

BULLETIN  
OF THE  
MIDDLE EASTERN CULTURE CENTER IN JAPAN

General Editor: H. I. H. Prince Takahito Mikasa

Vol. IV

1991

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

ESSAYS ON ANCIENT ANATOLIAN  
AND SYRIAN STUDIES  
IN THE 2ND AND 1ST MILLENNIUM B.C.

Edited by  
H. I. H. Prince Takahito Mikasa

1991

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

The *Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan* is published by Otto Harrassowitz  
on behalf of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan.

Editorial Board

General Editor: H. I. H. Prince Takahito Mikasa

Associate Editors:

Prof. Tsugio Mikami

Prof. Masao Mori

Prof. Morio Ohno

Assistant Editors:

Yukiya Onodera (Northwest Semitic Studies)

Mutsuo Kawatoko (Islamic Studies)

Sachihiro Omura (Anatolian Studies)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

**Essays on Ancient Anatolian and Syrian studies in the 2nd and  
1st millennium B. C.** / ed. by Prince Takahito Mikasa. –

Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 1991

(Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan ; Vol. 4)

ISBN 3-447-03138-7

NE: Mikasa, Takahito <Prinz> [Hrsg.]; Chūkintō-bunka-sentā  
<Tōkyō>: Bulletin of the . . .

© 1991 Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden

This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.  
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission  
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies  
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage  
and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on acidfree paper.

Manufactured by

MZ-Verlagsdruckerei GmbH, 8940 Memmingen

Printed in Germany

ISSN 0177-1647

## CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	VII
KUTLU EMRE Cemeteries of Second Millennium B.C. in Central Anatolia . . . . .	1
AHMET ÜNAL Two Peoples on Both Sides of the Aegean Sea: Did the Achaeans and the Hittites Know Each Other? . . . . .	16
DAISUKE YOSHIDA Ein hethitisches Ritual gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 12) und der Gott Zilipuri/Zalipura . . . . .	45
TSUGIO MIKAMI AND SACHIHIRO OMURA General Survey of Kaman-Kalehöyük in Turkey (1985) . . . . .	62
TSUGIO MIKAMI AND SACHIHIRO OMURA A PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE FIRST EXCAVATION AT KAMAN-KALEHÖYÜK IN TURKEY (1986) . . . . .	87
TADAHIKO OHTSU Late Assyrian “Palace Ware” – concerning dimpled goblet – . . . . .	131
L. M. MUNTINGH Syro-Palestinian Problems in the Light of the Amarna Letters . . . . .	155
A. R. MILLARD Archaeology and Ancient Syria . . . . .	195
YOSHINORI YASUDA Climatic Change at 5000 Years B.P. and the Birth of Ancient Civilizations	203

AHMET ÜNAL (The University of Munich)

## TWO PEOPLES ON BOTH SIDES OF THE AEGEAN SEA: DID THE ACHAEANS AND THE HITTITES KNOW EACH OTHER?\*

“I write these things as they seem to me; for the stories of the Greeks are many and absurd in my opinion”

(Hekataios the Milesian, FGH 1.1)

1. Introduction
2. The sources
  - a. Cuneiform sources from *Ḫattuša-Boğazköy*
  - b. Mycenaean sources
3. Brief historical overview of the Minoans and Mycenaean
4. Mycenaean pottery as evidence for Greek expansion and the first colonization in the Late Bronze Age
5. The problem of the location of Arzawa, *Aḫḫiyawa*, and Troy
6. History of the *Aḫḫiyawans* according to Hittite sources
  - a. Under the reigns of *Tuḫaliya III/III* and *Arnuwanda I*
  - b. Under the reign of *Šuppiluliuma I*
  - c. Under *Muršili II*
  - d. Under *Muwatalli II*
  - e. Under *Ḫattušili III*
  - f. Under *Tuḫaliya IV*
7. Conclusions

### 1. Introduction

In recent years the *Aḫḫiyawa* question has begun to attract scientific and popular interest once again, not because of the discovery of new material but because of the often volatile nature of the subject, which particularly in this case, depends less upon scientific research than upon popular appeal. The controversy is again at its apex, with numerous papers treating the subject, mostly confirming but

\* A different version of this study has been read at the invitation of Professor M. A. Powell at Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, 1988. For his kind invitation and the critical reading of the English text I would like to express my sincere thank to him. Thanks are also due to Dr. J. V. Canby, Bryn Mawr and Dr. G. McMahon, University of New Hampshire, for their corrections and suggestions. I read also a shorter version of it under the title “*Aḫḫiyawa* and Achaeans: A Mountain out of Molehill” at the 198th Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society, Chicago 1988.

some rejecting the identity of the Aḫḫiyawa with the Homeric Greeks, or correcting, re-interpreting and re-dating the pertinent Hittite texts. There are also believers as well as disbelievers. As Hans Güterbock recently said the identity of the Aḫḫiyawans with the Achaeans became “a matter of faith”. Mass media, tourist offices and travel agencies all try to incite a vivid interest in the matter. Millions of people witnessed the “Greeks” in the Hittite texts through M. Wood’s fictitious TV program on Troy and the Trojan Wars which has been aired by many TV stations in Europe and America such as BBC, Channels 11 and 20 in Chicago (cf. Easton 1985; Arbeitman 1986). In that program he read fluently first hand Hittite cuneiform tablets from the East Berlin Museum to his public spectators and “Greek” stories which allegedly are told in the Hittite cuneiform texts (appeared as book, Wood 1985; translated also into German).

The forms Ἀχαιία, \*ΑχαιΦία, allegedly closest to Hittite Aḫḫiyawa, do not appear in Homer (Huxley 1960: 23), and it is linguistically questionable to identify the Homeric Ἀχαια with Hittite Aḫḫiyawa (Sommer 1932; Huxley 1960: 23). We simply do not know what the Mycenaean called themselves and absolutely can not conclude from contemporary Hittite records that “in Mycenaean times they were apparently known as Achaeans” (Finley 1977: 16); this assumes what needs to be proven.

Although Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned only in some 25 fragmentary texts, while for example Egypt, written Mizri, Babylon, written Karaduniyaš and Kaška are attested hundreds of times, and not a single patriarch of the Old Testament world appears in the Hittite texts, the number of articles and special studies, monographs and colloquiums dealing with these questions is larger than those dealing with the main bulk of Hittitological studies.

Some of the arguments brought forward for the Greek presence in the Troad exceed the limits of logic. For example, the richness of the local waters in fish, especially tuna and mackerel, has been given as reason for the Greek colonization of the Troad. It was even thought that “The Trojan War may have its roots in rivalry over ‘fishing rights’” (Bloedow 1987: 16). Happily, no Anatolian fish bones have been discovered so far in the Greek Mainland settlements!

The hypothesis that Greeks were mentioned in the Boğazköy tablets was initiated first by Luckenbill (1911), Kretschmer (1924: 205f.) and with a great enthusiasm by the great first generation Hittitologist E. Forrer some 60 years ago (Forrer 1924; cf. also Götze 1924: 26 n. 5; on Forrer’s personality as a genuine scholar s. Szemerényi 1988). Forrer laid his eye on the Hittite texts with the express intention of finding in them mention of Greeks, like Schliemann, who was obsessed by the idea of discovering Troy.

As recent studies of Schliemann’s personality show he was perhaps a forger and a pathological liar; therefore his honesty and reliability as well as the authenticity

of the Trojan Treasure have been questioned (see Easton 1981; 1984a; 1984b; 1984c; 1985; Trail 1978–1979; 1981–1982; 1983; 1986).

The nature of ancient texts often allows us to find what we want to prove. According to Forrer the Hittite texts had to reflect the splendid world of the Greek heroic age, full of tough heroes, “sackers of cities”, beautiful intriguing women, grand palaces, and tragic wars. Atreus, Eteokles, Alexandros (= Paris), Andreus, Helena and many other famous persons of that epic era must have been recorded by Hittite scribes. Strangely no one asked from the opposite point of view why Homer does not mention, for example, the famous battle at Qadeš between the Egyptians and the Hittites which was fought within the scope of the “Mycenaean World”, and almost at the same time as the legendary Trojan War? Why is there no mention of an important wedding ceremony between a Hittite princess and a prince from the land of Arzawa? Why is there no mention of the severe wars between the Hittites and Arzawans and the deportation of hundreds thousands of West Anatolian manpower as slaves to Hatti? Were these events of less importance than the Trojan War? E. Forrer was cautious enough not to have pursued the controversy after 1928 (Szemerényi 1988: 278). Some other scholars, however, have taken up his early sensational theory prematurely.

## 2. *The sources*

a. *The cuneiform sources from Boğazköy-Ḫattuša* (Huxley 1960: 1 ff.; del Monte-Tischler 1978: 1f.; Sommer 1930; 1986a: 396ff.)

In the following we want to present in the form of a synopsis the pertinent Aḫḫiyawa texts from Ḫattuša-Boğazköy once again. They are limited to some 25 fragmentary tablets. Aḫḫiyawa, written in the earlier period as Aḫḫiya and then Aḫḫiyawa and Aḫḫiyauwa appears for the first time in the late 15th century in Hittite texts. The number of the texts is only 25 and they divide as follows: 7 historical texts (1–7), 6 letters (8–13); 1 indictment (14), 7 divination texts (15–21), 2 administrative texts (22–23), 1 prayer (24) and 1 treaty (25).

1. KUB 23.13 is the annals of Tuḫḫaliya III which attests the earliest mention of Aḫḫiyawa. In obv. 5 there is a mention of war and, the crucial expression *nu-zakán LUGAL KUR Aḫḫiyauwa EGIR-pa epta*. This phrase is now interpreted as “relied on”, not “drew back, retreated, withdrew” as earlier (see below). Šeḫa river land is also mentioned. The important thing in this text is the presence of the Aḫḫiyawan king in western Anatolia (see below).

2. KUB 14.15 is the annals of Muršili II. Uḫḫa-ziti, king of Arzawa and Milawanda together with the king (LUGAL) of Aḫḫiyawa are mentioned. It sug-

gests a close relations between Aḫḫiyawa and Millawanda as in the Tawagalawa-letter (s. below no. 7).

3. KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.125 is a fragmentary portion of the Ten Years Annals of Muṣili II. It mentions the politico-military anti-Hittite actions of Uḫḫa-ziti, the king of Arzawa, who took the side of the king of Aḫḫiyawa (s. below pp. 30ff.). The very fragmentary rev. iii 1 ff. reports the alliance of Uḫḫa-ziti's son with the king of Aḫḫiyawa. He returns from the sea and joins the Aḫḫiyawan king. Muṣili II sends a main force to seize him and defeats his soldiers.

4. KUB 26.76 is possibly part of some annals. Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned in obv. 11, and in rev. 13 the king of Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned. Egypt and Kargamiš are also mentioned.

5. KBo 16.22 obv. 2 (Güterbock 1936: 321 ff.) is a fragmentary text of Ḫattušili III mentioning the king of Aḫḫiyawa. It may indicate that the Aḫḫiyawan king did not help Urḫi-Tešub and his son Šippa-ziti during the civil war between Ḫattušili III and Urḫi-Tešub.

