

**SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY
OF WESTERN ANATOLIA IN THE LATE FOURTEENTH
AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES B.C.**

James MELLAART

In any interpretation of Hittite history - or rather the history of Hatti - it should constantly be borne in mind that we only have their view of events that cannot be checked against the records of their enemies in Anatolia which may well have presented us with a different picture. The prevailing idea that Hittite records are more reliable than e.g. the boastful texts of Egyptians or Assyrians is rather academic in the absence of «enemy records» and we have as yet no means of evaluating their veracity. If the study of history was confined to translating texts, there would be no need for historians, whose duty it is to sift the evidence, assess the veracity, in short evaluate the texts in their wider context without, if possible, any bias. Unfortunately, a pro-Hittite bias is inherent in the concept of a «Hittite Empire» and the other assumption that the rulers of Hatti were the natural rulers of Anatolia, the remaining peoples being their vassals, «loyal» or «disloyal» as the case might be at any given period or reign. One has to be a member of one of these «minorities» to understand this point of view and the violent reaction misuse of careless terminology may provoke. That such was the case in the Late Bronze Age in Anatolia emerges from the fact that when Kupanta-Inara king of Mira was given a Hittite princess as wife, she was provided with a Hittite bodyguard, because the «people of Mira» (Arzawans) were «méchant», is probably the best translation; in other words anti-Hittite¹. The same attitude transpires from the «Manapa-Tarhunta letter» where the same

1 J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti Reiches*. I, 1926.

pro- and anti- Hittite factions are expressly mentioned (once again in Arzawa)². What is clear is that with the rise of Hatti in Central Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age, there were two factions in the traditionally hostile Arzawa countries; those who opposed Hatti domination, «the patriots» and those who did not, the Quislings, a division the rulers of Hatti evidently fomented and abetted, on the principle of «divide et impera». Depending which way one looks at it, Madduwatta, Mashuiluwa, and Manapa-Tarhunta can be described as «turncoats», disloyal vassals, or clever politicians; the first two anyhow became enemies of the kings of Hatti. No such taint adheres to Piyamaradu, a resolute opponent of Hittite domination. Yet nearly all Hittitologists brand him as a «freebooter», whereas the actual Tawagalawa text makes it perfectly clear that he had been a king, formerly a Hittite «vassal» and might expect reinstatement on conditions of loyal vassalage, under Hittite law. Such prejudices, alas mark too many historical interpretations. If one does not like the person like Attarissiya, his title «LÜ» is translated «man» instead of the proper «ruler» as if Late Bronze Age kings bother to deal with individuals of no rank. Worse still, rulers of independant status (kuirwanas) like the ruler of Piggaya are ignored in the geography, though he must have been of considerable importance to deserve mention³.

Another form of manipulating the evidence is based on the positive virtue of «negative evidence», a *contradictio in terminis*. If a country mentioned before in the texts, disappears from them, it is assumed that it has ceased to exist, as if references to it are the ultimate arbiter to its survival. This naive approach ignores the fact that the historical record is never comprehensive (even for later periods) and that in fact it is usually full of gaps and lacuna, which every historian hopes may sooner or later be filled by new discoveries. To argue from the lack of records that such or such a country has disappeared is simply not warrented, especially when other factors, geographical or archaeological are not examined. To have no information does not mean it does not exist; if we took this

2 KUB. XIX, 5.

3 A. Götze, *Madduwattas* (1928).

line of argument as decisive, there would be no *raison d'être* for the existence of archaeology.

My third point is that the reconstruction of Hittite history is almost pointless if we do not know where it takes place; it must be placed in a geographical setting. Without it the many events recorded may not make any sense, but once properly located, the geographical environment, its resources and physical boundaries or restrictions may greatly improve our understanding of the text or the events it graphically outlines (usually with far too little detail). Without the geography no historical text makes sense; it is merely an academic exercise, largely irrelevant.

If we are to reconstruct the geographical background to Hittite history, we need to know not only the physical geography, but the archaeological conditions for the periods concerned. This can only be achieved by archaeological field surveys and excavations (of a modern kind), not by equating Hittite place name with similar ones of a much later age and without an archaeological demonstration of cultural continuity -the basis on which most Hittite Geography studies are based- and one bound to lead to wrong and worse, misleading, results. When faith takes the place of scholarship, beware! Bearing these four points in mind, let us now turn to the basic information and see what this has to tell us.

