

LOCATING AHHIYAWA*

The nature and location of the land known to the Hittites as Ahhiyawa and the site of its ruler are questions of great current as well as long-standing interest and debate. Recent study of Hittite inscriptions, of Linear B tablets from Thebes, and of results of excavations both in Greece and along what P. Mountjoy has termed the "East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface" have shed new light on the issues. Whether Ahhiyawa referred initially or subsequently to a place, a people, or both is unclear, and the relation of Ahhiyawa to the Achaioi of Homer and to Achaea is somewhat uncertain.¹ Indeed, confidence in the association might be absent were it not for the near certainty (established through recent research on Hittite/Luwian inscriptions and texts, above all the work of D. Hawkins on the rock inscription from the Karabel Pass southeast of Izmir) that the map of western Anatolia is secure. It now seems clear that the Millawanda/Milawata, Apasa and Lazpa of the Hittite/Luwian texts are the Miletus, Ephesus and Lesbos known to Greek history, and that the Wilusa of the texts is the Wilios/Ilios known to Homer, the Troy of Schliemann and of legend.² It is also clear

* It is an honor and a pleasure to offer this paper to Prof. Spyros Iakovidis, scholar par excellence, mentor and dear friend. The contribution of Prof. Iakovidis to the field of Aegean prehistory, through his meticulous excavation, magisterial publication and dedicated teaching, has been enormous. His commitment to his field, as evidenced by his willingness to undertake the burdensome task of publication of excavations concluded long ago as in the case of the citadel of Gla, is total. His many contributions to Mycenaean archaeology will ensure his eternal *kléos*.

I am most grateful to Jayne Warner, Erin Hayes and Catriona McDonald for invaluable assistance in obtaining publications, fact-checking and proofreading. I am further indebted to Prof. Christofilis Maggidis, outstanding pupil and successor at Mycenae of Prof. Spyros Iakovidis, for his numerous thoughtful comments on a draft of this paper. An excellent overview of the rise, florescence and fall of the Mycenaean palatial system including its relations with Anatolia is provided in C. Maggidis, *Mycenae Abroad: Mycenaean Foreign Policy, the Anatolian Frontier, and the Theory of Overextension – Reconstructing an Integrated Causal Nexus for the Decline and Fall of*

the Mycenaean World, in P. Kousoulis - K. Magliveras (eds), *Moving Across Borders: Foreign Relations, Religion and Cultural Interactions in the Ancient Mediterranean*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 159 (Leuven 2007) 71-98. I thank as well Dr. Hector Catling, Prof. Richard Janko, Prof. Peter Kuniholm, Prof. Sturt Manning and Dr. Penelope Mountjoy for many helpful comments.

1. P. Mountjoy, *The East Aegean - West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaeans and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa*, *AnSt* 48, 1998, 33-67. With respect to the proposed linguistic linkage of Achaioi to Ahhiyawa, see M. Finkleberg, *From Ahhiyawa to Αχαιοί*, *Glotta* 66, 1988, 127-134 (I am grateful to I. Singer for this reference).

2. On the significance of the Ahhiyawa question in Trojan War scholarship and Homeric studies, see M. Wiener, *Homer and History: Old Questions, New Evidence*, in *EPOS: Reconsidering the Greek Epic and Aegean Bronze Age Chronology. Proceedings of the 11th International Aegean Conference, Los Angeles, University of California Los Angeles, 21-23 April 2006, Aegaeum* 28 (Liège 2007) 3-33.

from the approximately twenty-five Hittite texts³ referring to Ahhiyawa that it included, at least at some points in time, the site of Miletus, shown by the excavation of the Niemeiers to be heavily Late Helladic in character after an earlier Minoan occupation. The texts make plain that Ahhiyawa also covered additional parts of the southern Anatolian coast and that its capital probably lay abroad. It is apparent that Ahhiyawa was an entity of some importance to the Hittites from at least the early 14th to the late 13th century.⁴ In one text (*KUB XXIII.1*) the ruler of Ahhiyawa is listed as a great king equal to those of Egypt, Assyria and Kassite Babylonia, but the reference to Ahhiyawa is then erased.⁵ Furthermore, the ruler of Ahhiyawa is sometimes addressed as "brother." It should be noted, however, that the term does not necessarily connote rulers of states approximately equal in power, for it is often used, at least in Egyptian diplomatic correspondence, to address a ruler of a much less significant state;⁶ rather, the term is seemingly employed whenever the pharaoh wants something, particularly gifts. The Ahhiyawan rulers with whom the Hittite rulers correspond are out of reach of Hittite power, control land forces on the Anatolian coast (including 100 chariots, assuming that Attarsiya, the man of Ahhiyawa, is under the Ahhiyawan ruler's control), and a brother of a ruler of Ahhiyawa rides with a charioteer who has married into the family of a Hittite queen and driven the Hittite king.⁷ Mursili II on one occasion requests a statue or token of an Ahhiyawan deity putatively capable of curing the Hittite ruler's illness.⁸

3. Most of which have been published either in the Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi (*KBo*) series or in the Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi (*KUB*) series. All have been catalogued in the *Catalogue des Textes Hittites (CTH)*, now available on the internet (J. Kelder, Greece During the Late Bronze Age, *JEOL* 39, 2005, 139; B. Collins, *Catalog of Hittite Texts [CTH]*, <<http://www.mesas.emory.edu/hittitehome/CTHHP.html>> [28.12.06]).

