

STUDI MICENEI ED EGEO-ANATOLICI NUOVA SERIE

5, 2019

STUDI MICENEI
ED EGEO-ANATOLICI
NUOVA SERIE

è una rivista del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Roma

eISSN 2532-1757

eISBN 978-88-5491-015-7

Direttore / Editor

Anna D'Agata (ISPC, CNR, Roma)

Comitato Editoriale / Editorial Board

Marco Bettelli (ISPC, CNR, Roma); Maurizio Del Frio (ISPC, CNR, Roma);
Andrea Di Renzoni (ISPC, CNR, Roma); Yannis Galanakis (University of Cambridge);
Luca Girella (Università Telematica Internazionale Uninettuno, Roma); Anna Judson (University of Cambridge);
Françoise Rougemont (CNRS, Paris); Agnese Vacca (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Comitato Scientifico / Advisory Editorial Board

Mary Bachvarova (Willamette University, Salem, Oregon); Fritz Blakolmer (University of Vienna);
Harriet Blitzer (Buffalo State College, New York); John Bintliff (Leiden University);
Eva von Dassow (University of Minnesota); Birgitta Eder (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna);
Fikri Kulakoğlu (University of Ankara); Maurizio Giangiulio (Università di Trento);
Carl Knappett (University of Toronto); Peter Pavúk (Charles University, Prague);
Jeremy B. Rutter (Dartmouth College); Recai Tekoğlu (Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir);
Andreas Vlachopoulos (University of Ioannina); Hélène Whittaker (University of Gothenburg)

Stampa e distribuzione / Printing and distribution

Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon s.r.l.

Via Ajaccio 41-43 – 00198 Roma

tel. +39 0685358444, fax +39 0685833591

email: info@edizioniquasar.it

www.edizioniquasar.it

© Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche

Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma nr. 288/2014 del 31.12.2014

SOMMARIO

<i>Oliver Dickinson</i> The Use and Misuse of the Ahhiyawa Texts	7
<i>Giampaolo Graziadio</i> Some Considerations on the Connections between Western Peloponnese and Cyprus in the Mycenaean Period	23
<i>Davide Nadali</i> Speaking Pictures, Writing Words: On the Interplay of Communication in Ancient Mesopotamia	47
<i>Laura Puértolas Rubio</i> How to Bewitch Someone: Bewitching Techniques According to Incantations in the Hittite and Luwian Ritual Texts	59
<i>Ester Salgarella</i> Non-Connective Behaviour of the Particle – <i>Qe</i> in the Linear B Documents from Pylos	71
POLITICAL BOUNDARIES AND CULTURAL CONTACTS DURING THE IRON AGE IN SOUTH-EAST ANATOLIA: CILICIA, AMUQ AND THE KARA SU VALLEY	
<i>Anna Lucia D'Agata</i> Misis (Ancient Mopsouestia) and the Plain of Cilicia in the Early First Millennium BC: Material Entanglements, Cultural Boundaries, and Local Identities	87
<i>Sabina Kulemann-Ossen, Hannah Mönninghoff</i> Hybridity of Styles: Iron Age Pottery from Sirkeli Höyük	111
<i>Marina Pucci</i> The Iron Age Sequence in the Amuq	147
<i>Sebastiano Soldi</i> The Iron Age Pottery of Zincirli Höyük: An Assemblage among Neighbouring Traditions	165

THE USE AND MISUSE OF THE AHHIYAWA TEXTS

Oliver Dickinson

Summary

The aim of this paper is to combat the interpretation of the texts promoted by the editors of *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (2011), that sees Ahhiyawa, a state whose centre clearly lay in the Aegean, as essentially external to and interfering in western Anatolia to expand its power and influence by subverting Hittite control. It is argued that Ahhiyawa inherited a long history of Anatolian-Aegean connections prior to Hittite dominance of western Anatolia. In a discussion of the related theory that Ahhiyawa was a “great Mycenaean kingdom” that incorporated much if not all of the Aegean world, the arguments for this, especially the archaeological, are disputed. It is suggested that Mycenae was probably the capital of Ahhiyawa and the leading Mycenaean centre, but did not control the other major centres, and that its ability to be active at sea and wide range of links in western Anatolia may have been the factors that made it seem formidable to the Hittites. The texts are argued to be too fragmentary and separated in date to provide an outline of Hittite-Ahhiyawan relations over the period of Mycenaean flourishing in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC; although they shed light on particular episodes, even these cannot be fully understood. They might be interpreted to show that the Hittite-Ahhiyawan relationship was initially quite good, but later came under strain; however, many questions remain unanswered. Their use is to provide clear evidence that there was a state of considerable local importance in the Aegean, that was treated with respect by the Hittite kings. The absence of any real memory of this in historical times only serves to discredit Greek tradition further as a potential source of historical information about the Mycenaean period.

INTRODUCTION¹

Although the Ahhiyawa texts and their potential relevance to the Aegean have formed a topic of research and discussion for almost a century, they have figured relatively rarely in accounts of Mycenaean Greece, even the most recent. Partly, no doubt, this is because of the long debate over whether they did in fact refer to any part of Mycenaean Greece, about which I was still doubtful in the early 1990s (Dickinson 1994, 253, 306). Partly, also, it may be because, seriously fragmentary as they are, widely varying translations of significant passages have been offered in different sources, and their interpretation has been constantly in question. One specialist has suggested that, because they are relatively few, they cannot represent a very important relationship (Greaves 2010, 885), while another has presented Ahhiyawa as a major adversary of the Hittite state in western Anatolia, carrying on a constant struggle for power and influence (Singer 2011, 410, 448-449). The tendency to interpret Ahhiyawa as a powerful state, and the relationship with the Hittite state as important therefore, has been the more common, and this view is closely related to recent arguments for the existence of a “great Mycenaean kingdom”, incorporating much if not all of the Mycenaean culture area, to be identified with the Ahhiyawa of the texts (Kelder 2010, 2012; Eder, Jung 2015).

This interpretation of Mycenaean civilisation has a long history (*e.g.* Desborough 1972, 17-18; *cf.* Gurney 1990, 45). It has drawn basic support from the supposed homogeneity of Mycenaean material culture, which has fostered a common tendency, evident in *AbT*, to refer to “the Mycenaeans” as if they were a single people, and hence to interpret the appearance of Mycenaean material outside its homeland as evidence of the presence or at least

¹ All dates cited are BC. Throughout, what used to be the standard chronology for the early Late Bronze Age in the Aegean, placing the eruption of Santorini around 1520, is followed, since the arguments for a higher date remain vigorously disputed. Also, an accession date for Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III in Egypt in 1479 BC is assumed, although personal information suggests that it may prove necessary to return to the once standard 1490.

activity of this people (cf. *AhT*, 269, 277 on Miletus specifically, also Eder, Jung 2015, 129 n. 92). Often also, especially in the past, when it was commonplace to identify the society of the Homeric heroes with that of Mycenaean Greece, it has involved imagining the army of combined Greek forces attacking Troy in the *Iliad* as the muster of a high king and his vassals (cf. *AhT*, 5-6, also Cline 2018, 198. In both the common description of Agamemnon, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, is mistranslated as “King of Kings”; it means merely “king of men”). In fact, it is perfectly clear from the account of the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles in *Iliad* I onwards that, while the other Greek leaders are expected to obey Agamemnon as their commander-in-chief, there is no suggestion that they owe him any form of allegiance. Moreover, the authors of *AhT* have failed to recognise that the “Mycenaean interpretation” of Homer, which they seem to accept without question (e.g. *AhT*, 5), is now discredited (Bennet 1997; Dickinson 2017a), and ideas that may be considered to derive from it, particularly the belief that Mycenaean civilisation was especially warlike (for comment see Dickinson 2014), need to be excluded from the discussion.

When I wrote Dickinson 2009, I had already long accepted the proposed placing of Ahhiyawa in the Aegean world after hearing Hawkins’ crucial paper given to the Mycenaean Seminar (published as Hawkins 1998), but my knowledge of the texts was still only partial and from secondary general sources. When I acquired a copy of *AhT*, I had no reason to question the readings and translations of the texts, but, as a long-time specialist in Mycenaean Greece, I felt strongly enough about the context of Hittite-Ahhiyawan relations in which the texts were presented to give a short lecture criticising it at Cambridge in 2014 and a Mycenaean Seminar enlarging on the theme in 2016 (for summary see Dickinson 2017b). This paper is a further development, designed to take account of Bryce 2018 and the responses to it and update views on Ahhiyawa first expressed in Dickinson 2009, but still with the main intention of combatting what I consider the tendentious interpretation of the Ahhiyawa texts that permeates the commentary in *AhT*, and to include critical comments on the intimately related theory of a “great Mycenaean kingdom” (here I hope it can be accepted that the generalisations made about widely known archaeological material will not be supported with copious references; see further Dickinson 2019).