At Mursili II's accession Arzawa⁴ was ruled by king Uhhaziti, an old man who was accused of having taken the king of Ahhiyawa's side and caused Millawanda to defect to Ahhiyawa. In his second year Mursili sent Gula and Malaziti and they sacked the city. On this or a similar occasion the cities of Attarimma, Šuruta and Huršanašša are involved and their inhabitants took refuge in Arzawa, whose king refuses a Hittite request for their surrender. This ostensibly is regarded as a *casus belli*.

The attack on Arzawa does not take place until the late summer or autumn of the third year, when the armies of Mursili, presumably coming from Hatti and that of his brother, Šarri-kušuh, king of Carchemish meet at the Hittite base of Šallapa. The text

4 A. Götze, *Die Annalen des Mursilis* (1933).

then says that they entered Arzawa and in Aura they were met by Mashuiluwa, a prince of Mira and Hittite protégé who had been conducting a campaign in Mira against Arzawan forces commanded by Piyama-Inara, son of Uhhaziti. A battle ensued at Walma on the river Astarpa where the Arzawan prince was defeated. The next thing we hear is Mursili reaching Apasa, Uhhaziti's city abandoned by its inhabitants, who have either gone with the king and prince Tapalazunauli to an island, or who have taken refuge in Mount Arinnanda that juts into the sea or ensconced themselves in Puranda, with the refugees from Attarimma etc. Mursili claims to have cut off Mount Arinnanda's watersupplies and the siege ends with the capture of 15500 people. With the campaigning season drawing to an end, Mursili returns to the Astarpa river and sets up winter quarters; his brother he sends back to Carchemish. The following year Mursili alone returns to Arzawa and reduces the fortress of Puranda, with another 15000 people. Tapalazunauli however escaped. Piyama-Inara after his father's death during the winter went to Ahhiyawa by ship.. whether that country gave him up to the Hittite king is not known.

After the capture of Puranda, Mursili marched against Manapa-Tarhunda of the Seha river land, who in spite of having been made king by Arnuwanda the year before Mursili's accession had sided with Uhhaziti. He was forgiven by Mursili, and gave up 4000 refugees and was installed as king by the Hittite who then marched back to Hatti, putting Mashuiluwa's kingdom of Mira-Kuwaliya in order, which involved garrisoning four cities (Impa, Arsani and Sarawa and the land of Hapanuwa) with Hittite troops, as well as a personal bodyguard of six hundred men. At the conclusion of this war we hear of three kings being installed : Manapa-Tarhunta in the Seha River land and Appawiya, Mashuiluwa in Mira and Kuwaliya and Targasnalli in Hapalla. No further mention is made of Arzawa. Mursili's personal share of the booty is said to have amounted to 66000 deportees; what the army took could not be counted.. Goetze has suggested that 100000 people may have been carried off. S. Heinholdt-Krahmer sees it as the depopulation and dismemberment of Arzawa; and she regards Appawiya and Kuwaliya as former portions of Arzawa which has henceforth

ceased to exist⁵. In support of this view is the lack of reference to a treaty made by the victor with an Arzawan king, but could the matter not be simply that no prince of the royal Arzawan house could be found willing to become Mursili's puppet? It is hard to believe that Mursili, having at least temporarily removed a dangerous rival, would have been as foolish as to create two, in the persons of Manapa-Tarhunda, a turncoat and Mashuiluwa, an ambitious prince with a Hittite princess as wife (Muwatti) in an unruly country that needed garrisoning and who seven years later was to rise against his benefactor⁶. To reward such characters each with a half of former Arzawa strikes one as a rather desperate solution. It is further contradicted by the Alaksandus treaty in which it is said, par. 4 and 17, that Mursilis gave the land of Arzawa to a predecessor Manapa-Inara⁷. One wonders whether the embassies of Manapa-Tarhunta and Mashuiluwa that met Mursili on his way back at Aura (after which the text breaks off) had something to do with this⁸. Perhaps an Arzawan prince had come forward prepared to receive his country back in vassalage. Nor is there any confirmation whatsoever to suggest that Appawiya or Kuwaliya were parts of Uhhaziti's kingdom proper and had been newly added to the Seha River land or Mira. Kuwaliya already existed in the time of Madduwatta and had a different ruler than the Siyanti River land, which many scholars believe roughly equals Mira⁹.

