
THE LATE BRONZE AGE ANATOLIA: THE ORIGIN OF TROJANS IN
THE CONTEXT OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

GEÇ TUNÇ ÇAĞINDA ANADOLU: DİL VE KÜLTÜR BAĞLAMINDA
TRUVALILARIN KÖKENİ

АНАТОЛИЯ В ПОЗДНЕМ БРОНЗОВОМ ВЕКЕ: ИСТОКИ ТРОЯНЦЕВ
В КОНТЕКСТЕ ЯЗЫКА И КУЛЬТУРЫ.

Onur ŞARAPLI*
Shawn Christian BROYLES**

ÖZ

Bilim dünyasında Truva medeniyetinin kökeni üzerinden devam eden bir tartışma vardır. Bu medeniyetin kökeni hakkında tarihçiler ve arkeologlar arasındaki hâkim görüş Truvalıların Yunan kökenli olduğu yönündedir, ancak bu görüş ile ilgili kesin bir kanıt da yoktur. Buna karşılık, bu makalede Truvalıların kökenlerinin, Anadolu'da yaşamış uygarlıklardan birine kadar uzanabileceği de öne sürülmektedir. Dolayısıyla, yapılan bu araştırma, Geç dönem Tunç Çağı üzerine varolan ikincil kaynaklardan yararlanılarak eski topluluklar arasındaki etkileşimler üzerinden Truva uygarlığını tanımlamak için medeniyetler arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmektedir. Bu çalışmanın ışığında yapılan değerlendirmelerle, kültürlerin toplumsal dinamiklerinin kültür ve dil sembolleriyle ifade edilişlerinin anlaşılmasında kültürlerarası iletişimin önemli bir işlevi olabileceği yönteminden yola çıkılmıştır. Truva medeniyetinin sinemada nasıl anlatıldığı ve Truva'nın literatürdeki mitolojik algısı bu makalede incelenen diğer önemli konulardır. İncelenen kaynaklar, bilim dünyasında hala geçerli bir cevabı olmayan Truvalıların kökenleri hakkında ipucu bulmamıza yardımcı olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Medeniyet, Tunç Çağı, destanlar, kitabeler ve yazıtlar*

ABSTRACT

There is an ongoing debate in the scientific world about the origin of the Trojan civilization. The prevailing view amongst historians and archaeologists about the origin of this civilisation is that the Trojans were Greek, but there is still no definitive evidence regarding this argument. In contrast, it is also suggested that the origins of the Trojans may be traced to one of the Anatolian tribes discussed in this paper. The aim of this research is, therefore, to

* ORCID: 0000-0003-3860-8049 Onur Şaraplı holds a PhD degree in Turkish Studies, onur.sarapli@uni.sydney.edu.au

** ORCID 0000-0002-9931-2770 Shawn Christian Broyles is a PhD candidate in Turkish Studies at the University of Cyprus, shawn.broyles@okstate.edu

The Late Bronze Age Anatolia: The Origin Of Trojans In The Context Of ...

examine the range of relationships between civilisations to identify the nationality of Trojans in the context of interactions amongst ancient communities during the Late Bronze Age, as explored through secondary sources. Under the light of this study, evaluation of this argument will concentrate on how that intercultural communication can be an important function in understanding the expressions of the social dynamics of cultures with the symbols of culture and language. How Troy is depicted in cinema, and the mythological perception of Troy in literature are additional important points analysed in this paper. This information examined will help us find clues concerning the origins of the Trojans, which still remains without an acceptable answer in the scientific world.

Key Words: *Civilisation, Bronze Age, epics, epitaphs and inscriptions*

АННОТАЦИЯ

В научном мире продолжается дискуссия о происхождении цивилизации Трои. Доминирующее мнение среди историков и археологов о происхождении этой цивилизации заключается в том, что троянцы имеют греческое происхождение, но нет точных доказательств об этом взгляда. С другой стороны, в этой статье предполагается, что происхождение троянцев может быть основывать до одной цивилизации, которые жили в Анатолии. Таким образом, в этом исследовании, используя существующий вторичные источники о позднем бронзовом веке, рассматривано отношения между цивилизациями, чтобы определять троянскую цивилизацию. В свете результатов этого исследования был сделан вывод о том, что межкультурная коммуникация может быть важной функцией в понимании выражения социальной динамики культур с использованием культурных и языковых символов. Какая роль играет троянская цивилизация в кино и мифологическое восприятие Трои в литературе - другие важные вопросы, рассматриваемые в этой статье. Рассмотренные источники помогут нам найти подсказки о происхождении троянцев, которые до сих пор не имеют достоверного ответа в научном мире.