6. KBo 19.83 obv? 5 only the name Aḫḫiyauwa without understandable context is presented; very fragmentary.

7. KUB 14.3, the so called Tawagalawa, or better Piyamaradu-letter, from the Hittite king Muwatalli II (see below) to the king of Aḫḫiyawa; it is only the third tablet of the letter, the first two have not survived in recognizable condition. The letter's main concern is Piyamaradu, a Hittite subject who was raiding in the Lukka lands. The Hittite king asks the king of Aḫḫiyawa to arrange the extradition of Piyamaradu, or to persuade Piyamaradu to settle permanently in Aḫḫiyawan territory.

8. KBo 2.11 is a letter replying to a request of an unknown person relating a number of gifts sent to the Hittite king by the king of Aḫḫiyawa and Egypt. In fact the Hittite king does not know whether the gifts from Aḫḫiyawa have reached him or not.

9. KUB 21.34 is a small fragment of a letter. Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned in obv. 1. The sender is likely to be a Hittite king, probably Muwatalli II, the addressee is unknown. My restoration is as follows: “[To the king of] Aḫḫiyawa [I sent/wrote] as follows: ‘When I arriv[ed in Millawanda??]’” (obv. 1f.) and “give” (obv. 5). These fragmentary remarks may refer to Muwatalli's intervention in the Arzawa countries, his travel to Millawanda, and Piyamaradu's request to send him a Hittite crown prince (*tuhkanti-/TARTENU*) in the Tawagalawa letter (KUB 14.3 i 5–9, s. below p. 34f.).

10. KUB 23.95 is probably a letter from a Hittite king to an independent ruler. [Aḫ]ḫiyauwa is mentioned in line 5, but the context is destroyed. There may be a proverb in line 8 “[They catch] the fox by his tail”. Line 19 might refer to extradition of Piyamaradu: “Give him! Let them bring him here (to me)!”



11. KUB 23.98 is fragment of a letter. In line 8 “to my brother the king of the land of A[ḫḫiyawa . . .]” is perhaps to be read. Date and significance are unknown.

12. KUB 26.91 is possibly a letter dating from Arnuwanda I to an unknown king. The kings of Aḫḫiyawa, Aššuwa, a great-grandfather and a Tuḫ[aliya] are named. The “man of Aḫḫiyawa” could be the same marauder Attaršiya in the famous Madduwatta-text. Obv. 9 strongly suggests that the king of Aḫḫiyawa was involved in some way with the Aššuwa campaign of Tuḫaliya. Tuḫaliya seems to have subdued him.

13. KBo 18.135 is an interesting letter, but too fragmentary to be interpreted. In obv. 9 we read: “In regard to the matter which you have written me, saying: ‘[let us] go to the country of Aḫḫiyawa’”.

14. KUB 14.1 is the famous indictment against Madduwatta and one of the earliest sources informing us about Aḫḫiyawa. It tells the misdeeds of Attariššiya, the man of Aḫḫiya, who causes trouble both under Tuḫaliya and Arnuwanda.

15. KUB 5.6 is a divination text from the time of Muṣili II or Ḫattušili III, mentioning the gods of Aḫḫiyawa and Lazpa who have been brought to succor the ailing emperor.

16. KUB 18.58 is again a divination text and mentions in ii 1 the king of the land of Aḫḫiyawa. It may comprise an oracular inquiry as to whether an impending danger of war from the king of Aḫḫiyawa is imminent or not.

17. KUB 22.56 is another oracular text. The land of Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned in the same line as the land of K[a]rkiy[a? (obv. 15). The mentioning of “enemy” and “fortified cities” makes it possible that the passage again deals with another possible threat of war from Aḫḫiyawa.

18. KBo 16.97 is an oracle text mentioning, “the enemy of the man of Aḫ-ḫiya”.

19. KUB 31.30 is probably an oracle text; it mentions the kings of Mira and Aḫḫiyawa in different paragraphs.

20. 130/h is obviously an oracle text (Marazzi 1986a: 393).

21. KUB 6.7 ii 1–4 the king of Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned as a figure in a lot oracle.

22. KUB 31.29 is a list of boundaries, and contains the names of Tarḫuntašša, Mira, Aḫḫiyawa. Each line is separated by a horizontal stroke. This text indicates that Aḫḫiyawa is among the states on the mainland.

23. KBo 18. 181 rev. 33 (Güterbock 1936: 321 ff.) is an inventory of clothing and various objects including clothes and draperies and ending with a mention of an object of copper “from Aḫḫiyawa”.

24. KUB 14.2 is connected with the banishment of the wife of Šuppiluliuma I (see below).

25. KUB 23.1 is the treaty between Tuḫaliya IV and Šaušgamuwa of Amurru.

It mentions the kings of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria and (erased) Aḫḫiyawa as being kings of the same rank as the Hittite king. This is of no particular significance, since there are hundreds of erasures; it might be simply a scribal error.

*b. Mycenaean sources*

Let us see now what the philological evidence says about the people living on the Greek Mainland and on Crete: The only written sources are the so-called Linear B Tablets, whose decipherment by Michael Ventris and Chadwick was at the beginning very controversial. The tablets represent only a part of the day-to-day business transactions of the two palaces at Knossos and Pylos, and also to some extent those in Mycenae, Tiryns and Thebes. We have 4000 tablets from Knossos and 1200 from Pylos. At Knossos they cover perhaps only a quarter of a century, i.e. 1400–1375 B.C. At other sites on the Mainland they cover the LH III period, 1400–1200.

Because of the nature of the Linear B Tablets it is evident that they cannot be used as sources for political history. They simply do not contain such records.

One thing may be of special interest for the relations with the West Anatolian world. The Linear B Tablets mention women who were largely engaged in weaving factories. The texts give their cities of origin which some Mycenologists want to interpret as Miletus (*Mi-ra-ti-ja*), Lemnos (*Ra-mi-ni-ja*), Knidus (*Ki-ni-di-ja*), Zephyria = Halikarnassos (*Ze-pu-ra*) and Asia (*A-swi-ja*) (Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 156, 410; place-names now collected by McArthur 1985). If it is true that these women slaves or workers came from west Anatolia, we should perhaps interpret their appearance in Linear B texts as a result of Hittite raids into the Arzawa lands in western Anatolia. As we well know, the Hittites deported almost the entire male population of the countries they conquered (NAM.RA), leaving women and children. It would mean that the widows of the Hittite wars were sold abroad as slaves. However, some Mycenologists assume that these towns were situated on Crete itself. In fact similarities do not bear much on the location of the sites; it is tempting for Anatolian geography to find in the Knossos tablets geographic names such as *Ma-ri*, *Ma-sa*, *Me-ra* etc. (McArthur 1985 s.v.), but all of these are in Crete.

What do we really learn from the Linear B tablets about the great events of the Greek “Heroic Age”, such as the exploits of Herakles, the voyage of the Argonauts, the grim story of the dynasty of Thebes, the rape of Helen and the resulting siege and destruction of Troy, the dispersal of the returning army, and the other themes well known from later Greek literature? The answer is: Nothing!

Let us cite here a few sentences from the co-decipherer of Linear B: “Yet we

have not shaken off the habit of regarding Homer as historian and the Attic tragedians as heirs of an unrecorded historical tradition. We still visit the site of Troy and contemplate with awe the great walls labelled Troy VI, and think of the body of Hector being dragged around them behind Achilles' chariot. I must be brutal: Homer is a poet, not a historian, and if we try to recreate the history of Mycenaean Greece by following him, we shall end in perplexity and contradiction" (Chadwick 1969).

### *3. Brief historical overview of the Minoans and Mycenaean*

In Crete, the early Minoan civilization, which takes its name from the legendary king Minos (he is probably from Egypt), began around 3000 B.C. The period 2000–1550 is called the Middle Minoan. The main characteristic of this period is the introduction of writing, the so called Linear A script which still defies all attempts at decipherment. There is a cultural break between the Middle and Late Minoan periods; the reason for this, however, does not seem to be migrations from the outside. The destruction of the palaces may be due to earthquake. Afterwards they were rebuilt and the island witnessed a prospering civilization. Minoan traders were exporting their goods to the eastern and central Mediterranean regions, enjoying their famous thalassokratia, i.e. "sea empire". In the 15th century a second destruction followed. This has been attributed to the volcanic eruption on Thera, some 65 miles north of Crete (Pollitt 1975; Luce 1976; Lungo 1986). The violence of this explosion has been estimated as being four times stronger than the volcanic eruption of Krakatoa in 1883. We all know very well the popular theories regarding this catastrophe's burial of the legendary civilization of Atlantis (Corsten 1987).

After the end of MM there were some basic changes in the culture. Architecture, the fortification systems and pottery shapes changed drastically. There was a decline in trade. There was a visible intrusion of the products from Mainland Greece. All this points to a migration from Greece; the newcomers took up their residence in Knossos. They also introduced a more advanced writing system, Linear B. The heyday of the island's civilization faded never to rise again.

The anachronistic term "Mycenaean" civilization derives from the name of a site which has been known since the spectacular excavations by H. Schliemann in the 19th century. Until the Linear B script was deciphered by Ventris in 1952 the creators of Mycenaean culture were regarded as a non-Indo-European people. The Linear B tablets revealed that an archaic forerunner of Greek dialects was in

administrative use since the LH period. This has been interpreted to mean that the bearers of this civilization were also Greeks.

Although the exact date of the Greek immigrations from the Indo-European homeland is still a moot point, it is quite possible that Indo-European speaking people started to come into Greece in small groups during the first half of the second millennium B.C. There are several attempts to push this date back to earlier periods. Indeed, in the Middle Helladic period (2100–1600) we observe a decline, a setback of the cultural level to that of at least half a millennium earlier, which can probably be attributed to the new immigrants who would some 800 years later call nonspeakers of Greek barbarians. The Late Helladic period (1600–1150) is known as the classical age of Mycenaean civilization and, for our theme the most important period, since, if contacts ever existed between the Hittites and the Mycenaeans, they must have taken place in this period. Mainland Greece in this period was characterized by small kingdoms centered in citadels such as Mycenae, Athens, Pylos, Thebes, Tiryns, Argos and many other places. The rulers used the Linear B script for their accounting of raw materials, production and the personnel overseen by their palaces.