There is a further point; Mursili impresses on his three vassal Arzawan rulers to be united as if there is still danger which in the circumstances can only be a resurgence of Arzawa, be it under its new king or from the expatriate princess and their sons. That such fears were justified is amply borne out by subsequent events in the reigns of Muwatalli and Hattusili III, Mursili's sons.

5 S. Heinholdt-Krahmer. *Arzawa*.

6 See note 4.

7 H. Otten in *MIO*, V, 29; J. Garstang and O.R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*, (1959), 102.

8 See note 4.

9 A. Götze, *Madduwattas*, 150-1.

Little is known of events in the west in the reign of Muwatalli. There was trouble in Wilusa (and the Seha River land) and the king had to intervene (at the death of Kukunni) and support his appointee, Alakšandu, a treaty with whom has survived¹⁰. It shows five Arzawa kings; Manapa-Inara (probably of Arzawa), Alaksandu of Wilusa, Kupanta-Inara of Mira-Kuwaliya, Manapa-Tarhunta of the Seha River land and Abbawiya and Ura-Hahusa of Hapalla. They are once again exhorted to unite against any of the Hatti Kings enemies.

To this period of trouble in Wilusa the Manapa-Tarhunta letter to the Hittite king may belong. It mentions that a certain Piyamaradu has made Atpa king of his Seha Riverland, causing a mass defection to the new ruler. Piyamaradu also attacked Lazpa and Hittite troops are said to have come and gone back to attack Wilusa (the point for dating it in connection with the Alaksandus affair)¹¹. That Piyamaradu was a former king is clear from a passage in the Tawagalawa letter, where Hattusili III offers him the following guarantee: «Do not offend against me, the Sun, any more, and I will let (you) back (into your land)»¹². The enthusiasm with which the appointment of Atpa, Piyamaradu's son-in-law was greeted in the Seha River land would suggest that Piyamaradu was a fellow Arzawan, of anti Hittite sentiment who would have regarded Manapa-Tarhunta as a traitor to the Arzawan cause. The fact that Piyamaradu installed Atpa, and not himself as king suggests to me that he was not a Seha River land man himself but a descendant of the old Arzawan overlords. It seems unlikely that he can be equated with Uhhaziti's son Piyama-Inara who had fled to Ahhiyawa in the fourth year of Mursili, for he is still active at a time when Hattusili III is already getting old, when the Tawagalawa letter was written. Piyamaradu's activity falls in the next generation (that of Muwatalli and his brother Hattusili III). He might easily have been the son of Piyama-Inara, and the legal heir to the throne of Arzawa, now occupied by a pro-Hittite puppet king. As such he would have been a powerful threat to the kings of

10 see note 7.

11 KUB. XIX, 5.

12 KUB. XIV, 3.

Hatti as long as he was protected by the king of Ahhiyawa and allowed to operate from their dependency Millawanda, where Atpa his son in law was king (at least at the time of the Tawagalawa letter) and Tawagalawa, brother of the Ahhiyawan king, a sort of High Commissioner¹³. To contain the threat of Piyamaradu and his Ahhiyawan ally both Muwatalli and Hattusili III boosted the power of Wilusa and the Seha River land, especially the latter that lay close to Millawanda. Masturi, Manapa-Tarhunta's son and successor was married to a Hittite princess, Matanazi, who apparently was barren, but his loyalty to Hattusili III was praised¹⁴. What happened in Wilusa under the same king's reign is unknown, except for an obscure passage in which a disagreement between Hatti and Ahhiyawa over Wilusa(?)¹⁵ is possibly referred to. Further east, the king of Mira-Kuwaliya, probably Kupanta-Inara had openly opposed Hattusili during the civil war with Mursili III (Urhi-Tesup) writing to Ramses II and urging him to support the latter's claim to kingship¹⁶. We do not know how Hattusili III, dealt with such «disloyalty», but Kupanta-Inara apparently remained in power. A fragment of a tablet mentions that Piyamaradu took nothing from Mira and mentions its king and his sons¹⁷. Of events in Arzawa proper nothing direct is known, but the miserable fragments of Hattusili's Annals¹⁸ record that the Lukka took a long list of cities and invaded as far east as Zallara, «with Harziuna on one side and the Lower Land (Kattiriya) on the other.» It would appear from these place names that the invaded territory reached from the Göksu (Calycadnus valley) to Zallara west of the Salt Lake. Though of course reconquered, it seems naive to suggest that such an attack was the result of nomad incursions coming from the Taurus Mountains. Even if Mira or Arzawa were not directly involved, it is hard to see how Hapalla could not have been. The last king of that country mentioned in the extant texts is Ura-Hattusa (Alaksandus treaty) under Muwatalli. His is a real Quisling name