Ключевые слова: *цивилизация, бронзовый век, эпопеи и надписи*

Introduction

Nine years after one of the greatest victories against the Byzantine Empire, around the 15th Century, the Ottoman Emperor Sultan Mehmet II, the Conqueror of Constantinople (Istanbul), visited the ancient city of Troy. As he has paid his respects there at the tombs of the heroes Ajax, Hector and the Mycenaean knight, Achilles, he suggested that he had taken revenge for his ancestors against the Greeks (Şahin, 2004: 18). Even though it is clear that the Turks did not properly reside in Anatolia until after the Battle of Manzikert (Malazgirt)¹ in 1071 and are thus unlikely relatives of the Trojans, it demonstrates the repeated contestation of this region both militarily, culturally, and ideologically. The largest empires such as the Romans, Ottomans, Spartans, Huns, Egyptians and many more have attempted to conquer not only the peninsula but the whole region. The Mediterranean Sea was the centre of the most crucial moments of those civilisations. Maybe some of the legendary wars of this

¹ According to Abbas Hamdani, the Battle of Manzikert in 1071 resulted in the settlement of the Turks in Anatolia and the beginning of a Byzantine desire to open its doors to Europeans for launching of the Crusades. (see: **Abbas Hamdani**, "A Possible Fatimid Background to the Battle of Manzikert", *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10 (1968), p. 1.

area took place for power, some for glory, some for honour, and some for love. Yet, questions still remain today concerning the many tribes, empires and civilisations that fought these wars. One myth about the Trojans and their origins has long awaited illumination: In spite of the multiple, time – spanning claims to affinity, what are the true origins of the Trojans?

Mythological Troy

A few years ago, the movie ‘Troy’ was quite popular in cinemas. It reminded us of the history of the Trojans, with the story unfolding in ancient Greece. History was the witness of Paris, Prince of Troy and Helen, Queen of Sparta, who triggered the war that would destroy the entire civilization. When Paris took Helen away from her husband, King Menelaus thought that it was an insult and he refused to suffer from that action. Family pride dictated that an offence to Menelaus was an offence to his brother, Agamemnon, powerful King of the Mycenaeans, who soon united all the massive tribes of Greece in order to bring Helen back from Troy in defence of his brother’s honour (The Movie “Troy” 2005). The city was surrounded by a strong wall, under the leadership of King Priam and defended by mighty Prince Hector. It was a fortress with walls that no army has ever been able to breach. One man alone stood as the key to victory or defeat over Troy, Achilles. Many considered him to be the greatest warrior alive. In the end, what King Menelaus had wished came true and the whole city fell, however his greatest warrior Achilles died during the battle (Truvalılar, 2006).

Disregarding the artistic license of the film, it is underpinned by something more important than compelling storytelling, preconceptions of Troy’s origins. According to Thomas J. MacMaster (2014), the Merovingian Chronicle of Fredegar around 660 describes that the Franks and the Turks had a common ancestry among refugees from Troy after its fall. This was the first post – classical appearance of descent from Trojan exiles. For MacMaster, this connection may be based on the Byzantine diplomacy in the late 6th or early 7th century even though it seems irrational. Fredegar states the return of some well – known ambassadors from Constantinople (Istanbul) in 629 may be the source in most of the Eastern histories. MacMaster thinks, some details that Fredegar gives fit that period. While the ambassadors’ sojourn encounters with Heraclius and Göktürks alliance, Fredegar seems unaware of Turkish involvement in the wars against Persians. In contrast, a few centuries later, similar material is reflected in the Icelandic Prose Edda where, Snorri Sturluson in a euhemeristic introduction discovers a Trojan ancestry for the Norwegian Gods in what he calls the Turkish city of Troy. Turks had writing before they had conquered Troy. For the same author, it has been argued as a reflection of the Fredegarian material would appear more likely to be independent (p. 1, 2).

