Iliad. II. 326-329.

and the episode of The Iliad where the lord of Olympus learns the result of the battle of the Greeks and Trojans and weighs applicable lots on the gold balance:

then verily the Father lifted on high his golden scales, and set therein two fates of grievous death, one for the horse-taming Trojans, and one for the brazen-coated Achaeans; then he grasped the balance by the midst and raised it, and down sank the day of doom of the Achaeans. So the Achaeans' fates settled down upon the bounteous earth and those of the Trojans were raised aloft toward wide heaven.
However, in Homer’s poems, a lot happens “contrary to destiny” to expect that events go pursuant to the totals of this weighing and measurement.

Outstanding Russian philosopher Alexei Losev pays attention to the fact that Homer often used this expression and, according to him, this formula “is reflection of a quite definite stage of the human historical development when he starts proudly lifting his head and does not kiss the ground under the destiny any more, as he did earlier in the primitive times and during his full feebleness”84.

Another great poem by Homer — the Odyssey — about the long return of the war hero Odysseus, the son of Laertes, to native Ithaca, tells about the victory of the Greeks over Ilion as an already accomplished fact. In the third song, the elder King of Pylos Nestor tells Odysseus’ son Telemachus, who worries about his father’s fate, about the events immediately following the fall of Troy:

*But when we had sacked the lofty city of Priam, and had gone away in our ships, and a god had scattered the Achaeans...*

*Odyssey. III. 130-131.*

Practically verbatim, as folklore requires, Odysseus retells this episode to his loyal servant Eumaeus, and the “godlike swineherd” heeded him:

*There for nine years we sons of the Achaeans warred, and in the tenth we sacked the city of Priam, and set out for home in our ships, and a god scattered the Achaeans.*

*Odyssey. XIV. 240-242.*

In the eighth song, Homer again returns to this subject. At the games arranged by King Alcinous in honour of a stranger, who was actually Odysseus, the blind Homeric bard Demodocus sings about the military feats of the King of Ithaca.

*And he sang how the sons of the Achaeans poured forth from the horse and, leaving their hollow ambush, sacked the city....*

*Odyssey. VIII. 514-515.*

And finely in the twenty-second song, Athena, having put on the mentor’s

robe, reminds undecided and aged Odysseus to engage in a close fight with Penelope’s grooms with respect to his past feats:

> Many men thou slewest in dread conflict, and by thy counsel was the broad-wayed city of Priam taken.

*Odyssey. XXII. 229-230.*

The detailed story about the Trojan War events is contained in the poems of the so-called Trojan epic cycle. Only its fragments and a brief summary remain, and they were included in The Anthology of Proclus and Bibliotheca (The Mythological Library) of Apollodorus. These poems accurately embrace The Iliad and The Odyssey and do not invade their territory, so that it can be explained by Homer’s indisputable authority and the unwillingness of ancient rhapsodies to augment substance. Why should you sing what someone else has already sung about even better than you?

The reasons for the war and its beginning are depicted in the “Cyprian Songs”, so named after their legendary author Stasin Cyprian. Zeus decided to inflict this war because he wished to protect the Earth against overpopulation. The poem describes The Judgement of Paris, his embassy in Lacedaemon and the abduction of Helen, and the countless treasures of Menelaus. Together with his brother, Menelaus planned a campaign against Troy.

An interesting point is that, according to the “Cyprian Songs”, the Achaeans miscalculated and mistakenly began a war in Teuthrania (Mysia), having mistaken it for Ilion. However, under pressure from the Mysian troops, headed by Heracles’s son Telephus, they had to recede. According to Apollodorus, “Telephus ... armed the Mysians and chased the Hellenes until reaching their ships harbour”.

Let's recall that the name of Mysian King Telephus, according to A. Volkov and N. Nepomnyashchyi, corresponds to the Hittite name Telepinu. If you link this fact to the aforementioned war between the Hittite and the Assuva alliance, it is possible to find an explanation why the ancient writers distinguished Asia Minor Teuthrania (Mysia) from Asia, which they considered as the location of all its neighbours. So, in “The Mysians”, Sophocles says, “We call Asia all the land / And this area we call Mysia”.

Other sources also refer to the Greeks’ attrition in Mysia. So, “The Catalogue

---

85 Ancient tradition appointed Stasin as a son-in-law to Homer. According to Aelianus, Homer due to poverty gave the poem “Cyprus” for his daughter as a dowry. (Claudius Aelianus. Various History, IX, 15.)
87 Sophocles, Mysoi (Mysians), 396-397 (411-412).
of Women, or Ehoiai”, attributed to Hesiod, says:

*Telephus turned back the hosts of the Achaeans in cooper armour
which arrived one day on the black-sided vessels
to the man parent solid earth...*\(^{88}\)

In the “Olympic songs”, Pindar explicitly affirms:

*... mighty Danaus’s men was turned back by Telephus
and thrown to the saline ship sides*\(^{89}\).

Strabo narrates the same: “Agamemnon, with his fleet, devastated Mysia, having mistaken it for the Trojan area, and *ignominiously* came back”\(^{90}\).

The fact that later, the main city of Teuthrania was Pergamon provokes special interest. This is another name often used by Homer for this legendary city, apart from Ilion and Troy.

American historian Rhys Carpenter became interested in the reason that there exists three different names for the same geographic object and found, in the history of the Mysian and Trojan Wars, a set of parallels and suspicious coincidences\(^{91}\):

1. In both cases, everything begins with a gathering on the Aulis Peninsula.
2. In both cases, they could not sail due to bad weather. In both cases, the soothsayer Calchas applied guesswork.
3. In both cases, upon landing, the local leader (in Teuthrania it was Telephus, and in Troy it was Hector) kills the Achaean hero.
4. Then, in both cases, the Achaeans devastate the surroundings.
5. In both cases, the battle happened in the river valley (in Teuthrania in the the Caic River valley, and in the Troad, it occurred in the Scamandra River valley).
6. In both cases, the initial success is followed by a defeat, and the Achaeans run to their vessels.
7. In both cases, Patroclus tries to prevent defeat but he is unsuccessful and is wounded in Tefrania; in the Troad, he gets killed.
8. Out of revenge, Achilles “fleet of foot” attacks the enemies’ leader (they are Telephus and Hector respectively) and pursues him, but cannot catch him.
9. The escapee is stopped by a trick performed by the god assisting Achilles. In

---

\(^{88}\) Hesiod, Megalai Ehoiai (Catalogue of Women), 57 (165).

\(^{89}\) Pindar, Olympian. IX, 73-74.

\(^{90}\) Strabo, Geography, I, 17.

\(^{91}\) Carpenter R. Folk tale: Fiction and saga in the Homeric epics. — Berkeley: University of California Press, 1946.
Teuthrania it is Dionysus and in the Troad it is Athena.

10. In both places, Achilles strikes the leader of the local forces: He wounds Telephus very badly, and he kills Hector.

11. On both cases, a storm broke the vessels down on the way back.

12. After the campaign was terminated, in both cases a person of imperial origin from the enemy camp appears in Agamemnon’s Argolida. In the first case, it was Telephus; in the second case, it was Cassandra, the daughter of Priam.

“Carpenter makes quite a logical conclusion: they are not two different stories but rather two versions of the same story. Not having caught it but having seen the actions of the same heroes in different territories, the ancient author of “Cypriot Songs” decided that they were two different episodes of the Trojan War, and has placed them sequentially, the Trojan one behind the Teutranic one (you see that some are killed in Troy), and he offers an explanation: they got lost on their way”\textsuperscript{92}.

Thereby, according to Carpenter, the Trojan War is a full-fledged twin war in Teuthrania, which terminated, according to antiquity sources, with the Greeks’ shameful flight. Could it have happened that, during a historically insignificant period in the same area, two absolutely identical wars had occurred, right down to the very detailed episodes? Or should we, with “lex parsimoniae”, filter historical outshoots from this plot for the benefit of a more authentic version? Having done so, we shall conclude that both The Cypriot Songs and The Iliad are referring to the same military campaign, ending with the Achaeans’ defeat\textsuperscript{93}. A little later, we shall see that there are many other extremely weighty arguments favouring this version.

The military campaign in Teuthrania, depicted in the Cypriot Songs and finished upon the Achaeans’ defeat, is similar to the Trojan War up to the smallest episodes.

Having hastily evacuated the Greeks from Teuthrania, the writer of the Cypriot Songs leaves them unattended for eight years, then again outfits them for a campaign. Having sharpened their silver-nailed swords and scrubbed the decks of multi-oar vessels, the Achaeans suddenly discover that they have no leader capable of pointing out the true marine way to the Troad. The Mysian King Telephus, who was cured by Achilles from a wound he had inflicted, volunteered to be a conductor. On the way, the Greeks visited the island of Tenedhos, where Achilles kills the local King Tenes,

\textsuperscript{92} Клейн Л. Найдена ли Троя? // Знание — сила. — 1985. №3. — С.42.

\textsuperscript{93} It is interesting here to return to the hypothesis of Volkov-Nepomnyastchy of the Trojan War as a clash between Greeks and Hittites. And whether the Achaeans fled from the Hittites led by Telephus-Telepinu?
and also visited the island of Lemnos, where they land the reeking plant as a result of a wound obtained by the great archer, Argonaut, and Philoctetes, a personal friend of Heracles.

Thereby, at last we learn where those ten years went, which passed between Helen’s abduction and the beginning of the siege of Troy, and what caused the mismatch in time between the 21 years that Menelaus’ wife stayed in Paris’ palace, which she speaks about at the end of The Iliad, and the city’s 10-year siege.

It is remarkable that the Achaeans, who learned from the Mysia experience, did not attack Troy on the wing, but first tried to resolve the problem amicably. Having anchored off the shore of the Troad, they sent Menelaus and Odysseus as ambassadors to the Trojans to propose handing over Helen and the riches, stolen together with her, without striking a blow. It was only upon being refused that they landed from their vessels and began the war.

*Warriors have lost their lives near Troy: Zeus’s will has come true*\(^{94}\).

The Cypriot Songs reduce the presentation of the war events up to the point where The Iliad starts - up to the division or share of living booty, when Achilles receives Briseis, and Agamemnon takes Chryseis. Then Homer enters….

---

\(^{94}\) Cypria, 1 (1).
because everyone knows his destiny, and that destiny is often tragic and unfair. Death is above Achilles, above Hector, and above Troy itself — and for us who know the story’s end, this is not surprising. It is strange that in the poem more than once in this poem do we meet phrases foreshadowing the Greeks’ defeat! Here are just a few.

In the eighth song, at the meeting of the gods before throwing lots on the golden balance, Zeus warns those at the meeting to refrain from helping the participants in the Greek-Trojan confrontation. On behalf of the whole pantheon, Athena assures the ruler:

_All of us... shall refrain from [this], if you shall do;

However, she notes:

... so have we pity for the Danaan spearmen who now shall perish and fulfill an evil fate. Yet verily will we refrain us from battle, even as thou dost bid; howbeit counsel will we offer to the Argives which shall be for their profit, that they perish not all by reason of thy wrath...

_Iliad. VIII. 33-37._

Hera says the same words, following Athena.

In the ninth song, Agamemnon decides to test the mood of the Achaean soldiers and offers them the chance to return home. He proclaims:

*My friends, leaders and rulers of the Argives, great Zeus, son of Cronos, hath ensnared me in grievous blindness of heart, cruel god! seeing that of old he promised me, and bowed his head thereto, that not until I had sacked well-walled Ilios should I get me home; but now hath he planned cruel deceit, and biddeth me return inglorious to Argos, when I have lost much people. So, I ween, must be the good pleasure of Zeus supreme in might... for no more is there hope that we shall take broad-wayed Troy!*

_Iliad. IX. 17-23, 28._

Noble Diomede objects to Agamemnon and decides to fight against Troy until the final victory, even though all the other soldiers would leave the battle field. However, Achilles is offended by Agamemnon and does not wish to battle in the interests of the Atrides states:

*Aye, and I would counsel you others also to sail back to your homes;*
seeing there is no more hope that ye shall win the goal of steep Ilios;
for mightily doth Zeus, whose voice is borne afar, hold forth his hand
above her, and her people are filled with courage.

Iliad. IX. 417-420.

According to Leo Klein, it is usually treated “as art methods intended to
highlight the fearlessness of Diomede, who contends with Agamemnon, as well as
Achilles’ worth. The reasonable explanation, and it would be both the sole one and
sufficient, if the vestiges of the future defeat were not so numerous and did not form
a system encompassing everyone’s thoughts in The Iliad: those of heroes, gods and
destinies. This deep system appears through the glorification of the Achaean heroes
and the lists of their victories”\(^95\). Thus, the appearance in the "Iliad" of the Acheans’
foreshadowing defeat probably represents traces of the most ancient rhapsodies, closer to
the historical truth.

**There are a few phrases in The Iliad foreshadowing the future defeat of the Greeks. They are probably traces of the most ancient rhapsodies, closer to the historical truth.**

The Iliad ends with the scene of Hector’s burial. The following poem of this
cycle, The Ethiopica, was named so after the locality from where Memnon’s
reinforcement arrived to support the Trojans. Memnon killed many Hellenes but also
ended up being killed by Achilles. In turn, Achilles was killed with Paris’ arrow,
directed by his patron Apollo. In the heat of the battle, Ajax Telamonid and Odysseus
take back the body of their murdered comrade. Achilles was buried on White Island
(Levkas), together with Partoclus, having their bones mixed in accordance with their
will. The Trojans handed the hero’s weapon to Odysseus, the most valiant, in their
opinion, of the remaining Achaeans.

Ajax took offence because he also counted on receiving a similar honour, so he
quarrelled with Odysseus and went off to cut the Trojan cattle and shepherds, after
which he committed a suicide. Agamemnon prohibited committing the body of this
suicide victim to fire, and Ajax, the only one killed near Ilion, was instead buried in a
coffin. But that is already another story, and now we again move back to giving a
synopsis of the next cyclic poem “The Little Iliad”. In this work, Philoctetes appears
again, having been landed by the Achaeans on the habitable island Lemnos.
Philoctetes proves his indispensability by killing Paris and his widow Helen

---

\(^95\) Клейн Л.С. Кто победил в Илиаде? // Знание — сила. — 1986. №7. — С. 43.
immediately marries Priam’s next eldest son Deiphobus.

Meanwhile, fresh forces arrive to Troy: the Achaeans’ troops are reinforced by Achilles’ son Neoptolemus, and the Trojans troops are reinforced by Telephus’ son and Priam’s nephew Euripilus, who led the whole army from Teuthrania. Euripilus kills Asclepius’ son Makhaon\(^{96}\), a renowned army doctor, but he falls on Neoptolemus’ brilliant sword, and, as we have already noted, all his Keteans also fell around the young leader. Odysseus changed into a tramp’s clothes and went to Troy\(^{97}\), where he confided in Helen. She counsels her former fiancé and the former ruler of Ithaca how to capture the city and helps him steal the Palladium — a sacred depicture of Athena, which Zeus once threw down to Earth from the sky as a sign for Troy’s legendary founder Ilus. Ilus erected a temple for Palladium, and the magic statue became a lien of the city’s might and inaccessibility.

Having been deprived of the Palladium, Troy lost all chances. All the more so since Epeius appeared; he was not only a famous fist-fighter but also a magnificent builder. According to an order by Odysseus, he built a huge wooden horse with a holding capacity from fifty to three thousand people. Everyone knows what happened next.

Or was this indeed the case?

From the side of history, it looks as if it would have to the inhabitants of Troy, who found the Danai’s “gift” at their gate. Having become exhausted by the 10-year fruitless war and the loss of their best soldiers, the Achaeans were unable to see any good prospects; they collected their belongings and departure for home. But before that, they make a proper sacrifice to the gods\(^{98}\). In this case, the victim is symbolical. They cannot find a horse whose size corresponds to an event of this scale, and therefore, they build a huge votive animal of either maple or cornel wood and inscribe the following into it: “Safely having returned home, the Hellenes have devoted this grateful gift to the goddess Athena”\(^{99}\).

\(^{96}\) Widely known butterfly of the family Papilionidae was named by the Swedish naturalist Carl Linnaeus in honor of this Homeric hero.

\(^{97}\) In Sophocles, Odysseus and Diomedes make their way to Troy through the “underground channel cramped and fetid”. (Sophocles, Lacaenae (Lacaenian Women), 276 (367)). According to our observations, this description is well suited to the man-made grotto, which was found by Korfman expedition.

\(^{98}\) According to Polybius, “almost all barbarous nations, in any case, most of them, kill and sacrifice a horse in the beginning of the war, or before the decisive battle, to read in the fall of the animal the sign of the near future.” (Polybius, The Histories, XII, 4b).

It is interesting who exactly from the Achaean’s camp could have made the inscriptions on the horse? When reading Homer, it is possible to imagine that the Greek soldiers arriving to Troy were completely illiterate. Everyone except for King Proitos of Tirinths. His wife slandered the young handsome Bellerofontis, and Proitos sent him to his father-in-law Iobatos with a kind of letter of recommendation, asking the King of Lycia to kill Bellerofontis.

...he sent him to Lycia, and gave him baneful tokens, graving in a folded tablet many signs and deadly, and bade him show these to his own wife’s father, that he might be slain.

Iliad. VI. 168-17.0

This is the only mention in The Iliad about the use of a written language by the Hellenes, but it demonstrates that, in Homer’s time, the Greeks knew about existence of a ideographic or syllabic written language in Argolidha long before the propagation of the Phoenician alphabet.

**Exhausted by the fruitless war and the loss of their best soldiers, the Achaeans saw no good prospects, they raised the siege and sacrificed a huge votive animal of wood to the gods.**

Here the story could have finished. And possibly it did end here in actuality. However, the author of The Odyssey, from where the wooden horse plot moved to
The Little Iliad, supported the Greeks and besides, as an outstanding poet, he was dissatisfied with the muffled end of the grandiose picture. And Homer devices a terrific plot trick — only he himself could glorify the ages! He introduces the building of the Trojan horse as an insidious plan by the Greeks of military cunning and strategic thinking. The cynical scheming lied in both making the opponent invite trouble into his home and also take pleasure in doing so.

In the late XX century, the Americans did the same, didn’t they? The launched “Trojan horses” of their way of life into our country. Grigory Chkhartishvili wrote the following on this occasion: “The safest and powerful way to spread their influence onto foreign lands is “seizure by love”, in other words - cultural expansion. When the inhabitants of other countries start being interested in your culture more than in their own, they fall in love with it and have the desire to live like you - to become part of you… In this very way, the West won a victory over the socialist camp in the cold war - not with the help of rockets but due to Hollywood, The Beatles, and jeans”100.

So that is what happened. The Trojans gleefully dragged the fatal horse into the city — and it is specifically from this place that the poem “Ilion’s Destruction” begins. Only Priam’s daughter Cassandra and Apollo’s priest Laocoön did not share the general happiness. The following phrase by a soothsayer, conveyed by Virgil, has gone down in history: “Whatever it may be, I fear Greeks who bear gifts!”101 And, apparently, the uprising to the maxima, was covered in another older ancient cyclic poem The Return:

“Gifts mislead both the human mind and deed”102.

For his prophecy (the cleverest!) Laocoön was severely punished: together with his sons, he was killed by snakes sent by Apollo.