13 H.G. Güterbock in *AJA*, 87, 1983, 133-138, M. Mellink *ibid* 138-141.

14 KUB, XXIII, 1, ii.; KUB XXI, 33.

15 KUB. XIV, 3.

16 KBo. I, 24 (in Accadian).

17 KUB. XLVIII, 80; KBo. XXVII, 41.

18 KUB. XXI. 6, 6a; XXXI, 19.

«Great is Hattusa» to be borne by an Arzawan king! The removal of the Hittite capital from nearby Tarhuntassa (under Muwatalli) back to Hattusa (under Hattusili III) may well have removed the constraints on neighbouring Hapalla to strike a blow for freedom. Although Hattusili III may have restored his power, he must have been aware that there was little love lost between himself and the Arzawans, both those temporarily cowed, and those who continued to put up resistance. It explains the conciliatory attitude adopted in the «Tawagalawa letter» to the Great King of Ahhiyawa, in his later years, when his health was failing.

The incident that led to Hattusili III visiting Millawanda is instructive¹⁹.

The scene is the city of Attarimma, already known as one of those Lukka cities whose inhabitants fled to Uhha-ziti when Mursili made his attack on Millawanda. Somebody whose name ends in -as, hence not Piyamaradu, but possibly either of his sons in law, Atpa or Awayana or Tawagalawa destroyed the city up to the wall of the king's palace. Just as some of the Lukka people had called in Tawagalawa, others called in Hattusili. When he arrived at Sallapa, Piyamaradus send a man offering to accept vassalage and to be sent the *tuhkantis*, (the crown prince Tudhaliya) in order to conduct him to the king. He, however send an inferior officer, possibly fearing a trap and Piyamaradus point blank refused to come telling the emissary: «Give me a kingdom here on the spot; if not I will not come». That Arzawans were weary of Hittite promises emerges from the Manapa-Tarhunta treaty where Mursili assures his would be vassal: «And you... come in, be not afraid, I shall not take you wickedly and (cast you in prison?) in the land of Hatti» (par. 5), which suggests that such things had happened before. Anyhow, Hattusili then sends a letter to Piyamaradu saying that if he really wanted to become a vassal he should clear out of the land of Iyalanda to which the king was proceeding. Instead he was attacked, though Lahurzi, Piyamaradu's brother had left Iyalanda and was not present at the battle. Piyamaradu presumably was. Hattusili then destroyed the entire land leaving

19 KUB. XIV, 3.

only Atriya as the one remaining fortress «in loyalty to (Millawanda)». Seven thousand prisoners escaped and it is inferred that Piyamaradus took or helped them. Resting in Aba.. (possibly but not certainly Abawiya) the king wrote to Piyamaradus at Millawanda and to the Great King of Ahhiyawa. To the former he wrote : «come to me here», to the latter an explanation of his conduct and a demand for Piyamaradu's extradition. Then an Ahhiyawan emissary arrived without greeting, nor present and a curt message; «He has written to Atpa : Put Piyamaradu at the disposal of the King of Hatti». Hattusili then went to Millawanda to find that Piyamaradu had escaped by ship. His sons-in-law, Atpa and Awayana received Hattusili and listened to his complaints.. The outcome of the resulting letter to the king of Ahhiyawa is unknown.