The city of Troy and its people have appeared in Latin and Greek literature. Homer was the first person to have mentioned the story of Trojans in the epics of the Iliad and the Odyssey, both of which later became the most popular subject in Greek drama (Porter, 2014). Alastair Blanshard argues that, “Looking for the reality behind the Homeric epics is a non – productive exercise. All such attempts necessarily

The Late Bronze Age Anatolia: The Origin Of Trojans In The Context Of ...

involve overly imaginative reconstructions. The Homeric epics were not historical texts and it is a mistake to treat them as such” (Blanshard, 2017). David Pritchard is a senior lecturer, with a considerable volume of scholarly work on ancient civilisations. Prichard lays out his argument on Homer’s poem The Iliad, stating that,

“The Trojans are of course an imaginary people who were invented by the oral poets of early Iron Age Greece and ultimately became a central subject of Homer’s famous poem The Iliad. As such perceptions of their ethnicity and relationship to the Greeks were subject to change. In Homer himself there is no strong sense of difference between the Achaeans and the Trojans. Both have the same customs, speak Greek and worship the same gods. Centuries later, in the wars aftermath of the Persian Wars, Trojans were conceived of differently” (Pritchard, 2006).

Pritchard continues his claim though:

“From these wars the Greeks developed the idea of the Persians and others as ‘barbarians’, who were the antithesis of themselves and inferior morally and militarily. Armed with this new conception of ethnic differences, the Greeks began to re – imagine the Trojans as ‘Barbarians’. This new concept is apparent in the staging of the myth of the Trojans by the tragedians of fifth – century Athens” (Pritchard, 2006).

The location of the city, on the other hand, has long been a matter of speculation. Around 1870 in the north – west corner of Turkey, the professor Heinrich Schliemann discovered the remnants of Troy. Archaeologists, then, have searched to find some other evidence in order to make a connection between Homer’s Iliad to base on historical facts (Drabelle, 2010: 59). Since then, the ruins of Troy in Hisarlık have been an important archaeological site in Anatolia for its relative chronological sequence in the entire Bronze Age, ca. 3000 – 1000 BC (Easton, Hawkins, Sherratt and Sherratt, 2002: 75).



Figure: 1.1: Anatolia in the time of Hittites (from: <http://www.ancientanatolia.com/maps.htm>)

Trojan Culture

The different peoples inhabiting the Eastern Mediterranean saw increasing commercial, diplomatic and military contacts during the Late Bronze Age; these, together with the consequent cultural exchanges, resulted in alliances being formed between a variety of state entities (Georgakopoulos, 2009: 1; Georgakopoulos, 2012: 140 – 143). According to Eric H. Cline (2008), the city of Troy, and other locations around the city, was also home to those from diverse cultural backgrounds and ethnicities throughout the Late Bronze Age, whether travelling merchants, sailors, or even warriors playing a role in its status as a ‘contested periphery’ and its commanding position on a major trade route. Substantiation that the Mycenaeans, Hittites, and Trojans were involved in the Trojan War, along with some evidence of a Trojan life style, has emerged from excavations, for which there is only one site, along with the harbour city of Beşiktepe (p. 14).

The city of Troy consists of separate levels in the Bronze Age. Each level corresponds to the city during a particular era. Troy VII formerly called Troy VIIa is the city of ca. 1300 – 1180 BC (Strauss, 2006: section xvii). The site of Troy, first discovered by Schliemann and subsequently serving as an archaeological benchmark for the chronological and comparative study of the whole neighbouring region, has revealed a civilization that continued from the Middle to the Late Bronze Age – from the Troy VI phase (c.1700 BC) to Troy VIIA (c.1200 BC) (Slowakei, 2012: 14; Becks, 2003: 84). Dörpfeld discovered some objects after the death of Heinrich Schliemann as well as during other excavations conducted by Carl Blegen and the University of Cincinnati in the 1930s following excavations conducted by the University of Tuebingen (German: Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen) since 1988 in Troy and Beşiktepe (Cline, 2008: 15). Some items recorded in Late Bronze Age texts, such as horses, copper, lead, ivory and lapis lazuli were probably exported from Troy and some other nearby regions. These are the ones found in high level gift exchanges across the Near East region during the Bronze Age with the exception of so – called Trojan grey ware. The majority of these items were exported from Troy. They are perishable in nature and thus no material records would remain. They could not be identified by the archaeologists who have excavated in Greece and in Egypt or any other place in the Eastern Mediterranean region (Cline, 2008: 15).

Surprisingly, a team organised by Manfred Korfmann has been working on the Bronze Age level in Troy and their excavations have revealed a city much greater than expected, including a new lower city constructed during the Early Bronze Age, which is surrounded by a ditch and underground water system. Those findings support Homer’s description about how big, wealthy and multi – ethnic Troy was. Kaufmann’s team also found that the city was destroyed by fire and war because arrowheads, sling stones, and human remains have been found in the streets of the citadel and in the lower city. In contrast, it is still not clear this assault goes back to Troy VI or Troy VIIa (Cline, 2008: 15).