#### *4. Mycenaean Pottery as evidence for the first Greek expansion and colonization*

The discovery that the language of the Linear B tablets was Greek has, of course, had an immense impact on research work and caused a review of earlier hypotheses regarding Greek migrations and the expansion of Greek culture in the second millennium Mediterranean world. People began to speak enthusiastically of a Greek colonization some 500–600 years earlier than the well known colonization of the 8–6th centuries. Every Mycenaean pot sherd from the Aegean islands, Anatolia (Boysal 1967; Mee 1978; 1984), the Levant (Gregori-Palumbo 1984), Cyprus (Pacci 1984, in:), Egypt (Vincentelli-Tiradritti 1984, in 1984), north Africa and Italy (Vagnetti 1984, in: 1984; Smith 1987) has been recorded, drawn, photographed and published as indication of the Greek presence in these far distant countries (Mellaart 1982: 372 f.). “When an Anatolian pot, on the other hand, turns up beside Mycenaean pottery, as in Cyprus or in the Levant, no one thinks of colonization and it is assumed that the Mycenaeans picked it up somewhere and brought it along” (Mellart 1986: 75 f.). Most of the famous settlements of the later period such as Miletos and Troy have been regarded as Mycenaean settlements or colonies. The fact simply is, however, that the small quantity of the pottery sherds found and taken as proof of Mycenaean trade or colonization is small in relation to abundant native ware. In most cases it does not exceed more than 20 percent of wares found on the site. For example, in Troy VI during the

heyday of Mycenaean trade 98% of the pottery is local Anatolian (Mee 1984: 51) and in Miletus perhaps only 5% is Mycenaean. If the extension of a culture is measured by means of maps, on which every single site yielding a few potsherds is marked, the results which turn up are astonishingly deceptive. It means that scholars are identifying the potsherds with the nations, their inventors. Scholars sometimes forget that there are many explanations as to how these sherds might have been dispersed. (On the problem of indo-european migrations and archaeological remains s. in detail Mallory 1989: 164ff., 186ff.).

The sad fact is that the native pottery has mostly been disregarded in the excavations as well as in the surveys. As an example we can look at the map and the list of settlements in the Levant (Gregori-Palumbo 1986: 383f.). One can see famous settlements such as Kargamiš, Alalaḫ, Ebla, Ugarit, Lataqiye, Byblos, Tyre, Hazor, Megiddo, Jerusalem, Amman, Ashkelon, Gaza, Hebron etc. among the 111 settlements yielding Mycenaean findings. When we have a look at the written contemporary documents from the same region (they are fairly abundant at this time, think first of all of the texts from Ugarit-Ras Shamra), we see that they do not mention a single toponym of Aegean origin (cf. French 1986: 279).

The picture is the same in the Hittite texts. The contemporary people simply did not encounter the presence of the Greeks. Mycenaean wares have never been detected east of the Euphrates, thus disproving the theory that the prohibition of Aḫḫiyawan ship traffic within the boundaries of Ammurru by the Hittite king Tuḫaliya IV in his treaty with Šaušga-muwa (see below p. 37) would indicate a great Mycenaean trade involvement in that region (cf. Liverani 1986: 408).

It has rightly been pointed out that it would be impossible for all these trade activities to have been carried out by genuine Mycenaeans; it would mean that a network of overseas agents of non-Greek origin were aping the mainland Mycenaeans in architecture, funerary offerings and ceramics production (Mee 1978: 148f.; French 1986: 278). In the graveyard at Müsgebi, for example, according to the excavator “the native pottery has imitated the Mycenaean pottery so exactly that it is impossible to discern them from the originals” (Boysal 1985: 16ff.). In the same way the potters of Troy VI and VIIa periods began to imitate the Mycenaean shapes in their own wares (Mellink 1986: 98). Even though we should accept the existence of foreign merchants, some “colonists” and foreign potters in some of the major settlements such as Miletos, Troy, the newly excavated Panaztepe (H. and A. Erkanal 1986; 1986; 1987; 1988), this does not sufficiently prove an immense Greek colonization in the Late Bronze Age in the Mediterranean world in the sense of the great colonization in the 8th century B.C. The excavations at the acropolis of Panaztepe did not yield any Mycenaean findings. The Mycenaean pottery comes from the graves (toloji); the imported pottery makes up only 0.6 percent of all the wares (A. Erkanal orally).

Now, because western Anatolia would have been the only geographical setting for direct contacts between the Hittites, the Minoans and the Mycenaeans, let us have a detailed look at the evidence, the distribution of the Minoan and Mycenaean pottery in the region:

Mycenaean pottery appears for the first time in the LH I–II, LM Ia–Ib periods, i.e. 1550–1450 (overview by Mellink 1983: 139 ff.). In connection with the import of Minoan pottery there are serious chronological problems; does this ware appear for the first time during the MM I–III or in the LM period? The major sites yielding scarce foreign pottery are Knidos, Miletos and Iassos. In the LM Ia–Ib period the Dodecanese were within the orbit of Minoan influence. We find on Kos, Karpathos, Kalymnos only pottery, while on Rhodes there was visible Minoan impact on the architecture. It seems that the Minoans had their own settlement in Trianda. In Miletos and Iassos the excavators tend to assign the edifices in which Minoan pottery has been discovered to Minoan settlers. This seems unlikely. Only a single sherd at Miletos and three pieces at Trianda exist; yet these have been taken as “proof” of Mycenaean influence in these regions.

In the LH II A period, which corresponds to LM Ib, the distribution of Minoan and Mycenaean ceramics in western Anatolia takes a very different shape. In this period Troy and Thermi on Lesbos off the Anatolian shore yield Mycenaean pottery for the first time. A clear division between the zones of dispersion of Minoan and Mycenaean pottery can be seen. In rough terms classical Ionia receives Minoan ware while Aeolia is within reach of the Mycenaean pottery (Re 1986a: 345). In LH III A and LH III B 1 the whole west shore yields Mycenaean pottery alongside Minoan pottery.

Figure 1 gives the provenance of Mycenaean pottery found in Turkey. It illustrates the tenuous nature of the evidence used to claim these sites as offshoots of Mycenaean civilization (Re 1986a: 345 ff.; 1986b: 139 ff.):

Fig. 1: Principal West Anatolian sites yielding Mycenaean pottery

Settlements	LH I-II	LH IIIA	LH IIIA/B	LH IIIB	LH IIIB/C	LH IIIC
Troy	?	many	3	many	-	few
Clazomenai	2	-	2	-	-	1
Milet	4	many	-	many	-	many
Mylasa	?	1	-	-	-	-
Iassos	1	many	-	many	-	many
Bayraklı	-	2	2	1	-	-
Selçuk (tombs)	6	-	-	-	-	-
Düver	-	-	5	-	-	-
Kazanlı	-	-	-	1	-	many
Çandarlı	-	-	-	-	-	1
Larisa	-	-	-	-	-	1
Müşgebi (tombs)	-	100	42	20	8	3
Beycesultan	-	-	1	-	-	-
Maşat	-	-	5	-	-	-
Tarsus	-	-	-	1	-	many
Sardis	-	-	-	-	2	-
Firaktin	-	-	-	-	-	1
Panaztepe (tombs)	-	many	few	-	few**	-

\* Numbers indicate quantity of pottery, mostly only sherds. Many means in most cases more than five pieces

\*\* Oral communication of A. Erkanal

How the biased evaluation of the quantity of Mycenaean pottery sherds found in a particular site could lead scholars to incorrect conclusions can be observed in the case of Maşat. The excavator stresses that only five Mycenaean III B vessels have been found in Maşat which were imported from Cilicia (Özgüç 1982: 102f.). This amount is really disappointingly small in relation to native pottery. However, in the general evaluation of this material Maşat is presented as yielding “numerous Mycenaean pottery and sherds” (Re 1986a: 349).

##### 5. *The problem of the location of Arzawa, Aḫḫiyawa, and Troy etc.*

Since the Arzawa lands make up the focal point of the area in which the relationship between the Hittites and the Aḫḫiyawans took place, the location of Aḫḫiyawa will largely depend on the location of Arzawa. That they must be located in the west, i.e. in the Aegean region, is certain.

Taking the geographical and textual evidence into consideration we can reconstruct three military or trade routes leading from central Anatolia to the west:

1. One proceeds due west through the Maeander
2. The other through the Hermos
3. A third one is in the north

Arzawa itself has a coastline, certainly on the Aegean, since survey work in Lycia and Pamphylia has so far shown no sign at all of settled occupation during the Hittite period (Mellaart 1952: 177 ff.). It is easy enough to accept that some sites in an area may have been overlooked, or that all settlements there were built of stone which was reused, or that they were collections of wooden shacks on the hillsides or among trees. But it is difficult to believe that all surface traces of a country as powerful as Arzawa have so far not been found in spite of all efforts to locate them or that the Lycians or Romans, reputed as skillful stone cutters in subsequent periods, would have been obliged to reuse the remains of the simple second millennium stones.

It seems reasonable to look for Arzawa in Lydia. Wiluša was sometimes part of Arzawa-land; it enjoyed friendly relations with the Hittites in every period. There has for many years been a strong temptation to link its name with (W)ilion and make it include the site of Ilion/Troy. But it is difficult to imagine that an extremely strong link with central Anatolia could have been preserved over many years if Wiluša lay in the remote and rather inaccessible Troad. Besides, finds of Hittite origin, especially pottery, are lacking at Hisarlık. Because of its loyalty and dependence on to the Hittites Wiluša could be located in the Eskişehir plain.

The Lukka Lands are also clearly western. Their identification, on the basis of similarity in name with Lycia or Lycaonia, is not significant, since Lycia and Pamphylia are archaeologically empty (see above). It has recently been pointed out that 'Lukka' in Hittite is used in reference to Luwiya, and that it is a linguistic rather than a geographical term referring to "Luwian-speaking" rather than "Lukka-land" (Macqueen 1986: 39 with a reference to Laroche, RA 1976, 18). This assumption also helps to explain how the Lukka-people keep popping up in unexpected places, such as the Levant, Cyprus, Egypt, etc.

One of the basic questions is whether Aḫḫiyawa was on the Anatolian mainland, on the offshore islands, or (if indeed identical with Akhaia) to be located on the Greek Mainland (different views given by Freu 1979: 23). The defenders of an overseas location or on the islands point out that Aḫḫiyawa was reached by boat. The scholars rejecting overseas locations understand this record as a sailing or trip along the coast of Asia Minor, and they note the existence of chariots of the Aḫḫiyawan king on the Anatolian mainland. Another passage in a fragmentary text (KUB 23.13) has been cited in favor of a mainland location. One sentence in this text seems to say, according to traditional translation, "the king of Aḫḫiyawa retreated" (see above). This presumably means that the Aḫḫiyawan king was



carrying out military operations in Anatolia. Recently, however, this passage has been translated as “[Tarḫundaradu] started hostilities [against me] and relied on the king of Aḫḫiyawa” (Easton in an unpublished paper from 1980, cited 1985: 194 and Güterbock 1983: 137f.; 1984: 119 w. n. 22–23). All in all the suggested locations range from Pamphylia in the south, through the Aegean islands, to the Troad and Turkish Thrace.

I want to propose here an alternate location for Aḫḫiyawa. Anatolia is big enough to include it. In Turkish Thrace, where some investigators (Macqueen, Mellaart) place Aḫḫiyawa, there are, according to most recent surveys, no settlements (Özdoğan, oral communication 1988). The shores are vacant, while the inner areas reveal only a very primitive and coarse pottery until Hellenistic times which has no relations to Mainland Anatolia. It was always open to influences from the Balkans and Thrace. Only the Peninsula of Gallipoli runs parallel to the overall cultural developments of western Anatolia until the Troy VI period at Troy (Özdoğan, 1986; 1987: 15, esp. 16). The south shore of the sea of Marmara is full of settlements from the second millennium. We have huge mounds in the Bandırma and Kapıdağ region, in Ayvalık and Ecaabat itself. In Kapıdağ two of the mounds are below water level; perhaps as a result of earthquakes and subsequent landslides. The reason I am citing this is that there are enough places and settlements to locate Aḫḫiyawa somewhere in this region. For the disbelievers of Schliemann’s identification of Hisarlık with Troy there are enough mounds around. A location for Aḫḫiyawa on the Gallipoli Peninsula, in the Troad and perhaps on some of the off-shore islands (Gökçeada, Lesbos) would fit very well in the historical picture. According to Herodotus the Hellespont was occupied by Pelasgians whose language was not Greek. This would also speak for the non-Greek character of Aḫḫiyawans.