Not covered in either in The Iliad or in The Odyssey, the plot with Laocoön became extremely popular among artists. The most known work on the subject of Rhodes sculptors Agesander, Polydorus and Athenodoros inspired Gotthold Ephraim Lessing to write his famous work “Laocoön or about the boundaries of painting and poetry”, where the German thinker explains why the respected cleric and descendant of the Dardanian Kings is depicted naked and not at the peak of sufferings.
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101 Virgil, The Aeneid, II, 49. В оригинале: «Quidquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes!»
102 Nostoi (Return from Troy), 2 (8).
A rather inaccurate copy of the sculpture of Agesander, Polydorus and Athenodoros “Laocoön and his sons” of the XIX century, which was ordered by Odessa City Head Grigory Marazly. In 1971, it was installed in front of the Archaeological Museum of Odessa.\footnote{Installation of the monument in the center of Odessa during "developed socialism" had birthed a considerable amount of songs, literary stories and anecdotes, and the "Literary Newspaper" even held a competition for the best caption to this sculpture. Readers competed in humor, inventing a signature like "At in-laws," "Snake's threesome", "Hose-okoon."}

Concerning how exactly the Trojan horse was delivered in the city, the interpretations offered by ancient writers vary. Most of them see no problem in that the artefact, filled in numerous soldiers, could be unfit to pass through the Scaean gate, which was not very high. Euhemeristic tradition solves the problem with the assumption that the Trojans had to dismount part of the wall.\footnote{Palaephatus, On Unbelievable Tales, XVI.} But in such a case, there was no need to equip the horse with a landing party — having come back from the Tenedhos islands, the Greeks without effort, would be able to enter the fortress through a breach in the wall. We cannot rule out the possibility that were are talking about two different plots in two different cities, each of which were conquered in different ways.
However, there are also other versions. According to some historians from Pausanias, the Trojan horse was actually a wooden or copper battering ram — “anyone who does not consider the Phrygians to be stupid can understand this”\textsuperscript{105}. According to Dares Phrygius, the gate was opened to the Achaeans by Trojan conspirators, headed by Antenor and Aeneas, and the story with a horse goes up to the possible depicted on the Scaeanx gate horse head\textsuperscript{106}. Modern writers remember that the horse in Mycenae Greece served as a symbol of Poseidon, who was considered to be the overlord of earthquakes. Austrian historian Fritz Schachermeyer linked this fact to a terrible earthquake in the XIII century B.C., which broke down Troy VI. According to him, the memory of this event very much could have been saved under Homer and was allegorically mirrored in the legend about the Trojan horse\textsuperscript{107}. An English expert on Hittite history, Oliver Gurney, suspected that the giant sculpture is a kind of Greek “thanks” to Poseidon – the Earth shaker, for the natural disaster that promoted the capture of Troy by the Achaeans\textsuperscript{108}.

\textbf{A prototype of the Trojan horse could become a Assyrian siege weapon in the form of a horse on wheels, which was known to the Prehomeric Greeks and which may have been captured by the Trojans as a trophy at the end of the siege of the city. (Relief on the Cycladic jug of VII century BC - one of the oldest “quotes” from the Homeric Cycle).}

\textsuperscript{105} Pausanias, Description of Greece. Κν. 1, ΧΧIII, 10.
\textsuperscript{106} Dareteis Phrygiui, De excidio Troiae historia, XL.
\textsuperscript{107} Schachermeyr F. Poseydon und die Enrstehung des griechischen Gotterglaubens. — Bonn, Salzburg, 1950.
By and large, there is no authentic information on the nature of the Trojan horse and, probably there will not be, at least until the next Schliemann finds a handful of ash and pronounces it the residual material of this legendary gift of the Danais.

Having destroyed Troy and shared the booty, the Greeks went to the “motherland”. The poem “The Returns” and a few reminiscences in The Odyssey are dedicated to their departure and further destiny. Hegei of Tresen was considered to be the poem’s author. Stesichorus also wrote a poem called “The Returns”.

The surviving synopsis of the poem starts with a savage quarrel between Agamemnon and Menelaus about how to return from Troy. In The Odyssey, Homer gives the details of this quarrel from the mouth of Nestor:

Then in truth Menelaus bade all the Achaeans think of their return over the broad back of the sea, but in no wise did he please Agamemnon, for he was fain to hold back the host and to offer holy hecatombs,....

So these two stood bandying harsh words; but the well-greaved Achaeans sprang up with a wondrous din, and two-fold plans found favour with them.

*Odyssey. III. 141-144, 148-150.*

In the morning, part of the Greeks, headed by Agamemnon, remain in order to calm Athena’s anger. Nestor and Diomede arrive home by sea, practically without adventures. Menelaus, who sailed later, falls in a storm and loses almost all his fleet. With only five vessels, he moored in Egypt. In native Lacedaemon, the fair-haired Atrid will return only after eight years, having grown rich during his wanderings about African countries. Later he would be pleased to show his riches to his guest Telemahos, who was wandering in search of news about his father Odyssey109.

Most other Achaeans, who sailed later, were either caught in a storm at Tenos (here was the very place where, in particular, Ajax Locrian perished) or shipwrecked on the Caphereus rocks. Neoptolemus was warned by Theitis about possible natural cataclysms reaching Thrace by land, burying the old Phoenix, who died on the way. After extensive wandering, other survivors from Hellenes ended up settling in different lands: “Some settled in Libya, others in Italy, some in Sicily and on the islands located near Iberia. The Hellenes also settled on the banks of the Sangria
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109 Odyssey, IV.
River; there were some who settled on Cyprus. As for those who suffered the shipwreck at Mount Caphereus, they were scattered in different directions. Huneus went to Libya, Anthiph, the son of Thessalus, arrived in Pelasgi, and, having seized this country, he called it Thessaly, and Philoctetes arrived to the inhabitants of Campania in Italy. Phydipp, together with the inhabitants of Kos, settled on Andros, Agapenor on Cyprus, and others in different places”\textsuperscript{110}.

In Troy, Agamemnon captured Cassandra as an honourable booty and then he managed to reach Mycenae. But there the ruler was betrayed by his wife Clytemnestra, who joined a criminal conspiracy with her lover Aegisthus. She arranged a feast in honour of the king and gave him a tunic without any sleeves and collar. “When putting it on, Agamemnon was killed, and Aegisthus became the king of Mycenae. Cassandra was also killed”\textsuperscript{111}. After a known period, the deceased Agamemnon advises Odyssey, who descends to Hades’ empire to learn a lesson from his story:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Wherefore in thine own case be thou never gentle even to thy wife.}
\textit{Declare not to her all the thoughts of thy heart, but tell her somewhat,}
\textit{and let somewhat also be hidden.}
\end{quote}

\textit{Odyssey. XI. 441-443.}

This phrase is worth learning by heart!

Aegisthus reigned in Mycenae for seven years until Agamemnon’s son Orestes grows up and mercilessly takes revenge for his father, killing both Aegisthus and his own mother.

By the way,

\begin{quote}
\textit{and on the self-same day there came to him Menelaus, good at the war-cry, bringing much treasure, even all the burden that his ships could bear.}
\end{quote}

\textit{Odyssey. III. 311-312.}

What a truly fantastic concurrence!

Odysseus’ fate deserves another story, which happened as it should have been: Homer devotes a poem, just a bit shorter than \textit{The Iliad}, to the king of Ithaca’s misadventure. But we are not going to retell it here and direct those who are curious to an animated cartoon of the same name and a popular film by Andrei

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{110} Pseudo-Apollodorus, Bibliotheca, Epitome, VI, 15.
\textsuperscript{111} Pseudo-Apollodorus, Bibliotheca, Epitome, VI, 23.
\end{footnotes}
The urgent chaotic departure of the Greek kings is more like an escape, and their further mostly disgraceful fate inspired more ancient writers to seriously doubt the truthful image of the history written by Homer. In his infamous “Trojan speech in defence of the fact that Ilion was not captured”, Dio Chrysostom, a cynical Roman philosopher and native of Prusa, a small town near the shore of Propontis (nowadays known as the Turkish city of Bursa), sees a true sign of a military fiasco therein: “It is clear that, in case of success, everyone unanimously and unquestioningly obeys the king, and Menelaus does not quarrel with his brother, as he had done much good for him. No, these are all signs of trouble and defeat. Let’s add to this that the army, in fear, escapes enemy land as soon as possible, facing the loss of delay, whereas the opposite is true for the winners, having a number of captives and piles of goods. So they wait for the most favourable time to sail; therefore, the land is within their power, and they face no shortages, and they do not perish at all, and this is after ten years of waiting! And the misfortunes facing those who returned home, admitting their defeat and incompetence. In reality, it was hardly a habit to attack those who came with a victory or who are always lucky — everyone rather admires and is afraid of them, but the losers are despised by both strangers and some friends.”

So how, in reality, did the “victor of the Trojans”, King Agamemnon, return home? He was killed by his own wife Clytaemnestra, and her lover Aegisthus was accepted by the Mycenaeas as king! It this conceivable when the rightful king returned home in glory? Nobody would have dared to attack him — people would be afraid to anger the gods patronising the hero. Do you think the Mycenaeas would have accepted a usurper who killed a great winner? Nonsense.

The urgent chaotic departure of the Greek kings was more like an escape, and their further mostly disgraceful fate fully entails signs of trouble and defeat rather than a great victory.

The fates of other “winners” also did not seem to be very successful either. Achilles’ son Neoptolemus, the heir of Telamon Teucer, the head of all Methones, Taumaceans, Meliboeas and Olizonians Philoctetes, the king of Cephas Huneus, leaders of the inhabitants of Kos Phydip and Anthip, the Athenian king Menesfey
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112 Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 130-132.
and the ruler of Arcadia Agapenor did not return home with glory. They either settle on other lands or they establish new cities. The glorified hero Diomede of Argos, the only Greek who dared to battle the Olympic gods, upon arriving at home, discovers that his throne has been captured, and upon making a narrow escape, he goes into exile in Italy. The once powerful union of the Achaean states is scattered into elements and dispersed in history.

On the face of it, everything is more and more less satisfactory for Menelaus — he returns his dissipate wife, either by picking her up in Troy or having found her already in Egypt (in The Odyssey Helen, as if nothing had happened, lives in Menelaus’ palace; however, Homer does not reveal how she got there). Menelaus travels to the resorts of the Mediterranean, getting extremely rich on his way and, having returned to Sparta, without effort, is restored to power. But why did he not return earlier? To take seven years to travel from Egypt to Greece is too long even for the vessels from the Mycenae times! Is everything correct here? Maybe Homer invented that ill-starred storm to allow Menelaus, who was afraid to return home after his dishonourable defeat at Troy, to save face before his descendants?

By the way, did Odysseus himself not arrive at home for ten years after the war’s end for the same reason? Would you say that the gods prevented this? Well, it happens. But what happens at the same time on his native Ithaca? Some grooms unscrupulously ask his wife Penelope’s hand in marriage, jeer at bright-eyed young Telemahos, plunder the treasury, and none of Odysseus’ friends step up to defend those being offended. Would those grooms act in such a way if they knew that the king was abased with defeat? No, the winner would have them shaking with fear.

Now we will look at how the region’s political map changed following the “Greeks’ victory”. It turns out that Troy was not at all destroyed to the ground as Homer assures us. In Troy, Antenor ascended to the throne and then was superseded by Aeneas, who returned from Phrygia and founded a new dynasty of Trojan rulers. The Iliad foretold Aeneas’ destiny to rule Troy after the Priamids, who were hated by Zeus:

\[
and\ now\ verily\ shall\ the\ mighty\ Aeneas\ be\ king\ among\ the\ Trojans,\ and \\
his\ sons'\ sons\ that\ shall\ be\ born\ in\ days\ to\ come.
\]

Iliad. XX. 307-308.

114 А женихи Пенелопы знали о «печальном ахее из Трои возврате» (Од. I. 322) доподлинно — им Фемий напел.
Practically all Hellenic tradition from Arctin and Homer until Strabo\textsuperscript{115} and Dictys Cretensis\textsuperscript{116}, whoever he actually was\textsuperscript{117}, and also Asia Minor writers including, the Troad native Demetrius of Hellespon, insisted that the authority in the Troad after the end of the Trojan War was passed to Aeneas. On the contrary, the Latin tradition tells of Aeneas’ expedition to Italy, elevating him to the level of Julius\textsuperscript{118}. Moreover, individual writers believe that the Trojan heroes even managed to achieve a small expansion: Hector’s brother Gehlen contributed part of either the Epirus\textsuperscript{119} or the Macedonian empire\textsuperscript{120}, Antenor began ruling the Wends in the Adriatic\textsuperscript{121} and founded the city of Potavium (now Padua)\textsuperscript{122}, and Capis captured Campania\textsuperscript{123} and founded Capua.

Let us suppose that all of the Trojans’ gains are just a figment of the imagination of the Trojanophilia of the Romans. But the fact that, after the Trojan War, the Trojans appeared in a better-off position than the Greeks is indisputable. It is true that there were not enough forces to maintain their position — the weakened country was captured by the Phrygians who, under Strabo, “left Thrace, killed the lord of Troy and the adjacent country and settled there”\textsuperscript{124}. By the way, during the war against the Greeks, the Phrygians stood on the side of Troy.

\textsuperscript{115} Strabo, Geography, XIII, 53.
\textsuperscript{116} Dictys of Crete, Chronicle of the Trojan War. V, 17.
\textsuperscript{117} Dikty\textsuperscript{s} Cretensis - the fictional author of \textit{Chronicle of the Trojan War}, the Greek original of which can be attributed to the end of the I - II century BC. Despite the fact that the ”Diary” gives a very controversial, almost parodic interpretation of the events of the heroic age, the text enjoyed a certain popularity and from 1471 to 1702 had 11 prints.
\textsuperscript{118} Virgil, The Aeneid, I, 1-7.
\textsuperscript{119} Virgil, The Aeneid, III, 500-505; Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 138.
\textsuperscript{120} Maurus Servius Honoratus. Commentary on the Aeneid of Virgil. К стих. 242.
\textsuperscript{121} Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 138.
\textsuperscript{122} Virgil, The Aeneid, I, 245-249.
\textsuperscript{123} Maurus Servius Honoratus. Commentary on the Aeneid of Virgil. К стих. 242.
\textsuperscript{124} Strabo, Geography, XII, 3.
Tomb of Antenor in Padua.

Apparently, that was that very city settled by Ilion after the war. Above, we have already stated that, in the archaeological layer of Troy VIIb, there were traces of a more primitive, rather European culture than Greek in terms of origin. And soon the Phrygians also conquered the Hittite empire. In the X to VIII centuries B.C., Phrygia was the most powerful empire, which dominated the entire Aegean Region. The capital was in the city of Gordion, named after King Gordius, the very one who, according to legend, knotted the node that nobody could undo and, only after a century, was it split by Alexander the Great. The king of Phrygia was also the legendary Midas, who probably could turn everything he touched into gold. An expressive image that speaks volumes about the power of Phrygia, isn’t it?

The decline of Phrygia began only five hundred years after the Trojan War. First, the Bythynian and Mysian tribes invaded Phrygia, then there were wars against Assyria, then the invasion by the Cimmerians… And only in the VI century B.C., Phrygia loses sovereignty and falls under the power of the Lidia Empire, while saving its autonomies. Lidia intercepts the glory of the richest state of Phrygia, and now Lidia’s ruler Croesus becomes a legendary rich man. This didn’t last for long, and soon Lidia herself was seized by Kir. Persian domination lasted for less than two hundred years. In the IV century B.C., Alexander the Great subordinated
Persia. Then Phrygia fell into the hands of Diadochus (in other words Lysimachus), after which it was shared between the Galatians and Pergamum, and, at the turn of Millennium, one of its parts became part of the Roman province of Galatea, while another part became a province of Asia.

So, the true winner in the war between the Greeks and Trojans was Phrygia. As for Greece… Greece was obscured by the Dark Ages for a long time. And it is not difficult to see signs of the Greeks’ heavy defeat in the Trojan War. What usually happens after great victories? The winners capture the country, turn it into a colony and, using the treasures it has confiscated from their enemy, they secure prosperity for their states. After Miletus was lost, the Hellenes could take advantage of a new foothold on the Aegean Sea to resume the colonisation of Asia Minor. But the Greeks abandon Ilion, not even leaving one of their deputies there.

Paul Fort, who does not share the hypotheses about an Asia Minor foothold, writes the following: “having plundered Troy, including the temples, the Achaeans were not going to settle there or to found a colony nearby, though they concluded unions with many petty domestic monarchs. Their ambition did not even extend to control the Dardanelles, and considering the unreliability of the Achaean vessels, it is doubtful that they could have traded in the Black Sea. The soldiers were only out for treasures, captives, pedigreed horses, wood for building new vessels and access to the massif of Ida in the Troad, because it was ten times richer with resources than Ida on Crete. And, certainly, everyone dreamed of returning home after the war’s end, but only if they could take some booty in Thrace on the way back”125. Military historian A. Korzhinsky also pointed out that Homer did not know about the land being captured (the city was taken with “a lance” and, after been robbed, it was abandoned by the victors)126.

However, even Menelaus arrives in Egypt dirt poor, not to even mention the other Achaean kings. It seems that, in Troy, only Odysseus was fortunate enough “to collect a lot of treasures from different booties” (Odyssey. X. 40-41), but he was indeed very clever. Other soldiers bitterly complained that “they have to return home empty-handed” (Odyssey. X. 42).

The fruits of victory, if there were any, appeared to have been squandered in vain. The explosive growth of the Greek civilisation, which we should have expected, did not happen. On the contrary, the “post-Trojan” times were characterised by the
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125 Faure, Paul. La Grèce au temps de la Guerre de Troie.
126 Коржинский А.Л. Война в поэмах Гомера // Античный мир и археология. Вып. 4. — Саратов, 1979. — С. 70—82.
full termination of Hellenic colonisation, the collapse of the formerly powerful Mycenae, Sparta, Pylos, Tirinthos, the decline of the previous culture, the degradation of art, the loss of the written language, and historical memory itself. At the expense of insufficient trade links, deliveries of tin to Greece practically stopped, which ended in impossibility of producing bronze. The population fell sharply. Up to 90 percent of the settlements on Peneloponnes were deserted, and their inhabitants returned to semi-nomadism and nomadism. This doesn’t happen after great victories, but rather after great defeats!

**After the Trojan War, Greece fell under the shadow of the Dark Ages. The cities were deserted, palaces fell down, the Greeks lost their written language for a few centuries, and historical memory itself.**

Historians call this period, covering the late XII until the early VIII century B.C., the Dark Ages. The catastrophe of the Bronze Age was of global nature and covered not only Greece, but also affected all regions of the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean, spanning from Egypt to the Hittite empire.

Many scientists consider the beginning of “the great transmigration of peoples” to be the main reason for the system’s collapse — Fritz Schachermeyr refers to the peoples of Phrygian and Thracian group as “hordes of destroyers”; recorded by the linear writing B plates of the Mycenaean empire, writings speak about the growth of piracy and raids to capture slaves, and Egyptian sources speak about the invasion of “the peoples of the sea”. However, most modern explorers fail to explain the crash of the Mycenaean civilisation by exterior factors. Other possible reasons they cite include a long-term drought (Rhys Carpenter, Harvey Weiss, and Brian Fagan), the collapse of the economy (Philip Betancur, etc.), internal revolts and riots (Manolis Andronikos), the appearance of a manoeuvring infantry armed with lances and capable of repulsing massive attacks by chariots, which were the basis of the military doctrine of the Mycenaean kings (Robert Drews).

The hypothesis put forward by Russian historian Yuri Andreev is quite interesting. In his opinion, the onset of the Dark Ages became possible because of the spiritual degradation of the Mycenaean society, where the cultural artefacts surviving until our time testify about the existence of standard homes, sanctuary places, burials, home utensils, and the bookkeeping records of the Mycenaean archives. “The ‘mass culture’ that arose on this diligently justified ground has gradually come to cover all levels of society, reaching even its top layers”\(^{127}\). It is
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possible to see, that practically all enumerated factors — variations of the climate, global economic crisis, anti-imperial moods and cultural degradation - are also characteristic of our own time. Maybe it is time to draw evident historical parallels and to make indispensable conclusions?

By and large, it is not possible to explain the approach of the Dark Ages using only reason. But the fact that one of the key factors of Greece’s decline was the defeat in the Trojan campaign is doubtless.