4. W.-D. Niemeier, Mycenaeans and Hittites in War in Western Asia Minor, in R. Laffineur (ed.), *POLEMOS: le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'âge du Bronze. Actes de la 7e Rencontre égéenne internationale, Université de Liège, 14-17 avril 1998, Aegaeum* 19 (Liège 1999) 141-155, pl. XV; W.-D. Niemeier, The Mycenaeans in Western Anatolia and the Problem of the Origins of the Sea Peoples, in S. Gitin - A. Mazar - E. Stern (eds), *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition: Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries BCE. In Honor of Professor Trude Dothan* (Jerusalem 1998) 17-27, 43-45 with references and bibliography; T. Bryce, Ahhiyawans and Mycenaeans - An Anatolian Viewpoint, *OxfJA* 8, 1989, 297-310.

5. T. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford 1998) 343-344. E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes Hittites* (Paris 1971) no. 105; English translation in G. Beckmann - H. Hoffner, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (Atlanta

1996) 98-102; Bryce *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 4) 304-305. The tablet in question contains many erasures; hence it does not follow that events along the East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface or in Greece led to a diminution in status. Scribal error may be responsible, although in that event it can be argued that the scribe at least thought the possibility plausible initially.

6. O. Dickinson, Ahhiyawan Questions (this volume pp. 275-284). I am most grateful to O. Dickinson for sending me his contribution to this *Festschrift* as I was in the process of completing mine. I have both benefited from his insights and been able to remove material from my paper which would have been duplicative.

7. Dickinson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 6); R. Hope Simpson, The Dodecanese and the Ahhiyawa Question, *BSA* 98, 2003, 230. Richard Janko has kindly reminded me that "the name of Pelops' charioteer [is] Myrtilos, which is the West Anatolian (Luwian) form of the Hittite name Mursili. Thus the legend makes Pelops bring his own charioteer from Lydia to Elis" (personal communication of 11 December 2006).

8. S. Morris, Potnia Aswiya: Anatolian Contributions to Greek Religion, in R. Laffineur - R. Hägg (eds), *POTNIA: Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 8th International Aegean Conference, Göteborg, Göteborg University, 12-15 April 2000, Aegaeum* 22 (Liège 2001) 428.

The raids on Hittite territory and on Alasiya – almost certainly Cyprus – conducted by Attarsiya as described in Hittite texts imply a fleet or at least a significant naval squadron controlled by Ahhiyawa or Ahhiyawans. In the reign of Tudhaliya IV around 1230 B.C., the rebel Tarhunaradu of the Seha River Land is said by a Hittite text to escape by boat, in a context which suggests possible reliance on the king of Ahhiyawa for aid (*KUB XXII.13*).⁹ Further, a text indicates that the Hittite king believed that the Ahhiyawan ruler could order Atpa, the ruler of Miletus, to extradite his own father-in-law to the Hittites. The king of Ahhiyawa claims in reply to have given the order, but Atpa's father-in-law has escaped by boat, and subsequently turns up at Ahhiyawa.¹⁰

Whether Ahhiyawa refers to a territorial entity, permanent or shifting, or to a people, or to a generalized ethno-geographical designation like Hurri and Luwiya (Hurrians and Luwians) in the Hittite texts,¹¹ or reflects the first Mycenaean (possibly including Creto-Mycenaean) representatives or elements encountered by the Hittites and hence acted *pars pro toto* we do not know. We may compare the Near Eastern term Yawani (Ionians) used for all Greeks.¹² In this regard, one more possibility requires consideration. Late Helladic rulers may have been identified by lineages rather than loci, and/or traveled between capitals, in a manner very roughly analogous to the later European lineages of Medici, Hapsburgs, Bourbons, Hohenstaufens and Hohenzollerns.¹³ P. Carlier in particular has noted the similarity in names encountered in Linear B tablets from the Late Helladic palatial sites¹⁴ while M. Finkelberg, noting the prevalence in Greek legend and experience of marriage of royal daughters to selected princes from other lineages who then assume kingship, has suggested that “the heroes of Bronze Age Greece saw themselves as the ‘Aiolids’, the ‘Perseids’, the ‘Pelopids’, rather than as the ‘Thebans’, the ‘Mycenaeans’ or the ‘Argives’.”¹⁵

CRETE

Were Creto-Mycenaeans the first Ahhiyawans whom the Hittites encountered? It would not be surprising if the putative Mycenaean conquerors of Crete were the first to head east

9. Hope Simpson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) 221. For alternative readings of this fragmentary tablet from Hattusa and the disputed hypothesis of physical presence of the king of Ahhiyawa in Asia Minor, personally leading his expedition force, cf. Niemeier 1999 *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 4) 152-153 n. 116-118.

10. Hope Simpson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) 219.

11. Bryce *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 5) 62-63.

12. Dickinson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 6). The Roman name Graecia is often said to come from the tribe Graikoi with their eponymous hero Graikos (Hesiod, *Cat.* 5, 3; R. Janko, personal communication of 11 December 2006). Janko adds that the Graikoi “lived on the mainland opposite Euboea; the Romans could

have come across them among the early Euboean colonists of the Bay of Naples.” However, the term was in common use to denote all Greeks by the time of Aristotle, and accordingly the path of transmission may have been different.

13. George I, the first Hanoverian ruler of England, spoke very little English.

14. P. Carlier, *Réflexions sur les relations internationales dans le monde mycénien: y a-t-il eu des hégémonies?* abstract of a paper presented at XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia (Rome, 20-25 February 2006).