Admittedly, my reading on the Ahhiyawa texts and the interpretation of Hittite texts generally has not been very wide or deep. My main source has been *AhT*, although I have consulted Beckman 1999 and Hoffner 2009 and referred back to older publications such as Güterbock 1983 and those collected in Singer 2011. Such reliance can have its pitfalls, as Weeden 2018 clearly shows in making a reasonable case for doubting what I had taken to be generally accepted interpretations of some well-known texts. For a knowledge of Hittite history generally, I have similarly followed the most recent standard work, Bryce 2005, and I may therefore be accepting viewpoints and arguments that other specialists dispute. If my own comments and criticisms echo points already made by other specialists, I apologise to them for not acknowledging this, but I take full responsibility for them all.

THE TEXTS; AHHIYA

As is generally accepted, only a few of the texts are useful historically, though others provide interesting information or insights relevant to the topic of Hittite-Ahhiyawan relations. It should be stated straight away, in opposition to *AhT*, 281, that it does not seem possible to produce a comprehensive or even a skeleton outline of relations between Hatti and Ahhiyawa that covers the thirteenth century, let alone earlier. Rather, the texts shed some light on a few episodes, but much of the context is lost, for the texts are generally fragmentary and mostly reflect only the Hittite viewpoint. What happened between these episodes, which often seem separated by decades, can only be conjectured, and I would like to argue that too often such conjectures have been based on unwarranted assumptions, especially the idea that is basic to the approach in *AhT*, that the kings of Ahhiyawa followed a consistent and basically antagonistic policy towards the Hittite state.

An important preliminary point needs to be made about which texts are actually relevant. I have considerable doubts about the relevance to Ahhiyawa of the late Ugarit texts referring to “Hiyawa-men” (Bryce 2016; 2018, 191), but these are not relevant to my theme, whereas the two texts no later than the early fourteenth century that refer to Ahhiya are. The statement that Ahhiya is an earlier form of Ahhiyawa (most recently Bryce 2018, 193) has become a

factoid, *i.e.* something repeated so often that it is generally believed to be true. But assuming that Ahhiya refers to the same entity as Ahhiyawa, and therefore to Mycenaean Greece, blithely ignores the fact that the link between Ahhiyawa and Mycenaean Greece was originally made because Ahhiyawa was thought to be a Hittite version of a hypothetical Akhaiwa (Gurney 1990, 43) or Akhaiwia, meaning “land of the Akhaiwoi”, *i.e.* the Achaeans of the Iliad; for the link was made in the period when the “Mycenaean interpretation” of the Homeric poems was dominant. As pointed out by Houwink ten Cate, cited in Finkelberg’s analysis of the philological difficulties of deriving Ahhiyawa from a hypothetical Akhaiw(i)a, no one would have thought of linking Ahhiya to Mycenaean Greece if it had not been for this suggested derivation of Ahhiyawa (Finkelberg 1988, 133-134, n. 18; cf. Dickinson 2009, 276-277).

If, after all, the name Ahhiyawa is not to be derived from anything to do with Akhai(w)oi, but originally meant simply “the people of Ahhiya” (argued to be a town according to Steiner, cited in the same Finkelberg 1988 footnote; cf. Kelder 2018, 204) and became generally applied to regions to the west of Anatolia, as Bryce suggests (2018, 194), it follows that there is no good reason to describe Attar(i)ssiya, the ruler of Ahhiya who figures prominently in “The Indictment of Madduwatta” (*AhT*, 69-100) as Mycenaean or relate him to the Aegean at all. His reported activities make much better sense in a purely west Anatolian context, in which he attacked a neighbouring Anatolian ruler, Madduwatta, with a force that apparently included one hundred chariots. The idea that the horse-teams and vehicles needed for such a force could have been transported by sea from somewhere in the Aegean strains credulity; they are surely local, and if so, their leader is likely to be local too. Ahhiya can then be seen as a temporarily powerful Anatolian principality in territory not too far from the Hittite homeland and so of concern to the Hittite kings, as shown by the only other reference to Ahhiya, concerning an unnamed “enemy ruler of Ahhiya”, who may very well be this same Attar(i)ssiya (*AhT*, 4, 219, 225). How its name somehow gave rise to the name applied to a later kingdom based somewhere in the Aegean has to remain a mystery. This interpretation renders Rutter’s theory that it was the name applied by the Hittites to the “Monopalatial” state in Crete (2018, 210) unnecessary. In fact, there is not much evidence for Cretan interest in Anatolia in this period, compared with that for the previous Minoan phases (see below), and none at all to suggest that it could involve the ruler of the Cretan state conducting a persistent feud with an Anatolian ruler, yet later launching raids against Alashiya (probably Cyprus) in alliance with him and a third local ruler.

The references to Attar(i)ssiya’s warlike activities seem to have played a major role in seeing the involvement of Ahhiyawa in western Anatolia as essentially intrusive and disruptive, which is the basic interpretation offered in *AhT*. Ahhiyawa is variously described as interfering (*AhT*, 156), stirring up trouble, and supporting “rebels” (*AhT*, 269-270), all in pursuit of its kings’ supposedly continual ambition to extend their power and influence in Anatolia, a view set out very clearly by Bryce in his general history (2005, 59); even more outspoken statements are made in papers in Singer 2011. But quite a lot of evidence can be assembled from the texts to suggest that there was considerable resentment of Hittite control in the western Anatolian kingdoms, which could give rise to attempts by the local kings to break away from Hittite control or to popular discontent with and sometimes overthrow of these kings if they remained loyal to the Hittites, all without any evidence of Ahhiyawan encouragement. The redoubtable Piyamaradu, who gave real trouble in the reigns of two Hittite kings, might have been regarded by Hittite kings as a “renegade subject” (*AhT*, 119, 120), but to his supporters, of whom there were clearly many in western Anatolia, he might well have seemed a “freedom fighter”. But in *AhT* such an interpretation is barely considered, and his activities are consistently presented as intended to further Ahhiyawa’s ambitions rather than, as seems much more likely, his own (cf. Singer 2011, 426).

EARLY AEGEAN CONNECTIONS WITH WESTERN ANATOLIA AND BEYOND

This whole approach ignores the fact that, as archaeology can show, there was a long history of interaction between western Anatolia and the Aegean before the Hittites made themselves masters there. Geographically the western coastal regions of Anatolia look more naturally to the Aegean than to the central plateau, and there is good reason to believe that maritime contacts between the populations of the Aegean, especially the islands, and of western

Anatolia go back to a very early time, relating to the spread of useful materials, especially Melian obsidian, also of developments in crafts basic to the farming economy like potting and weaving, and later of new technologies like metallurgy (Dickinson 1994, 32; Greaves 2010, 879). Evidence for this becomes quite strong in the Early Bronze Age, but it is not until the Middle Bronze Age that there is really impressive evidence for the growth of Cretan and other south Aegean interest in the islands of the north Aegean and the west Anatolian coast. Although much of this can be associated with Crete, it is becoming increasingly clear that the patterns of exchange and contact were very complex, including material likely to come from several other parts of the south Aegean and also locally produced wares that were inspired by south Aegean products. Often this material is found at sites that had a long previous history and were likely to be centres of exchange; good examples are Miletus and Iasos in southwest Anatolia (Greaves 2010, 880-882; also Niemeier 2011 on Miletus), and Koukonisi on Lemnos (Boulotis 2010; Petrakis, Moutzouridis 2010). Some of the material, like the discovery of Minoan-style administrative documents at Mikro Vouni on Samothrace (Greaves 2010, 879-880; Girella, Pavúk 2015, 394-395), is surprising, but the discoveries at Koukonisi suggest strong Minoan influence there also. Comparable evidence is lacking from Troy, where there are, however, clear links in pottery with central Greece (Pavúk 2010, especially 936-937).

It seems unlikely that significant exchange could take place without the involvement of local elites. This seems a possibility particularly in the case of Troy, which unlike the other sites mentioned was a fortified town, the only one of the period in the Troad (Rose 2014, 27, 40), so probably the centre of a principality. The idea gains some support from the identification in Crete, especially the east, of vessels clearly imitating a central Anatolian type of drinking vessel, of a form surely metal originally (Weingarten 2016). Surviving examples in Crete are mainly of fine decorated pottery, but one from Gournia is silver. Such metal vessels would have been prestigious, the kind of item that might be given as part of establishing or maintaining diplomatic contacts in a way that was becoming adopted in the Near East during the Bronze Age. This was a period of warfare and empire-building, but it also saw the development and spread of the concept of the “brotherhood of kings”, when standards of proper diplomatic behaviour became widely accepted (Podany 2010).