The Dark Ages lasted for three and a half centuries. Only after this long period ended did Greece start to unite. First Laconia united under Sparta’s control; and in the IX century B.C., the Lycurgus laws were passed. In 776 B.C., the first Olympic Games were held and, one hundred years later, Hesiod’s poems about the origin of the world gods and people appeared. A bit later, the great philosophers Phalec, Anaximander, Anaximenes appeared, and later Heraclitus and Parmenides, then Greece won great victories above the Persians. Then came Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. That is, the classical wonderful Greece “happened” only eight hundred years after the “victory” over Troy! And its foundation, Homer’s great poems The Iliad and The Odyssey were based on lies.
Chapter 5. The Poet who composed Greece

Muse! Tell about the bard Homer who is rich in songs! Who else can we appeal to in this regard, if there is virtually no historical information left about this singer? We cannot even be sure about the time he lived, to say nothing about how short or tall he was, whether he was single or married, or what wine he preferred at what time of the day.

Hellanikos, an ancient Greek writer, associates Homer with the early XII century B.C. Krates, who managed the Pergamum library, linked him to the late XII century, Eratosthenes, Aristotle and Aristarchus to the XI century, Apollodoros to the X century, Herodotus to the VIII century, Xenophanes, Heraclide of Pontius and Phil stratus to the VII century. Most modern writers identify the VIII century B.C. as the most probable period of Homer’s life.

Seven cities competed for the right to be Homer’s native land in ancient times, according to a known epigram from the Palatine anthology:

*Seven competing cities are called the motherland of Homer: Smyrna, Chios, Colophon, Pylos, Argus, Ithaca, Athens.*

In fact, however, they were even more, as their composition permanently varied. However, indirect signs indicate that he was a native of one of the Asia Minor colonies (most likely, Smyrna or the island of Chios) and that he knew the topography of the Troad very well, allowing him to describe rather precisely the geographic features of Ilion and its neighbourhoods, which were under Greek control during those times.

It’s not worth being surprised by such “vagrancy” on the part of Homer. In Salzburg, the guides still show the very different — according to their personal tastes - houses where Mozart was supposedly born - by the way, one of his names is Chrysostom. In Ukraine, there are inhabitants of not seven but even more villages who can assure you that the comedy film *The Wedding in Malinovka* was shot exactly in their locality. They even arrange tours to the village of Vasilievka in Odessa region, from adjacent republics to show that very “earl’s estate”. Though fans of the actual film know that, in fact, the popular Soviet comedy was shot in villages of the Poltava region, located seven hundred kilometres from Odessa.

It is accepted that Homer was considered to be blind. However, scientists have
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cast doubts on this. To reinforce them, you should read the texts of the poems more closely: the singer uses bright visual epithets, which are difficult to match if you haven’t seen for yourself the great sea showing black with silent swell (Iliad. XIV. 16), fishes and eels crowding the turbid waters (Iliad. XXI. 202-203), and white rocks brightly shining as if they were oiled (Odyssey. III. 408). All these rich art epithets could be written based on the formula style for oral poetry — Homer quite could have used them according to tradition. However, the fact that he could do this does not prove that he was blind.

![Modern (2000) Greek 50 drachma coin with the image of the singer Homer, capable of seeing.](image)

Until the IV century B.C., Homer was depicted as being capable of seeing with wide opened eyes; this is, until the Hellenic epoch which began under Alexander the Great. According to Plutarch, Alexander was a loyal admirer of Homer and carried The Iliad, which he believed to be his greatest treasure, with him everywhere. Having captured Egypt, the young king decided to found a populous Greek city there and to name it after him. And the site for it was already found and fenced when Alexander saw a grey-haired old man in his sleep who stood at attention, reading his verses:

Now there is an island in the surging sea in front of Egypt, and men call it Pharos.

*Odyssey. IV. 354-355.*

“Having stood up, Alexander leaves for Pharos, located a bit above the mouth of the Canobe River; at that time it was an island, and now is connected to the continent with bulk. Alexander saw that the area was surprisingly favourably
allocated. That was a band of land like a rather broad isthmus; it separated a vast lake from the sea, which, right at that site, forms a large and comfortable harbour. The king exclaimed that Homer was admirable in every aspect and, on top of that, that he was the wisest architect”¹²⁹.

In the winter of 332-331 B.C., Alexander founded Alexandria. For obvious reasons, the temple of Homer was built in the city centre and the singer was worshipped. It was exactly here that Homer was, for the first time, depicted as blind. According to Professor Alexander Portnov, “the intellectuals and numerous philosophers of Alexandria would have considered the old images of Homer… not very interesting. Probably, according to them, the god — poet should not look as an ordinary mortal, but somehow look differently. But how so? The sophisticated in disputes and discussions philosophers of the Hellenic epoch, educated on Plato and Aristotle, loved to underline the superiority of “sighted blindness” of the chosen over “blind sighted ones” from the semi-literate and uncultured masses. For the elite, the perception of the image of the blind founder of the world literature appeared very attractive. And Homer in the temple was depicted as a blind man”¹³⁰.

However, other explanations are also plausible. According to renowned philologist Alexander Zaitsev, the idea of a blind Homer could have easily appeared by analogy with the Phaeacian blind bard Demodocus in The Odyssey (VIII, 62), to whom, like the bard Phemius (Odyssey, I, 151, etc.), Homer gave the idealised features of his contemporary, and maybe even his own features”¹³¹. The words of the author of the hymn “To Delian Apollo”, who called himself the “blind man from Chios”, could have played a role in originating the legend about Homer’s blindness:

\[
\text{Remember me in after time whenever any one of men on earth, a stranger who has seen and suffered much, comes here and asks of you: “Whom think ye, girls, is the sweetest singer that comes here, and in whom do you most delight?” Then answer, each and all, with one voice: “He is a blind man, and dwells in rocky Chios: his lays are evermore supreme”}^{132}\.
\]

because for a long time, beginning with Thucydides, Homer was considered to be the author of this hymn.

A version was put forward in the IV century B.C. by a pupil of Isokrates

¹²⁹ Plutarch, Parallel Lives, Life of Alexander, XXVI.
¹³¹ Зайцев А.И. Древнегреческий героический эпос… — С. 400.
¹³² Homeric Hymns. 167-173.
Ephor and supported in the XVII century by the founder of Homeric criticism by abbot d’Aubignac and later by Soviet historian Nicolai Marr\textsuperscript{133}, better known as a character in Stalin’s book Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, arguing that the word ‘homer’ (όμηρος) is categorically not a proper name. In ancient languages, this meant “blind”, implying not just any blind person but someone that supports himself by begging and through his art. For d’Aubignac, this fact testifies that, in actuality, there was no Homer, and The Iliad was called “a poem of Homer” simply because it was performed by blind homers in the courts of the nobility.

But it is possible to look at this question in another way. Eventually, Homer himself could have been a homer. Or, on the contrary, the singer could have assumed this sonorous ancient pseudonym for image-related reasons. It is as if somebody today were to compose an epic poem and sign it as “Prophet” or “Medium”. And you see, the word “homer” meant the same thing and carried a shade of antiquity and mysticism.

What did Homer write? The question sounds strange, but only at first glance. They attributed not only The Iliad and The Odyssey to Homer, but also all poems of the epic cycle, and also 16 epigrams, 33 hymns that still now are called “Homeric”, and two Trojan epos parodies — “Margit” and “War of Mice and Frogs”. Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.) called his tragedies “Homer’s feast leavings”\textsuperscript{134}. However, there mostly the plots of the cyclic poems are developed. This indicates that Aeschylus considered Homer as their author. But already Herodotus (about 484-425 B.C.) starts to doubt Homer’s authorship of The Cypriot Songs\textsuperscript{135}. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) was also divided as to the composers of The Iliad and The Odyssey, and the authors of The Cypriot Songs and The Small Iliad\textsuperscript{136}. Only grammar experts in Alexandria (III-II century B.C.) completely recognised Homer’s authorship for only the two main poems of the Trojan cycle, having scrupulously analysed the contents, language and composition features of the ancient rhapsodies.

The Iliad and The Odyssey really stand alone in the epic cycle, being concentrated around a solid plot (first, it is Achilles’ departure and return, and second, the travels and return home of the King of Ithaca) while all other cyclic poems are built on the chronological principle, representing a series of episodes.

\textsuperscript{133} Марр Н.Я. К толкованию имени Гомера // Доклады Академии наук. — Л., 1924, январь—март. — С. 2—5.
\textsuperscript{134} Иванов Вяч. Дионис и прядионисийство. Фрагменты книги // Эсхил. Трагедии. — М.: Наука, 1989. — С. 362.
\textsuperscript{135} Herodotus. The Histories, II, 117.
\textsuperscript{136} Aristotle, Poetics, 23, 1459a. 30 — 1459b 5.
Homer’s literary innovation was highly estimated by Aristotle, who taught that only unity of action can bring completeness and integrity to a legend: “It seems that all the poets composing The Heracleida, The Teseida, etc. think that, if Heracles was alone, the legend about him should also be uniform. And Homer also differs [from the others], and here, as we can see, he looked at the matter correctly, whether due to his talent or art: in composing The Odyssey he did not take everything that happened [with the hero], including how he was wounded on Parnassus and how he pretended to be mad during war gatherings, - because there is no necessity or probability that one follows another; [no] he composed The Odyssey and The Iliad around the only action”\(^{137}\).

It is hardly likely that we will learn about who first performed the Trojan songs, and what they were about. With confidence, we can only say that they appeared long before Homer. They were likely much worse than Homer’s creations in the art style, as the other cyclic poems are worse; but at the same time, they were closer to the historical truth. The Iliad and The Odyssey were created over many centuries, each time acquiring something new from another performer, and Homer himself, for certain, performed them more than once, and every time in a new way, until they were written down based on Homer’s words, using an alphabetic writing language borrowed by the Greeks from the Phoenicians in approximately IX century B.C.

The Iliad and The Odyssey were created over many centuries, every time acquiring something new from another performer until they were written down based on Homer’s words using an alphabetic writing language borrowed from the Phoenicians.

Nobody knows who the first person was to have the idea of saving them in the form of written text. And nobody knows the exact goal pursued by the ancient wiseacre. But it is quite likely that the pioneer of the writing method was Homer himself, and, he probably even mastered the new fashionable written technique for this purpose.

A high-class rhapsodist, Homer did not need written text as a supplementary mnemonic means. He never thought that the songs he sang and that other poets

\(^{137}\)Aristotle, Poetics. 8, 1451a 19-30.
already learned from him could ever vanish\textsuperscript{138}. You see, for more than one century, they were alive, being reconstructed for every performance. However, as a man who was far-seeing in spite of his blindness, Homer could estimate the potential of the advanced humanitarian technology coming from the East — the alphabetic written language.

In the East, written language was used for not only economic records, but also for the needs of epic literature. By that time, Babylonian and Akkadian, Sumerian and Hebraic works had been written. They were closer by nature to The Iliad and The Odyssey. Namely, The Enuma Elish, a legend about Gilgamesh and the most ancient sources of the Pentateuch (Yahwist and Elohist). It is likely that Homer knew about these records, but it is also possible also that he independently arrived at the idea of using the whole force of the written word for the good of the recovering Greece.

**A high-class rhapsodist, Homer did not need written text as mnemonic means. However, as a man far-seeing in spite of his blindness, Homer was able to estimate the potential of advanced humanitarian technology coming from the East.**

The introduction of the phonetic written language intensified social processes, simplified clerical work and accelerated “metabolism” within culture. The lists of the Homeric poems became very popular and spread all over the Hellenic world. Poetic allusions to Homer’s songs can already be found on artefacts from the VIII-VII centuries B.C., which were found thousands of kilometres from the expected site where the poems could have been written — Chios or Smyrna. By the same time, the first painting of pottery refers to the themes of The Iliad and The Odyssey.

“The Glory of Homer was finally transformed into his worship. Since Aristophanes, Homer has been constantly called θεῖος — “divine”. In Smyrna there was a Homer temple, and one of the copper coins minted in the city was called a homeric. In Smyrna they would say that Homer was born from a deity dancing with Muses. Residents of Argos invited both Homer and Apollo to every state sacrifice. Ptolomaeus Philopator built a temple for Homer, where his statue was surrounded with images of seven cities competing for the honour to be his native land. The “Apotheosis of Homer” was the subject of the famous relief by Archelaus from Priene. Homer was depicted as a symbol of immortality, together

\textsuperscript{138} Lord, Albert B. The Singer of Tales.
with Dionysus and Heracles on the sarcophagi of the Roman epoch”.

Under the orders of the ancient writers, the propagation of the Homeric epos began back in the times of ancient Spartan legislator Lycurgus (the IX century B.C.). According to Plutarch, Lycurgus became acquainted with the poems of Homer in Ioniums (Asia Minor), where they were saved by the descendants of Creophylus, who was either a pupil or a gentle friend of the great bard. “Upon learning that, other than stories for pleasure and entertainment, they also covered a lot else that was extremely valuable to the tutor and statesman; [he] carefully copied and collected them to take away. There was already a rumour about these products being spread amongst the Greeks, and a few already had their separate parts brought to Greece incidentally, but the full acquaintance with them first took place thanks to Lycurgus”.

According to Diogenes Laertius, Athenian archon Solon (approximately 640-559 B.C.), one of the famous Seven Wise Men, arranged the public performance of Homeric poems by rhapsodes in Athens: “He directed [them] to read the Songs of Homer to the public in order: where one reader stopped, another would start; and, in such a way, Solon explained Homer more than Pisistratus”.

Seven Wise Men are especially respected ancient Greek philosophers and politicians of the VII-VI centuries B.C. expressing their wisdom in brief sayings such as “There is a time for everything” (Pittacus); “Know yourself” (Thales); and “Know when to stop” (Solon). The list of the seven wise men was not constant, it varied source by source. The first of the known lists is given in the dialogue of Plato “Protagoras”: Thales of Miletus, Pittacus of Mytilene, Bias of Priene, Solon of Athens, Cleobulus of Lindos, Periander of Corinth, and Chilon of Sparta.

The progressive Athenian tyrant Pisistratus (approximately 602-527 B.C.), who ensure the prosperity of the Athens economy and growth of their influence all over Hellas (Pisistratus’ governance was called the “Cronos Age”, i.e. the “Golden Age”) is perhaps best known today for having founded a special scientific commission on the writing and editing of The Iliad and The Odyssey. Owing to the efforts of its members — Onomacritus, Zopyrus of Heracleia and Orpheus of Croydon — the poems also began to assume a steady appearance.

The first items of information on this commission were brought to us by rather

140 Plutarch, Parallel Lives, Life of Lycurgus, IV.
142 Plato, Protagoras, 343a.
late authors - Cicero (“Pisistratus… the first, they say, to bring the separate poems of Homer in the order that we read them now”)\textsuperscript{144}, Pausanias (“Pisistratus collected the poems of Homer that were scattered around different places and that were saved in oral legend in some places”)\textsuperscript{145} and Aelian (“Lycurgus was the first to bring all songs of Homer to Hellas and; he took them from Ionia when he was there. Then Pisistratus joined the songs and created The Iliad and The Odyssey”)\textsuperscript{146}.

The thesis about the actual “creation” of Homer’s poems by the commission of Pisistratus will be accepted in a few centuries by University of Halle Professor Friedrich August Wolf. In his “Introduction to Homer” (1795) he will defend an idea that The Iliad and The Odyssey were created through the mechanic mixing of separate songs, and will thereby set the beginning of the discussion on so-called “Homeric question” between the “analysers”, asserting the component nature of the poems, and the “unitarians”, proving their initial unity.

It seems that, in this case, the question should be not about the “creation” of Homer’s poems by the Pisistratus commission, but rather about the unification of their different alternatives\textsuperscript{147}. And it is rather difficult to speak about their full impartiality in this case: the commission put the lines glorifying Athens and their ancient king “immortal” Theseus (Iliad. I. 265) into the final edition, proclaiming Athens’ historical rights to Salamis Island at the expense of assigning the Athenian and Salamis vessels to the uniform fleet:

\begin{quote}
And Aias led from Salamis twelve ships, and stationed them where the battalions of the Athenians stood.
\end{quote}

\textit{Iliad. II. 557-558}

This glorified “the selected Athenian warriors” (Iliad. XIII. 689), etc. Thus, already in the time of Pisistratus, whose goal entailed achieving Athens’ prominence, the poems of Homer became an instrument of philosophy.

At the same time, it is possible to refer to the beginning of their introduction in the Greek education system. Since the VI century B.C., The Iliad and The Odyssey have become obligatory to learn. From them, young Hellenes gained ideals and

\begin{footnotes}
144 Cicero, On the Orator.
145 Pausanias, Description of Greece. Кн. VII, XXVI, 5.
147 Similarly, one can say the same about the history of posthumous publication of the novel by Mikhail Bulgakov “The Master and Margarita”, that has undergone a number of changes since 1966. After the publication of an abridged version in 1966 in the magazine “Moscow” and a full version in the edition of 1973, the novel went from year to year continuing to be completed and edited. The final text was published only in 1990. (Булгаков М. Мастер и Маргарита // Булгаков М. Собрание сочинений в 5 томах. Т.5 — М.: Художественная литература, 1990). 
\end{footnotes}
became acquainted with mythology. Homer decorated the process of “humanising” deities and allotting them with anthropomorphic features, which was finally completed already in Hesiod’s The Theogony. The Greeks worshipped Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Hermes, Athena, Artemis and other gods of the classic period even before the Dark Ages, which is confirmed through a decryption of the plates found in Knossos and Pylos. However, the nature of the cult was different. The Mycenaean gods appeared in just one function - as subjects of sacrifice (not bloody!) and also served as the embodiment of various elements. For Homer, they really came from the heavens down to the ground and acquire human features and behaviour. Moreover, even many mortals look at the background of the gods as samples of decency and nobleness.

The rationalistic criticism of Homer’s and Hesiod’s anthropomorphism appear already in Xenophanes (approximately 570-475 B.C.), who was indignant in his “Silloi” (“Satires”):

Homer and Hesiod imputed on the gods everything
which people consider to be the shame or sin:
To steal, to adulterate and to deceive each other [secretly].

And further:
If bulls and lions or [horses] had arms,
To draw by hands, to create statues like people,
Horses would have drawn gods looking like horses, and bulls — like bulls,
And the gods bodies would have looked like their own appearance.148

It would be incorrect, however, to introduce the role of Homeric epos in Greeks’ education only as a catalogue of life situations and examples to follow. According to renowned German historian Werner Jaeger, “the myth itself is of normative significance; for this, there is no need to identify it as a sample or example. It is those by virtue of its own nature, instead of by virtue of the likeness of a definite life situation with an applicable mythological event. The myth is glory, a message about the great and the raised, brought by the legend of ancient times but not indifferent material. The unusual already obligates only by virtue of admission of its fact. But the singer not only narrates about feats; he eulogises and glorifies what in this world is worthy of praise and glory”149.

Extremely relevant was the consolidating function that mythology acquired as a result of systematisation obtaining its final decor in the poems of Homer and especially those of Hesiod. This systematisation probably started in the times of

148 Xenophanes. Silloi, 11 (15 G.-P., 10 D); 15 (19 G.-P., 13 D.)
149 Jaeger, Werner, Paideia, I.
Lycurgus, a semi-legendary legislator who gave Sparta the laws leading to the foundation of its political arrangement for several centuries. Eunomia (laws for good) by Lycurgus transformed Spartan society into a militarised “community of the equal” controlled by a gerucia (a Council of Elders from 28 gerontas and two kings), established special education for young men, regulated citizens’ housekeeping and customs (the expression “Spartan style of life” became a saying in ancient times). The passing of Lycurgus’ laws transformed Sparta into a powerful military state, which, in due course, established hegemony throughout Peloponnesus and became the basis for the aggregation of the Peloponnesus union in this city-state in the mid-VI century B.C. Greeks’ unification under Sparta’s authority happened not at the expense of successful military campaigns, but rather through “humanitarian expansion” and the propagation of ideas forming public consent. Thereby, already in the history of pre-classic Greece, we can see the confirmation of the thesis much later proposed by Niccolo Machiavelli and developed by Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault, whereby authority that is supported by consent, and authority offering a positive programme, a new design of the world, is steadier than authority that is grounded in violence.