The Late Bronze Age Anatolia: The Origin Of Trojans In The Context Of ...

Language in the Regions Surrounding Troy

All this leaves us in much uncertainty regarding the ethnic composition and culture of Troy were during the Late Bronze Age. In one of their publications, Anatolian Interfaces Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours, Collins, B. J., Bachvarova, M. R. and Rutherford, I. C. (2008) point out that the territories in the eastern part of Mediterranean and the Near – East came to a cultural point in which the region comprised of similar palace – states connected with each other by a political and religious network during the late Bronze Age (p. 1, 2).

According to Collins, B. J., Bachvarova, M. R. and Rutherford, I. C. (2008), the term ‘koiné’ is a metaphor from the idea of a common language which has been applied to the region. That use is acceptable if these cultures have a number of key features in common that facilitated interaction and exchange within these states. These regions were engaged in complex interactions of cultural diffusion and population movement (p. 1, 2). For Collins, Bachvarova, and Rutherford, it is an accepted view that the Luwians (or Luvian) and Hittites immigrated to Anatolia from either the northeast or northwest sometime in the 3rd millennium BC. These two newcomers spoke an Indo – European language and encountered indigenous people like the speakers of the Hattic language. It is quite possible that Indo – European speaking Greeks must have entered the mainland Greece at the same time and encountered other cultures such as Minoan Crete (Collins, Bachvarova and Rutherford, 2008: 1).

Following the first aspect of the cultural diffusion and population movement process, the second aspect is centre – periphery cultural transmission from Mesopotamia. Cuneiform is a writing system that employs nearly five hundred wedge – shaped symbols in the Hittite language (Strauss, 2006: section xx). It is known that cuneiform writing spread from Mesopotamia to other cultures. Certain religious practices also spread in a similar fashion. This phenomenon has been defined as a world systems relationship where Anatolia could be viewed as either part of the system or as part of a semi – peripheral zone in a homogenic situation with respect to even more other peripheral places (Collins, Bachvarova and Rutherford, 2008: 1).

Another aspect to be considered in the process developed by Collins, B. J., Bachvarova, M. R. and Rutherford, I. C. (2008) is cultural interaction in Anatolia. Artifacts from Hattusa indicate that the Hittite Kingdom kept ritual texts from several Anatolian cultures and composed in their own languages. One of them is in the language of Hattic. The people who came to control the Hittite territory after they moved on from the earlier seat at Kanesh spoke this language. Other cultures, of whose religion the Hittites appropriated, were those of the Hurrian state of Mittanni in North Syria and the Indo – European Luwian cultures of Arzawa in the West and Kizzuwatna in the South (p. 1, 2). According to the same authors, the Luwian religion had undergone a fusion process with Hurrian rituals when the Hittites came into contact with the region (p. 1, 2).

The fourth factor is the cultural interaction between the Aegean and Anatolian regions. Mycenaean Greeks were in the southwestern part of Anatolia in

the 13th century BC and the geographical term Ahhiyawa, used in Hittite texts, refers to Mycenaean Greece. The authors also think Anatolia functioned as the channel of cultural and / or ritual practices from Mesopotamia to Greece in some cases (Collins, Bachvarova and Rutherford, 2008: 2).

Although archeological data have shown that Knossos and Mycenae were the cultural centres of the Minoan and Mycenaean world, the lack of artifacts gathered over the years does not give us profound insight about their impacts. Hittite sources indicate that the people who inhabited the Western Anatolia were called Arzawa and Lukka. The Aegean coast from the Troad region, south to the Maeander River, and inland to the south west of Salt Lake formed the Arzawa Kingdom. The natives were Luwian – speaking which a language of Indo – European origin related to Hittites. Although the Arzawa and the Hittites had similar languages and common origins, they were actually rivals. The inhabitants of western Anatolia tried unsuccessfully to resist the Hittite advances during the 14th and 13th centuries BC. While it is a known fact that the information about Arzawa sprang from Hittite artifacts and the lack of materials in hand cannot help us to determine the culture of the native people lived in the area (Georgakopoulos, 2009: 1).

The last aspect of the process is the cultural interaction within the Aegean Sea. Early Minoans may have been influenced by other Anatolian civilisations. Iconography of seals indicates an influence level from Egypt. Crete exerted dominant cultural influence on Greece in the middle of the 2nd millennium BC but hybrid Mycenaean – Minoan culture became dominant in the region when the presence of Mycenaean was attested on Crete after 1400 BC. What is seen here is basically the direction of influence shifting from Crete to Greece and Greece to Crete (Collins, Bachvarova and Rutherford, 2008: 2).