## 6. *History of the Aḫḫiyawans according to Hittite sources*

### a. *Under the reigns of Tuḫaliya II/III and Arnuwanda I*

If the redating of some controversial texts is correct, the earliest mention of Aḫḫiyawa occurs under Tuḫaliya II and his son Arnuwanda I (ca. 1430–1380). From the comprehensive, but fragmentary annals of these kings (see in general Freu 1979: 7ff. Haas 1985: 269ff.) we know well that both of them were enthusiastically involved in the affairs of west Anatolia. Another text describes military actions in the Şeḫa River land. The king of Aḫḫiyawa seems to have taken part in these actions (KUB 23.13, see above). Curiously enough these annals do not mention Aḫḫiyawa.

At the beginning, the broken annals-text mentions the geographic names Limiya river, Arzawa, Apkuiša, Šeḫa river, Pariyana, Ḫapalla, Arinna, Wallarimma and Ḫattarša, which Tuḫaliya has conquered. As he turned back to Ḫattuša, the following countries started hostilities again. [Jugga, Kišpuwa, Unaliya, [?], Dura, Ḫalluwa, Ḫuwallušiya, Karakiša, Dunda, Adadura, Parišta, [?,?], Waršiya, Kuruppiya [?]-luisša, Alatra(?), land of Mt. Paḫurina, Pašuḫalta, [?], Wilušiya, Taruiša. In a night battle Tuḫaliya defeated the armies of this large coalition. Among the prisoners of war there were Piyama-Inara, his son Kukulli and Malaziti, whom Tuḫaliya brought to Ḫattuša. Later he installed Kukulli as an appanage king in the Aššuwa region. Kukulli started an anti-Hittite riot in the country, inciting many thousands of people. This revolt was smashed by the Hittite king and Kukulli was killed. Early research placed great emphasis on the importance of this so-called Aššuwa Coalition in the hypothetical reconstruction of the Trojan War. Taruiša, Wilušiya and Aššuwa have been identified respectively with Troia, (W)llios (Güterbock 1986: 39f.) and Asia (later the region of Lydia, Georgacas 1969: 22ff.). However, if the re-dating of this record correct, it cannot refer to the Trojan War (KUB 23.21? Annals of Tuḫaliya). Unless one wishes to place the Trojan War in the late fifteenth century B.C.

Our main source for Aḫḫiyawa is the redated Madduwatta text, an indictment of the misdeeds of Madduwatta (standard publication Götze 1928; redating Otten 1970; historical evaluation Bryce 1986). A philhellene scholar describes him as:

“His spirit now dim and low, now smoldering and burning, his treasonous irreverent growling, his restlessness in Zippašla snuffing with haggard expectancy the hungry wind” (Page apud Vermeule 1893: 141).

There is a letter written by Arnuwanda I to Madduwatta, the brother(?) of the king of Aḫḫiyawa (so Güterbock 1984: 120 against Sommer’s interpretation of “your brother and Tawagalawa”), complaining about the misdeeds of Madduwatta under Tuḫaliya, Arnuwanda’s father. The text includes many grammatical errors, including interchanging of the second and third persons singular of the verbs. A synopsis of this text will illustrate its importance:

#### Synopsis of the Indictment against Madduwatta:

Because Madduwatta is rebellious, Attariššiya, the man from Aḫḫiyawa, has driven him from his (probably Madduwatta’s own country rather than Attariššiya’s country) country. This does not mean, of course, that Madduwatta’s land was in Aḫḫiyawa. His land may have been somewhere in the Arzawa region. He came as a refugee to the Hittite king (Tuḫaliya), and the king gave him some hilly territory in the mountain Land of Zippašla, where Madduwatta would be near to the country of Ḫatti. However, Attariššiya continued his attacks on Madduwatta. Tuḫaliya sent thereupon a detachment under one of his generals, and a battle was fought. In this battle Attariššiya was severely defeated and lost some one hundred chariots and many of his soldiers. After he was expelled, Madduwatta was reinstated. Later, however, for unknown reasons, Madduwatta changed his alliance, and made common cause with his old adversary Attariššiya. He accompanied him in a joint expedition to Alašiya (Cyprus), which Arnuwanda claimed as his own. Since a total invasion of the island by the land-locked Hittites at this early period seems improbable, the declaration of the Hittite king can also be interpreted in a different way. He might have been boasting or he might have really possessed some fortresses of strategic importance there. But without being involved in the trade between the Levant, Egypt and the western Mediterranean world, and political-military control over the Levant and south-

ern Anatolia the possession of these strategic bases would not have any meaning. It is also possible that one of his appanage kings in the southern sphere of the empire was holding sway over some parts of the island.

Another historical text (KUB 26.91) also confirms Arnuwanda's involvement in the West.

#### *b. Under the reign Šuppiluliuma I*

We do not know much about Šuppiluliuma's activities in western Anatolia. His main concerns were about Kaškaeans in the north, Mitanni and northern Syria in the south.

During most of his reign the Arzawa lands were independent. Tarḫundaradu of Arzawa was able to correspond with Amenophis of Egypt and to discuss with him marriage affairs which were only customary among kings of equal rank. Based in Tuwanuwa in northwest Anatolia he campaigned in Ḫapalla (DS frags 18–20). One text speaks of the subjugation of Arzawa (KUB 19.22). It is possible that a revolt in Arzawa may be dated after this temporary invasion. Wiluša under Kukunni was loyal. Towards the end of his reign the Arzawa lands again revolted. It was probably at this time that Uḫḫaziti, the successor of Tarḫundaradu entered into relations with the country of Aḫḫiyawa. Mašḫuiluwa declined to join the revolt and therefore had to flee to the Hittite court. He was amicably received by Šuppiluliuma, and married the king's daughter Muwatti. In the Šeḫa River land Manappa-Tarḫunda was driven into exile by his own brothers. This complicated political situation was bequeathed by Šuppiluliuma to his son and successor Arnuwanda II, who unfortunately died after one year of rule. Muršili II had to cope with and solve these problems.

Under Šuppiluliuma I there is only an indirect mention of Aḫḫiyawa. According to a mysterious record of his son Muršili II he sent somebody, possibly his wife, into banishment in Aḫḫiyawa. Forrer and others developed the theory that a queen could only be banished into her native country and that she therefore must have been an Aḫḫiyawan woman. This interpretation seems, however, to be a figment of the imagination. The Hittites and other peoples of the ancient world usually chose friendly countries for exiles; this would have the benefit that they would not allow the exile to leave the place of banishment and would prevent him/her from stirring up further trouble. The only thing we can infer from this record – if we understand it correctly – is that the relations between Aḫḫiyawa and Hittites at that time must have been of a friendly nature.

#### *c. Under the reign of Muršili II*

By the time Muršili ascended the throne Ḫanutti, the governor of the Lower Land (probably in the Lycaonian plain), died, exposing this frontier to the danger from the Arzawa lands.

Muršili spent his first two and a half years punishing the unruly and rebellious Kaškaeans in the north. After settling the northern affairs he felt sufficiently prepared for the attack on Arzawa.

Aḫḫiyawa is mentioned only in connection with the Arzawan campaigns. Uḫḫaziti, the king of Arzawa, started hostilities against the Hittites. In the third year of Muršili's reign Uḫḫaziti took the side of the king of Aḫḫiuwa (Aḫḫiyawa); the people of Millawanda did likewise (KUB 14.15 i 23 ff.). Thereupon Muršili sent his commanders Gula and Malaziti with infantry and chariots. They were able to attack Millawanda and to capture it. Muršili wrote to Uḫḫaziti and asked him to extradite Hittite subjects; Uḫḫaziti rejected this demand of the Hittite king. These kinds of rejections is the most common *casus belli* in Hittite history. Muršili marched against Arzawa, provoking Uḫḫaziti to a battle.

It was during this campaign that an atmospheric phenomenon occurred. It was either a thunderbolt or a meteorite (<sup>Giš</sup>*kalmiššana-*), attributed by Muršili to his protective deity the Storm-god. It must have been some memorable occurrence that affected Arzawa, its capital Apaša, and Uḫḫaziti himself, for he is said to have fallen ill after this disaster. Is it possible that it was a volcanic eruption comparable to the one on the island of Thera around 1420 B.C. or earlier? Remains of the volcanic ashes of Santorini have been detected in the sediment cores taken from lake Gölcük, a small lake in Mt. Tmolus, ten miles south of Sardis by the excavators at Sardis (Greenwalt 1987: 5); they are the first traces found so far in Anatolia.

Since Uḫḫaziti was sick he sent his son Piyama-Inara against the approaching Hittite army. A battle was fought at the Aštarpa River in the land of Walma. The army of Piyama-Inara was defeated.

The name of this man is intriguing: It is written as Sumerogram SUM-ma-LAMMA-aš and is to be read as Piyama-Inara. On account of his activities he seems to be identical with Piyamaradu, that notorious freebooter known in the following decades under Muwatalli and Ḫattušili III. Mellaart guessed this. Independently I have come to the same conclusion. How can we explain -radu, inara, the Luwian or Hittite rendering of the logogram LAMMA (see G. McMahon, Diss. University of Chicago 1988)?

The way into the heart of Arzawa was now open. Muršili proceeded to Arzawa and its capital Apaša without any resistance. The sick man Uḫḫaziti fled by ship over the sea and remained there, probably taking refuge on one of the numerous off-shore islands or in Turkish Thrace (see p. 28) where the land-locked Hittite military could not pursue him. The population of the country scattered in flight, some fled to the steep mountain of Arinnanda on a peninsula, jutting out into the sea (according to my observations in 1971 identical with Mykale, Samsun Dağ, Ünal 1983: 168 n. 27; best description of the region can be found in Wiegand 1985: 51, 53–54), some to the city of Puranda, others followed their king Uḫḫaziti

across the sea. Muršili was able to capture the fugitives on Mt. Arinnanda. Cold and rainy weather came and prevented him from chasing the refugees in Puranda. He set up his military camp on the Aštarpa River and spent the winter there.

The spring time brought good tidings. Uḫḫaziti died where he had fled by ship. Tapalazunawali, one of his sons, succeeded his father and came to the Anatolian west coast and joined the civil population in Puranda. Muršili marched there and besieged the city using brutal war tactics such as cutting off its water supply. Tapalazunawali and his people made an escape from Puranda during the night, but Muršili followed them, and captured his children and people, and together with 15000 prisoners brought them to Ḫattuša. This means that the country was deprived of its manpower. In view of this campaign the mentioning of female slaves of Anatolian origin in the Linear B tablets from Knossos is not surprising (see above), although the tablets belong to an earlier period than the reign of Muršili II. Tapalazunawali, who had succeeded in escaping from Muršili's pursuit, returned later from the sea and joined once again the Aḫḫiyawan king. A small fleet of Muršili, however, pursued him and defeated him. He was captured and transported to Ḫattuša together with his soldiers and followers. Such are the records from Muršili's 3rd and 4th years. As can be seen there is no direct contact with Aḫḫiyawa and Aḫḫiyawans (AM 3rd and 4th years).