From the start of the Neopalatial period of Crete, evidence for Cretan interest in the east Aegean and western Anatolia, especially the southwest, increased greatly. It is evident on several islands of the Dodecanese, especially Rhodes, where Trianda became a major centre (Marketou 2010b, 779-785) and Kos (Marketou 2010a, 763-764), and can be identified on Samos, Chios, and at Çeşme-Bağlararası on the Urla peninsula opposite Chios, as well as on Lemnos and Lesbos as before (Greaves 2010, 879-882; Girella, Pavúk 2015, 396-405). There is clear evidence for local production of “Minoanising” and hybrid wares at various centres, and some, like Miletus and Trianda, seem to have become so Minoan in their culture that the leading inhabitants, whatever their origin, were surely identifying themselves with the Aegean’s currently dominant culture, as argued for Iasos by Momigliano (Greaves 2010, 882). This is not the place for discussion of the extent to which this represents political control or influence, as in the “thalassocracy of Minos” interpretation, which itself depends on the still much-debated question of whether Knossos dominated the other important centres of Crete. However, it must seem likely that Knossos was a major political centre that exerted considerable influence beyond its immediate neighbourhood, and that by this time it, and other Cretan powers if they still maintained their independence, had established some form of diplomatic ties with the principalities that had developed in western Anatolia. But this must remain largely conjectural; only two possible examples of ‘friendship gifts’ can be cited in support, the stone axehead shaped like a leopard protome from Malia and the undoubtedly Anatolian silver Stag Rhyton, identified as a *bibru*, a drinking vessel type used in ritual (Koehl 1995, 64), from Shaft Grave IV at Mycenae which, Koehl has suggested, might have been passed on from Crete along with the mass of precious vessels and other valuable items of likely Cretan manufacture in the Shaft Graves. These, it may be noted, are very likely to include if not largely to consist of ‘friendship gifts.’

It is in this period that the first clear indications of Aegean diplomatic involvement with a wider world belong, as shown in the well-known paintings of fifteenth century date in the tombs of leading Egyptian officials, collectively called the Keftiu paintings. The oldest, in the tomb of Senenmut, a major official of the female Pharaoh Hatshepsut, should probably be dated in the 1460s; no inscription is preserved, but in showing an embassy whose

members have very distinctive hair-style and dress that can be easily paralleled in Minoan art, and who carry gifts that include items with good parallels in Aegean metalwork, it is closely similar to paintings in later tombs of major officials over the reign of Tuthmosis III. These describe the embassies as representing the princes or chiefs of “the islands in the midst of the Great Green”, adding Keftiu, generally agreed to signify Crete, in the case of the finest painting, that from the Tomb of Rekhmire (Panagiotopoulos 2006, 392-393, 397; Phillips 2010, 824). There is also a written reference among the lists of gifts sent to Tuthmosis III by foreign powers, written on a wall in the great Karnak temple from 1447 onwards, often, it seems probable, in response to his victories in Syria. But this reference, dated in the 42nd year of Tuthmosis III’s reign, that is 1438, does not concern Keftiu, which is surprisingly absent from the Karnak inscriptions, perhaps lost in the numerous textual gaps, but rather a territory often transliterated as Tanaya (Panagiotopoulos 2006, 394; but note that Phillips 2010, 822 transliterates as Tinayu, much less similar to Danaoi, another Homeric name for the Greeks, with which Tanaya is often optimistically compared). Tanaya/Tinayu is associated with Keftiu in a later inscription on a statue-base in the mortuary temple of Amenophis III (*ca.* 1391-1353), on which both Cretan and Greek mainland, principally Peloponnesian, placenames have been plausibly identified (most recently Cline, Stannish 2011); it has been reasonably assumed therefore that Tanaya/Tinayu refers to at least part of the Greek mainland.

By 1438 the purely Minoan civilisation in Crete had collapsed completely, on the standard view, and the hybrid Minoan-Mycenaean civilisation centred at Knossos was probably still establishing itself. Thus, the ruler of a Mycenaean power, quite possibly Mycenae itself, may have decided to attract the Pharaoh’s attention and make a show on the international stage, though the gifts recorded are unimpressive – a few precious vessels, one in silver described as of Keftiuan workmanship. There is no reason to assume that Tanaya/Tinayu included the whole mainland, although the Amenophis III inscription may be using it in that sense. The evidence shows that different centres of power began developing at much the same time in the early Neopalatial period in many regions of the Greek mainland apart from the Argolid (which Mycenae itself seems to have come to dominate very quickly), and while these centres were clearly in contact with each other and show similar behaviour, significant differences can also be observed, notably in the types of tomb used to display their status by the new elites. Continuing discoveries have emphasised the enduring wealth, foreign contacts, and potential significance of some of these centres like Pylos in Messenia, the new palatial site at Ayios Vasileios well to the south of later Sparta in Laconia, and Thebes in Boeotia, all of which could have been Mycenae’s rivals in the fifteenth century; there is no reason to suppose that any were subject to Mycenae or any Cretan power. Indeed, their wealth may well come partly from networks of alliance and contact through which useful materials like metals could have been acquired and passed on, and which might extend into areas where Crete had little or no obvious contacts, the north Aegean and central Mediterranean. A combination of stylistic and scientific analysis shows that both north-eastern and south Peloponnesian and central Greek, probably Boeotian, pottery was reaching the central Mediterranean at this time (Jones *et al.* 2014, 200-204).

HITTITES AND MYCENAEANS IN WESTERN ANATOLIA AND THE EAST AEGEAN

By this time the Hittite kingdom had been long established, but the early Hittite kings showed hardly any interest in western Anatolia. The claim in the early thirteenth century treaty between Muwatalli II and Alaksandu king of Wilusa that Labarna, the traditional founder of the Hittite kingdom, had conquered “all the lands of Arzawa and the land of Wilusa” (Beckman 1999, 87), is not supported by other information that we have on any of the early kings. The Hittite kingdom was in fact seriously weakened by continual struggles over the kingship during the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries, which only ceased around 1400, when the era known to specialists as the Hittite New Kingdom began. The founder of the new era, Tudhaliya I/II, took a considerable interest in western Anatolia, and the history of Hittite-Ahhiyawan interactions may begin with him.

Apart from the reports in his Annals, the fragment KUB 26.91 (*AhT*, 134-139, Hoffner 2009, 290-292), now discussed by Weeden (2018, 223-225), is very probably referring to him, since it certainly mentions Assuwa, which he conquered, but, as Weeden makes clear, the text is very broken and provides no certain support for some of what has

been offered in restoration. What is clear is that KUB 26.91 was part of a correspondence between a Hittite king and a king of Ahhiyawa, in which the sender addresses the recipient as “my brother”, indicating quite a close diplomatic relationship.² The correspondence seems to have been principally concerned with the ownership of some islands, although Millawanda (Miletus) may also be mentioned. The view that has become standard is that this is a Hittite translation of a letter sent *by* a king of Ahhiyawa to the early thirteenth century king Muwatalli II (*ca.* 1295–1272?), asking for the return of islands that in former times his ancestor had been given by the king of Assuwa, but that had been taken over by Tudhaliya I/II during his conquest of Assuwa.³ This territory seems to have been in the northern part of western Anatolia, and to have formed a confederacy to resist Tudhaliya, following his successful attack on the Arzawa lands further south (Bryce 2005, 123–127). But Weeden has argued that the letter is *to* a king of Ahhiyawa from the Hittite king, who must then be presumed to be asking for the return of islands that Tudhaliya I/II had conquered and some time later had come into Ahhiyawan hands. While in some ways it might seem more plausible that it is a fragment of a Hittite letter, the arguments are rather technical, and for the recipient of KUB. 26.91 to say in a previous letter, as the text clearly shows, that “the Storm God” gave him control of the islands seems a much more appropriate thing for a Hittite king to say.⁴ However, on either interpretation of the text it seems clear that there had been Ahhiyawan activity in the north-east Aegean well before the thirteenth century. On the standard view this was in the early fourteenth century and involved diplomatic links between the kings of Ahhiyawa and Assuwa when the latter was an important state; on the revisionist view it must have involved an episode of Ahhiyawan expansion rather later in the fourteenth century, when the Hittites had lost all control in the west.⁵