15. M. Finkelberg, *Royal Succession in Heroic Greece*, *CIQ* 41, 1991, 313.

and take over or establish sites on the Anatolian coast.¹⁶ At this time (LM II/LH IIB), Linear B becomes the script of Crete and pottery of Mainland shape and decoration soon becomes a predominant influence in the Cyclades and the Dodecanese. The pattern is particularly clear at Miletus on the Anatolian coast where an assemblage typical of a Minoan colony¹⁷ is replaced by one where the pottery is ninety-five percent of Mainland type; in addition, Mainland-type kilns succeed Minoan types, and there are many other indications of Mainland presence.¹⁸ In LM/LH IIIA1, c. 1420-1380 B.C., the physical evidence for links between Creto-Mycenaean Crete and Egypt plus the Near East significantly outweigh those between the Mainland and these areas.¹⁹ The evidence provided by the Linear B tablets plus the excavation of the Palace at Knossos reveal a center controlling 100,000 sheep grazing on one-third of the island of Crete, the production of C1- and D1-type swords superior to any others known, and in general a site larger and more significant than any known site of the time on the Greek Mainland or in the Aegean or the Dodecanese.²⁰ The Attarsiya text of around 1400 B.C. says that a man of Ahhiyawa is able to command an infantry detachment plus a force of 100 chariots²¹ (although this part of the text is reconstructed²²) on the Anatolian coast, while a Linear B tablet from Knossos (Sf[2] 4420) speaks of eighty chariot

16. See C. Bachhuber, Aegean Interest on the Uluburun Ship, *AJA* 110, 2006, 358: "Crete's role in linking the Aegean to the civilizations of the greater Levant is not in doubt. After the crisis on LM IB Crete that marked the end of Minoan civilization, Crete appears to have led the Aegean in resuming interregional exchange activities."

17. W.-D. Niemeier, The Minoans in the South-Eastern Aegean and in Cyprus, in V. Karageorghis - N. Stampolidis (eds), *Proceedings of the International Symposium Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus-Dodecanese-Crete, 16th-6th cent. B.C., Rethymnon, 13-16 May 1997* (Athens 1998) 33-34.

18. W.-D. Niemeier, The Mycenaean Potter's Quarter at Miletus, in R. Laffineur - P. Betancourt (eds), *TEXNH: Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 6th International Aegean Conference, Philadelphia, Temple University, 18-21 April 1996, Aegaeum* 16 (Liège 1997) 347. In Hattusa, in addition to the Hittite texts referring to Ahhiyawa, a bronze saw of an earlier Minoan type was found in a level dating to the 13th century B.C. (P. Neve, Eine hethitische Bronzesäge aus Hattusa-Boğazköy, *IstMitt* 39, 1989, 399-406).

19. E. Cline, *Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea: International Trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean*, *BARIntSer* 591 (Oxford 1994) 9: "A sharp surge may then be detected, for in LH/LM IIIA contexts there are 141 Orientalia and 10 Occidentalia, even though this period lasted

only c. 50 years. . . . Crete seems to be the main area of importation, for there are 107 Orientalia found in LM IIIA contexts on Crete, but only 18 on Mainland Greece, 13 on Rhodes, and three on the Cycladic Islands. There are also 10 Occidentalia found on Crete in LM IIIA contexts, but none elsewhere in the LH/LM IIIA Aegean." It should be borne in mind, however, that there exists a major disparity between Crete and the mainland in terms of the number of excavated IIIA1 settlements; accordingly the numbers cited may be misleading. See also P. Mountjoy, Troia Phase VI f and Phase VI g: The Mycenaean Pottery, *StTroica* 7, 1997, 283.

20. J. T. Killen, The Wool Industry of Crete in the Late Bronze Age, *BSA* 59, 1964, 5; N. K. Sandars, Later Aegean Bronze Swords, *AJA* 67, 1963, 119, 121, 123-127; M. Wiener, LM III Knossos Outside the Palace: Another Approach to the Tablet/Destruction Date Debate, Lecture to the *New York Bronze Age Colloquium (15 February 1984)*; The Nature and Control of Minoan Foreign Trade, in N. H. Gale (ed.), *Bronze Age Trade in the Mediterranean: Papers Presented at the Conference Held at Rewley House, Oxford, in December 1989*, *SIMA* 90 (Jonsered 1991) 331; Collected Works, forthcoming.

21. Laroche *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 5) no. 147; English translation in Beckmann - Hoffner *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 5) 144-151.

22. Kelder *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 3) 144.

Knossos, at Katsambas, the port of Knossos on the north coast of Crete, and at the port of Kommos on the south coast in LM II-III A1 contexts

LOCATING AHHIYAWA

wheels. (The set of tablets from the Room of the Chariot Tablets at Knossos contains a higher proportion of Helladic names – between seventy and ninety percent – than other series, such as the livestock tablets where a very high proportion of apparently non-Greek names appear.²³ The Chariot Tablets may also be earlier in date than the other deposits at Knossos and hence closer in date to the Attarsiya text.) The only known possible reference to Ahhiyawa in the Linear B corpus comes from Knossos tablet C 914 as *A-ka-wi-ja-de* (which may refer to a town in Crete rather than a state since the tablet refers to the dispatch of 100 goats from Knossos).²⁴ Finally, pottery identified by visual analysis as coming from the Gulf of Izmir region has been recognized at ~~the port of Kommos in southern Crete in the LM-III A1 period.~~²⁵ Knossos in LM II-III A1 extended over forty hectares, and was hence in all likelihood still the largest site in the Aegean, if diminished in size from its LM I peak of about seventy-five hectares.