The Hittite attack on Iyalanda may not have been altogether welcome to the ruler of the Seha River land and Hattusili's complaint that he was short of troops may be indicative of some friction. Perhaps its ruler was sufficient in awe of his nearer neighbours, Piyamaradu and Ahhiyawa as to have found an excuse for not participating in Hattusili's campaign, or perhaps giving only token assistance. Hattusili's ignominious retreat from Millawanda without Piyamaradu or the «hostages or deportees» from Iyalanda could, theoretically at least, have been the occasion for a rising of the Seha River land as told in the so-called Annals of Tudhaliya IV²⁰. The passage alleging the presence of a king of Ahhiyawa on that occasion in the Seha River land is obscure and is now read. He (Tarhunaradu) made war and relied on the king of Ahhiyawa and Hattusili III, rather than Tudhaliya IV, as is often assumed, suppressed the rising, subdued the mountain peak Harana, captured 500 teams of horses as well as king Tarhunaradu and his family and installed a new king of the line of Muwa-UR.MAH on the throne as vassal. According to I. Singer this could be Mashuitta, known from a much damaged letter²¹. From a letter sent to Queen Puduhepa by the crown prince Tudhaliya we hear that sedition was rife in Lalanda²² during the ill health of the

20 KUB. XXIII, 13.

21 Public lecture, London. 24 May, 1983.

22 KUB. XIX, 23.

king during the last years of his life, and even a rising of the Lower Land is to be feared, and at the eastern frontier the Assyrians under Tukulti-Ninurta I presented a powerful threat to Hatti's north Syrian possessions. It may well be that when Tudhaliya IV came to the throne his main concern was with safeguarding his patrimony even if it meant retreat from some of the more exposed regions, like e.g. Azzi Hayasa. He reconstituted²³ the kingdom of Tarhuntassa, previously ruled by his sickly uncle, Kurunta, by merging it with the Hulaya River Land. Its new king Ulmi-Tesup, Kurunta's son, now provided the main bulwark against the threat from southwest; and the part of the border facing that region is regarded as hostile no man's land, a clear admission (Ulmi-Tesup treaty, par. 4). Hapalla, Mira-Kuwaliya, Arzawa no longer figure in the admittedly few texts and the only western campaign on record²⁴ is once again concerned with Ahhiyawa, the Lukka, Milawata and Wilusa. One of the altars from Emirgazi, erected by Tudhaliya IV, records his destruction of Awarna and Pina...²⁵ whereas the still unpublished blocks from Yalburt near Ilgn²⁶ that derive from a building of the same king contain a significant number of place names: Land Lukka, land Ahi(?) -wa, city Pina..., land Awarna, Land Talwa as well as a reference to the land Tarhuntassa. The so-called Milawata letter²⁷ refers to these same events and mentions «hostages of Awarna and Pina» retained by the addressee whereas the king has returned the hostages of Utima and Atriya to him; a source for complain. This looks as if two former allies are quarrelling over human booty, but if these poor people are the victims of Hittite aggression against Millawanda, the addressee of the «Milawata letter» is unlikely to be the king of Millawata. Moreover his titulature suggests that he is a vassal king, though a truculent one. He is being asked to send king Walmus to Tudhaliya, who is to be reinstated in Wilusa,

23 KBo. IV, 10.

24 KUB. XIX, 55 and XLVIII, 90.

25 Communication E. Masson, RAI 1978 at Berlin.

26 K. Kohlmeyer, Felsbilder der hethitischen Grossreichszeit. In *Acta Prehistorica et archaeologica* (Berlin), 15, 1983, p. 41, notes 365-375.