The most important condition for achieving public consent became uniformity given the speckled picture of the religious faiths existing in the Hellenic world. In reality, if, during the process of concluding contracts, everyone were to swear by his own gods yet despise the gods of his contractor, how could there possibly be talk of consent and trust?

On what foundation it is possible to order the gods in a way that it would be accepted by all Hellenics? Maybe, by allocating their spheres of competence, when one god should be responsible for healing, another one should patronise sailors, etc. However, such an order could hardly become the basis of public consensus. In each city, its own crafts are developed, a certain structure of life exists everywhere, seamen are inclined more than others to worship the god Poseidon, while it is Dionysus for wine makers. The only order that is familiar and clear to everyone is the family system: The mother, father, son, daughter, brother, sister - these concepts are universal. Even in the most primitive societies, and French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss convincingly demonstrated this in due time, the system of relations is a socio-forming matrix, on the basis of which the social hierarchy is established. The same is true for the epoch of the Dark Ages; according to legend, Lycurgus apparently lived during the tail-end of this period. While Mycenaean Greece had a difficult social structure, according to the plates from Pylos, Zeus’ only relative (son)
was a certain mysterious Drimys, and Zeus himself was not considered to be the main god at the end of the Dark Ages, characterised by a breakdown in former social links and a return to the tribal system, Zeus heads the pantheon and acquires a heap of relatives. “Zeus as the father of the gods means that Zeus is the head of the gods, and this representation mirrors the earth reality of Greece in the “Dark Ages”. This is, after the loss of the Mycenaean states, the carrier of real authority was, first of all, the head and oldest family member”\textsuperscript{150}.

The systematisation of the gods under the family principle, achieved by assigning each of them his/ her own place in the uniform genealogical tree, was realised rather voluntarily. Uniform will is indispensable for this programme’s implementation, such a process cannot be the fruit of many centuries of spontaneous collective creativity, or the result of the “national spirit”, as it was presented in the romanticism of the early XIX century. And if it is difficult to assert categorically that Lycurgus was the pioneer responsible for systematising the gods on the basis of blood relations (no documental sources from that time exist), with great veracity, we might suspect that this role may have been played by someone from amongst his contemporaries, whose name has been lost in the depth of history — especially since even Lycurgus himself, in the opinion of many scientists, is a mythological person. It is more correct to say that the actions of the really existing Spartan legislator could be assigned — by virtue of their exclusive significance for further history — to one of the most respective gods in antiquity, named Lycurgus. How did they associate other gods with the foundation of cities and dynasties, and also major inventions?

The classification of the gods, based on the related links, was not only learned by the masses, but also gave birth (and here we already can speak about the “creativity of the national spirit”), as a reverse reaction, to the tradition of assigning human qualities to the gods. If all families look the same and only unhappy in their own way, the same should hold true for the gods. And in the national epos, the gods start fighting amongst themselves, creating domestic tyranny, committing adultery against spouses, envying the neighbours and fighting with frying pans, which we can fully see in the poetry of the largest representative of the Homeric epos.

By historical measures, the anthropomorphism of the gods occurred swiftly, and still in the VI-V centuries B.C., the times when the gods were represented as certain transcendental categories, such as life, time, truth, enmity, and necessity were fresh in people’s memories. From here emerged the indignation of Xenophanes,

\textsuperscript{150} Зайцев А.И. Греческая религия и мифология. — СПб.: Филологический факультет СПбГУ; Академия, 2005. — С. 80.
Pindar and other thinkers, who protested against the profanation of the old gods and a diminishing the transcendental down to the earthly level. Homer and Hesiod were the subjects of their criticism, and, it should be noted, undeservedly so. Both of them embedded in their poems the already existing spiritual matrix, which there took on its final form. It is a completely improbable supposition that it was specifically Homer and Hesiod who were the cultural heroes constructing this matrix. First, the contents of their poems (this is most clearly identifiable in Homer’s work) is intended for a competent audience, who needs no hidden motive of the relations existing between the gods in certain situations — it instantly and literally from even a semi-hint reconstructs the completed picture, since it strongly retains in memory myths that have already been explained in the legends of other poets. Thereby, Homer is working in a paradigm, which was already formed before his time and accepted by all listeners. Secondly, the challenges of poetry in general are arduously conformant to the mission of a classifier executing the known social order. But by and large, about the grandiose classification work of the ideologists of the Lycurgus epoch, we can judge them according to the records of Homer’s poems. Here, the previously separated and complicated Olympic pantheon, gained its finished form. Now the legends of the world’s origination, the great battles and interconnection between the gods and heroes could easily be achieved and laid into the basis of the world outlook matrix. Owing to this, the uniform cultural space of the Hellenic world was created. Henceforth, Greece was the place where people worship Greek gods.

Centuries later, Roman Law became a similar principle, cementing apace and becoming Roman law — ratio scripta ("written rationality"), as the contemporaries called it. The creation of a developed law system and the creation of norms that were obligatory for everybody was vitally necessary for the rapidly rising state, which required more and more resources: territories, fertile land, manpower (slaves), mineral resources, food, and luxury objects for the upper class. While separate Greek city-states were strong enough for major colonisation, establishing new cities, and trade with the barbarians, the Romans had gained the power to seize them. The major thing — both for the Greeks and Romans — was to send a signal to the external “barbarians” around that there is a “right” world with settled, legible harmonic forms and canons of the religion and art, with a clear legal system, with an army that acts according to the same “templates” and does not know defeats.
Previously separate and tangled, Greek mythology was classified and taken as a basis of the vision matrix due to the fact that the uniform cultural room of the Hellenic world was created.

Homer is a “poet who brought up Hellas”, while Plato fixes the All-Greek consent with this maxim¹⁵¹, though he believes that reading poems about squabbles, fights and adultery among the gods is inadmissible in his ideal state as an activity harming to still weak minds: “A child cannot judge whether or not this is an allegory, and the opinions perceived by him at such an early age usually become indelible and invariable. That is why, perhaps, it is necessary to achieve the first myths heard by children, so as to be directed towards virtue in the most careful way”¹⁵².

In the works of Xenophon of Athens, it is possible to find a curious episode demonstrating their relation to the works of Homer in the times of Socrates (the V century B.C.). At a feast to which Socrates and Xenophon were invited, every guest speaks about the thing he is most proud of. When another guest’ (Niceratus) turn comes, he admits that he is most proud of the fact that he knows all the Homeric poems by heart. He explains, “My father, who wanted me to be a good man, made me learn all of Homer’s works and, and now I can fully recite The Iliad and The Odyssey by heart”¹⁵³. And, it should be noted that there were many such virtuous people at that time. Dio Chrysostom found them out even in the distant Greek colony Borysthen, located at the mouth of the Dnieper. He writes, “And though they speak Greek not absolutely correctly, as they live among the barbarians, but almost everyone knows The Iliad by heart”¹⁵⁴.

The Greeks believed in the reality of everything that Homer narrated, literally in his every word, even despite numerous conflicts in his texts. For Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristotle and Plato, Homer was the most authentic historical source, and the victory of the Greeks in the Trojan War an indisputable historical fact, though Thucydides nevertheless dared to note that the Trojan campaign did not sound as remarkable to him as affirmed in the legend saved by the poets¹⁵⁵. For Aeschylus, Sophocles and Evripid, Homer is a source of eternal inspiration. Only Heraclitus

¹⁵¹ Plato, The Republic, X, 606e.
¹⁵³ Xenophon, Symposium, III, 5.
¹⁵⁴ Dio Chrysostom, XXXVI, 9.
¹⁵⁵ Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, I, 11.
from the thinkers of that time seems to have criticised the great bard for somewhat misunderstanding of principles of dialectics (under Simplicius, “Heraclitus scolds Homer for the fact that he has said: “Let enmity among the gods and people disappear”; in such a case, he is saying that everything will disappear”156), but Heraclitus always had a reputation of a great misanthrope.

True, there was one Zoilus in the late IV century B.C., who was nicknamed “Homer’s scourge” for his insistent efforts to find and ridicule the discrepancies in the Homer’s texts. But Zoilus is Zoilus, and it is not for nothing that his name became a common name for identifying an unfriendly and petty critic. Consider, for example, what Aelian writes about him: “Zoilus always said spiteful things about people; he only acquired enemies, and was surprisingly captious. Once one of the philosophers asked him why he reviled everyone. He answered, “Because I cannot make them as angry as I would like to”157. According to stories by Vitruvius, once Zoilus arrived in Alexandria, there he read his pasquinades to the reigning Ptolomaeus, but Ptolomaeus did not respond. When, after spending a long time in the empire and had engaged in significant overspending, Zoilus appealed for support, Ptolomaeus told him that “if Homer, who died one thousand years ago, constantly feeds many thousands of people, then one who considers himself more gifted should know how to feed not only himself but also great many people”158.

Zoilus was condemned for patricide and executed — either crucified on a cross, stoned to death or burnt alive, but the opinions of the ancients differ in this regard. Anyway, according to Vitruvius, “he received a deserved punishment because a person condemning those who cannot personally appear to defend themselves as to the meaning of what they have written is deserving of nothing else”159.

In the Alexandria school in the III century B.C., there was serious strife between the so-called Enstatics, who searched out different conflicts in Homer’s poems, as Zoilus had done, and the Lytics, who resolved such issues. In particular, Zenodotus of Ephesus, Eratosthenes of Cyrene, Aristophanes Byzantine and Aristarchus of Samothrace belonged to the Lytics; they were enumerated in that very order in the famous Alexandria library. This library contained an impressive amount of Homer’s editions, which differed in some episodes. “The city editions included the Massilian, Chiosian, Argive, Sinopian, Cyprian and Athenian ones. Alexandria

156 Heraclitus. 28b5 (80 DK).
citizens considered the latter one to be “vulgate”\textsuperscript{160}. There were also editions issued by different persons, such as Antimachus of Colophon, who also was an epic poet, or the “from the casket” edition prepared by Aristotle for his pupil Alexander the Great, which accompanied him in his campaigns\textsuperscript{161}. These manuscripts were flown to Alexandria from all corners of the Hellenic world, and servants of the library scrupulosity compared symbol by symbol in attempts to reconstruct the primordial text and interpret, as far as the condition of that linguistic science allowed then, the difficult places already identified in that period of the ancient epos.

In passing, the Alexandrian grammarians quite often had to settle different conflicts encountered in Homer’s poems. For instance, the same Hebe — was she Hercules’s wife, as was written in The Odyssey or was she not, as was unambiguously stated in The Iliad? In the XXIV rhapsody of The Iliad, was it for nine or twelve days that the gods persuaded Hermes to steal Hector’s body from Achilles, who was mocking it? And where did Apollo’s aegis appear, with which he covered Hector’s body, which has been dragged by Achilles around Patroclus’ tomb? You see, the aegis belongs to Zeus, it is his personal shield for arising threatening storms! Aristarchus solved these problems by marking them as doubtful (or, in the scientific language, athenising) different lines\textsuperscript{162}, and sometimes even blacking them out from his edition of The Iliad. But in the majority of doubtful cases, he was inclined “to explain Homer based on Homer himself”\textsuperscript{163}, appealing to other parts of poems to look for analogies.

Absolutely different conclusions were drawn due to the abundance of conflicts between The Iliad and The Odyssey identified by Alexandria scientists Xenon and Hellanikos\textsuperscript{164}, who lived in the III century B.C. Having discovered that Hephaestus’s wife was called Charita in The Iliad, and Aphrodite in The Odyssey, that Nestor had eleven brothers in The Iliad, and only two in The Odyssey, they concluded that Homer simply could not be the author of both creations. Therefore, Xenon and Hellanikos were each nicknamed “chorisont”, which means “disconnector”. However, their critical views did not become a tradition and, for the next few centuries, nobody dared to challenge the poems’ authorship.

\textsuperscript{160} This, as we understand it, is about Peisistratos’ version.
\textsuperscript{161} История греческой литературы. Т.1. Эпос, лирика, драма классического периода. — М.—Л.: Изд-во Академии наук СССР, 1946. — С. 111.
\textsuperscript{162} Zenodot introduced as a symbol of ambiguity in Homer’s works ÷ (obelyus), used today in the calculators as a sign of division.
\textsuperscript{164} Не путать с Геллаником Милитинским, современником Геродота.
In Professor Bogaevsky’s paper, which was reproduced on the Internet many times and written for the Soviet Literary Encyclopaedia of 1930, he mistakenly indicates that Aristarchus of Samothrace explained numerous conflicts in the texts of poems where, according to his opinion, The Iliad was written by Homer in his young years, and The Odyssey was written in his old age. Actually, this thought can be attributed to pseudo-Longin (approximately 1 century A.D.). So he writes in his treatise About the Euphoric: The Iliad, which the poet composed in the period of his creative inspiration, wholly representing action and strife, and The Odyssey is almost completely narrative, which is typically for old age. In The Odyssey, it is possible to compare Homer to the setting sun, which has lost its former power but still retains its former greatness. The poet already does not have the strength to strike as in the Ilion’s legends; the euphoric here is not so uniform as to refuse the support; there is neither a flow of changing passions, nor quickly changing moods, nor public sounding, nor riches of different images borrowed from reality. Just like the ocean steps back after the ebb, losing its volume, in The Odyssey, our eye notes the fantastic and improbable digression of constant ebbs of the euphoric

The Alexandrian scientists formalised the analysis of Homer to the limit and attached therein the nature of a “thin didactic”, methodical and laborious routine. The very name Aristarchus became the common name “Aristarchus”, but in the sense opposite to “Zoilus”, used to signify a strict and very detailing critic. For example, Alexander Pushkin uses it in his youthful poem of 1815 “To my Aristarchus”. According to Losev, “Alexandria citizens… transformed Greek poetry into a museum, an inventory book, in piles of citations, resumes, catalogues and compilations. Everyone wanted to be very scientific and well informed. The aesthetics became stock, price-list, encyclopaedia, and extremely technologically oriented as a formalistic encyclopaedia. While antiquity earlier transformed objectivism into cosmology, now it is transforming subjectivism into the scientific character, compilation, and encyclopaedia

The Aristarchus editions of Homer and scholia to poems had historical value for the whole world culture. As far as the Byzantine times, Aristarchus’ manuscripts were carefully copied in the III-IV century A.D., derived from papyrus scrolls to parchment paper codes. “Comparing the numerous papyruses of Homer found in Egypt in the III century B.C. with the Homeric texts of the post-Aristarchus period, we see what a grandiose work Aristarchus has done. And if Aristarchus’

167 Лосев А.Ф. История античной эстетики. Ранний эллинизм. — С. 470.
interpretation of Homer’s poems was naïve in many aspects, imagining, in particular, Homer’s society as an imperial court of the Hellenic monarchy, the text of both poems, considering everything, only in rare cases deflects from Homer’s authentic text of the VIII century B.C.168 In Aristarchus’ edition, the texts of The Iliad and The Odyssey were, for the first time, printed in Florence in 1488, soon after the invention of book printing.

Homer’s authority gradually started to fade only by the late years of first century of the Roman empire. An author known under the name Diktys of Crete (late I-II century B.C.) was permitted to turn the contents and works of the great poet inside out; Ptolemy Henn (first half of the II century B.C.) exercised his wit in telling tales about the Trojan heroes, adding a pseudo-scientific vehicle “for cogency”. In one of his speeches, Dio Chrysostom (approximately 40-120 B.C.) calls Homer “the most desperate liar”169, making a slip of the tongue. However, in another delivery, he states that “everything written by Homer is favourable and useful” and the poet is “great to such an extent, that occasionally it is impossible to remember that the poems are written by him and not by an oracle of the gods, sounded from a secret and unapproachable depth”170.

In his “Trojan speech”, Dio paradoxically claims that Homer conscientiously cheated the Greeks, having told them about the victory over the Trojans, which actually never happened. Dio was told about this by a priest from Egyptian Anufis, who, in turn, had learned this from an inscription on the stele made according to a story by Menelaus, who visited here.

In his opinion, everything actually happened as follows. Once upon a time, King Tyndareus lived in Lacedaemon with two daughters — Clytaemnestra and Helen — and two twin sons — two fine giants named Castorius and Polydeuces. The time came for Helen to marry, but to whom? Menelaus was of humble origin. Paris, the son of the powerful ruler of Troy, numbered among the potential grooms for Helen. They were wed. Menelaus took offence and his brother Agamemnon became vexed, and they started to egg on other potential grooms: let’s, all together, board black-sided vessels and sail to war with Ilion. It is necessary to take revenge on the unreasonable Trojans for this insult and, at the same time, we can plunder the richest in the world. The Greeks sailed to Troy, set up camp and began the siege of the Trojans, but they failed and returned home.

168 Зайцев А.И. Древнегреческий героический эпос… — С. 413.
169 Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 23.
170 Dio Chrysostom, LIII, 10.
That’s the smooth way that everything actually happened. Homer’s story entails a complete mess! Homer’s version of Helen became Menelaus’s wife, gave the birth to a daughter\textsuperscript{171}, and then she was stolen by Paris, who had never seen her before, but ran away with her to the middle of nowhere across all of Hellas and nobody managed to catch them. But how could Helen yield to Paris’ persuasion if she did not know him at all and, in general, how could she have even meet with him? To explain everything, Homer invented a fairy tale that that this absurd love was arranged by Aphrodite. The army was going for a war campaign that would last ten years. So they are more dawdlers than soldiers! At the same time, the Trojans would have shown Helen the door without waiting for bloodshed! But they prefer to suffer from the siege for a few years and perish in battles while one of the king’s sons is amused! Besides, Homer’s version of the Trojan campaign does not involve Helen’s brothers Castor and Polydeuces, who had previously always helped her when in trouble. While looking out from the wall, Helen is unable to find them in the Achaeans’ camp, which surprises her very much. Homer justifies their absence by the fact that they had already died by that time. But Helen’s surprising leads us to understand that, by the time she was abducted, they were still alive and did not rush at once to rescue her, as occurred in the case with Theseus! Dio concludes that truth was obviously on the side of the Trojans, and Helen was the legal wife of Paris, and here, the Greeks actually appeared as the aggressors.

But they were, according to Dio, unlucky aggressors, and there were only a few battles during the whole war period. Priam’s sons Troilus and Mestor were killed by Achilles, for example, not during a battle, but rather during one of their raids beyond the fortress walls. Apparently the Trojans would only be able to leave Troy if they were treated well by the local inhabitants. At the same time, the Greeks were making ambushes, plundering and were even engaged in agriculture on the Troad\textsuperscript{172}. The war lasted for several years, and the Greeks needed some food. While at the beginning, they could count on the support of those local inhabitants for whom they might seen somewhat as potential “liberators” from the Trojans, for certain, the treatment towards these uninvited visitors eventually changed. Time was working against Hellenes, and if they could not take Troy at once, this would have been particularly difficult to achieve this after a siege lasting several years. Dio says that Homer unwillingly reveals the real situation in the Greeks’ camp, and, right at the

\textsuperscript{171} Так у Диона.
\textsuperscript{172} Here Dion repeats version of Thucydides, explaining the successful resistance of the Trojans for ten years by fragmentation of Achaeans fighting forces and difficulties of supplies, which “forced them to engage in farming on the Chersonese and robbery.” (Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, I, 11).
very beginning of The Iliad, he writes that Achilles is at variance with Agamemnon, and that the soldiers are suffering from famine and illnesses. So you see that conflicts always accompany failures and that indiscriminate death happens where there is no normal supply of food and water.