After the LM III A2 destruction of Knossos the picture of course changes. Although Ayia Triada in the south may become a major center, Cretan trade links to the East continue and Cretan trade with the Western Mediterranean increases, it is nevertheless unlikely for the reasons set forth below that the center of the kingdom of Ahhiyawa of the later Hittite texts refers to a site in Crete, whatever the origin of the name of Ahhiyawa.²⁶

RHODES AND KOS

The suggestion that Rhodes formed the center and capital of Ahhiyawa is of long standing, beginning with an article in 1929 by B. Hrozný²⁷ and memorably argued by D. Page as well as E. Vermeule, M. Benzi, C. Gates and S. Sherratt.²⁸ The argument was analyzed per-

23. J. Driessen, *The Scribes of the Room of the Chariot Tablets at Knossos: Interdisciplinary Approach to the Study of a Linear B Deposit*, *Minos* Suppl. 15 (Salamanca 2000) 192.

24. Kelder *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 3) 137; R. Janko, personal communication of 11 December 2006.

25. J. Rutter, *Southwestern Anatolian Pottery from Late Minoan Crete: Evidence for Direct Contacts between Arzawa and Keftiu?*, in M. Wiener (ed.), *Pottery and Society: The Impact of Recent Studies in Minoan Pottery. Gold Medal Colloquium in Honor of Philip P. Betancourt. 104th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, New Orleans, Louisiana, 5 January 2003* (Boston 2006) 138-153; M. Wiener, *Pots and Politics*, *ibid.* 14-16.

26. For those who believe that Knossos continued as a major Cretan center until 1260-1250 B.C. (E. Hallager, *The Mycenaean Palace at Knossos: Evidence for Final Destruction in the IIIB Period* [Stockholm 1977]), this problem is correspondingly less severe, but the

links in LH III A2-B between the Hittite realm and Mycenae in particular, discussed below, remain relevant. Niemeier 1998 *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 4) 17-65.

27. B. Hrozný, *Hethiter und Griechen*, *ArOr* 1, 1929, 323-343.

28. D. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley 1959) 15-16; E. Vermeule, *Greece in the Bronze Age* (Chicago 1972) 272; M. Benzi, *Problems of the Mycenaean Expansion in the South-eastern Aegean*, in E. De Miro - L. Godart - A. Sacconi (eds), *Atti e Memorie del Secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia* (Rome 1996) 967; C. Gates, *Defining Boundaries of a State: The Mycenaean and Their Anatolian Frontier*, in R. Laffineur - W.-D. Niemeier (eds), *POLITEIA: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 5th International Aegean Conference, University of Heidelberg, Archäologisches Institut, 10-13 April 1994*, *Aegaeum* 12 (Liège 1995) 296; S. Sherratt, *Potemkin Palaces and Route-Based Economies*, in S. Voutsaki - J. Killen (eds), *Economy and Politics in the Mycenaean*

ceptively by Sp. Iakovidis himself in 1973 in an article entitled "Rhodes and Ahhiyawa."²⁹ Iakovidis concluded that "the island was not extensively settled until after the middle of IIIB and during IIIC. Consequently, the land and seat of the mighty king with whom Mursilis corresponded cannot have been Rhodes."³⁰ This section of my paper examines to what extent, if any, the picture has changed as a result of the excavations during the thirty-three years since the Iakovidis publication.

The offshore location of Rhodes, matching the description of the Hittite texts, its proximity to the Anatolian coast and the generally Mainland Mycenaean culture of its population, as indicated by the burials in the cemeteries of Moschou Vounara and Makria Vounara near Ialysos in LH IIIA2-IIIB1, form the core of the argument for locating the center of Ahhiyawa in Rhodes. The burials in these cemeteries contain small amounts of gold, silver, electrum and amber,³¹ and the neighboring island of Kos has two warrior burials at Langada.³² The LH IIIA2-IIIB1 population of Rhodes now seems somewhat larger than it appeared a generation ago.³³ The Dodecanese, however, have thus far not produced grand burials or major architecture of the post-Minoan period, and surely nothing to compare with Mycenae/Tiryns or Thebes, or even, with regard to architecture, citadels such as Midea or Gla. No evidence of administrative literacy exists. Trianda/Ialysos, located near the major cemeteries and the most fertile plain of Rhodes, seems the natural Rhodian center, but lacks some of the indicia of a major site or a natural harbor, although a spur of land to the north blocks north winds, offering some protection. The total size of the site at Trianda/Ialysos is still unknown, and it is possible that rescue excavations may yet reveal the existence of a very large site extending across the plain to Mt. Philerimos. Of course it is possible that shoreline changes affect the picture, that an artificial harbor was created in the Bronze Age, that more evidence remains to be discovered under the city of Trianda, or that alluvial floods have covered parts of the site, but on present evidence a capital at Ialysos seems unlikely.³⁴ There is no evidence to date of a significant Bronze Age site under the classical, medieval and modern city of Rhodes despite its excellent harbors. Whether Rhodian ships could have controlled the Strait of Marmara separating Rhodes from the Anatolian mainland is difficult to gauge; the narrower strait between Kos and the mainland is a more obvious potential strategic bottleneck. Indeed, R. Hope Simpson has argued that Kos deserves considera-

Palace States. Proceedings of a Conference held on 1-3 July 1999 in the Faculty of Classics, Cambridge, Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. 27 (Cambridge 2001) 214-238. The literature on the location of Ahhiyawa is vast. W.-D. Niemeier in 1998 (*loc. cit.* [*supra* n. 4]) collected articles by seventy authors and the pace only quickens, with major contributions by Niemeier and Mountjoy (*e.g. loc. cit.* [*supra* n. 1]) among others.