In fact, during the fourteenth century Mycenaean influence becomes as noticeable in the east Aegean and western Anatolia as Minoan had been earlier. Miletus in particular seems to have become very largely Mycenaean in culture (Mee 2008, 373; Nimeier 2011, 522), so still aligning itself with the Aegean rather than its Anatolian neighbours, and further south, in Iasos, at Müsgebi, and in the Dodecanese, Mycenaean influences are clearly dominant; they are also noticeable further north, at Ephesus and in the Panaztepe cemetery particularly (Mee 2008, 373; Greaves 2010, 882–884). It seems reasonable to connect all this with Ahhiyawa, and to argue that wherever its centre was, it controlled or exercised heavy influence at Miletus and sites to the south. But it is worth noting that in this region the populations were probably very mixed. Although some of the population at Miletus and elsewhere may derive from the mainland, Atpa, a major local figure who was effective ruler of Miletus by the mid-thirteenth century, has a name that does not sound Greek or even Luwian.⁶

If KUB 26.91 was sent by Muwatalli II, he is unlikely to have recognised the king of Ahhiyawa as an absolute equal, for he does not list him in the treaty with Alaksandu of Wilusa as one of the kings “who are my equals in majesty” (Beckman 1999, 90). But he clearly regarded him as a person to be treated with respect and corresponded with in the proper diplomatic manner, and the king of Ahhiyawa evidently knew how to engage in such a correspondence. This is not surprising, for there is good reason to suppose that diplomatic relations between Ahhiyawa and Hatti had been established already in the reign of Mursili II, Muwatalli’s father. For in about 1319 Mursili II decided to settle once and for all the problem of the kingdom of Arzawa, which had been a dangerous rival to Hatti at one time. Two accounts in Mursili’s Annals survive, the second being a more extensive and revised version of the first, and both con-

2 The significance of this usage is underlined by the refusal of a Hittite king to accept being addressed as “my brother” by an Assyrian king, even though he admits that the latter has become a Great King (Beckman 1999, 146–147). That kings of unequal status could call each other “brother” is evident from the correspondence between a king of Alashiya and a Pharaoh, Moran 1992, 104–112.

3 The inscribed sword taken during this conquest and dedicated at Hattusa (*AhT*, 270) is not a standard Aegean Type B sword, though clearly influenced by the type, and cannot seriously be offered as proof of Ahhiyawan involvement on the Assuwan side, since it could have reached Assuwa in any number of ways.

4 The theory that this might refer to Zeus only raises further problems, for we have no evidence that Zeus, although named as receiving offerings in Linear B texts from several Aegean centres, was the head of any pantheon in Mycenaean times.

5 The production of local imitations of Mycenaean decorated pottery at Troy from as early as Late Helladic IIA, *i.e.* the fifteenth century (Mountjoy 1997), is interesting, potentially related evidence.

6 Also un-Greek-sounding is the name of Awayana, apparently an important resident of Miletus and like Atpa a son-in-law of Piyamaradu.

tain references to Ahhiyawa. In the first, it is merely said that the king of Arzawa's refusal to return fugitives was the immediate cause of war, and that after defeat the king of Arzawa left his capital Apasa (probably the later Ephesus) and fled "to the islands", remaining there "in the midst of the sea" with his sons until he died. Later, one son, Piyama-Kurunta, seems to be with the king of Ahhiyawa, but a message is sent, and he is "brought out" (*AhT*, 13, 15, 19, 23). But in the extended version, it is stated that the king of Arzawa had given Millawanda, *i.e.* Miletus, to the king of Ahhiyawa, perhaps in hope of support, and that Mursili, considering Millawanda his territory (on what basis is unclear), sent two Hittite generals to conquer it. Here and later, restorations are made to say that the king of Arzawa supported the king of Ahhiyawa and became hostile to Mursili (*AhT*, 29, 39). This is certainly enough to suggest friendly diplomatic relations between Arzawa and Ahhiyawa, but the implication that Mursili's quarrel was initially with Ahhiyawa does not seem to be reflected in the account of his campaigns. There is in fact no suggestion that the king of Ahhiyawa gave any military support to the king of Arzawa or his sons, or even attempted to protect Piyama-Kurunta and other refugees with him, when a Hittite embassy was evidently sent to bring them back.

It is reasonable to suppose that any hostility Mursili may have felt towards Ahhiyawa was diminished by the readiness to hand over Piyama-Kurunta, and that Hittite-Ahhiyawan diplomatic relations were established from this time, if not before. There are signs that these relations were quite close. A source tells us that a god of Ahhiyawa and a god of Lazpa, surely Lesbos, *i.e.* divine images, were sent to Mursili as part of attempts to cure him of something like a stroke (*AhT*, 193, 209). There is also the mention in a Hittite king's prayer of his father's banishment of a queen to Ahhiyawa, which may well be a reference to Mursili's documented troubles with his stepmother, but could be earlier or later (*AhT*, 159-161); whichever king and queen were involved, this would surely imply friendly relations. A further reference suggesting quite a close relationship is the comment in the "Tawagalawa Letter" that the messenger who was to ensure safe-conduct for Piyamaradu was a man of high rank, who had "mounted the chariot" with the king sending the letter (probably Hattusili III, Mursili's younger son), when he was young, and also with Tawagalawa, named as the brother of the king of Ahhiyawa addressed in the letter (*AhT*, 111). Tawagalawa is indicated by other comments in the "Tawagalawa Letter" to have been in Anatolia at one time; one possible (and to me plausible) interpretation of a reference to him is that he was the previous king (Weeden 2018, 221-222). Sharing a chariot with a high-ranking Hittite suggests at least a friendly meeting in Anatolia. By the time of the "Tawagalawa Letter" Miletus was clearly under the suzerainty of the king of Ahhiyawa, although it had a local governor, so some kind of agreement must have been made over its status between Hatti and Ahhiyawa; perhaps the islands whose possession was disputed at the time of KUB 26.91 were surrendered to Hittite control⁷ and in exchange Miletus and its territory were relinquished to Ahhiyawan control. Finally, it is worth noting that the son of Muwatalli generally referred to as Urhi-Teshub, who was overthrown after a short reign as king by his uncle Hattusili III, at one time appealed to Ahhiyawa for help, although he did not get it (*AhT*, 165-166). It is not clear when this appeal was made, maybe quite late, when Urhi-Teshub had returned to Anatolia (Bryce 2005, 281), so at a time when relations between Hatti and Ahhiyawa may well have been strained. But this could be taken as another indication of Ahhiyawa's possible significance in the eyes of Mursili and his descendants.

THE "GREAT MYCENAEAN KINGDOM" HYPOTHESIS

(1) THE MAJOR MYCENAEAN CENTRES

This seems a natural point at which to pause and consider what grounds we have for identifying the centre of Ahhiyawa, which must involve discussing the possibility of a "great Mycenaean kingdom". By the early thirteenth century, on the standard view, what Rutter calls the Monopalatial state ruled from Knossos had collapsed and with it any potential for significant Cretan influence elsewhere in the Aegean, although individual Cretan centres were

⁷ Lazpa/Lesbos, which might have been one of these islands, was clearly later a dependency of the Seha River Land kingdom, on which purple-dyers who owed tribute to both the king of the Seha River Land and the Hittite king were based, at the time of Piyamaradu's raid (*AhT*, 141-144).

still flourishing. Mycenaean influences were completely dominant, and Mycenaean types of pottery were not only traded but locally imitated in many neighbouring regions, such as Macedonia, southern Italy, and Cyprus. Some examples of Mycenaean monumental work had not yet been built (*e.g.* the Lion Gate), but overall the Mycenaean world gives every impression of flourishing. Its centres were mainly those that have already been named: Mycenae, with which the major fortified site of Tiryns was surely associated; Pylos, although it may still have had local rivals (*cf.* Cosmopoulos 2019, especially 370-374, on Iklaina); Thebes and Orchomenos in Boeotia; perhaps for a while Ayios Vasileios in Laconia, where the major episode of destruction is now being placed early in Late Helladic IIIB; perhaps also, but largely on the strength of the late fortification, Athens. At the moment no others on the mainland or in the Aegean islands have produced the impressive architectural and engineering remains that testify to the leading centres' resources and implicitly conflict with the description as "pocket-handkerchief states" (Bryce 2018, 195). The absence of any such evidence from Rhodes, whose Mycenaean cemeteries have produced little of note except good quality pottery, makes a strong argument against it having been the centre of Ahhiyawa.