During these military expeditions Muršili II conquered all the Arzawa lands, installed there friendly vassal kings and concluded treaties with them. So Targašnalli of Ḫapalía and Manappa-Tarḫunda of the Šeḫa River land were reinstated as vassals. The rest of Muršili's reign was occupied with military expeditions against the Kaškeans in North Anatolia, Azzi-Ḫayaša in eastern Anatolia and north Syria; responsibility for the latter was transferred to his brother Šarri-Kušuh, king of Kargamiš. Nuḫašše and Kinza in North Syria revolted, probably with the support of Egypt under Horemheb. Assyria now became a dangerous rival, having conquered Mitanni. There is some evidence that Arzawa revolted again in Muršili's twelfth year. The instigator of the uprising this time was an individual whose undeciphered name is written É.GAL.KUR (or É.GAL.PAP). Mašḫuiluwa was also implicated, and Kupanta-Inara succeeded him. It is likely that here again the king of Aḫḫiyawa played a sinister background role. He presented himself as an equal of the great king of Ḫatti.

More evidence comes from a divination text. According to this text a divinity of Aḫḫiyawa and Lazpa was brought to Ḫattuša and consulted about Muršili's illness and probably to heal his aphasia (KUB 5.6, Carratelli 1952). The date of this text is uncertain; it may belong also to the reign of Ḫattušili III.

#### *d. Under the reign of Muwatalli II*

Since he resided most of the time at his newly founded capital Tarḫundašša, we do not have historical records of his own time from Ḫattuša. Information about his reign must, therefore, be culled from the biased texts of his brother Ḫattušili III who, as an usurper, gives in his records a one-sided, belittling picture of his brother Muwatalli and of his nephew Urḫi-Tešub, Muwatalli's son and successor.

From the autobiography of Ḫattušili III we know that Muwatalli was engaged in west Anatolian affairs, and that he actually might have undertaken a comprehensive military expedition to the west before he moved to his new capital in Tarḫuntašša (Ünal 1974: 51). It seems that the Arzawa lands continued to remain Hittite dependencies. Piyama-Inara in Arzawa, Kupanta-Inara in Mira-Kuwaliya, Ura-Ḫattuša in Ḫapalla and Alakšandu in Wiluša held the appanage kingdoms. Man-appa-Tarḫunda was succeeded by his son Mašturi in the Šeḫa River land.

Detailed illustration of Muwatalli's involvement in western Anatolia before he moved his capital to Tarḫuntašša comes from some comprehensive documents which can be dated to his reign (Ünal 1974: 52 ff.). Among these documents the so-called Tawagalawa letter (Sommer 1932: 2 ff.) deserves special attention. Written by an unnamed Hittite king to the ruler of the country of Aḫḫiyawa, it was previously dated by scholars to the reign of Muršili II. However, some Hittitologists have recently proposed a date in the reign of Ḫattušili III (Singer 1983: 205 ff.; Popko 1984: 199 ff., esp. 202; van den Hout 1984: 91 f.; Heinholdt-Krahmer 1986: 47 f.). In my dissertation (1974: 52 ff. with note 24) I have spelled out my reasons for dating this important letter to the reign of Muwatalli II, and these reasons are confirmed now by brand new evidence from the recently discovered bronze tablet. According to this treaty text of Tuḫaliyas IV with Kurunta (<sup>mD</sup>LAMMA) of Tarḫuntašša, Kurunta is most probably the son of Muwatalli II (Bo 86/299 i 11 ff., iii 3 ff., Otten 1988: 3 with note 9 and 4). During the reign of his father his official title is "prince" (<sup>LU</sup>TARTENU, hitt. *tuḫkanti-*, Taw. i 67 f., 73). The most striking evidence is that the author of the Tawagalawa letter calls him "my son, the crown prince" (DUMU-YA <sup>LU</sup>TARTENU, Taw. ii 4), and Ḫattušili III calls him "the son of my brother", ([DUMU ŠEŠ-Y]A, Hatt. iv 62, contra Sommer 1932: 35 with note 3 and passim). Therefore the author of the letter is to be identified with Muwatalli II. The only remaining problem is the identity of the "crown prince" (<sup>LU</sup>TARTENU) with Kurunta in the Tawagalawa letter, but this identity can be regarded as certain since Muwatalli II seems to have sent only one envoy to Aḫḫiyawa to take charge of Piyamaradu, namely his own son *tuḫkanti-/TARTENU* (Taw. i 7 ff., 67 ff., ii 4 ff.), and that son is none other than Kurunta: "When I, the great king, arrived (at Millawanda), he (Piyamaradu) turned aside from Millawanda. [Earlie]er <sup>mD</sup>LAMMA-aš was here (i.e. in Millawanda, to handle the extradition of Piyamaradu). A great king (namely Muwatalli) has (also) come to you. Was he not an eminent (enough) king (for you)?" (Taw. i 71–74). KUB 21.34 1 ff. refers to this very event. In it Muwatalli II complains again that Piyamaradu left Millawanda before Muwatalli could encounter and capture him (s. above p. 6 ff.). And: "Did I not send him (Piyamaradu) the crown prince (Kurunta), my son? I instructed him (like) this: 'Go and swear to him. Take his hand and bring him to me!'" (Taw. ii 4–7). Much later Muwatalli II sent

him another prince by the name of Dabala-ziti, but he was not his son (Taw. ii 58f.). The fragment KBo 19.78 3ff. from the time of Ḫattušili III can be restored and related with some certainty to the same events: “Did not [Piyamaradu seek] the lordship? [. . . Piyama-/Kupanta-]Inara, the king of Mira, [. . . . .]. And the brother (i.e. Muwatalli) of his majesty [sent his son Kurunta] to him. [. . . Whatever Piyam]aradu holds. [. . . . .]”. In light of this new dating, a translation of the text (Sommer 1932: 2ff.) should show us the intense activities of Muwatalli in western Anatolia, as I reconstructed them already in 1974 (Ünal 1974: 51 ff.):

“He (i.e. Piyamaradu, as opposed to the “Gulla” of Sommer; so Heinholdt-Krahmer 1986: 59) came [again], destroyed and burned down the city of Attarimma totally, including fortification and royal residences. The people of the city of Lukka brought it to his mind to come to those countries. They suggested that I (i.e. the Hittite king) also (come there), and I came down to those countries. When I arrived in Šallapa, he sent me a [messenger]: ‘Take me as your subject! Send me a crown prince so that he may bring me to His Majesty’. I sent him the crown prince, (saying); ‘Go! Let him sit in the chariot, and bring him here!’ (However), he (i.e. Piyamaradu) did not respond to the crown prince; he did not speak to him. He blamed him in the face of other countries. But the crown prince is related (*ayawala*-) to the king; he is allowed to hold the king’s hand (by helping him to mount the chariot!). He (Piyamaradu) insisted: ‘Allot me the kingdom here! If not, I will not come!’

“When I arrived in the city of Waliwanda, I wrote to him: ‘If you ever desire my suzerainty, I do not want to encounter any of your men in Iyalanda, when I march into the city of Iyalanda. So remove every one (of your men) from there! You yourself, do not be (found) in the regions of my suzerainty! I will take care of my subjects myself’. When I [arrived] in Iyalanda, the enemy came in three (different) locations to fight against me. The landscape there is difficult. So I went up on foot and fought the enemy. I [seized] the inhabitants there. <sup>m</sup>Laḫurzi, his brother, ambush[ed] me. Ask, my brother, whether it is so or not. P[iyamaradu??] did not participate in the battle. I did not encounter him [in] Iyalanda. He [went] [from] there, (saying): ‘In loyalty to (our) agreement(?) of Iyalanda I will n[ot] go [again] to Iyalanda.’”

“These words which I wrote to you are true. I, the great king, swore to the gods. May the Storm-god and the other deities hear it.”

“When I destroyed the entire land of Iyalanda, I left, in accordance with the agreement with the city [of Millawanta??], only the fortification of Atriya. I came back up to [Iyalanda]. [During] my stay in Iya[landa], I destroyed (again) the entire land. [I did not pursue] the prisoners of war. Since there was not any water, I did not pursue [the prisoners of war]. I came up to [the city of Abawiya, to rest]. . . . . When/if [. . . . .], back [. . . . .]. When [I was] in Abaw[iya, I wrote to Piyamaradu in Millawanda]: ‘Come here!’ [To you, my brother,] I wrote (also): ‘I held [hi]m responsible in this matter. Why does Piyamarad[u] fight this [land] continually? Does my brother know it or not?’ (I 53 ff.) When [the messenger of my brother] reached me, he did not bring me [good news. He (also) did not bring] gifts. He said: ‘To Atpa he (i.e. the master of the messenger, also an Aḫḫiyawan king?) wrote’, (saying): ‘Deliver Piy[amaradu] to the hand of the Hittite king!’ [. . . . .]. I went [to Mill]awanda, on account of this matter (i.e. to take possession of Piyamaradu): ‘Whatever (remorseful) word I am going to tell Piyamaradu, let the subjects of my brother hear them also!’ Piyamaradu came from/with a ship. Atpa too heard the words, which I had (to say) to Piyamaradu. Awayana too heard them. Why do they conceal the words? Because he (Piyamaradu) is their father in-law?”

“(I 66 ff.) I made them (Atpa and Awayana) swear. Let them tell you the true words. Did I not send the crown prince (saying) ‘Go, drive over there, hold him by the hand, seat him on the chariot and

bring him to me!?' He, Tawagalawa, did not speak. When I, the great king, arrived at (Milawanda), he (Piyamaradu) turned aside from Millawanda. [Earli]er <sup>md</sup>LAMMA-aš was here (i.e. in Millawanda, to handle the extradition of Piyamaradu). A great king (namely Muwatalli) has (also) come by chariot to you. Was not he an (enough) eminent king (for you)?"

(II 1 ff. fragm. lines)

"If he says: 'I was afraid of being killed.' Did I not send him the crown prince, my son? I instructed him (like) this: 'Go and swear to him. Take his hand and bring him to me!' (As concerns) the matter of being killed, of which he was afraid: Is bloodshed legitimate in Hatti land? No, it is not!"