29. Sp. Iakovidis, Rhodes and Ahhiyawa, in *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "The Mycenaean in the Eastern Mediterranean," Nicosia 27th March - 2nd April 1972* (Nicosia 1973) 189-192.

30. Iakovidis *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 29) 192.

31. S. Voutsaki, Economic Control, Power and Prestige in the Mycenaean World: The Archaeological Evidence, in S. Voutsaki - J. Killen (eds), *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 28) 210 n. 39.

32. C. Mee, *Rhodes in the Bronze Age: An Archaeological Survey* (Warminster 1982) 88-89.

33. Hope Simpson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) 225.

34. C. Mee has suggested that perhaps a major site could have existed on the acropolis of Lindos, only to be leveled to make room for the Classical temple, but evidence is lacking (*op. cit.* [*supra* n. 32] 74).

tion as the Ahhiyawan capital because of its central and strategically important position with regard to the East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface. The two Koan warrior burials were noted above. Kos, however, has less indication of extensive population or substantial settlements than Rhodes.³⁵

What does exist is evidence for very close ties between Rhodes and the Argolid. S. Voutsaki notes that such evidence exists in many spheres, from burial practice to iconography, jewelry and weapons. The pottery is particularly notable in this regard. In addition to obvious similarities of shape and motif, clay analysis has shown a high proportion of imports from the Argolid among the cemetery material, in contrast to Kos where the Argolid imports, while major, constitute about half of the total.³⁶ Voutsaki has accordingly suggested the possibility of military or dynastic control from the Argolid.³⁷ R. Janko notes that the dialect of Rhodes in this period would have been Arcado-Cypriot, the dialect closest to the Mycenaean of the Linear B tablets.³⁸

Evaluation of the evidence raises interesting questions. Surely Rhodes and Kos should be regarded as part of an interface including Mūsgebi/Halikarnassos, Iasos, Miletus, Ephesus and Panaztepe, all more or less cut off from inland Anatolia by mountains,³⁹ except where river traffic permits easy (but blockable) communication with the interior, as at Miletus. Each seems to have participated in differing ways in a Mycenaean koiné. More recently the Anatolian coastal plain was for a time part of the domain known as Rhodian Peraea. A ruling family at Ialysos on Rhodes or the Seraglio on Kos may have acted as a semi-independent agent of a ruler in Mainland Greece, with much discretion at times in its agency. A maritime confederacy led by Mycenae or another Mainland power provides another possible model,⁴⁰ as does a Mycenaean proconsul or envoy headquartered on Rhodes or Kos. It is worth noting, contrary to the opinion of some, that the sea passage from Miletus to Rhodes is not necessarily easier than the passage from Miletus to the Greek Mainland, for in good sailing weather the latter presents no problem, with convenient island ports in the Cyclades available en route, whereas the trip from Miletus to Rhodes has some potentially difficult

35. The absence of evidence to date of major or many settlements on Rhodes and Kos may to some extent be an artifact of survey technique, for as Hope Simpson notes, surveys on Rhodes and Kos have been extensive rather than intensive, and that where intensive survey has been conducted, such as those of M. Melas on Karpathos at Saros and Kasos, a higher proportion of settlements to cemeteries has been noted. Hope Simpson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) 223.

36. S. Dietz, *Excavations and Surveys in Southern Rhodes: The Mycenaean Period, Lindos, IV, 1. Results of the Carlsberg Foundation Excavations in Rhodes 1902-1914, Publications of the National Museum, Archaeological Historical Series 22, 1* (Odense 1984); Hope Simpson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) 229.

37. Voutsaki *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 31) 195-213.

38. R. Janko, Seduta di chiusura, in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Rome 2002) 664; *The Iliad: A Commentary IV* (Cambridge 1992) 15 n. 24; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots* (Paris 1968-1980).

39. Mountjoy *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 1) 47; E. Karantzali, *The Mycenaean Cemetery at Pylona on Rhodes* (Oxford 2001) 80; see also Y. Boysal, *New Excavations in Caria, Anadolu 11, 1967, 31-56.*

40. C. Mee, A Mycenaean Thalassocracy in the Eastern Aegean, in E. French - K. Wardle (eds), *Problems in Greek Prehistory. Papers Presented at the Centenary Conference of the British School of Archaeology at Athens, Manchester, April 1986* (Bristol 1988) 301-306.

passages and a perhaps greater possibility of encountering Lycian pirates. In any event, relations over two centuries between Rhodes and/or Kos and a Mainland Greek center or centers were unlikely to have remained fixed, given the exigencies of fate including the frequent brevity of Bronze Age life and the documented incidence of plague, famine and warfare in the period.⁴¹

THE GREEK MAINLAND

It is to the arguments in favor of locating the center of Ahhiyawa on the Greek Mainland that we now turn, and in particular the conflicting arguments favoring Thebes and Mycenae. The claims of other Mainland locations, for example, Pylos, Dimini/Iolkos, and Orchomenos, do not appear compelling, even allowing for the fact that little is known of Orchomenos, which after all is not on the sea.