Further, Dio’s version develops Homer’s plot as follows: the Trojans attack the Greeks’ camp and actually smash it up. Patroclus puts on the armour of his friend Achilles and leads his group in combat. He pushes the Trojans back, but Hector kills him. Having put on Achilles’ armour, the famous warrior Ilion wins several battles and only night prevents him from setting fire to all of the Greeks’ ships. After Patroclus’ funeral, the gods give Achilles a new weapon and he summons Hector to a duel, kills him, and then Paris incidentally kills Achilles, who is buried in the same tomb with Patroclus. Hector’s body is returned to Priam.

Chrysostom sees this as unreal. How could Achilles not enter into combat and instead wait for the Greeks’ defeat? Why would Achilles’ group, headed by the insignificant warrior Patroclus, suddenly be able to push back all the Trojans’ forces, and why were the Greeks unable to achieve this earlier? Why did Achilles decide to enter into combat with Hector only after several years of siege? Dio’s version is simple: “Patroclus is a double who Homer used in attempts to hide what happened with Achilles, substituting him”\(^ {173}\). That is, Achilles actually participated in the fight, and Hector killed him and took his armour.

So that nobody would ever think to look for Patroclus’ tomb, Homer invented the story that he was buried in the same tomb with Achilles, whereas “even Nestor, who brought home the Antiloxos ashes and killed for him, did not ask that they be buried together, so who would dare to mix remains of Achilles and Patroclus?”\(^ {174}\)

The end of the war, according to Dio, looked as follows. The Greeks were in fact destroyed, Achilles Ajax and other heroes perished, pestilence raged, the leaders were quarrelling, simple soldiers sailed home on their ships, and the Trojans received help from allies like Amazonians and King Memnon, who had heard that the Trojans were having good luck and wished to divide the fruits of their victory. At the same time, the Kings of the Greeks — Agamemnon, Menelaus and Odysseus — remained alive and kept off shore. They even managed to kill Paris, who was the cause of the war. If they escape, the Trojans and their allies would have indispensably built a fleet and came to enslave Greece. The Greeks need peace on the condition that the Trojans do not come to Hellas, and they are even ready “to lose face”, which would mean

\(^{173}\) Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 102.

\(^{174}\) Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 103.
publicly recognising defeat and, moreover, formalising their fiasco with some symbol of humiliation.

The Trojans accept such an alternative, and they would have been powerless to capture Greece anyways, not to mention that such ventures could otherwise result in further loss (Priam had already lost a few sons). The most important thing is that continuing to war would bring nothing, while the symbol of victory is better than nothing. They settled on that. The Greeks built a huge wooden horse bearing the inscription: “The Achaeans do favour for Athena of Ilion”, meaning that the Greeks surrender at discretion the patroness of Troy, and the defeated surrender to the winners’ discretion! “The Trojans brought it to the city, and destroyed a part of wall as it could not pass the gate. From here developed the amusing story about the city that was sieges with a horse”\textsuperscript{175}.

According to Dio, all consequent events actually attest to the Greeks’ defeat — the actual flight of the Greeks after the war’s termination, the loss of the fleet near Euboea, the fact that the Trojan kings ruled in some small regions of Hellas, Helen being handed over to Deiphobus as a wife, and Menelaus fleeing to Egypt. At the same time, Chrysostom does not believe that his words could win anybody over. While reading a speech, he appeals to the inhabitants of Ilion: “Although everything was so, I perfectly know that nobody will agree with it, and everybody, except for pensive people, will repeat that this is a lie, and not only the Hellenes but also you yourself. Certainly, it is not easy to digest a lie, especially if delusion has been lasting many years”\textsuperscript{176}.

Having awarded Homer, during his exposé, with a set of unflattering epithets, Dio nevertheless justifies him, pointing out that his works “were support for the Hellenes of that time and would not let them become confused, unless a war were to have begun between them and peoples of Asia, as had been expected. It is possible to forgive this man, who, being a Hellene, did everything within his power to help his compatriots”\textsuperscript{177}. But those times, under Chrysostom, passed long ago; it is hardly now that any peoples would move from Asia to Hellas, all the more so that both ultimately end up under another state — the Roman Empire. So, it is high time to tell the truth…

While Dio’s speech was considered with “frightening gravity”, as Nietzsche would say, it is possible to divide all the rhetorician’s argumentation, having pointed out the permanent astute manipulation of the facts, and attribute those plots not

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{175} Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 1
  \item \textsuperscript{176} Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 12
  \item \textsuperscript{177} Dio Chrysostom, VIII, 14
\end{itemize}
referring to The Iliad, The Odyssey to Homer, and the appeal to a rather suspicious source — an anonymous Egyptian priest. It is possible, however, to act otherwise and, having left exercises in sophistry for highbrowed scientists, it is simple to enjoy Chrysostom’s beautiful interpretation of all the known facts and to observe the extraversion of what was, for that time, taken as absolute truth. Moreover, as you can easily note, there was a rational grain in Dio’s reasoning, and it is hardly possible that his speech was only taken as a joke, as was accepted for many centuries.

However, the concept of an “immutable truth” does not suit the Hellenic epoch very well. This was a time when “large philosophies” fell, and philosophising turned into a game with methodologies and genres that had been created in earlier centuries, in addition to juggling citations, and the ironic subversion of idols.

To a certain extent, this became a consequent of the poet’s centuries-old hegemony in the Greek education system, comparable only to Lenin’s domination in the Soviet textbooks. “Homer became more to the Hellenic reader like no other writer, and his “guesswork” — especially for an audience not of the highest educational level (whose education finished with Homer) — frequently performed in such a way that Homer’s information appeared to be something unexpected or even scandalous. In recalling the situation, it is possible to understand the origination of the numerous stories about a certain “correct version of The Iliad”, about The Iliad written before Homer and, about The Iliad telling “the real truth” of the Trojan War — that is without the permanent interference of the gods and without stoning the heroes, when it is impossible to pick up such a stone even for a dozen of mere mortals. While such exception of fancy details was the most simple and popular way to revise Homer, you should not think that someone was actually interested in revamping the historical truth. Interestingly, this was just intended to invert the well-known Homer and put him “from his head on his feet”.

With the propagation of Christianity, people became less and less interested in the heathen Homer. Augustine, for example, conceded, that he is tired of Homer. And in Byzantium, Homer as a carrier of the Hellenic spirit, began to be considered almost an enemy of the empire (you should note that the Byzantine Greeks separated themselves from the culture of antique Greece and they didn’t called themselves Greeks but rather “Romans”.

At the same time, separate scientists of Byzantium worked to preserve Homer’s heritage. In the 860s, they prepared a corrected The Iliad based on

Aristarchus’ edition, known today as Venetus A and so called because it is stored in the St. Marco Cathedral in Venice, where it ended up after Constantinople was plundered by the crusaders in 1204.

One of the major financial resources of Byzantium was customs inflows from the grandiose international trade in the Bosporus region and the Dardanelles. Enterprising Venetians managed to convince Constantinople that, by having a powerful fleet and capability to pay guarding of transport flows and building of ports, they can better control marine commerce, and the consequences appeared immediately. The industry and agriculture in the country begun to degrade, and Byzantine businessmen became dependent on foreigners. “Enjoying the right to settle in Constantinople, to establish factories and offices in the ports and to trade free of duty in the empire, Venice was ale to manage Byzantium at own discretion, free from the police and customs supervision and from any competition”179.

At the end of the XII century, Emperor Manuel Komnin, and later his successor Andronicus I, began to expropriate Venetian merchant enterprises to return to the country the income that had been flowing abroad. The Venetians could not reconcile with this and, in the early XIII century, Venice doge Enrico Dandolo managed to redirect the Fourth Crusade, organised by Pope Innocent III, from Egypt to the Dalmatian city Zadar (as carriage payment), and then to Constantinople from there. The Crusaders led a treacherous attack on the capital of the Christian empire, culminating with its siege on April 13, 1204 and consequent ruin. The crusaders, upon establishing the so-called Latin empire in New Rome, began to export its treasures, which lasted for more than fifty years. Hundreds tons of precious coin alone was taken out, and it is estimated that the annual budget of the richest countries of Europe, at that time, compounded no more than two tons of gold. “An unprecedented flow of free money stimulated the rapid growth of Western European cities, became a decisive stimulus for the development of crafts, sciences, and the arts. The barbarous West became the civilised West only after it stole, plundered, shattered and occluded in itself the Byzantine empire… At the same time, the Venetians — the bulwark of free business in those times — declared to the whole western world that they had restored downtrodden laws, the rights of the free international market, and above all, they have managed to successfully struggle with a regime denying all-European values. From that very moment in the West, the image of Byzantium as a heretical “empires of evil” began to emerge. Further, this image was always, when required, extracted from the ideological arsenals”180.

In 1261, the troops of Michael VIII Palaeologus seized Constantinople, having put an end to the Latin empire. While the city was freed from the crusaders, Byzantium could not recover from that shock.

That was Byzantium, the “heretical empire of evil”, where the poems of Homer came to Europe after several centuries of oblivion. However, they did not become very popular, and the Europeans would come to know about the Trojan War from quite suspicious sources — from “notes”, translated into Latin, from the imaginary Trojan War participants Dictys Cretensis and Daret Phrygian, and also from the medieval “Novel about Troy” by Benoît de Sainte-Maure, “Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye” by Raoul Lefèvre, “Songs About Troy” by Herbort von Frilzlar, “Stories of Troy’s Ruin” by Guido de Columna\textsuperscript{181} and other fiction of a propaganda nature.

\textsuperscript{181} Since the beginning of the XVI century, these works were widely known in Russia also. См.: Троянские сказания. Средневековые рыцарские романы о Троянской войне по русским рукописям XVI—XVII веков. — Л.: Наука, 1972.
The Trojan horse in the miniature of the Raoul Lefèvre’s manuscript “Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye”, XV century.

The legend about Troy started to be actively used as an ideological weapon already during the emergence of the Roman Empire. From these positions it is possible to consider, for example, The Aeneid by Virgil, which was devoted to glorifying Rome and Juliuses. Having pronounced Aeneas as their grandparent, Romans found their place, backdating into Greek mythology and in such a way, received the legitimate right to be considered as an ancient people and with rich cultural traditions. Among the Romans, it was prestigious to trace their family back to the heroes of Hellenic mythology and even to speak the language of the captured country. “Romans fell under such a powerful influence of the Hellenes, their philosophy, highly developed culture and institutes, that the Roman empire of the later period, by its nature, became an absolute sample of the universal Hellenic state, and in an even late period of the Roman empire’s existence, an overwhelming majority of all educated layers of society began to speak the Greek language, and no other way. When the famous Roman commander and future emperor Gaius Julius
Caesar crossed the Rubicon River to take control of Rome by force power, he stated in Greek: “Jacta alea est!” (The die is thrown!), and he said this in Greek”\textsuperscript{182}.

The legends about Troy started to be actively used as an ideological weapon already during becoming the Roman Empire. The Aeneid by Virgil glorified Rome and Juliiuses and found a place for Romans in Greek mythology.

Not only Romans trace their families back to the Trojans (we should remark: not to the Achaeans!). Shortly before Rome’s decline, Ammianus Marcellinus asserted that the runaway Trojans had settled in Gaul. In about 550, Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus, in \textit{The History of Goths}, insisted that the Ostrogothic King Theodoric of Italy was of Trojan origin. The Franks had a legend about their common grandparent — Frank of Troy. In Wales of the XII century, they claimed that the founder of Britain was Brute, who came from the family of Ilus. This tradition was probably initiated by Welsh priest Geoffrey of Monmouth\textsuperscript{183}. The idea about London being a “New Troy” (Troynovant), perceived as a part of a “Tudor’s myth”, also originated with him: the ancient “Trojan — British” dynasty came to the throne in 1485, and England immediately “entered the Golden Age”.

Scientific interest in Homer returned to the rationalistic epoch of the New Time. Then with unprecedented sharpness, the question arose about the origin of Homer’s poems and about the historical reality of his figure. Abbey d’Aubignac became the founder of Homeric criticism and, in 1664, he wrote the treatise “Academic Hypotheses concerning The Iliad”, where he cast doubts on the existence of Homer and proclaimed that The Iliad was a set of separate songs gathered by an ancient editor, most likely Lycurgus, without any specific plan. Each of these fragments is, according to d’Aubignac, an independent song eulogising this or that hero and performed for the descendants of such a hero. He claims that, this is the only possible explanation for all the conflicts found in the poem.

The treatise was published only after the writer’s death, in 1715, and it influenced a whole series of thinkers of the XVIII century, including Giambattista Vico, Herder, Heine, and in particular, German philologist Friedrich August Wolf, the author of the above-mentioned “Introduction to Homer” (1795). In this book,

\textsuperscript{182} Аннерс Э. (Anners, Erik) История европейского права. — М.: Наука, 1996. — С. 57.
Wolf proclaimed that The Iliad and The Odyssey are weak and contradictory in terms of their composition, that they contain a set of mismatches, that different parts of the poem are written in different languages and by writers having different talent levels, that the text was edited by hacks, and that the final aggregation of the poem fragments took place at the court of Pisistratus in the VI century B.C. While Wolf was sure, contrary to d’Aubignac and Vico, of Homer’s existence and even his authorship of some of the songs, he refused to specify which ones exactly were written by the poet and which ones represent the latest inserts.

Wolf’s study was, in general, dependant, as the majority of his establishing theses were borrowed from his forerunners. Thus, he took the proposal about the impossibility of the literature’s existence outside of the writing language from d’Aubignac, and the idea that the legend of Homer was not made in writing but rather was sung and saved in memory came from Robert Wood. All the mismatches and conflicts in Homer’s poems he cited in accordance with those identified by Aristarchus, and the he borrowed the estimation of the role played by the Pisistratus Commission from Vico’s treatise “Foundation of the New Science”. In such a way, Wolf, according to academician Mikhail Pokrovsky, having seen the first agglomeration of the poems in the Pisistratus meting, Wolf “deceived almost the entire XIX century by asserting that all antiquity saw the business. It was completely incorrect as antiquity did not doubt of the poet’s unanimity”.

Despite its nature as a compilation, Wolf’s book was impressive as a serious scientific study, reinforced with a set of facts, which ensured even greater popularity with contemporaries. And for classic philology, it became rather epoch-making, giving a stimulus to numerous surveys of the “Homer problem”. The whole scientific world was sectioned into “analysers”, inclining to follow Wolf in picking fragments out of Homer’s text, and “Unitarians”, who insisted on the unity of the poems’ authority, and who attribute different mismatches to the poet’s carelessness, by “art conditionality” or as being due to editorial side effects. Eventually, the highest level of art and faultlessness of composition led us to speak about a single author of The Iliad and The Odyssey — such works cannot be written under the bouts-rimés principle.

Eventually, the highest level of art and faultlessness of

184 "Wolf painstakingly made sure that he had the claim of the first discoverer and in most obstinate ways got rid of his predecessors: Heine, Herder, Wood and especially d’Aubignac." (История греческой литературы. Т.1. — С. 117).
185 Vico, Giambattista. The New Science, III.
186 История греческой литературы. Т.1. — С. 117.
composition led us to speak about a single author of The Iliad and The Odyssey — such works cannot be written under the bouts-rimés principle.

In one form or another, the discussion continued for another two centuries and gave birth to new directions in classical philology, folklore and linguistics. A peculiar compromise between the doctrines of the “analysers” and the “Unitarians” became the so-called theory of “the basic core”, which achieved widespread popularity in the late XIX century. According to this theory, The Iliad is based on the small poem “Anger of Achilles” or “The Achilleis”, which covers songs I, XI and XVI-XXII making them the foundation of Homer’s mentioned creation. All other rhapsodies (for example, The Catalogue of Ships and The Review from the Wall, which rather relate to the beginning of the war but not its concluding phases, as depicted by The Iliad) were included in the poem from the outside, and the primal plot, where the action promptly went to a head, was distributed throughout all its parts. It’s not clear whether these inserts were the fruit of the latest rework of the more ancient “Achilleis” or, on the contrary, whether they were created earlier and included in the composition of the poem to provide it with more “monumental” nature. The founders of “the basic core” theory, Jorge Grote and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, were attracted by the first point of view. Martin Nilsson held another position, demonstrating that these inserts were related to more ancient layers of the epos. Is rather remarkable that exactly those ancient fragments (including the eighth and ninth songs) include foresight of the Greeks’ defeat in the Trojan War.

The conflicts between the “Unitarians” and the “analysers” was settled by “the oral theory” of Parry-Lord, according to which the epic song does not exist in an invariable aspect, and arises anew upon every performance-improvisation. “The oral tradition exists. To call this multiple authorship would mean to detract the role of not only Homer, but also all the narrators of the oral tradition. Such an assertion comes from an improbable dispatching, namely that someone once created a permanent original for every song within the tradition, and that everything happening later with these plots was like modifications to a subject of a single-piece of marble. As the scientists thought they were dealing with something solid and invariable, it is possible to speak about multiple authorships and about interpolations. It would be possible to beat off a piece from one monolith and to add it to another. However … we are not dealing with monoliths, but plastic, a substance that does not have a
constant shape”\textsuperscript{187}.

\textit{Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff comparing the study of Homer with the methodical excavations when the top layers percolate. Image by Olga Aranova.}

Progress in the Homer study was accompanied by new and novel discoveries in the field of ancient history. The archaeological excavations of Ilion and Mycenae, the discovery of the Hittite civilisation, the decryption of the written sources of the Bronze Age resulted in a real revolution in historical science and led to the revision of many scientific truths. Only one remained practically unshakable — faith that the Greeks were victorious in the Trojan War. It is possible to literally count on one’s fingers those scientists who publicly allow themselves to express their doubts in this victory\textsuperscript{188}, even despite the fact that arguments in favour of this are becoming fewer every year. And it is difficult to say what exactly the problem is — as to whether this is due to scientific caution or the force of inertia (too lengthy a tradition, Homer’s overwhelming authority!)

And if his authority remains so great for us today, it is possible to imagine its extent in ancient Hellas! One thousand years of Greek history has passed in the atmosphere of the undivided hegemony of Homer’s genius; in such a time, it is possible to consider everything as true. For over one thousand years, the Greeks heeded stories about the copper armour of the Danai flaming in battles, about a violent “thundering” wind and about the “stellar” sky above Troy even during daylight, about the greatest victory of Greek weaponry and the Hellenic spirit, and about the victory that never happened.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{187} Lord, Albert B. The Singer of Tales.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{188} Of Russian scientists, these include, for example, Zaitsev, Klein, Nemirovsky and others.}
The poems of Homer were recorded in the late VIII century B.C., and most serious scientists agree with this today, three centuries after the events depicted in them occurred. On the one hand, this period was sufficient to accumulate a huge number of different legends; on the other hand, all events are no longer seen as absolutely actual. An attempt to state that the Greeks defeated the Trojans would certainly have been rejected three hundred years earlier: the bitterness of defeat was too great, and it would look too ridiculous for the national memory. Now, in the Greece of the VIII century, the country was reviving, uniting, at last having survived both the pain of defeat and the gloom of the Dark Ages, reaching a new historical arena, so the writing and propagation of the songs of Homer, which spoke to the Greeks’ great victory and were capable of being integrating into an All-Hellene philosophy, were more than well-timed.

An attempt to state that the Greeks defeated the Trojans would certainly have been rejected three hundred years earlier: the bitterness of defeat was too great, and it would look too ridiculous for the national memory.

Homer was the creator of the great national myth of new Greece through his “matrix book”. If it is possible to say so, Homer essentially created a new Greece. It is unimportant whether he acted originally on his own or according to the exterior political order of newly arising forces, or, on the contrary, whether he was the father of Greece’s revival, advancing the country with his creativity. It is important that, in any case, Homer sprouted throughout the whole Greek culture. For a long time, his language instituted the development of the Greek language in general; the development of poetic canons, and the heroes’ actions established the standards in terms of morals. Homer is the very thing that united Greeks as a nation, though, politically, they were divided and their poleis were located hundreds kilometres from each other. What Homer achieved is possible to compare to that which Moses did for Israel.