Apart from these clear Anatolian influences, Ralf Becks (2002) thinks Troy has also been influenced by the Mycenaean – Greek civilization (p. 90). According to Becks (2002), the clear influences are seen in potteries, weapons and utensils. While Mycenaean ceramic was the only imported product at the beginning, it was manufactured by locals during the late Troy VI and VIIa phases. This shows how much they were appreciated (p. 90). Becks (2002) remarks that Troy was the centre of a large area within Troy, and there were no other similar settlements in the region due to its geographical location in the 14th and 13th centuries BC. Troy was, therefore, the meeting place of Eastern and Western influences (p. 90).

Language Spoken in Troy and Textual Evidence

The Cuneiform archives in Hattusa have many texts in seven different languages and one of those languages is Luwian (Mouton, Rutherford and Yakubovich, 2013: 1). As the Hittite Empire expanded southwards and westwards over Anatolia during the second millennium BC, it became increasingly influenced by the Luwian language (written in both cuneiform and hieroglyphic scripts called logograms) and adopted much religious and ritualistic vocabulary from it. There is now some strong evidence suggesting that the inhabitants of Troy spoke Luwian.

The Late Bronze Age Anatolia: The Origin Of Trojans In The Context Of ...

The native hieroglyphic script developed for Luwian by the 14th century BC was used mainly only for writing proper names on seals (Fortson IV, 2010: 185, 186).

Some relevant locations in Anatolia were only discovered a few years ago. There is still insufficient linguistic evidence about the Trojan language. The first linguistic evidence discovered concerning the identity of the Trojans was a seal, inscribed in the hieroglyphic script of the Hittites, which dates back to sometime between 1280 and 1175 BC (Bryce, 2006: 118). According to Trevor Bryce (2006), this Luwian seal discovered at Troy has, however, generated considerable debate over its significance in terms of linguistic evidence. Bryce points out that both the seals and those who had the skill to inscribe them were highly mobile at this time, and that Luwian was used for inscribing seals throughout the domains ruled by the Hittites (p. 118).

This information examined has neither helped us find clues concerning the origins of the Trojans nor resolved some other questions about the cultural roots of this ancient civilisation yet. Then, another question arises: Which ancient Anatolian language did connect the Trojans to the Hittites? Alwin Kloekhorst is an academic and has conducted much research, particularly related to the Trojans. In one of his publications, 'Troy, City, Homer, Turkey: The Language of Troy', Kloekhorst (2012) emphasizes the other Anatolian languages. Kloekhorst (2012) thinks that the closest languages to the language spoken in Troy were Phrygian, Lydian and Mysian. He also offers the position that the Phrygians and Mysians invaded Anatolia soon after the fall of Hittite Empire; therefore, none of their languages were originally spoken in Troy. Lydian is out of this approach because this language is from the same linguistic family as Hittite and Luwian, and it was the closest language to the language spoken in Troy during the 1st millennium. Most likely, the Lydian language was officially used in Troy for this reason (p. 49).

In addition to his hypothesis, Kloekhorst developed another hypothesis regarding an indigenous language called Lemnian, the language spoken on Lemnos, an Aegean island in the west of Troy. There are some Lemnian inscriptions as evidence discovered in the Island (Kloekhorst 2012: 49). According to Kloekhorst (2012), Lemnian language is very similar to Etruscan and they both have very similar dialects (p. 49, 50). Hence, what Kloekhorst (2012) believes is that they were not indigenous to Italy but Lydia. This claim was dismissed as a myth with little historical support, sparking a debate on the Etruscan language and the language spoken in Lemnos, as well as their relation to each other (p. 50).

Kloekhorst's argument is echoed by Professor Beekes from Leiden University who believes that the Etruscans may have originated in Lydia. In fact, this does not refer to classical Lydia but rather to the region the Lydians inhabited in the 2nd millennium BC. The region was then called Masa. It is also believed that the Etruscans were forced to leave Masa by sea in response to a crisis that occurred in 1200 BC, and they subsequently ended up in Italy (Kloekhorst, 2012: 50).