THEBES

During the past five years, Thebes has gained favor as the putative center of Ahhiyawa and the location of the king whom the Hittite ruler thought capable of ending the raids of Piyamaradu. The advocacy of Thebes has been sparked in particular by recently published translations⁴² of Linear B tablets from Thebes which are said to support the proposition that the tablets reflect a polity with a wide territory and many foreign contacts. B. Sergent in 1994 had already proposed that central Greece from Phocis down through Attica and into the Megarid in the late Mycenaean palatial phase was split into two kingdoms, a western kingdom controlled by Orchomenos and a central and eastern kingdom with Thebes as its capital, comprising eastern Boeotia, most of Euboea, Attica at least as far as Athens and the Megarid,⁴³ a view now partly endorsed by the translations of Aravantinos, Godart and Sacconi.⁴⁴ The translations have provoked controversy, sometimes heated, with many of the

41. After all, in English history the ruler was at times extremely powerful, as in the case of Henry VIII, and at times so weak that the barons could force him to come to the meadows of Runnymede and sign the Magna Carta establishing their rights; moreover, at times the English king ruled much of France, but at other times not.

42. V. Aravantinos - M. Del Frego - L. Godart - A. Sacconi, *Thèbes: Fouilles de la Cadmée* 4 (Pisa 2005) 22 (TH Fq 214.13), 30 (TH Fq 254+255.7), 85 (TH Gp 197.2), 87 (TH Gp 227.1), 88 (TH Gp 231.2).

43. B. Sergent, *Les petits nodules et la Grande Béotie (première partie)*, *REA* 96, 1994, 365.

44. V. Aravantinos - L. Godart - A. Sacconi, *Thèbes: Fouilles de la Cadmée* 1 (Pisa 2001) 355-358;

Aravantinos - Del Frego - Godart - Sacconi *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 42). One particular aspect of the Sergent suggestion that Thebes controlled Athens at this time should be noted, namely that the area proposed would include the mines of Laurion. A recent article by R. Drews follows the suggestion of Onofrio Carruba in 1995 that the Egyptian geographical term usually vocalized as *Tanaju* for a part of Mycenaean Greece, as well as the later term vocalized as *Denyen* from the reign of Ramses III, refer not to the Danaoi of Homer, but Athenai, and that the reason for the Egyptian interest was the silver and copper of Laurion (R. Drews, *The Laurion Mines and a Bronze Age Name for the Greek Mainland*, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 33 [2005] 227-232).

claims questioned.⁴⁵ T. Palaima and others strongly challenge some of the geographic identifications, both with regard to places claimed to be under the control of Thebes and places outside the putative Theban state with which Thebes is said to be in contact, and some of the presumed foreign contacts as well. Palaima further notes that in historical times Thebes had great difficulty in controlling Boeotia, with the border cities always struggling to break free. Coupled with this controversy is another, namely whether the conjecturally restored name *Ka-ga-mu-na-aš* in Hattusa cuneiform tablet *KUB XXVI.91* provided by a putative Ahhiyawan king as a 15th-century (or earlier) ancestor can be identified with the Theban Kadmos. F. Starke⁴⁶ seconded by J. Latacz⁴⁷ believes this to be the case, and this view has been adopted by L. Godart and A. Sacconi.⁴⁸ This suggestion has been dismissed as impossible, however, by most specialists in the Hittite, Luwian and/or Mycenaean and later Greek dialects.⁴⁹ With regard to this and similar questions of etymology, it is appropriate to recall the admonition of Socrates in Plato's *Cratylus*: "If you are permitted to put in and pull out any letters you please, names are easily made, and any name may be adapted to any object."⁵⁰ Moreover, C. Melchert notes that the structure of the text suggests that *Ka-ga-mu-na-aš* is more likely to have been a forebear of the king of Assuwa than the king of Ahhiyawa.⁵¹

In addition to the assertion of wide Theban jurisdiction and influence based on texts, the large size of the area (192,000 sq. m.) surrounded by the walls of Thebes has been noted.⁵²

45. T. Palaima, *Mycenological Perspectives on the Ahhiyawa Question*, paper presented at the workshop *Mycenaeans and Anatolians in the Late Bronze Age: The Ahhiyawa Question* (Montreal 4-5 January 2006).

46. F. Starke, *Troy press conferences* (9 and 11 August 2003).

47. J. Latacz, *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery* (Oxford 2004) 243-244.

48. L. Godart - A. Sacconi, *La géographie des états mycéniens*, *CRAI* April-June 1999, 545.

49. Palaima *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 45); C. Melchert, *Mycenaean and Hittite Diplomatic Correspondence: Fact and Fiction*, paper presented at the workshop *Mycenaeans and Anatolians in the Late Bronze Age: The Ahhiyawa Question* (Montreal 4-5 January 2006); see also J. T. Katz, *Review of Joachim Latacz's Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery*, *JAOS* 2005, 422-425. On *KUB 26.91* see P. Taracha, *Mycenaeans, Ahhiyawa and Hittite Imperial Policy in the West: A Note on KUB 26.91*, in T. Richter - D. Prechel - J. Klinger (eds), *Kulturgeschichte: Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag (Saarbrücken 2001) 417-422.