The Iliad of Homer was, for the Greeks, the same that The Lay of Igor’s Campaign was for the Russians; namely, this was an appeal to unification before an enemy invasion. “The Genuine sense of the appeal of The Lay’s author,” writes Dmitry Likhachev, “may be a rather wider and more courageous task than an attempt to arrange one or another campaign, such as aggregating the public opinion against the feudal contentions of princes, stigmatising parasitic feudal ideas in public
opinion, or mobilising public opinion against princes looking for personal glory, personal honour and revenge or personal insults. The task of The Lay was not only a military one, but also represented the ideological consolidation of the Russian people around the thought of Russian land unity**189.

Applying the same yardstick to The Iliad, it is possible, according to Leo Klein, “to see it as an appeal for the unification of all Greek tribes in strife for the development and security of the Aegean world in the face of more, larger and threatening empires in the East, the armies of which flow to the West like waves of lava. Phrygia, Lidia, Midia, Persia... This appeal sounded in time — a couple of centuries before the most dangerous Persian invasion. Moreover, it was not lost. Having defended their civilisation, the Greeks saved almost completely developed fundamentals of democracy and culture, where man became a measure of all things, for the future world. As the appeal for unification was naturally conjugated in The Iliad to the glorification of mutual understanding, restraint and humanity, and already, in itself, this requirement was distributed through contacts between the peoples even in war, this appeal sounds topically for about three thousand years — as for the whole of mankind at the most important and dangerous hour of its history”**190.

In reality, when Asia in the person of the Persians attacked Hellas, they were countered by the young Greeks, who knew Homer by heart and believed that, like their distant forefathers, they would win that war between Europe and Asia, whatever the cost. They went to combat with verses of The Iliad on their lips, and the genuinely won.

One can be sure that, if Homer had not won the Trojan War in his verses, the Greeks would not have won the war against the Persians in actuality. The participants in our last great war testify how serious things like songs can be. Vadim Kozhinov has devoted a special study to the Russian and Soviet military songs that helped defeat the fascists, to that special spirit they created, and to their great power**191.

** One can be sure that, if Homer had not won the Trojan War in his verses, the Greeks would not have won the war against the Persians in actuality.

**190 Клейн Л.С. Кто победил в Илиаде? — С. 45.
The great feeling that Europe always defeats Asia and is historically above it was, for the Hellenes, fixed forever, and later it was also inherited by Alexander the Great, the Roman Empire and Christian Europe until modern days. This phenomenon has been called “Europocentrism” and consists of the idea that European history is predominantly the history of the world, whereas the history of other countries and peoples is second and minor for the accomplished destiny of world history.

It is easy to see a certain error in this, a certain European chauvinism, but really after the victories above the Persians, the Greeks managed to construct a civilisation that, until now, determines the course of development of world history, whether or not this pleases others.

The ideas Homer expresses in his poems, such as the Trojan horse, shaped the entire western world. Revived with the immediate participation of Homer, Greece has constructed an unprecedented culture. Its architecture and literature are studied in all classic humanitarian faculties until this day. Its political traditions and theories, still now, underlie world ideological discourse. The whole of world science is based on Greek science. Purely, world science and engineering speaks in the Greek language until this day; its terms and concepts are Greek. Greek philosophy underlies all western metaphysics; that is, it forms the basis of all western thinking, and the Greece invented all limits in the concepts of our thinking. This philosophy was first inherited by the Romans, who considered Greece as a standard of wisdom, and then Greek scholarship was incorporated into Christianity. In the epoch of the Renaissance and in the new time, Greek philosophy was rediscovered without Christian clothes, and became the basis for the great expansion of the West worldwide. Today, the whole world is westernised; and when we say western, you can read this as Greek. It is not without reason that the greatest thinker of the XX century, Martin Heidegger, said that, to begin a new history, not a Greek one, we should once again rethink that which is of the Greeks, and those who do not do so have no chance of getting rid of the western project, no matter how critically they treat it.

In such a way, the PR project “Homer” has appeared at the sources of not only the purely Greek world, but rather has become a cornerstone of all modern civilization. Homer, probably not aware of that, started the process that, already for about three thousand years, has guided the course of western history. This is the strength of poetry, its great power winning over all “real facts”. Great poetry, in such a way, incorporates in itself its pitiful denial, “the truth of the facts”, which float to the surface, after which nothing can be changed.

“The darkness of low truths is more valuable for us than a rising fraud,” said
the Poet. And this axiom is known for any real poet, especially after thousands of years of world history, during which Homer’s feat was repeated by many and many people, albeit on a much lower level. However, in the period of the end of western metaphysics, all fundamental axioms tend to come under question. It is not without reason that vanguard art has fought against classical samples, and postmodern art plays with them and experiments. But it is questionable as to whether the time has come to once again apply the truth, but not the truth of facts, low truth, and truth that determines historical destiny and, therein, makes possible to identify every “truths of the facts” and “rising frauds”.
In Lieu of an Afterword; Two hours of Turkish Tea

August in Asia Minor is almost intolerable. Sun scorches the earth from morning to evening, giving its all; like a runner about to cross a finish line. Strangely enough, the best refreshment in this weather is hot Turkish tea. We call it “that Turkish tea”, from the nineties. We could not brew it properly in Russia and thought it a waste product destined for third world countries; the domain that Russia, the former great state, entered all of sudden over a couple of senseless and merciless years.

When dry, the tea truly looks suspicious; brown dust, almost without aroma. They somehow boil, brew and filter it. With some effort and in modest circumstances anything goes for tea. The Turkish people had a few hundred years to practice.

In Tefficia the dust is actually everywhere. Strange dust, not familiar. It’s not a black dust of Ekatherinburg, covering windowsills like mold in a matter of hours during the short summer. Not the grey dust of Moscow that burrows into your expensive shoes the first time you wear them. Not light, always spring-like dust of Yalta that’s more like pollen. Not *domum vulgaris*; your regular house dust that scientists claim consists fifty percent of dead skin cells.

Dust here is special. You only see dust like this in ancient towns that are like history itself. One can say that it is ashes of the great empires, if you wish to speak ornately and incorrectly (in other words, poetically). By the way, Joseph Brodsky invented a great metaphor: Dust is the tan of the centuries. The metaphor floated out of our subconscious here in Troy and it made it “trice” more valuable; we would say if we weren’t afraid of corny jokes.

In the *Iliad* the word “dust” is used seven times, and not once in relation to Troy. Dust exists only outside of Troy, on the roads, on the stadium. It is kicked up by the hooves of long-maned horses, but there is no dust on the streets of Priam. Homer’s Troy is a city that has not yet been covered by dust.

A whole another matter is Troy now, glorified over the centuries and ever present on the screens of today. Its dust is like patina on bronze, like craquelures on an oil painting; a stamp of quality and sign of authenticity. We just wish it wouldn’t get into eyes and fill the shoes…
A.B: Personally, I took on writing a book about the Trojan War because of somewhat of an “economic motive”. I consider it filling a certain shortage. It seems like there is nothing to say about Troy anymore. There are thousands of books written already. But the one that is the most needed has not been done yet. THAT is the source of inspiration. I described its nature once before. You just look at the bookshelf and say “There are no books about this. I will have to write one.” Then you get paper and a pen and write to fill a void in the world of books that seemingly came from nowhere (or maybe a void in a world described as a book).

John Barth has a landmark paper that’s called “The Literature of Replenishment”. He talks about a slightly different thing though. Barth is a post-modernist and he was going to replenish gaps between genres, spheres, between science and common sense, high art and kitsch. And we, as I see it, need to fill one of the most horrendous gaps in our knowledge of ancient history. However, I suspect that most of our contemporaries find the topic of our research at least bewildering.

O.M: The main question that concerns our potential reader is why two idiots in the 21 century decided to write a book about Trojans and Greeks when everyone is writing about space exploration and nanotechnology and other gobbledygook like artificial intelligence? Who cares?

My answer is this; for the last ten years my main concern was ideology. My main premise is that for solving any kind of economic crisis, for any kind of growth the
basis is always ideology. I assume that “the havoc is never in the closets, but in the minds” and if the minds are in order, the order will transpire to the economics and politics, because the economics and politics are nothing but ideas. And all societal relations are also ideas.

For example, “property” and “state” are ideas. You cannot touch them. But if a certain number of people have the same understanding of how these ideas relate to them – for example, the idea of “property” – then they will behave accordingly and predictably with each other. Same for a concept of “state”. There is some commonality for all – symbols, flags, hymns, Kremlin, common history, same heroes, saints, sacred sites, holidays and so on. This common concept is in everybody’s head and it makes us one nation. Since we have this common idea of a state that means that there is a certain way of social relations. And if we don’t have a common idea, we won’t have a state or a nation. That’s why disintegration of a state and its people is disintegration of its symbols and ideology. And vice versa, the creation of new symbols, new social relations and a new order. The creation of a new government, is a necessary condition of its growth and prosperity; that is if the new offered order wins over the chaos or alternative order that looks like chaos.

As an example, Peruvian economist Hernando de Sote wrote a book Mystery of Capital. What’s the main point? The poorest societies in the world are those where there are no written and notarized notes, where nothing is registered and codified, where the resources and the labour are not turned into capital. Millions of people in Latin America build their huts toiling 24 hours a day without going anywhere. That’s because it’s not written anywhere that this dwelling belongs to Jose Ignacio and since there is no record, he can’t take credit secured by his house. And if he has a workshop, he can’t issue company shares and find investment that way. And his workshop will never become a international corporation. And the government, if it’s not present or weak won’t protect his interests internally or perhaps, internationally, as by American aircraft carriers. Americans have property rights, everything is written down, codified, and all courts, police and all other institutions accept it. Common trust and positive feedback is created within the system, when everyone knows what to expect, count on and to build a communal house on common rules and axioms.

A.B: And it becomes a basis for growth and power and civil society, state and culture. I understand. Continue.
O.M: Ok. I would like to propose a major hypothesis that still needs to be proved. I suggest that the difference between ancient great states and nomadic, wild societies is that the great civilizations had writing—not just the set of laws, but the written language in itself. They had something that was written, counted, and “the pen is mightier than sword”. There is order, stability, institutions, governance, and continuity of traditions. Where there is nothing written down, there is nothing but tumbleweed, wind, practices that extend rather than build and horizontal growth.

Nomads do not create grand cultures because there are no levels where something is built on top of something else. Nomads do not know where the base is because they only know the mycelium, the rhizome, as Deles said. If something is recorded, on the base of mastering it something new can be created. This something new can be an interpretation or a side move or deeper exploration, but in any case it’s a new order and a start from a certain point of reference. There could be a reflection of second, third, fourth order and therefore building of a Babylon tower of culture becomes possible.

And nomads have to teach each new generation the same thing, repeat elementary knowledge from elders to children. That’s why nomads had such a great respect for elders, since they are the carriers of oral culture; it’s not separated from them in written culture like in ancient civilizations.

A.B: What’s interesting is that hieroglyphic writing works in this sense better than phonetic. For example, in China now a Cantonese speaking person and a Mandarin speaker will pronounce and read the same hieroglyph differently, but it’s written identically and also in the same way as it was written three thousand years ago. So the continuity is better than phonetic writing because the latter follows the changes of the language and sound and registers it only technically.

O.M: So, getting back to what I was saying: the foundation of the state power and longevity, the greatness of its culture is a consequence of a fixed order existing there. Civilizations of Egypt and China existed longer that all following history of humanity. If you divide all history into two parts, the bigger part will be the history of Egypt and China. And the smaller part will be all the rest. Some historians think that, for example, in Egypt there was already Christianity, Islam, Judaism, mathematics, engineering, politics, basically, the entire western world.
A.B: American sociologist Lewis Mumford, for example, stated that all western science and all western rational thinking is structured according to a so called “archetypal machine” that was a liking of a model of governance in a totalitarian state of ancient Egypt. So the first was not the mechanization of tools, but the mechanization of behaviour in a mega-machine of Egyptian society. Institution is headed by a single brain with a very specific task (motor), and the impulses from it passed to each link of the mechanism down to the smallest bolt through a system of controls; intermediary functionaries. All other mechanisms of the later epochs were built according to the same principle.

O.M: So, the foundation of the power and longevity is the presence of law and order. No wonder Aristotle, Machiavelli, Gramsci and Foucault always said that the authority is supported not by force, but by agreement, not by violence and war, but by peace, by the design of the peace. Peace means order, interconnection, cosmos, harmony. Authority is always a positive process, new peace. During peace one can grow and develop, there is interconnection and trust. Jurgen Habermas and Karl-Otto Apel write about this, stating that the key is mutual reflection of expectations and positive feedback which create a basis of ethics.

Therefore I’ve written in my book *The Sovereignty of the Spirit* that if Russia wants to survive and have some kind of authority in the world, it should offer not a national idea “we are united against everybody else”, but an international and inter-historic one – a design of peace for everybody, for the whole planet – which would be competitive with other world peace concepts.

A.B: Your favourite Dio Chrysostom wrote about Nero—who is conventionally condemned and hated – that his orders were carried out happily, and even several generations after his death everyone would have liked him to still be alive. He says that this is what Nero’s power was based on and not on ferocity of his praetorians. It can be suspected though that Dio idealizes Nero on the backdrop of Domitianus atrocities, whom the philosopher had personal reasons to hate; Domitianus had expelled him from Rome and Dio had to wander around and beg.

O.M: Who knows. Anyway, what Chrysostom says about Nero is an extra illustration of the idea that the state policy does not have to be based on violence.

And I am not talking just about politics. Let’s take another human sphere. Imagine a court and jury. A defense lawyer comes out. He doesn’t say “You know, the real
matter of things here is not that this evidence is right and that evidence is not; and these witnesses are good, and those are not good. The real matter is that I am speaking to you because my client needs me to and if you don’t believe me, the client will go to jail and I won’t get paid”.

No defense lawyer will ever say that. Instead they say “In the name of justice we all, as people, have and in the name of truth and fairness that should triumph, we ought to accept these facts, because if we don’t accept them we will insult the world harmony, reason, God and so on…” So they appeal to common values. However when we enter government policy where the jury is the whole world, our diplomats, presidents and press say “this is favourable to Russia or China or US…” It’s stupid to say what’s favourable to you. Why should the others care? That’s why they need to speak about universal values, universal justice, and appeal to universal norms. We are not just “for ourselves”, but we are there for everybody, for the world peace and order. We don’t give a damn about national interests. We are ready to die for universal values. We need universal, world historical ideas.

Our history already had these ideas. For example, Moscow as a Third Rome. Such as “we are the last Orthodox Christian true kingdom that is holding the world from falling into hell. Then came Fedorov, Ziolkovsky, Russian communism with the mission of carrying justice into the world, fighting the capitalism, colonialism and exploitation.

A.B: And we see that the ideas of Ziolkovsky and other Russian cosmologists came true. I don’t mean win over gravity and leaving our planet to build intergalactica colonies. The space exploration became possible because thousands of people in Soviet Union received the idea of cosmic flight with great enthusiasm and started creating all kinds of clubs and groups and then GIRD and Institute of Reactive Power; all with the support of major government figures.

At the same time in the West, solitary thinkers talking about the possibility of overcoming Earth’s gravity were regarded as eccentric dreamers. And that’s putting it mildly. Robert Goddard, the “father of American astronautics”, was mocked not only by journalists, but by colleagues who were very skeptical about his ideas, advising him to re-read the physics textbook and calling him “earthworm”. He tried very hard to make the idea of space flight more popular and in 1924 he scheduled a date for a Lunar rocket launch to make the newspapers write about it. We know the flight did not happen then or during the next few decades. However, we are getting distracted.
O.M: Yes, it’s time to get back to the Greeks. After the Dark Ages someone in power, some sovereign decided they will have a new project. I very abstractly, within very large post-modern quotation marks will call him “Lycurgus”.

A.B I think you know that even ancient Greeks considered Lycurgus to be a semi-mythological figure.

O.M Let’s not argue if Lycurgus was real or not and what he has done or not done. Someone was doing it, and I am calling this person Lycurgus. Someone, most likely of Spartan origin, during the Dark Ages when there was chaos in all of Greece, decided to conquer the country. The later historians would call it “unite”, but of course, it was to conquer. The conquest was done not by force, but by—like I said previously—using ideology. In other words, someone or some people turned out to be wise enough that they understood that to preside over the Hellenic world they needed to provide peace, some sense of order, cosmos, law that would the same for everybody and work for everyone.

So, besides giving Sparta laws (leave the healthy babies, kill the sick, enforce a diarchy, elders’ rights, etc.)—laws that were strict but created a military elite up until the later times—and besides creating a sort of intra-corporate PR, this person realized that there needed to be external ideological influence. That influence should not be built on fascist principles of “We—Spartans—are super humans and the rest of you are scum and slaves,” but on common-to-all Greek principles. Even the little things such as measures of weight and length—they should be the same for all merchants in the united territory so there would be no cheating—so it would be easier to sign contracts and set pricing, take loans secured against crops, and so on.

So the standard was created and was very convenient for everyone in trading. Then you start creating laws that are common for everybody, for example: a duty-free trading space where you don't have to pay out to racketeers and pirates; everyone is protected by the same king; and you know that if you stole a hundred rubles you will have your hand cut off and if you stole a thousand; you will be impaled. The rules are the same and don’t change from a city to city. You have a constitution; not as a set text, but a set of rules supported by common will.

There is another very important moment. Everything should be supported not by sheer force, but a convenience of both the laws and their application. For example, Greeks took an oath when making contracts. But what gods if everyone has different
gods and different tradition? One town has Hermes as God, and in the other town he is only a minor deity. You need unified standard of reverence.

A.B: I think it’s not exactly true. Take the well known mutual assistance pact between Hittite King Mutawalli and the ruler of Wilusa, Alaksandus. They swear not by some kind of common for both, conventional God, but each by his own; one by Kaskal Kur, the other by Baliunas (the precursor of the Greeks’ Apollo). So, everyone swears by something that’s sacred for them.

O.M: Ok, sure. When a Muslim merchant during deal-making swears by Muhammad and a Christian one by Jesus, that’s not so bad, because everyone is swearing by what is the most sacred to either of them. What if he demands that I would swear by Muhammad instead of Jesus? And the ancient Greek world had thousands of gods and deities. Maybe the issue is not the oath itself, even though it’s important that everybody swore by something equally sacred. The issue is the same standard of reverence. Travellers and merchants go from town to town, bring gifts and make sacrifices to gods of the state they are in, and also to gods of their own land and gods of their craft. There are always arguments which god is the most important and who helps the most, which god is more ancient and mighty. The arguments grow into major conflicts.

There should be a unified hierarchy of gods. One common denominator, one worldview which everyone shares and no one argues about. The purpose of any war is peace, and peace is not absence of war, it’s a presence of unified system of coordinates.

So, let’s put ourselves in place of this imagined Lycurgus who decided to codify the gods in order to please everyone and there was no conflict. He couldn’t just arbitrarily take one of his own gods and announce that god as the main one and force everyone believe it. No one would follow that scheme. Those who live near the sea would always swear by Poseidion and those who grow wheat would always swear by Demeter. They won’t accept any imposed hierarchy, will fight against it, and the fight will be for their gods, for the holy purpose. This matter is very delicate. It concerns very subtle and important issues that the humans have; their religion, conscience, memory of their elders, motherland, family, tradition, someone’s profession. One wrong word and you got yourself mortal enemies. How to deal with all of this? There is a great mess. Read, for example, what Alexander Zaitsev says in his book *The Greek Religion and Mythology*. Every town had something different going, according
to the signs on temples. For example, Hera at that time was not Zeus’s wife (Zeus is Deus, god in Latin, same root as the Russian word den, day). She had a husband named “Trieros”, three-time Eros, a quality emphasized in a multiple. However, since Hera, as wife, was a matron of family, childbirth, agriculture, nature and so on, she became more known in all different territories than her thrice glorious husband. At the same time the thunderous Zeus became more known as well. And, as a result, much later the two better known gods were “married up”. The Asia Minor gods were mixed up with the Attic. There was great confusion going on. That’s why before creating a common ideology, speaking in today’s terms, a widespread sociological study needed to be conducted.