27 KUB XIX, 55 and XLVIII, 90. H. Hoffner in *Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft* 19, 1982.

from where he had fled in an anti-Hittite coup. Moreover, and this is unusual, it is proposed that the recipient of the letter and Tudhaliya shall both exercise suzerainty over Wilusa, an unheard devolution of power, or weakness, on the part of a Hittite King. H. Hoffner regards the recipient of the letter as the king of Millawanda and sees an Ahhiyawan-Hittite compromise over Wilusa but another vassal state would seem to fit better in this context. One is of course immediately reminded of the neighbouring Seha River Land, under its new king Mashuitta (so I. Singer)²⁸. Whatever interpretation of these events will eventually emerge, the real interest of Hatti and Ahhiyawa in this region is nowhere stated, nor much discussed except in terms of power politics, Hatti versus Ahhiyawa. These are the last texts we have dealing with Western Anatolia, none dating from the reigns of the two last kings, Arnuwanda III and Suppiluliuma II refer to this region.

However fascinating the textual evidence is, it makes no sense unless it is set in a proper geographical setting. At present there are two schools of thought; the traditional one²⁹ which relies heavily on the equation of names from the Hittite records with placenames of classical antiquity and thus opts for a southwest Anatolian arrangement with Millawanda at Miletus; whereas the second eschews most of the name equation element and thinks rather in terms of trade and prefers a northwestern location with Millawanda somewhere in or near the Troad³⁰. The issue is further complicated by those who want Ahhiyawa as a country on Anatolian soil, or those who regard it as extra-Anatolian with only a

28 KBo. XVIII, 18 and see note 21.

29 J. Garstang and O.R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* (1959); A. Goetze, *Kizzuwadna* (1940); A. Goetze in *Cambridge Ancient History* II, part 2a (1975), map. p. 17-8; T.R. Bryce in *AS*, 24, 1974, 103 ff. K. Kohlmeyer, *op. cit.*, map, p. 153.

30 J.G. Macqueen in *AS* 18, 1968, 169-185, map fig. 11 and *The Hittites* (1975) fig 15, J. Mellaart in *AS* 18, 1968, 187-203, map. p. 197; and *Afo Beiheft*, 19, 1982, 372-7, map, fig. 1; A Hittite Stronghold in Galatia. in *K. Bittel Festschrift*, Mainz 1983, 345-348. D.F. Easton, Hittite geography and the location of Ahhiyawa. in *Vth International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory*, Sheffield, April 1980 (in press) S. Košak, Western Neighbours of the Hittites. In *Eretz Israel*, 15, Jerusalem, 1981, 12-15.

base at Millawanda. The third ingredient in this argument is the possible (or impossible) equation of Ahhiyawa with Mycenaean «Achaean» and thus Late Bronze Age Greek colonisation in Anatolia (or not), in an Ahhiyawa on Anatolian soil.

Recent reviews of the archaeological evidence³¹ offer no support to a theory of Mycenaean settlement in Anatolia, except perhaps at Müsgebi near Bodrum/Halikarnassos, where a cemetery was found at Miletus, where local wares far outnumber Mycenaean pieces, but where a chamber tomb cemetery is said to exist; and at Colophon where a tholos tomb was found, but not adequately published. Every where else the sherd evidence suggests nothing more than trading contacts, which only at Troy can be said to be fairly strong. On present evidence this provides no adequate evidence for Mycenaean colonisation, or for a Mycenaean Ahhiyawa on Anatolian soil. Two arguments can be advanced against the idea of Ahhiyawa being located in Anatolia; the fact that no king of Hatti has ever reached it and the fact that the presence of another great king on Anatolian soil would have been intolerable to Hatti. Yet in the Tawagalawa letter the King of Ahhiyawa is clearly addressed as an equal by Hattusili III. As Ahhiyawans on occasion fight in Anatolia (Attarissiya, Tavagalawa) they do so from an bridgehead in Millawanda.

The present evidence suggests that Ahhiyawa lay beyond Anatolia, wherever it is to be located, be it in the Dodecanese, the Peloponnese Danae (Tinai), Boeotia (Thebes) or Thessaly in the southern, or in Thrace, in the northern arrangement.

The evidence from the Linear B texts, ably summarised by John Chadwick³²: *The Mycenaean World* (CUP, 1976) is disappointing for Anatolian contacts; it mentions slave women from Miletos, Knidos, Zephyros, *Aswiai* = of Asia, and Lamnos. They and their children were employed as weavers. As far as an equivalent of Ahhiyawa is concerned, one Knossos tablet mentions a flock

31 C. Mee, Aegean trade and settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C. In *AS* 28, 1978, 121-156.

32 J. Chadwick, *The Mycenaean World*, Cambridge 1976, p. 80.

of goats being sent to Akhaiwia, a name which occurs nowhere else on the tablets³³ and is presumably to be located in Crete.