Kloekhorst (2012) supports Beekes' argument and posits that the Etruscans inhabited Troy and the western islands as their main locations with an extension to the southern coast of the Sea of Marmara. This region overlaps the region of Lydia

therefore; this could be the reason why it is believed in classical antiquity that the Etruscans originated in Lydia (p. 50). Kloekhorst continues his argument on why the origin of the Etruscans must have resided in this region by forwarding two additional arguments supporting the link between Etruscans and Trojans. One of those arguments concerns the root of the name Troy in Hittite and Kloekhorst says:

“...the root of the name Troy in Hittite, tru- (Truiša), and in Greek * (Troie), appears to be identical to that in the name for the Etruscans, which is tru-. (The e- in Etrusc’ is a vowel prefixed to facilitate articulating the initial consonant cluster tr-, compare the e- less variant tur- in the Greek word Tursenoi, and the Latin Tuscia derived from the earlier *Turscia.)” (Kloekhorst, 2012: 50).

The volume of scholarly work that has been done on this issue is quite considerable. In Elizabeth Mazzola’s text, *The Pathology of the English Renaissance Sacred Remains and Holy Ghosts*, a pilgrim in 1506s is quoted as saying, “All the countre of Troya is the Turkes owne countre by inherytance, and that countre is properly called nowe Turkey, and none other. Neuerthelasse he hath lately vsurped Grece, with many other countreys, and calleth them all Turkey” (Mazzola, 1998: 19).

It was Sir Arthur Evans, the British excavator of Knossos in Crete, who had decided to designate as ‘Linear A’ and ‘Linear B’ the two different varieties of script found on the clay tablets present at that site. ‘Linear B’, dated to the 15th century BC, is characterized by containing amongst its 87 different phonetic signs a syllabary, or system in which each sign represents either a pure vowel sound or a consonant + vowel combination (Latacz, 2004: 156; Strauss, 2006: section xviii; Judson, 2013: 1)

	a	e	i	o	u	
	H ₀₈	A ₃₈	Y ₂₈	D ₆₁	F ₁₀	a ₃ Ψ 43
h-	a ₂ I ^u 25					au ʃ 85
p-	ʃ 03	E 72	A 39	G 11	A 50	pu ₂ Ψ 29
pt-		M 62				
t-	C 59	E 04	A 37	F 05	G 69	ta ₂ W 66
tw-		B 87		W 91		
d-	t 01	X 45	T 07	E 14	K 51	
dw-		E 73		A ^u Δ ^o 90		
k-	⊕ 77	X 44	Y 67	⊙ 70	3 81	
q-	⊙ 16	⊙ 78	T 21	Y 32		
j-	E 57	X 46		5 36		
w-	H 54	Z 75	A 40	Δ ³ 42		
m-	D ^u 80	H ^u 13	B 73	3 15	q 23	
n-	F 06	I 24	X 30	W 52	C 55	nwa X ^u 48
r-	L 60	Y 27	Z 53	t 02	T 26	ra ₃ E 33
r ₂	ʃ 76			5 68		
s-	Y 31	H 09	H 41	5 12	E 38	
z-	q 17	p 74		5 20		

The Late Bronze Age Anatolia: The Origin Of Trojans In The Context Of ...

Figure: 1.2: The symbols of Linear B (Latacz, 2004: 158)

As well as continuing the work of Schliemann and Dorpfeld at Troy, the archaeologist Carl W. Blegen started to excavate in 1939 the Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Greece, known for its mentions in Homer. A surprise discovery amongst the ruins at Pylos was that of around 600 tablets containing the same script as that found on the Linear B tablets from Knossos. It was mainly the British linguist and architect Michael Ventris who later took forward the work of deciphering the Linear B tablets from Knossos. He eventually postulated that the underlying language was Greek, with inflected forms of words, and constructed a syllabic grid in order to work out the relationships between the phonetic signs (Latacz, 2004: 156, 157; Judson, 2013: 3). One of Ventris' work notes is shown below:

POSSIBLE VALUES		VOWELS	VOWEL					VOWEL INDICATOR
CONSONANTS			v 1	v 2	v 3	v 4	v 5	
PURE VOWEL ?	—		⊔				⊔	
j-?	c 1		⊔		⊔		⊔	
z-? v-? θ-?	c 2		⊔	⊔	⊔	⊔	⊔	
z-? p-?	c 3		⊔		⊔		⊔	⊔
z-?	c 4		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	
t-?	c 5		⊔	⊔			⊔	
t-?	c 6		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	⊔
θ-? r-?	c 7		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	
n-?	c 8		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	
f-?	c 9		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	
h/x-? θ-?	c 10		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	⊔
f-? l-?	c 11		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	⊔
l-?	c 12		⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	⊔
v-? r-?	c 13		⊔		⊔		⊔	
c-?	c 14				⊔		⊔	
m-?	c 15			⊔	⊔		⊔	⊔
OTHER CONSONANTS			⊔	⊔	⊔		⊔	⊔