The imagined Lycurgus sent his messengers to all lands to understand who is revered where and in what order. It was needed to understand the ratings of this or that god, because if you want support of the majority, you need to create a classification where on top there are gods revered by the majority and by most powerful and rich city-states. I think this process didn’t happen without a hitch. Here we have a major port where all seamen swear by Poseidon and at the same time Zeus is known to be more popular all over Hellas. But if you put Poseidon under Zeus, you will positively create yourself a war with, at a minimum, that one city. And if the majority muscles in and takes over the city, the city will always revolt later, and the main thing, this disobedience will replicate itself, because seamen will always respect Poseidon more due to the character of their activity. Therefore, Zeus and Poseidon should be put in an equal position, like brothers, without taking administrative subordination as an example. The order of gods should be arranged, not like in an army or government, but like in a family clan.

And so step by step this imagined Lycurgus and his advisers solved each problem with each city state. This is the key reason that family structure was taken as a model for gods’ classification. They needed to be presented as brothers and sisters and not as subordinates.

A.B: I suspect that one more reason played a role here. With coming of the Dark Ages and collapse of complicated, even delicate social structures of Mycenaen times, the Greeks returned to the clan system. The blood relation became the only understandable social model.

O.M: Exactly! People did not know any other order or societal grid than the family one. I can easily admit that any philosopher could derive one god from another
dialectically, just like Hegel derives one category from another. But no one would get that! So a classification should be created that is understood by everybody, including—and foremostly by the illiterate. Philosophers and priests will snort at this, but there are very few of them. When you explain that this somebody is a brother to somebody else, or a father-in-law, it’s clear, because it’s a familiar order to everybody. Claude Lévi-Strauss in his book *The Structural Anthropology* has written that the clan order is the most natural one and is a model of any order, as it’s the most simple to understand. So the commission of this imagined Lycurgus stuffed all chaos and diversity of the Greek gods into a family-like grid. So, all manner of “the night gives rise to the day”, or “night and day are the one” by Heraclitus or “goddess truth” by Parmenides, the dialectic and metaphysical properties of gods and their relations are left to philosophers. “The plebeians won’t dig it,” but the clan system is understood by everybody.

So, here we have a very interesting process. On one side, there are priests, mystics, philosophers and theologists that continue to think about gods as metaphysical, supernatural forces or spirits and, like in old days, communicate with them by metaphysical means. On the other side we have the regular folks that found out that all gods are related to each other and begin to see them through the prism of their family relations. Here we have a wife cheating on a husband while he is away making money; this analogy is transferred to gods. Here are children fighting with their father set against him by their mother; and this is applied to the gods as well. Brothers fighting, sisters and the rest of the domestic squabbles. From here appears the specific-to-Greece so-called anthropomorphic character of its religion. It wasn’t such in the beginning and could not be. All studies and findings (see Zaytsev’s work) show that until a certain point, as far as Greek gods go, there was a mess and confusion and after approximately 900-800 centuries B.C. the clan order begins and after that anthropomorphism and wild stories about Zeus cheating on his wife, and enmity between Athena and Artemis about who is more beautiful.

A.B: By the way, the same professor Zaitsev had noted that anthropomorphism of the gods as Greeks practiced it is a very rare occurrence in the history of religion. And that is true…

O.M: To the point, we understand that there was a whole process that took time. First, there was a decision made about gods’ classification. Second, there needed to be a “sociological study” done and measure of gods’ ratings. Third, create a unified
concept, test all sticky points. Forth, insert this into the mass consciousness, and fifth, receive anthropomorphism as a response. Therefore, between the time when teachers in schools and bards on the agoras described the new relationships between gods—between the time when everyone understood that Zeus is the father and Athena is the daughter—there was a period when the people invented a whole Greek soap, much like Santa-Barbara. Only then do we see that Homer weaved the “Santa-Barbara” motives in the fabric of The Iliad and The Odyssey.

Herein lies the major scientific value of our work, as PhD thesis presenters like to say. Some people in the West received their PhD degrees because they related Homer’s poems to a certain period, and proved it by referring to his description of material culture, artifacts and societal relations in the poems—not from the time of the Trojan War, but a much later time. And we also show that spiritual and religious artifacts used in Homer’s poems trace back to 800-700 BCE. Absolutely not any earlier than that! It’s not important when the integration of Homer’s poems (the ones we know about) occurred, or if this amalgamation was of various disjointed pieces and poems or on the basis of one proto-poem about Achilles’ anger. The main thing is that integration happened on the basis of the matrix of a family clan of the gods.

A.B: I will note, by the way, from cyclic epics about the Trojan War there was practically nothing left. These bits were translated to Russian not so long ago. So, I don’t know how the things were in the original versions of them, but in the surviving fragments there are no “Santa-Barbara” happenings between gods. Maybe a few hints that Zeus is everybody’s father and Athena is his daughter; a blood relation. But no more than that. I think that according to our concept we can suggest with a good deal of confidence that cyclic epics are older than The Iliad and The Odyssey known to us. Many researchers before us have said the same thing; all these Kuhlmanns, Borgias, Pestalocci, etc., although they based it on something else.

O.M: I will say this plainly but graphically. As a former member of the presidential administration, as a political consultant—as an advisor who has been dealing with research and ideologies all his conscious life—how I see all of this. The imagined Lycurgus (again, I emphasize “imagined”, maybe it was one of his grandchildren or sons that later all blended into one person and was declared god-like) gathers sophists, philosophers, priests and other advisers for a meeting. Same as Surkov or Volodin gathered us, political consultants, in the Kremlin. And he tells them, “Invent ideology common for everybody. We have all these different people,
different languages, different temples and gods! And there are also all these
foreigners, too, they have completely strange to us languages and gods. We need to
do something so everybody agreed that our gods are the main ones; so everyone
swore by them, so the newborn children are called their names, our oracles consulted,
our plays watched, our temples visited by pilgrims and the dead are buried by our
laws. Then only our rule will be strong, and everything will have one cosmos, one
law and one order!” They, of course answer: “First we need to conduct a survey, send
our men to all lands”.

The survey gets done, they make a matrix. Maybe not just one, maybe there were
several concepts. Perhaps, Zeus was the only father at first, and Poseidon was the
son, and perhaps not Hera, but Demeter was Zeus’s wife. Same as in the President’s
Administration there are different concepts considered, weak spots and risks pointed
out; something is taken as a basis and then worked out in details. And at the end the
final solution accepted.

However, they still had to arrive at some kind of a popular, mass accepted
outcome—so the youth could remember it in schools, therefore they needed a kind of
tale, easy to memorize by heart, so, perhaps, a poem. So, some philosopher/poet sat
down and wrote The Origin of Gods. Then they started thinking whom it should be
attributed to, “An important work like this that talks about origins of gods could not
be coming from someone well known to everybody Joe Jones. This is an ancient
manuscript, an ancient source.” It always happened this way in history, so many fake
“ancient treasures” always float around: The Will of Peter the Great, Constantine’s
Gift, History of Little Russia, Velesov’s Book, and “Protocols of the Zionist Wise
Men”. Many, many fake ancient documents are out there. So they sat down and
decided to attribute “The Origin of Gods” to … Hesiod, who was already in those
times a semi-mythological figure, like our bard Boyan from The Lay of Igor’s
Campaign. So the singers will come out and say, “Here is the poem of Hesiod, which
you have not heard yet, dating from antiquity,” and the antiquity claim shows its
power. Here we go! And as soon as the poem of the fake Hesiod was ready, it was
launched into the education system, re-written a hundred times, popularized, and
since because all these sophists were teachers in schools for youth, they made
everyone learn it by heart; got the bards out to the squares. Everything was the same
as now. Put together a concept and then implement it through news, films, school
programmes, mass media, etc.
A.B: Only often it’s botched up, particularly on the implementation level. Is that why there are so many arrogant semi-educated people declaring “aesthetic differences” with the current authority?

O.M: Ok, and after some time there is a second meeting. Checking in, how are things, how is the propaganda of the new ideas coming along? And political consultants-slash-sophists say:

“In principle, everything is fine, our lord. There are no protests. However, there is a problem with the youth. They have difficulties absorbing the text; they make many mistakes. Who is interested in gods and going to the temple? The grown up men make sacrifices before business deals, old women and widows remember old days and light candles, but young people are not interested in who is whose father-in-law or brother-in-law. They want stories about love, forbidden sex, fights, feats, and only with sour faces do they learn our theogony. And when our bards sing the mantras about origins, who is born from whom—even flies on the walls get bored. We need action, drive, conflict, scandal, sex and blood; who is fighting with whom, who is cheating on whom, who got hit in the face, and bad news. Only then we will get decent ratings. “

“So what are we going to do?” asks Spartan Surkov-Volodin and maybe even Lycurgus-Putin himself. And they answer:

“Here at the markets our street cripples sing songs about the Trojan War for three hundred years already, about the heroes, about Odysseus, Diomedes, Menelaus, Achilles, and about love of Helen and Paris. We should collect all the songs in one poem and shove our gods and their family relations into it. Like we give our kids bitter medicine with honey, we will wrap the poem around our ideology. There is a bit of a problem in that the songs are all sad, because all of our heroes died in that war, and there is this nonsense that our Spartan woman was kidnapped. By the way we can change that. We should make it that it was us who won over the Trojans. Anybody who steals our Spartan brides will be annihilated and their town destroyed. And the main thing, we gathered all the Greeks from all islands and moved as a united force. We shouldn’t put it all out together like that at markets and squares, as it would sound strange. First we launch one poem with the gods and our winning heroes and if people like it, we will make a second poem in which we will say that we won the Trojan War. And so the folks believe us, we will attribute these poems not to Hesiod but to Homer himself! He, as people think, is even more ancient than Hesiod and therefore has more authority!
They already had the tradition to attribute thoughts to other authoritative figures, for example, Plato attributed his thoughts to Socrates, and how many pseudo-Dionises were there? It’s in our society; the newer the better. But in a traditional one, the older the better.

A.B: This tradition exists now, too. For example, as you remember, while in university I thought up different ancient philosophers “whose works are not yet introduced in scientific circulation,” assigned my thoughts to them, putting the thoughts in a specific stylistic format and successfully cited “the philosophers” in my exams. However, for me it was a literary game à la Borges, and now this trick is used all over the place in advertising and journalism. You can’t imagine how make fake citations are out there! It’s not so bad when used by girls in Odnoklassniki.ru, but some book authors claiming to be scientific and serious are not ashamed to use them either! I would advise them to check one extra time that “famous saying”, as not to look like an idiot.

O.M: Ok, so now walking the talk. Political consultants slash sophists got a bag of gold in the presidential administration. They collected songs about the feats of Odysseus and Diomed and Achilles with Hector in the pile. Whatever didn’t work they threw out, whatever was missing they added, taking as a basis the plot about Achilles being angry and his quarrel. For the second poem the basis was Odysseus’s return. Naturally, a throng of scribes was hired that wrote it all down (the most modern technology of the time borrowed from Phoenicians) and all of that goes to schools and public squares, especially since the same people who go to these meetings are in charge of schools. The bards gladly take the money for performing these new songs and sing them, especially since people get tired of listening to the same old with variations and here we’ve got new hits, and so cheery too.

So, it turns out it’s us, Greeks, that defeated everybody and smashed everything and not like in old songs where everything was dull and tragic. That’s how it was implemented and then as a result in several centuries Greece experienced cultural revival and gave the world its greatest examples of philosophy, politics and art lasting thousands of years.

A.B: Ok, good. But let’s try a reverse operation. We just imagined the ancient Greeks as modern political consultants and PR people, watched their meetings and envisioned how their problem solving would look now. Let’s imagine now that the
ancient Greeks had appeared in the Kremlin today to solve a similar problem. And the way I see it, a similar problem exists.

O.M: Sure, let’s do it. Let’s suggest that Putin is Lycurgus who assigns to the political consultants the same task: create a concept, a sketch for the entire world. For the entire world! How to unite all the gods: give Russia a world-wide ideology. Create an order that would work for everybody; for Hindus and Arabs, Americans and Japanese, Latinos and Africans with their different religions, languages, and divergent political views.

The first alternative is the act according to the Greek matrix. Collect all gods, and begin to build a hierarchy. So, for example, the chief god is Christ, and Mohammed would be his brother or, the key figure would be Yahweh and his brother would be Allah and so on. There are plenty of similar ideas. For instance, all religions of the world, including the most primitive, were packed in one concept or, to be more exact, in one worldwide historical idea, moving from primitive forms to more developed ones by Hegel. He packaged them beautifully; all religions were all neatly folded into one. However, not only would seven billion people be unable to understand the work, but barely 70 people on earth could finish reading it. The ones who could are all professors of history of philosophy of some (not all) faculties of philosophy and there are about 40 of them on the world. All religions in one, and so what? There were later pop attempts. For example, Sun Myung Moon took all religions and also folded them into one, and it just so happens that Moon himself is the last prophet. There is also Baha’u’llah, who also synthesized all religions in one.

Why doesn’t it work? Why would such an interesting ideology not work and why is our task is more complicated than it was for Lycurgus’s advisors? Because, relatively speaking, for Muslims “there is no god other than Allah, and Mohammed is his messenger,” and there are no compromises possible. And in Christianity it’s the same; no believers would renounce Christ as the personified revived God, as the Saviour. So compromise is impossible.

Besides, within each religion, other religions have already been incorporated, and not only as heresy or the devil’s creation. For example, in Islam Christ is the prophet Isa, and on the contrary, in Judaism and Christianity, Muslims are the Hagarenes, children of Hagari, Abraham’s illegitimate wife. Christians do not deny Judaism, and the Old Testament is the forerunner of the New Testament, while Muslims also recognize prophets from the Old Testament. Abrahamic religions consider Buddhists
to be “mad before the God with all their wisdom”, while Buddhists, on the contrary, consider all Abrahamic prophets sacred Buddhas or Bodhisattvas.

A.B: By the way, it is not just Abrahamic prophets. The Buryat pantheon, for example, includes as goddesses, White Tares; the two Russian empresses who acknowledged Buddhism as a faith in Russia, Catherine the Great and Elizabeth I. And just after the October Revolution, the Buryat Buddhists recognized… Lenin as the reincarnation of Buddha.

O.M: Yes, I’ve heard of it also. But why am I talking about this? The matter is that the Greeks had different gods, but it was possible to take and to create a meta-narrative, a meta-history to compile everything into one story. In our situation, it is religions that collide rather than gods. In our situation, meta-narratives collide! Each religion includes another one, while simultaneously denying it. It is also impossible to invent a meta-meta-narration! More exactly, it is possible, and everyone would accept it, but only if the actual God showed up and explained everything and there would have been a new story and a new history that would include all religions. However, no prophet, no poet, no philosopher can do this. This needs to be an EVENT of the advent of God in power and glory. Not even like the first coming of Christ who did not come as a king, but as a Holy Lamb. In power and glory; so there would be no doubts in his divinity, so all would tremble, especially non-believers. The last advent of the Last God.
One has to understand here that no political consultants can think up anything. And even if they could, how would they create a worldwide historical spectacle of the last coming, so the heavens would split and miracles happened, so all countries and people fell to their knees. I don’t know how much money directing this show could cost and what technical means it would take and what country could afford it. So, artificially this cannot be created, I cannot really picture it happening. However, the script can be written and played with. Then we have to wait for the eventual coming of the Last God. Heidegger wrote about this. Heidegger also did not think that the second coming would be like thunder in a clear sky. Just as the first advent of Christ, it would be rather inconspicuous, not in power and glory, but rather in subtle hints that the Last God will send. Maybe it will be so. There is one problem. Everything that God wanted to say to people about ideology, he has already said. The second coming is not for giving people new truth, but for judging. But this is another topic.

Now, let’s consider another possibility. Not a step up, which is a meta-step and contains other religions, but a step down, going through rejecting all religions and gods. Here we have different types of atheism. It is explained through class consciousness like Marx, or through psychoanalysis, like Freud, or through the will
to power, like Nietzsche, and through dozens of other methods. The essence is the same: “I hate all gods”, they are all inventions, and were invented with some pragmatic interest in mind; either economical, psychological or political.

A.B: Antiquity experts call it Euhemerism, named after the philosopher Euhemerus, who argued that faith in the gods comes from the cult of the great people of the past. For example, by idea attributed to Euhemerus, Zeus was an ancient king of Crete and became famous as a mighty warrior, and his tomb was even still there at Knossos. Later the citizens of Crete made him a deity due to some practical interest.

By the way, there is also a whole tradition of interpreting the Trojan epic from an euhemerism position, which allowed explaining its numerous mismatches and conflicts. And it is in the spirit of this tradition that Snorri Sturluson, in his “Younger Edda” compares the clan of Odin, the Icelandic “father of the gods” to Priam, the “supreme conung” of Troy; a famous city built exactly in the centre of the Earth.

O.M. This euhemerism reached its peak in Voltair’s works. Remember? Christianity is an intertwined mesh of the dirtiest lies, created by the lowest men. I am citing almost literally. As known, Voltaire’s atheism pursued very particular political goals. And this pragmatism and not its sources and arguments, unites with “popular”, spontaneous atheism of Russian revolution times.

For example, the Red Army soldier comes to a kishlak (a village) in Central Asia. He asks the villager “who do you believe in, Alla? Then you are a fool, I too at one time was a fool and believed in Christ, but I now understand that the gods were invented by my landowner and your bai to exploit us. So, grab the rifle and let’s go together to fight them.” So, on the common ground of rejection they fraternized and built Soviet states.

But this only works—this situation of enlightenment and especially of our post-modern situation— to a certain limit and I will tell you why. “No meta-narrators!” said Lyotard. This is a post-modern situation, when all religions are rejected and therefore all divine and sacred stories are also.

But here’s where the trouble lies. Postmodernism itself is also a meta-narrative, no matter how you slice it and the main thing is that atheism is already written in all the religions. In all religions atheism is evil—for Muslims, Christians, Jews—and atheism will never be accepted by any of them. Even though it tries to reconcile everything on a base of zero, it won’t happen. All traditional religions consider all atheists—either old ones or the new, postmodernist, globalist ones—as a work of the devil. The
religions consider atheism in contest with their own history. The more there will be attempts of “zero approach” – the presentation of all religions as an expression of class interests, or psychological problems, or simply “language games” as per Wittgenstein – the more fundamentalists will revolt against this “zero approach”. More postmodernism, more terrorism. Žižek particularly likes to emphasize this.

Therefore, if we are looking for a worldwide unifying concept and are sitting at a conference, the path of the meta-narrative – religion that includes all others – is closed for us. Nobody will agree with that and the path of rejecting all religions is closed also; no one will agree with that either. And the more you impose rejection, the more terrorists and fighters for the faith there will be. The modern terrorist fights on two fronts. He fights against other religions and universal concepts; and against globalism and atheism as such.

Abraham had it easy. When there were many smaller local gods, gods of sun, moon, fire and woods, he took it all and transcended, and said, “There is invisible God.” He does not look like anything existing, he created the Universe. Romans and Greeks had it easy: they made up their pantheon from various local gods. However, the Romans and Jews had a war of two meta-ideologies, each claiming the whole world and nothing less. And during Middle Ages; the same war between Christians and Muslims, collisions of two universals. Not a collision of two local concepts, but a collision of two global ones, when one world collides with another, completely foreign one.

A.B: Ok, so what do we have today? Today is postmodern.