"(II 9 ff.) When the messenger of my brother brought me the message: 'Take that man! Do not remove him!' I say this: 'If... of mine...'. If someone or my brother spoke: 'When I hear his words... Now my brother, the great king, has written to me as (my) peer (equal). Shall I not listen to the words of my peer? (This time) I myself drove (with my chariot). If [I had sent] my [messenger], my brother would demure again, (saying) 'I did not hear the matter. He did not yield to me(??). He is a deaf man'. Have I not asked my brother?: 'Did you yield to me anyway?' I went. When I entered (the city?), I spoke to Atpa: 'Come! What did my brother write you? (He answered): 'Go and take him to the Hittite king. Bring him. As he earlier [obey]d my words, in the same way he will [obey] your word.' If he says: 'I am afraid' Now look! I will send one of my lords, or I will send (my) brother (i.e. Ḫattušili III?). Let him (my brother) sit in his (Piyamaradu's) place (as hostage). He still keeps saying: 'I am terribly afraid!' Atpa told me the following: 'Your Majesty, stretch your hand to (this) child! Why did my brother give his hand to him? I made [Atpa] swear and gave him my hand. To my bro[ther], king of Aḫḫiyawa(??) . . . . . ' II 37–55 very much damaged.

"II 56 ff. Out of respect for my brother [I did] not [do anything else]. [If] my brother says (to me); 'To the Hittite king [I shall go]. Let him support me in my career.' Look, Dabal[aziti], the crown prince, I sent (to you). Dabalaziti is not [someone] of inferior descent. He has sat since his childhood as crown prince with me on the chariot. He sat (also) with your brother a[nd] Tawagalawa [on the chariot]. [I gave] to Piyamaradu warranty. Warranty is in Hatti like this: If one sends somebody bread and *šiyatar* (a drink?), (it means that) he will never harm him. As warranty I brought this: 'Come honor me. I will support you in your career. I will write to my brother about the way I want to support you in your career. If you wish, let it be done; if it does not please you, then my man will bring you in the same way back to Aḫḫiyawa (II 70). If not, let this crown prince sit in his (Piyamaradu's) place (as hostage), until he (Piyamaradu) returns. This prince is an important person, (since his wife?) is from the family of the queen. In Hatti the family of the queen is big. Let him sit in his place (as hostage), until he returns.

"Rev. III 1 ff. Greet him. Let him bring one of your [men]. Send him (Piyamaradu) the warranty as follows: 'Do not commit any crime against the king! I will send you again [into your land] . . . ' The way, how I shall support him in his career, let [my brother] [beware of] it. (III 7 ff. fragm.) My brother . . . 7000 prisoners of war to me. My man is coming; take (him), my brother, in front of the lords(?). With force he took some . . . aside [Probably Piyamaradu abducts some Hittite prisoners of war]."

"III 41 ff. The son of Šaḫur[unuw]a . . . Let the fugitive come b[ack] to my brother; whether a lord or [a slave]. . . . III 52 ff. He says this: 'I will go over to Maša and Karkiya. The prisoners of war, my(!) wife, sons [and] hous[hold] I will leave here'. How is this matter? He will leave his wife, his children and household in the midst of my brother's land? (So) your land welcomes him? (But) he is continually attacking my land. Whenever I try to catch(?) him, he comes to your country. My brother, do you approve this?"

"III 63 ff. My brother, send him this one message: 'Get up and go to the Hittite land! Your Lord was (always) considerate about you. [If he (now) is] not (considerate about you), come again to Aḫḫiyawa. I will settle you in some place. . . ."



“IV 1 ff. Go [with your prisoners of war], wife and sons! Stay somewhere else! Continue the hostilities against the Hittite king from another country. Do not do it from my country. If you(!) like, go to Maša or Karkiya. The Hittite king and I made an agreement on the matter of the land of Wi?[luša]. On that matter we have been (once) enemies. Now we are no longer enemies!” [Write] him th[is]! If [you] l[eave him] in Millawanda, so my subjects shall flee there always. I am keeping [my occupation army therefore] in Millawanda.”

“IV 16 ff. vacat ] Piyamaradu[. . . .]. I confessed to you, my brother, my fault. [I will] never again [be your enemy]. My brother earlier [wrote] me: . . . ‘Perforce you sent to me [. . . .]. I was a child’. I wrote, not [ ]”. In the following the Hittite king confirms, that he did not send military force and say unfriendly words to the king of Aḫḫiyawa. He accuses the king of Aḫḫiyawa of slandering, evil words in regard to the Hittite king. He, therefore proposes: “Let them make a litigation. Send your subject who brought you that (false) news. Let them cut off his head.”

“The third tablet f[inished]”.

Schachermeyr (1986: 107) has recently produced a historical fantasy about the double mission of Tawagalawa, comparing him with a European archaeologist who must get permission from his homeland as well as from the Turkish officials in order to dig in the ancient sites: “Finden wir da nicht auch europäische Archäologen irgendwie in der Rolle eines Tawagalawas-Eteokles? Ja, sind sie nicht viel erfolgreicher als einst der allzu hochnäsige mykenische Prinz? Scheuen sie sich doch keineswegs, den Weg nach Ankara anzutreten und dort von den Behörden ihre Lizenz, in Anatolien Grabungen durchzuführen, entgegenzunehmen, nachdem sie vorher die analogen Aufträge von ihren heimischen Behörden erhalten hatten? Auch das ist nun ein doppelter Dienst, um den wir nicht herumkommen, verbunden allerdings mit einer doppelten Anerkennung. Und können wir einen solchen Forscher, wenn er seinen Aufgaben vollauf gerecht wird, nicht auch einen Prinzen bezeichnen?”

In a letter to a Hittite king, possibly Muwatalli, Manappa Tarḫunda (Houwink ten Cate 1983–1984: 49 ff.), the ruler of the Şeḫa-River land complains about the political developments in his region. He also mentions Piyamaradu and Atpa who possibly succeeded Piyamaradu after the death of the latter.

#### *e. Under the reign of Ḫattušili III*

We do not have sufficient evidence for his involvement in the western regions of Asia Minor. As mentioned above (p. 33), the proposed dating of the Tawagalawa letter and certain other documents to his reign remains uncertain. It seems that the affair of Piyamaradu continued to play an important role under his reign, since, according to a pledge text Ḫattušili himself or his wife Puduḫepa implored the deified “Great Sea” to extradite Piyamaradu (KUB 56.15 ii 16 ff., 26 ff.). Ḫattušili seems to have devoted most of his literary efforts to justifying his usurpation. In spite of all his efforts it is significant to observe that he was scolded by his own son and successor to throne Tuḫaliya IV (Ünal 1974: and new evidence in his treaty with Kurunta of Tarḫundašša on the newly discovered bronze tablet, Otten 1988). From his reign we have only a few fragmentary texts of an historical nature, which are generally understood as his annals. They mention military expeditions in the Lukka lands (KUB 21.6 etc.). Under his reign Tarḫundašša, the temporary capital of the empire under Muwatalli, acquired a special status.

We learn from the bronze tablet from Boğazköy that Hattušili created a big appanage kingdom there and assigned the son of his brother Muwatalli, Kurunta (LAMMA), there as king. If certain toponyms mentioned in the text have been correctly identified this kingdom extended enormously far to the west (Otten 1987; 1988: 36 ff.). It seems that the expansion of the borders of this kingdom took place under a particular agreement between Hattušili III and his nephew Kurunta who instead of Urḫi-Tešub might have been the legitimate successor to the throne in Hattuša. Hattušili, however, managed to confine him to the earlier seat of his father at Tarḫundašša and to make Urḫi-Tešub Great King at Hattuša, whom he also expelled after a short while. How far this expansion worked to the detriment of Arzawa lands and Lukka we do not know. We learn indirectly that Hittite authority in the west was declining, since the king of Mira, earlier a Hittite vassal, was corresponding independently with Ramesses II of Egypt.

*f. Under the reign of Tuḫaliya IV*

We have seen above that Tuḫaliya IV mentions, in his treaty with Šaušgamuwa of Amurru in north Syria, the king of Aḫḫiyawa as one of his peers. This line, however, is curiously erased. The same treaty with Šaušgamuwa (KUB 23.1 rev. iv 12 ff.) warns the king of Amurru to be an enemy of the king of Assyria, as the king of Hatti is an enemy. No merchant may go to Assyria from Amurru, and no merchant from Assyria may stay or pass through Amurru: “No ship may sail to him (Assyria) from Aḫḫiyawa”. This is important, since it shows Aḫḫiyawa as a trading state. Recently Steiner has convincingly proposed to read this crucial passage not, as usual, [ŠA KUR Aḫ-ḫ]i-ya-u-wa-aš-ši <sup>GIŠ</sup>MÁ pa-a-u-wa-an-zi [i-e] [tar-na-]ú but [la-aḫ-ḫ]i-ya-u-wa-aš-ši and to translate “No battle ship may sail to him” (Steiner 1989: 395, 401).

The Millawata letter can be dated to this time (Hoffner 1982); it does not mention, however, Aḫḫiyawa.

Mellaart 1984: 79 f. takes the rock monuments of Karabel, Spylos and Eflâton Pınar in the west as thanksgiving for the end of Hittite tyranny. (For the toponyms Awarna, Pina, Attarimma, Talwa, Lukka, Aḫiya in the hieroglyphic inscriptions from Emirgazi, Köylütölu and Yalburt see Masson 1979: 33 ff.; 1980: 109 ff.).

## 7. Conclusions

The equation of Aḫḫiyawa with the Mycenaean Greeks has been strongly and persuasively argued since 1911. However, the tenuous nature of the evidence is vividly illustrated by the fact that conclusive proof is still lacking. What we really need is something rather more secure than deductions made from the Homeric

poems about what the Mycenaeans might have called themselves. Evidence from Linear B texts would be invaluable on what Mycenaeans called themselves and how they were called by their contemporaries. The entry on a Linear B tablet from Knossos records a place *A-ka-wi-ja-de* (with allative in *-de*, KN C 914) as destination for 50 sheep and goats. It is the only Mycenaean toponym that bears any resemblance to either Akhaia or Ahhiyawa. But since it is impossible that Crete would be exporting animals to overseas Greece, even this place must be located on Crete itself (Chadwick 1976: 50, 178; McArthur 1981: 191; 1985: 13; Mellaart 1986a: 226f.). Some day such evidence may be found; but that day has not arrived yet. Let us, until then, read the Homeric epics only as belles lettres!

“Seven wealthy towns contend for Homer dead  
Through which the living Homer begged his bread” (Late Greek epigram)  
How many scholars argue today for the historicity of his legends, which the  
“blind” bard himself might have not believed?