50. Plato, *Crat.* 414d.

51. Melchert *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 49). Ironically, Finkel-

berg and Janko have gone one step further, noting that if one accepts that "the name that appears in Hittite as Tawagalawa, the brother of the king of Ahhiyawa, represents the Greek name Etewoklewes (which is how it appears in the Linear B tablets from Pylos, in the adjectival form *E-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo*), the later Eteocles (the initial vowel is dropped in the Hittite version)" (R. Janko, personal communication of 11 December 2006; also see H. Güterbock, *Wer war Tawagalawa?*, *Or* 59, 1990, 158 and I. Hajnal, *Troia aus sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht: die Struktur einer Argumentation*, *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 109 [Innsbruck 2003]), then on the same logic involving disturbance of the initial syllable in the Anatolian transcription (with misdivision causing the loss of the initial E and subsequent loss of the digammas in later Greek), the Hittite name *Ka-ga-mu-na-aš* for a Greek ruler, which some have claimed to be a Hittite version of Kadmos of Thebes, may become instead the Hittite version of Agamemnon! Melchert, however, has set forth a number of grounds for regarding this suggestion as wholly implausible (personal communication of 30 January 2007, for which I am most grateful).

52. S. Symeonoglou, *The Topography of Thebes from the Bronze Age to Modern Times* (Princeton 1985) 31.

Of course the total area occupied by a site extends beyond its walls – consider, for example, the ‘lower towns’ of Mycenae and Tiryns.⁵³ Conversely, the walled area of Gla in the nearby Kopais plain is larger still, at approximately 260,000 sq. m.,⁵⁴ but the area within sparsely built upon. The original name of Gla has not survived, site size notwithstanding, unless Gla is to be associated with the site remembered as “Arne”, (described as multi-vined in the *Iliad*⁵⁵ and by later authors as part of the realm of Orchomenos).⁵⁶ The size of the intramural area of a site is of course influenced by the size of the natural feature originally chosen for settlement. In sum, the extent of the intramural area of a site is a poor indicator of the extent of a realm. Another argument for the importance of Thebes may lie in a possible Theban role, perhaps in conjunction with Orchomenos, in the massive engineering project undertaken in the last years of the 14th century B.C. to drain the Kopais basin. (The submerged marshland was drained by means of an ingenious and complex system which involved diverting the courses of six rivers and streams, with the banks protected by massive watertight embankments, and the resulting system supplied with underground drains and channels.⁵⁷) In the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, the Kopais is part of the Boeotian realm, but the Catalogue in this respect may reflect a post-Bronze Age milieu. In later antiquity the feat was attributed solely to Orchomenos.⁵⁸

A further pro-Theban argument rests in the seals of lapis lazuli found in the 1964-65 excavation of Thebes. E. Porada believed them to constitute evidence of state gift exchange between the ruler of Thebes and Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria. Others, however, noting that the seals originate in various periods and cultures, that many are recarved and that their weight totals exactly one mina, believe that the seals constitute a shipment of lapis lazuli as a raw material, thus indicating contact, perhaps indirect, but not necessarily state exchange with the East.⁵⁹ The proposed date of destruction of the relevant locus in Thebes is earlier than the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I in any event.⁶⁰

Accordingly it is appropriate to consider other evidence of distant contact, both with regard to Thebes itself and then in comparison with other centers. A famous Egyptian text

53. See also the preliminary results of the 2002-2006 geopropection survey of the lower city of Mycenae, which has increased our knowledge of the nature and size of the Mycenaean settlement outside the walls (C. Maggidis - A. Stamos, *Detecting Mycenae: Systematic Remote Sensing Survey in the ‘Lower City’ – Towards the Discovery of the Mycenaean Settlement Outside the Citadel* [Oxford 2006], 157-166).

54. Symeonoglou *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 52) 32.

55. *Il.* 2, 507.

56. C. Maggidis, *Mycenae Abroad: Mycenaean Foreign Policy, the Anatolian Frontier, and the Theory of Overextension – Reconstructing an Integrated Causal Nexus for the Decline and Fall of the Mycenaean World*, in P. Kousoulis - K. Magliveras (eds), *Moving*

Across Borders: Foreign Relations, Religion and Cultural Interactions in the Ancient Mediterranean, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 159 (Leuven 2007) 71-98.

57. Sp. Iakovidis, *Γλας Π. Η ανασκαφή 1981-1991*, Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας 173 (Athens 1998); Maggidis *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 56); R. Hope Simpson, *Mycenaean Greece and Homeric Reflections*, in C. A. Rubino - C. W. Shelmerdine (eds), *Approaches to Homer* (Austin 1983) 122-139.

58. Strabo 9, 2, 40; Paus. 9, 17, 2; Diod. 4, 18, 7; discussed in Maggidis *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 56).

59. Cline *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 19) 25-26, 135 no. 19, 151 no. 165; E. Porada, *The Cylinder Seals Found at Thebes in Boeotia*, *AfO* 28, 1981, 68-70, 77.