Figure: 1.3: Linear B syllabic grid used by Michael Ventris (Judson, 2003: 3)

Another of Ventris's hypotheses was that columns contained signs sharing the same vowel, while rows had signs sharing consonants. Having guessed that certain signs had the sound values 'a' and 'ni', Ventris went on to suggest that some of the words on the Knossos tablets could infact be Cretan place – names in syllabic form, and thus identified not only Amnisos, the harbor for Knossos, as 'a-mi-ni-so' but Knossos itself as 'ko-no-so'. As more and more phonetic values were deduced, the usefulness of the grid as a tool for decipherment became apparent. At this stage, in the early 1950s, Ventris put aside his initial idea that there might be a link between Linear B and Etruscan and instead concluded that the underlying language of the Knossos and Pylos tablets was Mycenaean Greek – half a millennium before Homer. Ventris's discovery is highly significant, not least for demonstrating an ethnic link and continuity between the language and culture of the Mycenaeans and that of the

revived Greek world of the 8th century BC (Judson, 2013: 3, 4; Latacz, 2004: 157). With that rebirth of literacy and the use of an alphabetic writing system Greek was used not just for financial records, as had been the case with the Mycenaeans, but for transmitting oral epics in a written form (Starkston, 2015).

Considering Kinship

Truthfully it is possible that the Trojans were themselves a distinct people that arose out of centuries of intermarriage between local Anatolian Tribes, Luwians, and Greeks (Teffeteller, 2013: 575). Groups in Anatolia during this time had developed a tendency to intermarry both as a part of elite kingship culture and Trade which frequently resulted in separate institutions, identities, and cultures arising out of confluent streams of cultural practices. The Hittite Queen Mother "Tuwanana" held many resemblances to earlier Hattian female offices but as the Hattian and Hittite cultures mixed over time it became an office enshrined with elements from both cultures. It is reasonable to think that if the Trojans carried on trade with the Luwians, and that certain Trojan names such as Priam have clear Luwian roots that something similar happened in Trojan culture. The Trojans likely engaged in a prolonged process of cultural diffusion in which they assimilated both Luwian and Greek characteristics while occasionally warring and trading with both. This behavior is logically and reasonably determined by the tendency of peoples in this region for interdynastic marriages and at times the co – existence of parallel kinship systems (Pringle, 1993: 294).

Conclusion

As discussed earlier, specifying the exact origins of the Trojan people is an ongoing mystery partially because of conflicting cultural interests in the answer to the question and mostly because of a profound lack of hard evidence. The most solid evidences we have are the Luwian seals which are contemporary with Troy VIIa, the likely candidate for the famous city. Whether or not the Luwian Theory is correct it is easy to rule out the other competing theories. There is no reason to believe that the Trojans were purely Greeks as the site is devoid of Greek script from the period with which we are familiar. The only linguistic evidence seems to indicate that if the Trojans were not Luwians themselves that they engaged in trade or tribute giving with the West Anatolian peoples. The Luwians' origins are perhaps more of a mystery, but it is believed they originated from Proto – Indo European peoples on the southern Russian Steppes (Bryce, 1999: 32). Despite the thoroughness of Kloekhorst's thesis there is simply no way to confirm or deny the population migrations needed to fulfill it. We can conclusively say that the evidence currently points us away from Greek or Turkish origins to an even more mysterious people from whom we can only hope the answer can be discovered.

The Late Bronze Age Anatolia: The Origin Of Trojans In The Context Of ...