#### *Bibliography*

- Aitchison, J. M., 1964: “The Achaean Homeland”, *Glotta* 42. 19–28.  
 Andrews, P. B. S., 1954: “The Mycenaean Name of the Land of the Achaians”, *RHA* 13/56. 1–19.  
 Angel, J. L., 1986: “The Physical Identity of the Trojans”, in: M. J. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War* 63 ff.  
 Arbeitman, Y., 1986: “Trojan, Luwian, and the Mass Media”, *Diachronica* 3/2. 283–291.  
 Bader, F., 1969: “Alexandre et Cleopatre”, *Revue de Phil.* 43. 15–38.  
 Bammer, A., “Ephesos in der Bronzezeit”, *Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 57, Beiblatt (1986–87) 138 ff.  
 Barnett, R. D., 1975: “The Sea Peoples”, *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 359 ff.  
 Bernal, M., 1987: *Black Athena. The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization. Vol. I. The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785–1985.*  
 Blegen, C. W., 1973: “Troy VI”, *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/1, 683 ff.  
 Blegen, C. W., 1975: “Troy VII”, *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 161 ff.  
 Bloedow, E. F., 1987: “Mycenaean Fishing in Troubled Waters”, *Belleten* 199. 15–18.  
 Bouzek, J., 1985: *The Aegean, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural Interrelations in the Second Millennium B.C.*  
 Boysal, Y., 1967: “Batı Anadolu’da Son Araştırmalar – Ahhiyava Sorunu”, *Anatolia* 15. 63–72.  
 Boysal, Y., 1985: “Einige neue Gefässe der Dark Ages aus Karien”, *Fs. H. Vettters* 16ff.  
 Bryce, T. R., 1974a: “The Lukka Problem and Possible Solution”, *JNES* 33, 395 ff.  
 Bryce, T. R., 1974b: “Some Geographical and Political Aspects of Mursilis’ Bryce, T. R., 1988: “The Nature of hycenaean Involvement in Western Anatolia”, *Historia* 38. 120 ff.  
 Bryce, T. R., 1985: “A Reinterpretation of the Milansata Letter in the Light of the New Join Piecel”, *AnSt.* 35.13-23.  
 Bryce, T. R., 1986: “Madduwatta and Hittite Policy in Western Anatolia”, *Historia* 35. 1–12.  
 Bryce, T. R. 1988: “The Nature of Mycenaean Involvement in Western Anatolia”, *Historia* 38. 120 ff.  
 Bryce, T. R., 1989: “Ahhiyawans and Mycenaeans. An Anatolian Viewpoint”, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 8. 297–310.

- Bülöw, G. von, 1983: "Die Beziehungen zwischen der Balkanhalbinsel und Kleinasien in der Bronzezeit", *Das Altertum* 29. 49–54.
- Burn, A. R., 1977: *The Pelican History of Greece*.
- Cadogan, G. (ed.), 1986: *The End of the Early Bronze Age in the Aegean* (Cincinnati Classical Studies, N. S. 6).
- Çapar, Ö., 1981: "Ahhiyava Sorunu", *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 14 (1981–1982). 387–413.
- Carratelli, G. P., 1950: "Ahhiyavā, Lazpa et leurs divinités dans KUB V 6", *JKIF I/2*. 156–163.
- Carruba, O., 1964: "Ahhiyawa e altri nomi di popoli e di paesi dell' Anatolia occidentale", *Athenaeum* 42. 269–298.
- Caskey, J. L., 1973: "Greece and the Aegean Islands in the Middle Bronze Age", *CAH<sup>3</sup> II/1*, 117ff.
- Cavaignac, E., 1935: "Hittites et Achéens", *RHA* 3. 149–152.
- Chadwick, J., 1963: *The Mycenaean Tablets III*, *TAPS* 52/7.
- Chadwick, J., 1969: "Aegean History 1500–1200 B.C.", *Studi Classici* 11. 7–18.
- Chadwick, J., 1973: "The Linear B Tablets as Historical Documents", *CAH<sup>3</sup> II/1*, 609ff.
- Chadwick, J., 1976: *The Mycenaean World*.
- Chadwick, J., 1987: *Reading the Past: Linear B and Related Scripts*.
- Cline, E., 1989: "Hittites in the Mycenaean World, and vice versa", *AJA* 93 272, the longer version is in print in the same journal.
- Cook, J. M., 1973: *The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study*.
- Cook, J. M., 1987: "Troy and the Sea", *Fs. Akurgal, Anadolu/Anatolia* 21 (1978/80). 75–78.
- Corsten, T., 1987: "Thera und Platons Atlantis", in: S. Wolfgang (ed.), *Ägäis-Kolloquium. Schriften des deutschen Archäologen-Vereins IX*, 1986. 205–209.
- Covey, C., 1987: *Homeric Troy and the Sea People*.
- Crowley, J. L., 1989: *The Aegean and the East. An Investigation into the Transference of Artistic Motifs Between the Aegean, Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age*.
- Desborough, V. R. d'A., 1975: "The End of Mycenaean Civilization (a) Archaeological Background", *CAH<sup>3</sup> II/2*, 658ff.
- Dickinson, O. T. P. K., 1986: "Early Mycenaean Greece and the Mediterranean", in: M.-S. Tusa–L. Vagnetti (eds.), *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo*. 271–276.
- Dow, S., 1973: "The Linear Scripts and the Tablets as Historical Documents", *CAH<sup>3</sup> II/1*, 582ff.
- Drews, R., 1988: *The Coming of the Greeks: Indo-European conquests in the Aegean and the Near East*.
- Easton, D. F., 1981: "Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure': Two Enigmas", *Antiquity* 55. 179–183.
- Easton, D. F., 1982: "The Schliemann Papers", *Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens* 77. 93–110.
- Easton, D. F., 1984a: "Hittite History and the Trojan War", in: L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies (eds.), *The Trojan War. Its Historicity and Context* 23–44 with discussions pp. 57–61.
- Easton, D. F., 1984b: "Priam's Treasure" *AnSt.* 34. 141–169.
- Easton, D. F., 1984c: "Schliemann's Mendacity – a False Trail?", *Antiquity* 58. 197–204.
- Easton, D. F., 1985: "Has the Trojan War been Found?", *Antiquity* 59 no. 227. 188–196.
- Erkanal, A. and H., 1986: "A New Archaeological Excavation in Western Anatolia", *Turkish Review Quarterly* 67ff.
- Erkanal, A., 1986: "Panaztepe Kazısının 1985 Yılı Sonuçları", *VIII. KST* 253–261.
- Erkanal, A., 1987: "Panaztepe Kazıları 1986 Yılı Sonuçları", *IX. KST* 345–350.
- Erkanal, A., 1988: "Panaztepe Kazıları 1987 Yılı Sonuçları", *X. KST* 59–65.
- Erkanal, A., in Print: "Panaztepe Kazısının Tarihsel Açısından Değerlendirilmesi", *10th Congress of Turkish Historical Society*, in Print.

- Ersoy, Yaşar E., 1988: "Finds from Menemen/Panaztepe in the Manisa Museum", *ABSAA* 83: 55–82.
- Finkelberg, M. 1988: "From Ahhiyawa to Αχαιοί", *Glotta* 66. 127–134.
- Finley, M. I., 1964: "The Trojan War", *JHS* 84. 1–9.
- Finley, M. I., 1972: *Lost: The Trojan War*.
- Finley, M. I., 1975: *Schliemann's Troy – One Hundred Years After*.
- Finley, M. I., 1977a: *The Ancient Greeks*.
- Finley, M. I., 1977b: *The World of Odysseus*.
- Forrer, E., 1924a: "Vorhomerische Griechen in den Keilschrifttexten von Bogazköi", *MDOG* 63. 1–22.
- Forrer, E., 1924b: "Die Griechen in den Boghaz-köi-Texten", *OLZ* col. 113–118.
- Forrer, E., 1930: "La découverte de la Grèce Mycénienne dans les textes cunéiformes de l'empire hittite", *Revue des Études grecques* 43/202. 1–16.
- French, D. H., 1967: "Prehistoric Sites in N-W Anatolia", *AnSt.* 17. 61 ff.
- French, E., 1986: "Mycenaean Greece and the Mediterranean World in LH III", in: M.-S. Tusa–L. Vagnetti (eds.), *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo* 277–282.
- Friedrich, J., 1927: "Werden in den hethitischen Keilschrifttexten die Griechen erwähnt?" *KIF* 1. 87–107.
- Freu, J., 1979: "Les débuts du nouvel empire hittite et les origines de l'expansion mycénienne", *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Nice* 35. 7–35.
- Freu, J., 1987: "Problèmes de chronologie et géographie hittites: Madduwatta et les débuts de l'empire", *Hethitica* 8. 123–175.
- Georgacas, D. J., 1969: "The Name of Asia for Continent: Its History and Origin", *Names* 17. 1–90.
- Gérard-Rousseau, M., 1973: "Connection in Religion Between the Mycenaean World and Anatolia", in: R. Crossland (ed.), *Colloquium on Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean*. 163–167.
- Götze, A., 1924: *Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit*.
- Götze, A., 1928: *Madduwattas*.
- Götze, A., 1975a: "Anatolia from Shuppiliumash to the Egyptian War of Muwatallish", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 117 ff.
- Götze, A., 1975b: "The Hittites and Syria (1300–1200 B.C.)", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 161 ff.
- Greenwalt, C. H. Jr., 1987: Report in: *Archaeological Exploration of Sardis*, September.
- Gregori, B. and Palumbo, G., 1986: "Presenze Micenei in Siria-Palestina", in: M.-S. Tusa–L. Vagnetti (eds.), *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo* 245–260.
- Gültekin, H. and Baran, M., 1964: "The Mycenaean Grave Found at the Hill of Ayasoluk", *TAD* 13. 125.
- Gurney, O. R., 1973a: "Anatolia c. 1750–1600 B.C.", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/1, 228 ff.
- Gurney, O. R., 1973b: "Anatolia c. 1600–1380 B.C.", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/1, 659 ff.
- Gurney, O. R., 1980: *The Hittites*.
- Güterbock, H. G., 1936: "Neue Aḥḥijavā-Texte" *ZA* NF 9. 321–327.
- Güterbock, H. G., 1983: "The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 1. The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered", *AJA* 87. 133–138.
- Güterbock, H. G., 1984: "Hittites and Akhaeans: A New Look", *Proceedings of Amer. Phil. Soc.* 128. 114–122.
- Güterbock, H. G., 1986: "Troy in Hittite Texts? Wilusa, Aḥḥiyawa, and Hittite History", in: M. J. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and Trojan War* 33–44.
- Güterbock, H. G., 1988: Review of F. Schachermeyr, *Mykene und das Hethiterreich*, *Gnomon* 60, 360–361.
- Güterbock, H. G., 1990: "Wer war Tawagalawa?" *Or.* 59. 157–165.