In fact, we have no real basis on which to estimate what power or influence any of the leading centres might have exercised on the mainland or in the Aegean, and the recent discovery of Ayios Vasileios at a quite unremarkable site is a salutary warning against being too assertive in our conclusions on the basis of the present distribution of evidence.⁸ Probably each of the major centres controlled a quite substantial territory, but only at Pylos do the Linear B texts give an indication of the extent of this, covering most of later Messenia (although only a few of the many places named can be identified), and they give no indication of any interests further afield. Linear B material from Thebes suggests that it controlled much of eastern Boeotia and sites in southern Euboea, notably Carystos, whose strategic position would have given it a useful foothold in the Aegean from which it might expand its control and influence. It is partly on this basis that it can be considered a potential contender for the capital of Ahhiyawa, which should undoubtedly have had a capacity for being active at sea, although since it controlled islands it could have relied partly on the islanders' expertise. But, although the evidence from Thebes for palatial buildings, foreign contacts, wealth, and a flourishing town is impressive, it is still outclassed by that from the Argolid, especially Mycenae, with its array of fine buildings, monumental fortifications, nine very impressive tholos tombs, chamber tomb cemeteries that held some very rich graves, and an extensive town with roads. Tiryns and other Argive centres like Midea make best sense as part of a single state controlled from Mycenae, fortified to guard various approaches, and the fortified township of Kalamianos on the Saronic Gulf coast may well have been founded by Mycenae. Overall, being spread over a series of hills and slopes, Mycenae may not have been as well laid out as the older island and Cretan towns, but it is much the most impressive of the mainland centres, and was enhanced during the thirteenth century by the major extension of the citadel fortifications that included the Lion Gate, and, perhaps in Late Helladic IIIB2 (Chr. Maggidis, *pers. comm.*), a substantial circuit wall with at least two gates to protect the Lower Town (Maggidis, Stamos 2006, 161, 163; Maggidis *et al.*, forthcoming, Chs. 6 and 9).

THE "GREAT MYCENAEAN KINGDOM" HYPOTHESIS

(2) THE ARGUMENT FROM HOMOGENEITY: CRETE

Nevertheless, this does not mean that it could have controlled all the other major centres in a "great Mycenaean kingdom". The arguments against this theory have to be based largely on what seems plausible, but in my view they carry more weight than the arguments for, which make various over-emphatic assertions and ignore one salient point, the differentness of Crete. For the argument for the "great Mycenaean kingdom" is based essentially on homogeneity – general homogeneity in material culture and specific homogeneity in the manner in which the Linear B script was used and the details that Linear B documents reveal about the society that they were used to organise. In both cases the degree of homogeneity has been exaggerated (Dickinson 2019, 35-37), but there is no denying that it was a recognisable feature in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries. The interpretation of cultural

⁸ I acknowledge my own past error in dismissing the possibility of a major late Mycenaean principality in Laconia.

homogeneity as reflecting any kind of political unity remains questionable, however, in part because it is actually an Aegean-wide phenomenon that in some respects, but not all, includes Crete. For although the Linear B script was almost certainly developed in Crete, to write documents in Greek, and continued in use there after the collapse of the state administered from Knossos, the material culture of Crete in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries cannot be described as Mycenaean. Although it shares a very similar range of artefacts such as weapons, implements, jewellery and clothing ornaments with the Mycenaean world which now embraced most of the Aegean, quite often the history of these shared types indicates that they were first developed in Crete. This is particularly evident in the field of decorated pottery, the most conspicuous and widespread product in the Aegean at this period. The creators of the Mycenaean style evidently drew very heavily on Minoan inspiration, but the ordinary Mycenaean and Minoan decorated styles are readily distinguishable, even in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries, and they continue as quite distinct though related traditions in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, to the extent that it is virtually impossible to mistake a whole vase or large fragment decorated in a Late Minoan III style for Mycenaean. Some mainland shapes or versions of common forms were adopted on Crete, but only the stemmed goblet, later kylix, became very common, while the plain domestic pottery of Crete in this period retained the range and sophistication of the Minoan past, that is hard to match at ordinary Mycenaean sites.

Other differences are equally clear and notable. It does not seem that local versions of the Mycenaean clay figurines characteristic of this period were ever popular in Crete, despite the long Minoan tradition of using figurines in ritual. Indeed, in the very important area of public ritual Crete seems quite distinctive, continuing to use long-established types of ritual site like caves and sometimes peak sanctuaries, and developing new types that are readily recognisable and widely spread, both buildings (the bench sanctuaries) and ritual paraphernalia (especially the figures with upraised arms and “snake tubes” that served as stands for offering bowls). This provides a stark contrast with the relatively scanty and diffuse evidence for Mycenaean shrines, in which each new example of a ritual site seems to have individual features and only the most general shared patterns of behaviour can be distinguished. In burial practices there is more similarity, for chamber tomb cemeteries of Mycenaean type became very popular all over Crete, but their use very often involved the burial of the dead in clay larnakes, again a custom that has deep Minoan roots but has no parallel in the Mycenaean world except at the quite anomalous Tanagra cemeteries.

Thus, although the Knossos administration wrote its documents in the same Greek that was later used at Mycenaean sites, it is very misleading to speak of “Mycenaean Crete”. Although so much emphasis is laid on the strongly similar features of Linear B documents wherever they are found, it must be remembered that only at Knossos and Pylos do we have sufficient material to draw some general conclusions about how their administrations functioned, and there are still many gaps and obscurities. So little is preserved at other sites where Linear B material has been discovered that they provide very little comparable evidence. Rather, similarity has been assumed from the use of similar administrative practices and terminology, although these could easily mask substantial differences in social structure. Further, if the evidence for similarity is thought strong enough to justify arguments for a single state, this would be an obvious argument for siting the centre of Ahhiyawa at Knossos, where Linear B and the administrative practices with which it is associated were probably developed (cf. Rutter 2018, 210). But, however important Monopalatial Knossos was in Crete, there is no convincing evidence that it wielded any major power or influence anywhere else in the Aegean, and as already noted, by the late fourteenth century, on standard views, the Monopalatial state had collapsed.

THE “GREAT MYCENAEAN KINGDOM” HYPOTHESIS

(3) THE ARGUMENT FROM HOMOGENEITY: THE GREEK MAINLAND

It is hard to see how, once the state controlled from Knossos had broken up, a single authority could have been imposed in Crete from outside, and this point applies with equal force when considering the Mycenaean mainland. It is not just that it is difficult to imagine Mycenae being consistently successful in conquering the other centres, as suggested in Eder and Jung 2015 and implied by Rutter 2018, when it had no obvious superiority except perhaps

in manpower. That it could have attacked and at least temporarily knocked out rivals perceived as dangerous, in the Hittite manner, is certainly possible, but it is really hard to believe that Mycenae could have maintained control of these over generations, in terrain that is notoriously difficult to move over quickly by land, in the Peloponnese as much as anywhere. Historically the Greek peninsula has never been under the rule of a single power unless this was an externally based, considerably more powerful empire like the Roman or Ottoman; any predominance by a single power was short-lived, and was not taken to the level of control, *e.g.* taxation, that those who argue for the “great Mycenaean kingdom” want to imagine. There are no clear signs of an outside power’s supposed dominance in other territories, in the form of fortresses, watchtowers and the like. It might be argued that the Cyclopean style of fortification was particularly associated with the Argolid, so that sites that have fortifications in this style but no evidence of “palaces” or something similar could have been outposts of Mycenae’s power (*e.g.* Teikhos Dymaion in Achaia and Krisa in south Phocis). But this has to be speculative, and will not explain all occurrences of the style; another explanation would have to be provided for the great Cyclopean fortification at Gla and the associated minor fortifications and engineering works for draining Lake Copais (as suggested in Dickinson 2019, 41).

The presence of major palatial structures at several different centres has generally been considered *prima facie* evidence for the existence of separate states, particularly since these do not conform, except at Pylos, to what might be considered a standard “Argolid” plan. The notion that they could be for the use of a single *wanax* (Eder, Jung 2015, 118), who would presumably move between them, ignores the considerable, arguably prohibitive, effort involved in transferring the *wanax* and his court in lengthy journeys by land, sea or both, which would be far greater than boating up and down the Nile would have been for the Pharaohs and their courts. Where a major palatial structure seems to be destroyed and not replaced on a comparable scale, as seems likely though not yet fully demonstrated at Ayios Vasileios, perhaps this could reflect a successful attack by Mycenae on a rival; but it is just as possible that this example reflects discord between different centres in Laconia. I find it quite possible to imagine that the Mycenaean world consisted of several major centres of varying strength, that probably had circles of allies and dependents and might have varying relations with each other, much as the later *poleis* did in the Archaic and Classical periods of Greek history, and that the rulers of lesser centres might be expected to show general loyalty to their overlords and provide military contingents when required, as the Hittite kings’ treaties show was expected of dependent kings. But without written documentation it is impossible to do more than speculate that this or that pattern of domination or control might have been followed, and as Kelder has rightly pointed out (2018, 200–202) the same data can allow very different interpretations, according to the theoretical approaches of different observers.