A list of Aegean place names from the funerary temple of Amenhetep III³⁴ juxtaposes a group of (Keftiu) Cretan place names starting with Knossos and Amnisos with a Tanayu = Danaia (Peloponese) group headed by Mycenae and Nauplia. Once again there is no mention of Ahhiyawa, though the Egyptians appear to be well informed about both Crete and the Peloponese.

A further piece of irony is provided by Hattusili and a scribe of Tudhaliya IV³⁵ according to the king of Ahhiyawa equal rank with the kings of Hatti, Egypt and Babylonia, whereas virtually all Mycenaean scholars are agreed that no such single and paramount ruler existed in Greece, which appears to have consisted of at least half a dozen independent states, each with a palace. This of course does not rule out the emergence of warleaders temporarily heading alliances, like Agamemnon in the Iliad or Adrastus, leading the Seven against Thebes, in the Thebaid. Seen from the other side of the Aegean such leaders might well have been regarded as Great Kings, i.e. independent rulers and as such equals, in status, though not necessarily in might.

One can of course argue that the term Ahhiyawa was the word the Luvians of western Anatolia used for all people of the Aegean - roughly the equivalent of «Aegeans», their western neighbours from Thrace to Greece, Crete and Rhodes. Such terminology need not agree with what peoples called themselves; in the Hittite texts e.g. Egypt is Mizri; in Linear B, probably borrowed from Ugaritic (Hkpt) for Hut-ka-Ptah (Memphis) it is Aigypite (as in Aigyprios = Egyptian). Sangara of the Egyptian and Hittite texts stands for Babylonia, called Karduniash by its Kassite rulers. There is thus ample scope for confusion and misunderstanding.

33 *Ibid*, p 50 and 178 «in any case we doubt whether the Mycenaean called themselves by that name («Achaean»)?».

34 E. Edel, *Die Ortsnamen aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III.* 1966, esp. p. 54. also in *Orientalia* 40, 1971, 1 ff.; G.A. Lehmann in *Jahresbericht des Instituts für Vorgeschichte der Universität Frankfurt A.M.*, 1976, note 67, p. 107-8.

35 In the Sausgamuwa treaty; KUB. XXIII. 1.

To return to the immediate problem of locating Millawanda and its neighbours, Atriya (in Iyalanda), the Seha River land and Wilusa we have the choice between a string of states from the Troad to a frontier with Hatti in the Gordion area along the trade route from the Hittite capital to the Dardanelles and Europe or as an alternative a similar route from Miletus, up the Maeander (Seha R.) valley to Wilusa south east of Afyon Karahisar and on to the Pittassa (Hatti) frontier. In either case Arzawa proper, with a large population, must occupy the central area of Western Anatolia, like later Lydia. To locate Arzawa proper, or for that matter Ahhiyawa, on the south coast of Anatolia in Lycia, Pamphylia or Western Cilicia goes against all archaeological evidence³⁶ and the principles of demography. Not a single Late Bronze Age site, not a single grave, not a single pot or metal object is known from the area, between Knidos and Ura (Silifke), including the site of Meydancik which E. Laroche and M. Mellink claim as Muwatalli's capital of Tarhuntassa³⁷. If there is Late Bronze Age material there why has nothing been published to substantiate the claim?

The choice between the two different geographical arrangements may seem unimportant to some, but in fact entails some momentous consequences. If Millawanda is Miletus, Ahhiyawa points to Mycenaean Greece (or part thereof), if on the other hand it is in the Troad, it may have controlled the crossing of the Dardanelles and the road into Europe, and Ahhiyawa can hardly be anything else than Thrace. From the purely strategic point of view an Ahhiyawan bridgehead at Miletus/Millawanda could hardly be regarded as a great threat as it could easily be cut off and isolated; one in the Troad was different proposition with the whole of Thrace immediately behind it. Moreover Ahhiyawa had ships, something the Hittites had not. The northern road was a traditional invasion route into Anatolia and offered little danger to the invader; the southern route up the Maeander into Anatolia however would be like fighting one-way through a tunnel. It is also hard to envisage Arzawa allowing Ahhiyawans to settle on their door-step at Miletus (or being

³⁶ *pace* A. Goetze, T.R. Bryce, K. Kohlmeyer, S. Kořak.