Bibliography

- “Anatolia in the Time of Hittites” retrieved from the website: <http://www.ancientanatolia.com/maps.htm>, accessed on 04 / 04 / 2008.
- Becks, R. (2002). “High Troian Culture: Troy VI / VIIa”, Ekrem Işın (eds.), *Troy: Journey to a City between Legend and Reality*. İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Anıtlar ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü ve Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.
- Blanshard, A. J. L. (Paul Eliadis Professor of Classics and Ancient History), School of Historical and Philosophical Inquiry, The University of Queensland, Personal Interview on 12 / 10 / 2017.
- Bryce, T. (1999). *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bryce, T. (2006). *The Trojans and Their Neighbours*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Cline, E. H. (2008). “Troy as a “Contested Periphery”: Archaeological Perspectives Perspectives on Cross – Cultural and Cross – Disciplinary Interactions Concerning Bronze Age Anatolia”, Billie Jean Collins, Mary R. Bachvarova and Ian C. Rutherford (eds.), *Anatolian Interfaces Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours*, Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 11 – 20.
- Collins, B. J., Bachvarova, M. R., Rutherford, I. C. (2008). “Introduction”, Billie Jean Collins, Mary R. Bachvarova and Ian C. Rutherford (eds.), *Anatolian Interfaces Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours*, Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 1 – 10.
- Drabelle, D. “The (continuing) Tale of Troy”, the May – June Issue of *Pennsylvania Gazette*, University of Pennsylvania 2010, retrieved from the website: www.upenn.edu/gazette/0510/PennGaz0510_feature5.pdf, accessed on 01 / 09 / 2014.
- Easton, D. F., Hawkins, J. D., Sherratt, A. G. and Sherratt, E. S. (2002). “Troy in Recent Perspective”, *Anatolian Studies*, (52), pp. 75 – 109.
- Fortson IV, B. W. (2010). *Indo – European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley – Blackwell Publishing.
- Georgakopoulos, K. (2009). “Aegean World and Central Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age: Interconnections, Intermediaries and Interpretations” a poster journal, retrieved from the website: <http://www.wac6.org>, accessed on 28 / 10 / 2014.
- Georgakopoulos, K. (2012). “Minoan – Anatolian Relations and the Ahhiyawa Question: a Re – assessment of the Evidence”, *Talanta* (XLIV), pp. 137 – 156.
- Hamdani A. (1968). “A Possible Fatimid Background to the Battle of Manzikert”, *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (10), pp. 1 – 39.
- Judson, A. P. (2003). “The Decipherment Process”, from the official website of the Mycenaean Epigraphy Group, Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge: <http://www.classics.cam.ac.uk/pdfs/mycep/process.pdf>, accessed on 08 / 07 / 2015.
- Latacz, J. (2004). *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery*, (Kevin Windle and Rosh Ireland trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2012). *Troy, City, Homer, Turkey: The Language of Troy*, W Books 2012, retrieved from the author’s personal website: <http://www.kloekhorst.nl/KloekhorstLanguageOfTroy.pdf>, accessed on 01 / 09 / 2014.

- MacMaster, T. J. (2014). "The Origin of the Origins: Trojans, Turks and the Birth of the Myth of Trojan Origins in the Medieval World", *La légende de Troie de l'Antiquité Tardive au Moyen Âge. Variations, innovations, modifications et réécritures*, dir. Eugenio Amato, Élisabeth Gaucher – Rémond, Giampiero Scafoglio, Atlantide, (2), pp. 1 – 12.
- Mazzola, E. (1998). *The Pathology of the English Renaissance Sacred Remains and Holy Ghosts*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill.
- Mouton, A., Rutherford, I., and Yakubovich, I. (2013). "Introduction", Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford and Ilya Yakubovich (eds.), *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden: Brill Publications, pp. 1 – 21.
- Porter, J. "The Mythological Background of Homer's Iliad", Course Notes from the website of the University of Saskatchewan: <http://homepage.usask.ca/~jrp638/CourseNotes/HomMyth.html>, accessed on 18 / 03 / 2014.
- Pringle, J. M. (1993). *Hittite Kinship and Marriage, a Study Based on the Cuneiform Texts from 2nd Millennium Bogazkoy*, PhD Thesis, University of London.
- Pritchard, D. M. (senior lecturer), School of Historical and Philosophical Inquiry at the University of Queensland. Personal Interview on 09 / 08 / 2006.
- Slowakei, M. (2012). *Pottery of Troy VIIB Chronology, Classification, Context and Implications of Trojan Ceramic Assemblages in the Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age Transition – Volume: 1 (Text and Catalogue)*, PhD Thesis, Eberhard Karls University of Tuebingen.
- Starkston, J. "Profile of Troy: The Hittite – Trojan Connection", retrieved from the author's personal website: <http://www.judithstarkston.com/articles/profile-of-troy-the-hittite-trojan-connection>, accessed on 08 / 12 / 2015.
- Strauss, B. (2006). *The Trojan War: A New History*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- Şahin, H. (2004). *Troyalılar Türk müydü? Bir Mitosun Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını*, Istanbul: Troya Yayıncılık.
- Teffeteller, A. (2013). "Singers of Lazpa: Reconstructing Identities on Bronze Age Lesbos", Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford and Ilya Yakubovich (eds.), *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*. Leiden: Brill Publications, pp. 567 – 589.
- The Movie "Troy" retrieved from the website: www.themovietroy.com, accessed on 25 / 04 / 2006.
- "Truvalılar" retrieved from the website of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey: www.kultur.gov.tr, accessed on 23 / 03 / 2006.