Returning to the question of cultural homogeneity, it should be noted that there is no evidence that the Great Kings of the Near East imposed this in any way, although the Pharaohs did make some effort to bind the local principalities in Syria and Palestine to Egypt through “Egyptianising” the heirs of local rulers (Panagiotopoulos 2006, 398–400). Nevertheless, Kelder’s remarks on a Mycenaean *koiné* (most recently 2018, 199–200) deserve some comment. As he admits, there are significant local variations in the production of pottery and in types of tomb used. The latter is a particularly prominent feature, in fact; quite substantial settlements and even whole districts continue local traditions. There are even local preferences for types of burial goods in the chamber tombs, as pointed out by Mountjoy for pottery (1999, 31), and another notable difference is in the presence or absence of the characteristic Mycenaean figurines, whose patterns of distribution over the Mycenaean cultural region are not simple (they seem to have been much more common in the Argolid than anywhere else). But Kelder’s implication that some features of the *koiné* are effectively a “palatial” veneer over an underlying, presumably “Helladic” stratum seems to be conflating types with admittedly limited distribution and “elite” associations, like frescoes and writing, with features that were embedded in Mycenaean material culture at ordinary level, like the basic decorative style of the pottery and many of its shapes.⁹

9 Singling out kylikes as having “palatial” associations, as Kelder does, is particularly odd, since the plain form is so common in settlement deposits that recognisable fragments are generally the best indication that a site was in use in Late Helladic IIIA–B.

It is surely necessary to accept that, while the imitation of styles in pottery and other artefacts certainly has something to do with the influence of dominant cultures, to suggest that this necessarily reflects *political* domination is over-simplifying the phenomenon, as has been widely argued in the context of the much-discussed “Minoanisation” trend earlier in the Late Bronze Age. It is better simply to note that Ahhiyawa seems to have had wide interests in the eastern Aegean, as indicated by references at different points in the “Tawagalawa Letter” to Wilusa in the north-west and the Lukka Lands in the far south, and this is surely likely to have required ease of access to the Aegean. Viewed in this light, only Mycenae, with likely access to both the Argolic and Saronic Gulfs, and Thebes, with its zone of control apparently extending to Carystos, are likely contenders, and, as has already been suggested, Mycenae was much the more prominent of the two.¹⁰ It can be considered a significant additional piece of evidence that the bulk of the imported Mycenaean pottery in the eastern Aegean is of Argive origin. Therefore I consider Mycenae the most probable centre of Ahhiyawa, and believe that it probably controlled at least some of the Cycladic islands along the route to the Miletus region, quite likely some of the east Aegean islands as well, by the time of the “Tawagalawa Letter”, to which we must now turn.

THE “TAWAGALAWA LETTER” AND WHAT FOLLOWED

This is the most enlightening of the Ahhiyawa texts (*AhT*, 101-122), even though what is preserved is only the third and final page of what has been suggested by Hoffner (2009, 297) to be a draft of a letter or maybe a briefing document to be taken by the envoys sent to the king of Ahhiyawa. The surviving tablet has substantial gaps and obscurities, but enough is clear to make the purpose of the letter obvious – to get the king of Ahhiyawa to expel Piyamaradu from his territory, once and for all. It is generally attributed to Hattusili III (as I shall assume in what follows), whose reign is dated *ca.* 1267-1237 in *AhT*. Evidently Piyamaradu was posing a serious threat to Hittite control of western Anatolia, as he appears to have done already in the time of Muwatalli II; for Muwatalli is the probable recipient of a letter from Manapa-Tarhunta, king of the Seha River Land (*AhT*, 140-144), detailing Piyamaradu’s various successes, which included defeating the king and putting him under the control of Atpa, later if not already Piyamaradu’s son-in-law. A Hittite army seems to have been in the region, but to be more concerned with attacking Wilusa, perhaps to help Alaksandu in the trouble mentioned in his treaty with Muwatalli (Beckman 1999, 87-88).

The typically fragmentary text of Manapa-Tarhunta’s letter contains not a hint that Piyamaradu was working for or supported by Ahhiyawa, nor does it explain who Piyamaradu was except, clearly, someone able to command enough support in western Anatolia to defeat a local king. This suggests that he was certainly of high rank, and the speculation that he might be a descendant of the royal house of Arzawa is given added plausibility by the fact that he has the same name as the son of a fourteenth century king, named in a letter found at Ortaköy, written to, probably, Tudhaliya III by a Hittite secret agent (Hoffner 2009, 256-257). If he was descended from the Arzawan royal house he might well have hoped for support from Ahhiyawa, given the previous friendly relations between the two kingdoms, and evidently by the time of the “Tawagalawa Letter” he was getting some support, at least tacitly. It seems that his base of activities was now southwestern Anatolia, where he may well have been involved in a major anti-Hittite movement which centred on the Lukka Lands, that was serious enough that Hattusili himself was campaigning there (Bryce 2005, 290-291). But a remarkable development, that indicates that we are only getting part of the story, is that he was also negotiating to become a vassal king of Hattusili. But he kept refusing to meet anyone but the Hittite King himself, claiming he was afraid of treachery, and finally he took refuge in Miletus, where his son-in-law Atpa was now in charge but clearly subordinate to the king of Ahhiyawa. In response to a previous complaint by Hattusili, the king of Ahhiyawa had already sent a written message to Atpa ordering him to hand Piyamaradu over to the Hittite king, and at the same time he sent a messenger to Hattusili to tell him this orally. However, by the time Hattusili entered Miletus in pursuit of him, Piyamaradu had left by sea, presumably

10 I gave this topic a more extensive discussion in Dickinson 2009, 280-283.

to an overseas base in Ahhiyawan territory. So, apparently very soon after these events, Hattusili was having the “Tawagalawa Letter” prepared.

Despite receiving neither formal greetings nor gift with the message sent to him, Hattusili generally displays great respect for the king of Ahhiyawa, repeatedly addressing and referring to him not just as “my brother” but as “Great King, my peer”. In the later sections of the letter interesting facts emerge that could explain the apparently undiplomatic behaviour of the king of Ahhiyawa and the seemingly flattering treatment of him by Hattusili. There had been recent hostility between them over “the land of Wilusa”; frustratingly, we know absolutely nothing of what this involved, except that Hattusili indicates that he had been in the wrong, and a diplomatic solution had been agreed. But this was not all; there was a still unresolved matter, about which we know nothing except that the king of Ahhiyawa had complained in a letter, “You used force against me” (*AhT*, 117, §15), or, as Hoffner translates (2009, 312), “You have acted aggressively towards me”. It certainly seems from what follows that Hattusili may only have made some kind of aggressive remarks in a letter. This apparently happened some time in the past, for Hattusili seems to excuse it on the grounds that he was young then; but again he admits that he was at fault and professes willingness to settle the matter by diplomacy.

So the king of Ahhiyawa could have been motivated partly by having a grudge against Hattusili of long standing, which could have been sharpened by the recent problem over Wilusa. Nevertheless, he did try to fulfil Hattusili’s original request by sending Atpa a written message to hand Piyamaradu over, even if he might have suspected that this would be circumvented somehow. Clearly, also, he did suggest, presumably in a previous letter to Hattusili, that he should reconcile with Piyamaradu (*AhT*, 107, § 6), which implies that he had a personal interest and was acting as Piyamaradu’s patron. Hoffner (2009, 392, in n. 301) suggests that this may be what is happening in the action between Hattusili and Atpa described in the same place, *i.e.* Atpa is acting as proxy for Piyamaradu in taking Hattusili’s hand; certainly, the wording that Hattusili offers for the king of Ahhiyawa to use to Piyamaradu suggests that there has been a formal reconciliation (*AhT*, 115, § 12).