³⁷ E. Laroche in *The Times*, 25/9/1973, p. 7; M. Mellink in *AJA* 78 (1974), III and 79 (1975), 205.

unable to prevent Mursili II capturing it before declaring war on Arzawa). With Millawanda, say at Çanakkale, in the Troad these objections disappear. If Hittite policy was mainly to isolate Arzawa from Ahhiyawan support the containment of Millawanda would be futile as both had ships and harbours other than those in Millawanda. The real anxiety, I suspect, although it is not mentioned in the texts, which do not concern themselves with economics, was the need for European tin, an essential commodity in the Bronze Age. A friendly Ahhiyawa might be persuaded to sell tin only to Hatti and not to its enemies and if Millawata was in the Troad and Ahhiyawa in Thrace, it could even supply Hatti's worst enemies; the Kaska tribes of the Pontic Mountains. That such considerations played a role in Hittite politics is shown in the treaty which Tudhaliya IV made with his vassal Sausga-Muwa of Amurru³⁸. He is forbidden to trade with Ahhiyawa, and Ashur. As shown above this same king was much concerned with the hostages of a number of cities on the perimetre of Millawanda, among them a place called Atriya, which his father had singled out for generous treatment when he destroyed the rest of Iyalanda «because of loyalty to (Millawanda?)»³⁹.

Donald Easton has suggested that Atriya might be the Hittite form of Troy, and the importance attached to this place by two Hittite kings is certainly remarkable. In a paper entitled «Troy VII A in Anatolian perspective»⁴⁰, I have suggested that Atriya might have been a free-trading city, somewhat like Ugarit, and exempt from political domination by both Ahhiyawa and Hatti. Some such explanation seems to be called for and might also explain its wealth and fame in the Homeric epic. If one accepts the arguments put forward in that paper that Atriya is Troy, then nearby Millawanda is in the Troad, controls the Dardanelles and the northern location of Iyalanda, Attarimma, the Seha River land and Wilusa is assured. It still does not locate Ahhiyawa, but increases the probability that it lay in Thrace.

38 see note 35.

39 KUB, XIV, 3.

40 J. Davies and L. Foxhall (Eds.) *The Trojan War; its historicity and context*, Liverpool 1981.

One final argument remains to be disposed of; the view that Lukka in the Sea of Marmara area are unlikely as they attack Alasia (Cyprus) in the Amarna period. So, incidentally does Madduwatta and his allies, Attarsiya of Ahhiyawa and the ruler of Piggya. Mursili I took Babylon, which does not suggest that Hatti was near Babylonia, and Thotmes I and III reached the Euphrates, nowhere near Egypt. E. Laroche⁴¹ has suggested that Lukka is Hittite for «Luvian» which greatly widens the geographical use of the term. Even if one does not accept this, there is the testimony that the Lukka under Hattusili took many places⁴², including e.g. Walwara, which figures in the Ulmi-Tesup treaty⁴³ as southwest of the Konya Plain. This is so far away from the Marmara that there evidently were Lukka elsewhere, as is further suggested by the letter of Ammurabi, the last king of Ugarit who in a reply to the ruler of Alasiya states; «my army is in Hatti, my fleet in Lukka⁴⁴», i.e. evidently off the south coast of Anatolia west of Ura. No one ever doubted that Luvians were widespread.

One feels sure that Bahadır Alkım, a long-time friend and a great scholar, who contributed so much to the archaeology of his country would have been interested in this humble offering.

41 E. Laroche, Lycien et Termiles in *R. Arch.* (1976), 18.

42 KUB XXI, 6, 6a : XXXI, 19.

43 KBo, IV, 10.

44 H. Otten in *MDOG*, 94 (1963) i ff.



Tentative political geography of the Eastern Mediterranean in the 14th and 13th centuries B.C.

B
J.M. 1957 1952