O.M: Today is postmodern; all universals, all ideologies as either meta-ideologies or atheistic versions. All lifestyles look like religions. Take consumer culture. Instead of afterlife and saving one’s soul, we have eternal youth and saving one’s body. Instead of going to a temple on Sunday we go to the megamall; instead of communion – shopping; instead of icons and a Bible, magazines and posters; instead of saints, celebrities; instead of a morning prayer, make-up and affirmations, “I am happy and beautiful”; instead of priests, fashion designers; instead of Lent, diets and so on. We can find an analogy for absolutely every phenomenon. Or let’s take sports for example. Same thing. Instead of saints, we have sport stars; instead of prayer, training and fitness; instead of church services, sporting competitions, matches and the Olympics; instead of priests, coaches, and so on. Every lifestyle is a universal
religion; quasi-religion. And it arouses a special hatred from traditional religions. The devil is God’s monkey.

The postmodern answer, soft European atheism (as opposed to a brutal one like Trotskyites’ destruction of churches), tries to present all religious universals as “private ideologies”. So, “You guys can believe in anything you like, but scale your ambitions. Don’t tell us you have absolute truth, because there is only one known absolute truth and that is there is no absolute truth.” This already happened in the Hellenic epoch. Christ told Pilatus the same thing: “What is the truth, you arrogant fanatic? If you proclaimed yourself the Judaic king, you would be a political criminal. If you claim that you are Truth and God you are mad. I am a civilized educated man. I have seen many universal truths, one better than another, but all of them eradicate each other simply because there are so many of them.” The opposite of being is not the negation of being, but doubling and multiplying it, and then mutual negation happens, like Baudrillard said.

There is also one more tendency in the world of universals. There is a dumb postmodernism with its political correctness, such as “don’t behave defiantly, wear a cross or hijab in full view and insult the religious feelings of others.” Even Christmas trees were banned in Europe, because these unfortunate plants have caused an allergic reaction for some Muslims. But what does the Christmas tree have to do with Christ? It only became a Christmas symbol in the XVIII century.

Instead of rejecting universals, it’s better on the basis of universality to create the inter-penetration of ideologies. But not in a dumb way, such as, “You know, Turks and Muslims are people too, or invalids with their limited capabilities, or gays.” Further, “Pedophiles will be people too”, just like “murderers”. Breivik, who murdered a lot of people, complains that his TV screen is too small for him there in prison.

A.B: You are late with your predictions. I do not know about murderers, but pedophiles are already “people”. Five years ago, the Hague court declined a claim about the interdiction in Holland, of the party “Mercy, freedom and variety”, which appeals for free sex with children. They say that we are tolerant in the western world, and we can profess any views. And in Canada during parliamentary sessions, the question was seriously debated whether or not it is necessary to recognize pedophilia an aspect of sexual orientation. Probably, its adepts are already called “juvenile-oriented persons”, like thieves and robbers would be “persons with alternative views of property rights.”
There is more to come, while democracy is understood not as the power of the people, but rather societal structure that prevents stigmatization of any minority, up to an individual person.

O.M: I am not talking about acceptance of universal political rights for every little minority and even individual people. I am talking about cultural interaction; not on the level of national dishes and cuisines that already became a common legacy in Europe, but on the level of literature, music, philosophy. This is something that once upon a time the theologians called “Perichoresis”, when they tried to explain communication and the intercoupling of the three persons in the Trinity, in their divine substance. The divine substance of the Trinity is the same for each person of the triune God, and is absolute foundation and stage for all interaction between them. No wonder, Sloterdijk used the Greek word *perichoresis* for what’s happening right now in postmodern culture. By the way, it’s the same thing that happened in the multinational and multi-denominational empires earlier (for example, the Byzantine, Mongolian, Austrian-Hungarian empires and especially in the Russian empire and the USSR); universality of universals as common ground for communication, and not as a reason for war and ambition. One should note that it’s neophytes that don’t know the culture and religion that they are “defending” that fight with each other. Mullahs and priests won’t fight. They will get into theological disputes that will enrich both sides, but two youngsters who never read the Koran or the Bible will blow up each other with the words “God be with us!”

A.B: So, is there a way to divide all universals, to guard them against conflict?

O.M: Yes, there is; virtual worlds. Every universal can have its own world where everything is according to its desires. Somebody, for example, a Muslim, connects to the matrix, enters a virtual space where everyone is wearing a hijab, where there are only sharia laws and the ideal Islamic order. Leaving the matrix he will come back to universally sterile, non-religious technocratic world.

Also it’s possible to make a world for the pleasure of not only Christians, Mormons and Zionists, but even for pedophiles and passive necrophiliacs, should they want to. Everyone will get their own toy; the virtual world will provide it.

I think a lot of young people would be hopping from one virtual reality to another to try out living in the ideal worlds of different religions, different minorities and fetishes. Their slogan would be “you should try everything in your life”. Too bad that
this phrase usually means filming a porno or trying drugs and not studies of quantum mechanics and molecular chemistry. However, there will be worlds for scientists-fetishists too, who will completely immerse into scientific subjects. Generally speaking, even now we live like bees flying from one flower to another, from one lifestyle to another. In the future, these styles will be clearer, cleaner, more precise and separate from each other; a person’s life would be longer and the division between virtual reality and so called “reality” will be fainter and more and more indistinguishable. So the winning meta-ideology is the ideology of technology which is a true universal and that will allow all universals, even technophobe universals, their universality within the borders of their universal virtual world. That’s what Heidegger meant when he wrote about technology as the destiny of our way of being-in-the-world.

A.B: We have slipped off the topic of ancient Greeks in the Kremlin

O.M: Yes. Getting back to our virtual meeting in the Kremlin on creating a worldwide unifying concept. We conclude that we cannot create a meta-meta-narration for already existing meta-narratives, meta-religion for already existing religions, because they transcend any “meta”. All of them are such that there is nothing “higher”. We will keep in reserve the idea of the coming of the Last God as a meta-meta event which will explain everything and unite everybody.

Second, we cannot follow a path down “the zero alternative”, or the rejection of the meta-narratives, because this rejection is already a meta-narration known to the others. And, by the way, known as a hostile alternative, included already as “the enemy”, and causing allergic reactions such as terrorism. We will leave the possibility of technology to split all meta-narratives into their own corners in an enormous virtual space, so they can create ideal worlds and lifestyles in which followers would fully realize their ambitions and did not create conflicts in the real world. Neither the possibility of the Last God or the possibility of a technical virtual world is in our capabilities, so we have them on the horizon in general. There are two extremes, unifying Last God and virtual world separating everything into their own burrows. Inside these two extremes there lies something that can become modern practical politics. What are we going to do, particularly with ideology? What if it was ordered right now?

A.B: And?
O.M: I see it this way. If we take these universal ideologies as philosophies, we will fall into a kind of endless analysis. If we start to scientifically disassemble and dissect them, we will fall into the “zero alternative”, atheism, and we already talked about that alternative. If we take these universal ideologies as whole systems that not a brick could be moved from, we will come across a struggle of ambitions where everyone is shouting, “God is with us!” and only the Last God can say whom he “is with.” So, neither the scientific approach nor the religion approach will work with these ideologies, and they won’t work for us as a worldwide unifying concept.

What will work is the approach from the point of view; art. “Beauty will save the world!” Here is one historical anecdote. When Luther was protesting against indulgences and was translating the Bible so it was finally understood by common people, at least Germans, Rome answered back that money collected from indulgences goes to finance the Sistine Chapel, which will make the Bible understood by everybody!

Art is language, understood by all without exceptions, understood without words. We look at paintings, sculptures, architecture, listen to music. Art is a common unifier. Even language arts, losing something in translation, are still quite synthetic. Remember Wagner who wanted to make opera such a language for all Germans and all Europe and the world. Additionally, he thought of opera as a unifier of all the arts. Art had developed since that time, now synthetic art will be interactive. It has the spectator as the performer, participant of the show and not a passive object. A game is such art; for example, a computer game; a game that the whole world is playing and is building something, like a civilization or an epic.

So, I am thinking that the ancient Greeks were not stupid, sitting at the meeting of the imagined Lycurgus. It’s possible they may have been dealing not with individual gods, but with the established universal religion of each god. Who told us Poseidon was only the god of the sea? We know that from post-Hesiod and post-Lycurgus reform! One particular god - the brother of Zeus. What if there was a whole religion, “Poseidonism”, with all nymphs and other small deities and supreme attributes? And maybe this religion was so universal, that it did not need anything? And who said that the same thing didn’t happen to other gods who became specific gods as a result of the Lycurgus reform?

A.B: Continuing your thought, it is easy to imagine a fantastic situation where a very powerful conqueror subjugated the Earth and that he was so mighty that he could by force impose a universal religion, in which Sabaoth (Thunder Maker) would
be the major god, and Allah, for example, would be his younger brother, a patron of travellers, and Yahweh would be another brother and the patron of merchants. And also Buddha would be the son and patron god for doctors; or something like that.

Now in 3000 years try to go and tell your distant descendants that initially, there were independent religions with individual gods! They would make fun of you!

O.M. In any case, the epos, saga or poem became a real religion of the Greeks, something that unified Hellas. In our world, it should not be a Hollywood epic screened everywhere, but a game, with interaction; a game about resistance to “the others”. Something is attacking the Earth, and we, earthlings of all religions, all tribes and peoples inside this game, fight off the attacks, do heroic feats, compete with each other in heroism and ingenuity and finally achieve victory which should not come easily, but instead through retreats and small defeats, when sometimes it was all hanging by a thread and so the game really touches the lives of people and the stakes are high.

Worldwide unifying ideology should be created originally on the level of imagination. This problem has existed since the times of Kant, who in the first issue of his Critique of Pure Reason arrived at the conclusion that two sources of knowledge that had been described by philosophers for thousands of years, namely that mind and sensations are not self-sustained and are founded in one’s imagination. Plainly speaking, it’s our imagination that dictates to us what we see, hear, smell, what we consider a perceived fact and what we don’t notice. And it’s our imagination that dictates how we reason, what causes we are looking for and which connections and arguments we build. Kant himself was surprised at this discovery, and in the second edition of Critique of Pure Reason he stepped back from it. However, we are not that timid!

The human brain is more complex than the universe. The number of possible connections between neurons is greater than the amount of matter in the universe. Every one of us carries more in their skull than the entire Cosmos! There are explosions, birth of supernovae and nebulas. Besides, what we see as Cosmos is past, because its light takes millions of years to reach the Earth. But what we have in our heads is future. The imagination surpasses the speed of light, and everything flows differently there, you are already where you wanted to be and even earlier than you realized you wanted to be there. The effect creates cause, and to be more exact, these two terms don’t even exist there, they belong to reason as Kant already understood,
and simply package orders of imagination, process them and draw a certain discourse.

However, this is a separate matter and we are not talking about it now. The task is to work on the level of imagination, shift some layers, impress.

We need images, but not like in “Star Wars”, “Pirates of the Caribbean”, “Lord of the Rings”, “Avatar” and “Harry Potter”. All these blockbusters certainly awaken your imagination, they are the children's fairy tales that billions of children on the planet are being raised with and these kids are already similar in some ways; they have common background. And a very certain ideological matrix is sewn into these blockbusters. I am not going to analyse which one right now, although the matter is worthy of attention of all philosophers, because it’s formatting the brain of billions of children and adults on the Earth.

But as I said, cinema is not going to do it. We need something interactive, some flash mob, participation in which creates a common worldwide identity. Not uniformity, but identity in a sense of involvement in a common goal. Not a fight of North and South, East and West; the whole world needs to fight with something extra-terrestrial. It may be a virus. And then as in the Camus novel *The Plague*, we all fight. Maybe a computer virus. Maybe aliens. But they need to be made so they make real damage and not just run around like demons on the drawn up levels.

Maybe it won’t be fighting. Maybe it will be a positive project, like Fedorov has it, “Philosophy of the common goals,” “Resurrection”. But it shouldn’t be done as a book; it needs interactivity. For example, task everyone with saving the maximum amount of genetic material or something, the main thing is to operationalize it, so it’s not just some scientists in labs working on longevity and resurrection, but it’s **everyone who** has a chance to participate, so people see their life duty in it, pleasure, drive and purpose.

If we are speaking about the game, it may even end in failure; humanity can even lose. The main thing that we win in a real situation, because the Greeks lost the Trojan War, and later won it in poems, then won a real war against the Persians. But that was a war between the East and the West. We need that it would be a war of earthlings against non-earthlings. We remember how the Kalmykian Buddhists united with Muslim Tatars and Christian Russians against Hitler. There needs to be a common enemy that is carrying a death threat to humanity. No more, no less; and not just a particular death from something. The best way is when humanity is fighting with the enemy; death itself. Death is the main enemy, the main enemy of all humanity and every person, irrespective of their religion and language. And the battle
with this enemy is not a negative thing, it’s a positive project; to become immortal! What can be more absolute than such an ideology?

A.B: But religious people may not go for that. Kind of “Kingdom of God on Earth instead of Heaven”, human pride; the attempt to become God and make decisions about one’s own death.

O.M: There was already a discussion about that, with Fedorov and later. Writers Gorsky and Setnitsky wrote a book “Smertoboznichestvo” (death-godliness), where they were proving that Fedorov does not contradict Christianity, but on the contrary. It is said “God did not create death”. And later Christ defeated it too.

A.B: Ok, let’s imagine everyone becomes immortal and then it turns out that if someone is bored with living he will have to commit a suicide and people will be doomed to do that since science can prolong anything indefinitely. To stop the extension of one’s life means to decide to commit suicide and that decision is the great sin in all religions, just like pride.

O.M: First, the desire to die from boredom and weariness is a melancholy that was appropriate for the preceding history, and here the person can try out different roles for hundreds of years, and also there is an opportunity to live a life that will never be boring, such as scientific pursuit, or even better, a philosophical pursuit. There is also one more alternative; a war, a real war, where all despaired can fight and kill each other instead of committing suicide. In this sense immortality can give (these people who have no will to live) a chance to become heroes and not victims of suicide. Generally, I don’t think our descendants will be more stupid than us, they will figure it out.

A.B: Ok, it’s time to sum up our work…

O.M: What did we do in this book, briefly speaking?

First, we overviewed all data on the Trojan and Homeric issues and have shown that the collection of all scientific data today shows: Greeks did not win the Trojan War and it’s a high time to end this fable and officially announce it from the name of
science at all schools and universities. Many people have approached it and raised the issue. We have generalized all that has been said.

Second, we have demonstrated that The Iliad and The Odyssey belong to a certain time period based on the “humanitarian artifacts” available in these poems. We dated the poems, just as Blegen and Finley did, and studied their material artifacts and social relations. However, they are world famous scientists, and we are prepared to die unknown.

Third, we solved the main mystery which stunned all specialists on antiquity; the famous rare anthropomorphism of the Greek religion. How did it come about? We have shown that it appeared as a reaction to “artificially” created religion, where gods’ family clan relations were placed as a basis for gods’ classification.

Forth, we have shown that particularly in Greece, the birthplace of Western Civilization, the focus of politics was already on “soft power” even then. Modern cultural and informational, ideological wars, black PR—the falsification of history—is not an innovation or accident, but the very ancient essence of Western thinking.

Fifth, we refuted the popular axiom that “history is written by the victors”. On the contrary, we have proven that based on the example of the Greeks, those who write history become the victors. And they can be the ones who lost. Therefore, historians, ideologists and poets are a thousand times more important for the state than all of its weapons, political or economical power.

Sixth, we have outlined a problem of the current postmodern world, in which universals conflict with each other and each of them includes the others and have demonstrated two methods of solving the problems (the unifying arrival of the Last God, and technical universalism with divisive variety of virtual worlds and lifestyles) and also proposed a mechanism of identification of humanity on a basis of a serious interactive game which consists of opposition to “The Other” and universally anti-human and at the same time be a positive project of the future; battle with death for immortality.

A.B: A rather serious contribution if you consider everything together.
OM: But we won’t be awarded the Nobel Prize or given honorary Oxford degrees.

AB: Not even one from the second-rate Rostock University like Schliemann received.

OM. Yep. And all because any clown if they were born in USA can easily publish any papers in scientific journals, written at the level of the Russian third-year student and can become a known scientist, issue books and live on the proceeds of the sales. There are a couple dozen people in Russia in the sphere of international policies and geopolitics who are much more interesting than Huntington, however, the entire world knows him, but does not know them. Or, for example, take world renowned political scientist Fukuyama. This man admitted in his papers, without hesitation, that he heard about Hegel in Kozhev’s papers and at advanced age, while he was already a professor. Any graduate from our philosophical faculty or political science knows Hegel.

AB: However, their readers did not hear about Hegel from Kozhev and did not hear about Kozhev either. So here we go, ignorant people write for even more ignorant people and those, in turn, make them famous, buy millions of books, make them millionaires, give them PhDs, hire them as advisors to presidents, give them Nobel prizes and this life continues in a full confidence that they are the centre of the world and whoever is outside of the borders are barbarians and nothing interesting can come out of there and no one is even curious.

OM: This confidence is carried over into our so called elite that are also sure that everything important happens in the West and needs to be copied from there. So the ignorance is transferred here, although of course, there are smart people in the West too.

AB (laughs) So, what’s the solution to not let our discoveries die and some Americans writing the same things in 50 years and collecting all the glory and money?

OM: If one of our wealthy patrons of culture finds a way to translate this into English and other languages, order scientific reviews, distribute the work in magazines, publish books and articles in the West, do presentations, put it in
scientific circulation; in other words, promote. We can solve a lot of historical mysteries, we have clear heads and we like to do it, but we need to work as journalists, copywriters, script writers, PR experts to survive. And at the same time some nouveau riche buys himself a fifth Jeep, tenth golden toilet, gives a gift to some hooker costing more than our yearly salaries. Because the lesson of the ancient Greeks is that they let sophists and poets do what they do and they won the war that was lost by the military, businessmen and politicians. Philosophers and poets are the most valuable asset that a state has; it’s why a state persists in the centuries, yet they eke out a living, while the respect and glory goes to those who will not be remembered after one generation.

A.B: There is one more obstacle for promotion. We have not written an academic book, it’s more of a popular history.

O.M: Oh, we did not format the references correctly! This is a terrible crime! And you shouldn’t have pictures. And you should put Latin words in the text, and incomprehensible words, write in a dry, boring and nauseating way so the reader falls asleep, so no one could possibly finish reading it. And that, by the way, happens to ninety percent of theses, which are not read even by one’s peers and reviewers, who limit themselves to the abstracts. We are breaking the canons of the scientific form. Therefore, we have no chance. However, we enjoyed the intellectual challenge, did we not? You can say we completed this work playing. We had fun and our readers will too. And the rest we will leave to fate.
Authors of Antiquity

Lycurgus
IX century B.C.

Homer
VIII century B.C.

Hesiod
VIII—VII century B.C.

Solon
Approximately 640–559 B.C.

Pisistratus
Approximately 602–527 B.C.

Heraclitus
544–483 B.C.

Parmenides
Approximately 540 or 520–450 B.C.

Aeschylus
525–456 B.C.

Pindar
522/518–448/438 B.C.

Sophocles
495–406 B.C.

Euripides
485 or 480–406 B.C.

Herodotus
Approximately 484–425 B.C.

Thukydides
Approximately 460–400 B.C.

Xenophon
of Athens
No later than 444—no earlier than 356 B.C.

Plato
428/427–348/347 B.C.

Aristotle
384–322 B.C.

Zenodotus
Approximately 325–260 B.C.

Aristarchus
216–144 B.C.

Polybius
201–120 B.C.

Apolloodoros
of Athens
(pseudo-Apollodoros)
Approximately 180–after 120 B.C.

Cicero
106–43 B.C.

Virgil
70–19 B.C.

Hyginus
Approximately 64 B.C.—7 A.D.

Seneca
4 B.C.—65 A.D.

Nero
37–68 A.D.

Dio
Chrysostom
Approximately 40–120 A.D.

Plutarch
Approximately 45—127 A.D.

Strabo
Approximately 64/63–23/24 B.C.

Pausanias
110–180 A.D.

Flavius
Philostratus
170–247 A.D.

Aelian
Approximately 170–after 222 A.D.

Diogenes
Laertius
Late II–early III century A.D.
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