In the end, although we get far more information from the “Tawagalawa Letter” than any other source, we still know too little of the background to understand the situation at all clearly. Indeed, if Weeden’s argument that Tawagalawa, brother to the current king of Ahhiyawa, was also his predecessor and now dead (2018, 220-222) is accepted, this would surely put a different complexion on the whole “Piyamaradu problem”, suggesting that it had been a serious issue between Hatti and Ahhiyawa for quite a while, perhaps necessitating a personal visit by Tawagalawa to Miletus and the Lukka Lands – but this may reflect other causes of friction. Neither do we know enough about Piyamaradu to be sure whether his activities in western Anatolia represent a continuous campaign whose focus shifted, or separated episodes in a complex career, similar to that of Madduwatta much earlier. Many interesting questions remain unanswered, such as how he could hope to be accepted as a vassal king, and of what territory, if he was such a great enemy of the Hittites. The Hittite kings clearly found him hard to deal with conclusively, probably because they were unable to confront him effectively at sea, to the extent that Hattusili’s wife Puduhepa offered great gifts to the sea god if he would put Piyamaradu in her hands (*AhT*, 251)!

What does seem clear is that at this time there was such a well-established relationship between the two courts that Hattusili could address the king of Ahhiyawa with language suitable to a discussion between equals, as Weeden demonstrates (2018, 220), without this seeming totally incongruous, even if Ahhiyawa was not a very great power in fact. That Hattusili should have taken the trouble to use rhetorical skills in attempting to persuade the king of Ahhiyawa to do what he wanted suggests that in his eyes the situation was serious enough to warrant this. But it is a misuse of the text to present it as conclusive evidence that Ahhiyawa was a Great Kingdom in Near Eastern terms, and therefore to seek for evidence to support this.

A further reminder of how little we actually know is that we have no idea how the Piyamaradu problem was eventually resolved, if at all. Perhaps Hattusili did not get a satisfying response to his complaints, and this explains the strong indications that the relationship between Hatti and Ahhiyawa was worse in the reign of his son and successor Tudhaliya IV (*ca.* 1237-1209?). One indication of this is in the document known as “The Offences of the Seha River Land,” a proclamation of Tudhaliya (*AhT*, 154-157), in which it is stated that the king of the Seha River

Land “became hostile and relied upon the king of Ahhiyawa.” We know nothing more, except that the king of the Seha River Land was apparently not from the previous royal family. He may have seized an opportunity to reject Hittite control when Hatti was in serious difficulties, as it was more than once in the 1220s. This does seem to be an occasion when Ahhiyawa was trying to undermine Hittite control, but we have no indication of the circumstances. Tudhaliya was able to retrieve the situation and install a descendant of the old dynasty in the Seha River Land (Bryce 2005, 304-305), and Bryce believes on the strength of the “Milawata Letter” (2005, 306-307) that he took over the Miletus territory, but this interpretation is not accepted by all commentators (*e.g.* Hoffner 2009, 315), and Miletus certainly remained Mycenaean culturally.

Other evidence of a hostile attitude towards Ahhiyawa has been found in the draft of Tudhaliya’s treaty with Shaushga-muwa, king of Amurru, in which, notoriously, “the king of Ahhiyawa” was listed among the “kings who are my equals in rank,” but the words were struck out, although they remain visible (Bryce 2005, 309-310; *AbT*, 50-68). Maybe including the king of Ahhiyawa in the list was a scribe’s error, but that it could have been made at all suggests that he might have been included in previous such lists, and indicates how seriously Ahhiyawa had been taken at the Hittite court at one time. Because the king of Assyria is now regarded as an official enemy of Tudhaliya, Shaushga-muwa must also regard him as an enemy and allow no trade with him, and a later fragmentary statement seems to say that Shaushga-muwa shall not allow any Ahhiyawan ship “to go to him” (*AbT*, 63). This has been interpreted as an embargo on the transfer of Ahhiyawan goods (or, less plausibly, mercenaries) bound for Assyria through Amurru ports, but the context seems too broken for any certainty. At the least, it suggests that Ahhiyawa is no longer regarded as a friendly power but as potentially hostile; it also indicates, interestingly, that Ahhiyawa was still active at sea late in the thirteenth century and that the name of Ahhiyawa would be familiar to the king of Amurru. Evidence of such familiarity can also be found in a very fragmentary letter written by a Hittite king to another Great King (but not the Pharaoh, who is mentioned in the text); this contains two references to “the king of Ahhiyawa” (*AbT*, 169). But no such written references have yet been identified outside the Hittite texts, for example in the extensive documentary material from Ugarit.

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, the important use of the Ahhiyawa texts is to prove the existence of a substantial state based in the Aegean during the Mycenaean Palace Period, which may have reached the height of its power in the middle thirteenth century and which the Hittite kings treated with respect. Yet it is most unlikely that Ahhiyawa was recognised as a “Great Kingdom” on the level of Hatti by the other established Great Kings; as Nancy Sandars has written, “There was a rich man’s club, and it looks as though the Aegean rulers were not full members” (1985, 184). As a sign of this, there is absolutely no evidence that the kings of Ahhiyawa maintained experts in the international diplomatic language, Akkadian. Rather, the Hittite kings’ letters to them were surely written in Hittite, like their letters to the west Anatolian kings, a language which would almost certainly be familiar to some Ahhiyawans through the long-established connections with the west Anatolian powers and with Miletus. From the Hittite point of view Ahhiyawa’s importance may well have lain, not so much in whatever territory and system of alliances it might have controlled on the Greek mainland, about which the Hittites may not have been well informed, but rather in these West Anatolian contacts and Ahhiyawa’s power and influence in the Aegean islands, including some of those close to Anatolia, all of which emphasised its capacity to be active at sea and so to support anti-Hittite activity at any number of different points.¹¹ Ahhiyawa’s control of the Miletus territory also gave it a perfectly acceptable reason to have an interest in west Anatolian affairs.

In point of fact, friendly relations with Ahhiyawa do not seem to have helped the west Anatolian kings much, and there is nothing in the texts to support the theory of a long-term Ahhiyawan policy of attempting to

¹¹ It may be significant that in the Shaushga-muwa treaty Tudhaliya IV seems to be especially concerned about the activity of Ahhiyawan ships.

undermine Hittite control in the west. There are various points where friction seems to have arisen, and it is possible that individual kings may have been interested in expanding their influence, especially at times in the thirteenth century. The support evidently given to Piyamaradu may seem particularly unfriendly behaviour, but this may have been motivated more by hostility generated by Hattusili's own actions than by hopes of gains in territory or influence. Certainly, if Piyamaradu was working at least part of the time in collaboration with Ahhiyawa, there is no evidence that Ahhiyawa gained any advantage from his activities, but this only serves as a reminder of how little information we actually have. If looking for a pattern, one might suggest that a relatively good Hittite-Ahhiyawan relationship was established in the time of Mursili, that this was still reasonably good but came under increasing strain in the reigns of his sons, and, perhaps in the aftermath of the "Piyamaradu problem", broke down completely in the reign of Tudhaliya IV. However, the data provide no more than hints at this possibility.

Finally, one faint memory of Ahhiyawa may survive in the Greek legendary tradition, the description in the *Iliad* of how Agamemnon inherits the sceptre made originally by Hephaistos that gives him the right to rule over "many islands and all Argos" (*Iliad* II, 101-108). Thucydides (I, 9) argued that Agamemnon must have had a fleet to control islands far from the Argive coast, so he could envisage this as a possibility. But this would hardly surprise him, since in his day Athens controlled not only Salamis off shore, but Skyros, Lemnos, and Imbros in the north Aegean, and also effectively dominated the whole Aegean through the Delian League. But the Greek legendary tradition generally envisaged the communities of heroic age Greece as independent *poleis* and peoples, as in historical times, and did not speak much of alliances or conquests. Here then is another use of the Ahhiyawa texts, to help to undermine the persistent notion that Greek tradition preserved meaningful historical information about Mycenaean civilisation, for no detailed memory of any state like Ahhiyawa was preserved.

Acknowledgements

I would like to record thanks to John Bintliff, who by asking me to give a short paper at the celebrations of Anthony Snodgrass's eightieth birthday in Cambridge gave me the impetus to develop my views about the presentation of Ahhiyawa in *AhT*; to the conveners of the Mycenaean Seminar, Institute of Classical Studies, London, for accepting my offer of a much expanded version of these views; and to Anna Lucia D'Agata for offering me the chance to develop my views further in responding to the Forum Article centring on Bryce 2018. I am also very grateful to Christofilis Maggidis for information about his important discoveries in the "lower town" at Mycenae, to Adamtia Vasilogamvrou and Nektarios Karadimas for information about Ayios Vasileios, and to Mark Weeden for helpful comments about Hittitological and Anatolian matters.

Abbreviations

AhT Beckman G.H., Bryce T.R., Cline E.H. 2011, *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (Writings from the Ancient World 28), Atlanta.