- Haakey, V., 1987: "The Chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age", in: P. Aström (ed.), *High, Middle or Low II*. 39–59.
- Hammond, N. G. L., 1975: "The Literary Tradition for the Migration", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 678ff.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S., 1977: *Arzawa: Untersuchungen zu seiner Geschichte nach den hethitischen Quellen*, in: *THeth.* 8.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S., 1986: "Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu", *Or.* 55. 47–62.
- Helck, W., 1979: *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens und Vorderasiens zur Ägäis bis ins 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*
- Hiller, S., 1975: "RA-Mi-Ni-JA. Mykenisch-kleinasiatische Beziehungen und die Linear B-Texte", *Ziva Antika* 25. 388ff.
- Hiller, S., 1987: "Mycenaean Presence in Asia Minor: Structural Aspects", handout of a paper given 9.30.1987 in Ankara. I would like to express my sincere thanks to A. Erkanal for supplying me with this handout. Hoddinott, R. F.: *The Trojans*.
- Hoffmann, I., 1984: "Einige Überlegungen zum Verfasser des Madduwatta-Textes", *Or.* 53. 34–51.
- Hoffmann, O., 1940: "Alexandros" *Glotta* 28. 21–77.
- Hoffner, A. H., 1982: "The Milawata Letter Augmented and Reinterpreted", *AfO Beih.* 19. 130–137.
- Hooker, J. T., 1977: *Mycenaean Greece* (London).
- Hout van den, Th. P. J., 1984: "Kurunta und die Datierung einiger hethitischen Texte", *RA* 78. 89–92.
- Houwink ten Cate, P. H. J., 1983–1984: "Sidelights on the Ahhiyawa Question From Hittite Vassal and Royal Correspondence", *Jaarbericht ex Oriente lux* 28. 33–79.
- Hrouda, B., 1986: "Noch einmal Troia", *JKF* 10. 197ff.
- Huxley, G. L., 1960: *Achaeans and Hittites*.
- Imparati, F., 1988 (ed.): *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*.
- Jasink, A. M., 1983: *Movimenti di popoli nell'area Egeo-Anatolica* 21–38, 107–129.
- Jewell, R. E., 1974: *The Archaeology and History of Western Anatolia During the Second Millennium B.C.* (Diss., University of Pennsylvania).
- Kirk, G. S., 1975: "The Homeric Poems as History", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 820ff.
- Košak, S., 1980: "The Hittites and the Greeks", *Linguistica* 20. 35–48.
- Košak, S., 1981: "Western Neighbours of the Hittites", *Eretz-Israel* 15. 12–16.
- Kraft, J. C. – Kayan, I. – Erol, O., 1982: in: G. Rapp – J. A. Gifford (eds.) *Troy, the Archaeological Geography, Supplementary Monography* 4.
- Kretschmer, P., 1924: "Alaksandus, König von Wilusa", *Glotta* 13. 205–213.
- Kretschmer, P., 1930: "Zur Frage der griechischen Namen in den hethitischen Texten", *Glotta* 18. 161–170.
- Kretschmer, P., 1954: "Achaer in Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit", *Glotta* 33. 1–25.
- Laroche, E., 1955: "Importations myceniennes à Boğazköy?", *Minos* 3. 8–9.
- Laroche, E., 1973: "Contacts linguistiques et culturels entre la Grèce e l'Asie Mineure au deuxième millénaire", *REGr* 86. XVII–XIX.
- Latacz, J., 1988: "Neues von Troja", *Gymnasium* 95, 385–403.
- Lebrun, R., 1980: "Considérations sur l'expansion occidentale de la civilisation hittite", *OLP* 11. 69–78.
- Liverani, M., 1986: "La ceramica e i testi: commercio Miceneo e politica orientale", in: M.-S. Tusa – L. Vagnetti (eds.), *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo* 405–412.
- Luckenbill, D. D., 1911: "A Possible Occurrence of the Name Alexander in the Boghazkeui Tablets", *Classical Philology* 6. 85–86.

- Luce, V., 1976: "Thera and the Devastation of Minoan Crete", *AJA* 80 (1976). 9–18.
- Lungo, O., 1986: "Una catastrofe locale: l'eruzione di Thera nel Minoico Tardo", *Magna Graecia* 21: 11, 12. 1–5.
- Macqueen, J. G., 1986: *The Hittites and Their Contemporaries in Asia Minor*<sup>2</sup>.
- Mallory, J. P., 1989: *In search of the Indo-Europeans. Language, Archaeology and Myth*.
- Marazzi, M., 1986a: "Gli 'Achei' in Anatolia: Un problema di metodologia", in: M.-S. Tusa–L. Vagnetti (eds.), *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo* 391–403.
- Marazzi, M., 1986b (ed.): *L'Anatolia hittita. Repertori archeologici ed epigrafici*.
- Masson, E., 1979: "Les inscriptions Louvites Hiéroglyphiques d'Emirgazi", *Journal des Savants* 1–49.
- Masson, E., 1980: "Les inscriptions louvites hiéroglyphiques de Köylütolu et Beyköy", *Kadmos* 19. 106–122.
- Matz, F., 1973a: "The Maturity of Minoan Civilization", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/1, 141 ff.
- Matz, F., 1973b: "The Zenith of Minoan Civilization", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/1, 557 ff.
- McArthur, J. K., 1981: "The Textual Evidence for Location of Place-Names in Knossos Tablets", *Minos* 17. 147–210.
- McArthur, J. K., 1985: "A Tentative Lexicon of Mycenaean Place-Names", *Minos* 19, Appendix 1–136.
- McMahon, G., 1988: *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*, Diss. University of Chicago.
- Mee, C. B., 1978: "Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C.", *AnSt.* 28. 121–156.
- Mee, C. B., 1984: "The Mycenaeans and Troy", in: L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies (eds.), *The Trojan War. Its Historicity and Context* 45–56.
- Mellaart, J., 1952: "Preliminary Report on a Survey of Pre-classical Remains in Southern Turkey", *AnSt.* 4. 175–240.
- Mellaart, J., 1974: "Western Anatolia, Beycesultan and the Hittites", *Melanges Mansel* 493–526.
- Mellaart, J., 1978: *The Archaeology of Ancient Turkey*.
- Mellaart, J., 1982: "The Political Geography of Western Anatolia During the Late Bronze Age. Who Lived Where?", *AfO Beiheft* 19. 372–377.
- Mellaart, J., 1984: "Troy VIIa in Anatolian Perspective", in: L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies (eds.), *The Trojan War. Its Historicity and Context* 63–82.
- Mellaart, J., 1986a: "Some Reflections on the History and Geography of Western Anatolia in the Late Fourteenth and Thirteenth Century B. C.", *JKF* 10. 215 ff.
- Mellaart, J., 1986b: "Hatti, Arzawa and Ahhiyawa; a Review of the Present Stalemate in Historical and Geographical Studies", *Philia Epe eis Georgion E. Mylonan, Festschrift G. E. Mylonas* 74–84.
- Mellink, J. M., 1983: "Archaeological Comments on Ahhiyawa-Achaians in Western Anatolia", *AJA* 87. 138–141.
- Mellink, J. M., 1986: "Postscript", in: M. J. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and Trojan War* 93–101.
- del Monte, J. F. and Tischler, J., 1978: *Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*, *RGTC* 6.
- Morpurgo Davies, A.–Duhoux, Y. (eds.) 1984: *Linear B: A 1984 Survey. Proceedings of the Mycenaean Colloquium of the VIIth Congress of International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies*.
- Muhly, J. D., 1974: "Hittites and Achaeans: Ahhiyawa Redomitus", *Historia* 23. 129–145.
- Murray, O., 1980: *Early Greece*.
- Niemeier, W.-D., 1986: "Crete, Egeo e Mediterraneo agli inizi del Bronzo Tardo", in: M.-S. Tusa–L. Vagnetti (eds.), *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo* 245–260.
- Nylander, C., 1963: "The Fall of Troy", *Antiquity* 37. 6–11.

- Otten, H., 1987a: "Das hethitische Königshaus im 15. Jahrhundert v. Chr.", *Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 123. 21–34.
- Otten, H., 1987b: "Staatsvertrag von Tuthaliya IV. mit Kurunta von Tarhuntašša, apud P. Neve, AA (1987) 410–412.
- Otten, H., 1988: Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV. StBoT Beiheft 1.
- Özdoğan, M., 1986: "Prehistoric Sites in the Gelibolu Peninsula", *JKF* 10. 51 ff.
- Özdoğan, M., 1977: "Taşlıcabayır. A Late Bronze Age Burial Mound in Eastern Thrace", *Anatolica* 14. 1 ff.
- Özgüç, T., 1978: Excavations at Maşat Höyük and Investigations in its Vicinity.
- Özgüç, T., 1982: Maşat Höyük II. A Hittite Center Northeast of Boğazköy.
- Özgünel, C., 1983: "Bati Anadolu ve İçlerinde Miken Etkinlikleri", *Belleten* 187. 697 ff.
- Özgünel, C., 1987: "Selçuk Arkeoloji Müzesinde Saklanan Miken Pyxisi ve Düşündürdükleri", *Belleten* 200. 535 ff.
- Özgünel, C., in print: Anadolu'da Miken Seramiği (Habilitation Thesis).
- Page, D. L., 1959, 1963: *History and Homeric Iliad*.
- Pollit, J. J., 1975: "The explosion on Satorin (Thera) and Its Place in the Aegean Bronze Age", in: D. Kagan (ed.), *Problems in Ancient History I*<sup>2</sup>, 135–145.
- Palmer, L. R., 1965: *Mycenaeans and Minoans*.
- Palmer, L. R., 1968: "Linear A and the Anatolian Languages" *Atti e memorie del I. Congresso di Micenologia* 1. 339–354.
- Palmer, L. R. and Boardman, J., 1963: *On the Knossos Tablets*.
- Parotti, Ph., 1986: *The Greek Generals Talk: Memoirs of the Trojan War*.
- Popko, M., 1984: "Zur Datierung des Tawagalawa-Briefes", *AoF* 11. 199–203.
- Puhvel, J., 1983: "Homeric Questions and Hittite Answers" *AJP* 104. 217–227.
- Rapp, G., 1982: "Earthquakes in the Troad", in: G. Rapp and J. A. Gifford (eds.), *Troy. The Archaeological Geology* 43–58.
- Re, L., 1986a: "Presenze Micenee in Anatolia", in: M.-S. Tusa – L. Vagnetti (eds.), *Traffici Micenei nel Mediterraneo* 343–358.
- Re, L., 1986b: "Testimonianze micenee in Anatolia", in: Marazzi 1986b. 139–179.
- Schachermeyr, F., 1935: *Hethiter and Achäer*.
- Schachermeyr, F., 1982: *Die Ägäische Frühzeit*, 5 Band: *Die Levante im Zeitalter der Wanderungen*.
- Schachermeyr, F., 1986a: *Mykene und das Hethiterreich*.
- Schachermeyr, F., 1986b: "Der kleinasiatische Küstenraum zwischen Mykene und dem Hethiterreich", *Philia Epe eis Georgion E. Mylonan* 99–107.
- Siebler, M., 1990: *Troia, Homer, Schliemann*.
- Singer, I., 1983: "Western Anatolia in the thirteenth Century B.C. According to the Hittite Sources", *AnSt.* 33. 205–217.
- Smith, T. R., 1987: *Mycenaean Trade and Interaction in the West Central Mediterranean 1600–1000 B.C.*, BAR International Series 371.
- Sommer, F., 1932: *Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden*.
- Steiner, G., 1964: "Die Ahhijawa-Frage heute", *Saeculum* 15. 365–392.
- Steiner, G., 1989: "Schiffe von Ahhijawa" oder "Kriegsschiffe" von Amurru im Šauškamuwa-Vertrag?" *UF* 21. 393–411.
- Stubbings, F. H., 1973: "The Rise of Mycenaean Civilization", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/1, 627 ff.
- Stubbings, F. H., 1975a: "The Expansion of the Mycenaean Civilization", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 165 ff.
- Stubbings, F. H., 1975b: "The Recession of Mycenaean Civilization", *CAH*<sup>3</sup> II/2, 338 ff.
- Szemerényi, O., 1988: "Hounded out of Academe . . . The sad fate of a genius", in: Fs. P. Carratelli (ed. *Imparati*) 257–289.