References

- Beckman G. 1999, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 2nd edition (Writings from the Ancient World 7), Atlanta.
- Bennet J. 1997, Homer and the Bronze Age, in Morris I., Powell B. (eds), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden-New York-Cologne.
- Boulotis Chr. 2010, Koukonisi (Lemnos), un site portuaire florissant du Bronze Moyen et du début du Bronze Récent dans le Nord de l'Égée, in Philippa-Touchais *et al.* 2010, 891-907.
- Bryce T.R. 2005, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (2nd edition), Oxford.
- Bryce T.R. 2016, The land of Hiyawa (Que) revisited, *AnatSt* 66, 67-79.
- Bryce T.R. 2018, The kingdom of Ahhiyawa: a Hittite perspective, *SMEA NS* 4, 191-197.
- Cline E.H. 2010 (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Bronze Age Aegean*, Oxford.
- Cline E.H. 2018, Reaction to Trevor Bryce's article, *SMEA NS* 4, 197-199.
- Cline E.H., Stannish S.M. 2011, Sailing the Great Green Sea? Amenhotep III's "Aegean List" from Kom el-Hetan, once more, *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 3/2, 6-16.

- Cosmopoulos M. 2019, State formation in Greece: Iklaina and the unification of Mycenaean Pylos, *AJA* 123, 349-380.
- Desborough V.R.d'A. 1972, *The Greek Dark Ages*, London.
- Dickinson O. 1994, *The Aegean Bronze Age*, Cambridge.
- Dickinson O. 2009, Ahhiyawan questions, in Danielidou D. (ed.), *ΔΩΡΟΝ. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Σπύρο Ιακωβίδη* (Academy of Athens Monographs 6), Athens, 275-284.
- Dickinson O. 2011, Catalogue of Ships, in Finkelberg M. (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia*, Chichester-Malden, MA, 150-155.
- Dickinson O. 2014, How warlike were the Mycenaeans, in reality?, in Galanakis Y., Wilkinson T., Bennet J. (eds), *ΑΘΥΜΑΤΑ. Critical essays on the archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean in honour of E. Susan Sherratt*, Oxford, 67-72.
- Dickinson O. 2017a, The will to believe: why Homer cannot be 'true' in any meaningful sense, in Sherratt S., Bennet J. (eds), *Archaeology and Homeric epic*, Oxford, 10-19.
- Dickinson O. 2017b, The use and abuse of the Ahhiyawa texts, <https://humanities-digital-library.org/index.php/hdl/catalog/view/BICSmycenaean2016/48/136-1>. Access date: 11 July 2019.
- Dickinson O. 2019, What conclusions might be drawn from the archaeology of Mycenaean civilization about political structure in the Aegean?, in Kelder J., Waal W.J.I. (eds), *From LUGAL.GAL to Wanax. Kingship and State Formation in the Late Bronze Age Aegean, Proceedings of a Workshop held at the Leiden University, 14 October 2016*, Leiden, 31-48.
- Eder B., Jung R. 2015, 'Unus pro omnibus, omnes pro uno': the Mycenaean Palace System, in Weilhartner J., Ruppenstein F. (eds), *Tradition and Innovation in the Mycenaean Palatial Polities*, Vienna, 113-140.
- Finkelberg M. 1988, From Ahhiyawa to 'Αχαιοί, *Glotta* 66, 127-134.
- Girella L., Pavúk P. 2015, Minoanisation, acculturation, hybridisation: the evidence of the Minoan presence in the North East Aegean between the Middle and Late Bronze Age, in Stampolidis N.Chr., Maner Ç., Kopanias K. (eds), *NOSTOI. Indigenous culture, migration and integration in the Aegean islands and Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age*, Istanbul, 387-420.
- Greaves A.M. 2010, Western Anatolia, in Cline 2010, 877-889.
- Güterbock H.G. 1983, The Hittites and the Aegean world: Part 1. The Ahhiyawa problem reconsidered, *AJA* 87, 133-143.
- Gurney O.R. 1990, *The Hittites* (revised 2nd edition), London.
- Hawkins J.D. 1998, Tarkasnawa king of Mira: 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy sealings and Karabel, *AnatSt* 48, 1-31.
- Hoffner H.A. Jr., 2009, *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom* (Writings from the Ancient World 15), Atlanta.
- Huxley G.L. 1960, *Achaean and Hittites*, Belfast.
- Jones R., Levi S.T., Bettelli M., Vagnetti L. 2014, *Italo-Mycenaean Pottery: the archaeological and archaeometric dimensions*, Rome.
- Kelder J. 2010, *The Kingdom of Mycenae. A Great Kingdom in the Late Bronze Age Aegean*, Bethesda, MD.
- Kelder J. 2012, Ahhiyawa and the world of the Great Kings: a re-evaluation of Mycenaean political structures, *Talanta* 44, 41-52.
- Kelder J. 2018, The kingdom of Ahhiyawa: facts, factoids and probabilities, *SMEA NS* 4, 200-208.
- Koehl R.B. 1995, The silver stag "BIBRU" from Mycenae, in Carter J.B., Morris S.P. (eds), *The Ages of Homer. A tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, Austin, 61-66.
- Maggidis Chr., Stamos A. 2006, Detecting Mycenae: Systematic Remote Sensing Survey in the 'Lower City' – Towards the Discovery of the Mycenaean Settlement Outside the Citadel, in Campano S., Forte M. (eds), *From Space to Place: Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop, CNR, Rome, Italy, December 4-7, 2006* (BAR-IS 1568), Oxford, 157-66.
- Maggidis Chr., Blinkhorn E., Fallu D., Karkanis P., Stamos B., Tsokas G., Vouvalidis K. forthcoming, *The Lower Town of Mycenae I: Archaeogeophysical Survey 2003-2014*.
- Marketou T., 2010a, Kos in the Bronze Age, in Cline 2010, 762-774.
- Marketou T. 2010b, Rhodes, in Cline 2010, 775-793.
- Mee C.A. 2008, Mycenaean Greece, the Aegean, and beyond, in Sheldermine C.W. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*, Cambridge, 362-386.
- Moran W.L. 1992, *The Amarna Letters*, Baltimore-London.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1997, Local Mycenaean pottery at Troia, *Studia Troica* 7, 259-267.
- Mountjoy P.A. 1999, *Regional Mycenaean Decorated Pottery*, Rahden.
- Niemeier W.-D. 2011, Miletos, in Finkelberg M. (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia*, Chichester-Malden, MA, 521-522.
- Pavúk P. 2010, Minyan or not. The second millennium Grey Ware in Western Anatolia and its relation to mainland Greece, in Philippa-Touchais et al. 2010, 931-943.
- Panagiotopoulos D. 2006, Foreigners in Egypt in the time of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III, in Cline E.H., O'Connor D. (eds), *Thutmose III: a new biography*, Ann Arbor, MI, 370-412.

- Petrakis V.P., Moutzouridis P. 2010, Grey Wares from the Bronze Age Settlement of Koukonisi on Lemnos: First presentation (poster), in Philippa-Touchais *et al.* 2010, 909-917.
- Philippa-Touchais A., Touchais G., Voutsaki S., Wright J. (eds) 2010, *MESOHELLADIKA. La Grèce continentale au Bronze Moyen. Actes du colloque international organisé avec l'American School of Classical Studies at Athens et le Netherlands Institute in Athens, Athènes, 8-12 mars 2006* (BCH Suppl. 52), Athens.
- Phillips J. 2010, Egypt, in Cline 2010, 820-831.
- Podany A. 2010, *Brotherhood of Kings*, Oxford.
- Rose C.B. 2014, *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*, Cambridge.
- Rutter J.B. 2018, An Aegean archaeologist's response, *SMEA* NS 4, 208-213.
- Sandars N. 1985, *The Sea Peoples* (revised edition), London.
- Singer I. 2011, *The Calm before the Storm. Selected writings of Itamar Singer on the end of the Late Bronze Age in Anatolia and the Levant* (Writings from the Ancient World Suppl. 1), Atlanta.
- Weeden M. 2018, Hittite-Ahhiyawan politics as seen from the tablets: a reaction to Trevor Bryce's article from a Hittitological perspective, *SMEA* NS 4, 217-227.
- Weingarten J. 2016, The silver kantharos from Gournia revisited, in Koehl R.B. (ed.), *Studies in Aegean Art and Culture. A New York Aegean Bronze Age Colloquium in memory of Ellen E. Davis*, Philadelphia, 1-10.

Oliver Dickinson
Department of Classics and Ancient History
Durham University
Durham DH1 3EU
United Kingdom
otpkdickinson@googlemail.com