60. Kelder *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 3) 155.

from a statue base of Amenhotep III (c. 1390-1352 B.C.) from his mortuary temple at Kom el-Hetan may mention Thebes along with Keftiu sites such as Amnisos, Phaistos, Knossos and Kydonia, and the Tanaja sites of Mycenae, Tiryns and Nauplia. Thus even assuming that the *Dq*'s listed on the statue base is Thebes (Thêgwai in a reconstruction of Mycenaean) rather than Zakros in Crete or any of a number of other locations proposed,⁶¹ on the evidence of this text it appears that sites in Crete and the Argolid were of greater interest to Egypt.⁶²

Aside from the lapis lazuli seals discussed above, an ivory scepter head and faience seal from abroad have been found at Thebes. Excavations at Thebes have produced considerable amounts of ivory and banded agate as well.⁶³ Here too, however, Crete and the Argolid outnumbered Thebes in foreign precocities and exotica found. For example, of the fourteen objects associated with Amenhotep, nine came from Mycenae and none from Thebes. In total, there are twenty-nine Egyptian objects from Mycenae, but only one from Thebes.⁶⁴ In general, it is Mycenae, not Thebes, which displays early contact with the East via sites along the former Minoan trade routes, and it is at Mycenae that Minoan and Cycladic artifacts are found, together with Minoan influences on iconography, technology and materials.⁶⁵

With respect to Mycenaean pottery found abroad, the picture is equally one-sided. The overwhelmingly Argive origin of the Mycenaean pottery found on Rhodes has already been noted, and the same picture with regard to imports applies as well to Cyprus. A similar pattern apparently exists with respect to sites along the coast of the Levant and Canaan. E. French and J. Tomlinson report that a large percentage – 80.3 percent – of the LH IIIB pottery tested by neutron activation analysis from various sites came from the Argolid, with Boeotia next at 14.2 percent.⁶⁶ (It should be noted, however, that the sample size at most

61. *Ibid.* 146.

62. Latacz has proposed that the Mukana (Mycenae) of the Amenhotep III statue base inscription is the capital of Danaja/Tanaja, which he would associate with the Danaoi of Homer. Latacz *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 47) 210.

63. O. Krzyszkowska, *Aegean Seals: An Introduction*, *BICS Suppl.* 85 (London 2005) 304; A. Megaw, *Archaeology in Greece, 1963-64*, *ARepLond* 10, 1963-1964, 13; A. Megaw, *Archaeology in Greece, 1964-65*, *ARepLond* 11, 1964-1965, 15. I am grateful to H. Catling for reminding me of these finds, and for his observation that such comparisons depend on the accidents of recovery, which in the case of Thebes is greatly affected by the intensive Byzantine reoccupation of the site.

64. The numbers of Egyptica and Orientalia throughout this paper are taken from Cline *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 19). C. Lambrou-Phillipson, *Hellenorientalia: The Near Eastern Presence in the Bronze Age Aegean ca. 3000-1100 B.C.: Interconnections Based on the Material Record and the Written Evidence; Plus Orientalia: A Ca-*

tologue of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Mitannian, Syro-Palestinian, Cypriot and Asia Minor Objects from the Bronze Age Aegean (Göteborg 1990) gives somewhat different numbers.

65. Maggidis *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 56); M. Wiener, *The Isles of Crete? The Minoan Thalassocracy Revisited*, in D. Hardy - C. Doumas - J. Sakellarakis - P. Warren (eds), *Thera and the Aegean World III, 1. Archaeology. Proceedings of the Third International Congress, Santorini, Greece, 3-9 September 1989* (London 1990) 128-161. The silver stag rhyton of typical Hittite type found in Shaft Grave IV of Grave Circle A at Mycenae may be an early example of state contact (whether direct or via Crete, in the event the rhyton came from Crete), in light of the fact that in a later Amarna Letter (EA 41), Suppiluliuma I informs the pharaoh that a silver rhyton in the form of a stag with a weight of five minae would be sent (W. Moran, *The Amarna Letters* [Baltimore 1992] 114, discussed in Cline *op. cit.* [*supra* n. 19] 68).

66. J. Yellin, *Instrumental Neutron Activation Based Provenance Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, with a Case Study on Mycenaean Pottery*

sites studied was small, sometimes numbering only a few sherds, and that the totals cited are heavily dependent on the sampling from one site, Tell Abu Hawam.) A study of Helladic pottery found at Tell Kazel in Syria found an overwhelming preponderance of imports from the Argolid.⁶⁷ Comparing these results to neutron activation analyses of Helladic pottery found in Egypt at Tell el-Amarna and Qantir⁶⁸ and in the southern Levant at Akko, Tell Abu Hawam and Tell Dan,⁶⁹ the authors suggest that specific Argive workshops may have held 'a certain monopoly' on the export of Helladic ware to these areas.⁷⁰

A final argument in favor of Thebes as the capital of Ahhiyawa, made in particular by W.-D. Niemeier, rests on the proposition that the Achaioi from whom the name Ahhiyawa has been argued to originate were known in the Bronze Age initially in Boeotia, before the Achaioi migrated first to Achaea and then to the East. However, as Burkert has noted, the Achaioi were present in legends and in Homer in various places.⁷¹ In any event, this line of argument does not appear of much salience to the question of the center of Ahhiyawa, for even if one accepts the hypothesis as to the origin of the name, there is no way of knowing where or how the Hittites adopted the name, or whether it referred to a land, a people, or an undifferentiated combination, as previously noted.

from Cyprus, *Archaeometry* 49, 2007, 274-288; E. French - J. Tomlinson, The Contribution of Chemical Analysis to Provenance Studies, in J. Balensi - J.-Y. Monchambert - S. Müller Celka (eds), *La céramique mycénienne de l'Égée au Levant. Hommage à Vronwy Hankey, Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée* 41 (Lyon 2004) 15-25.

67. L. Badre - M.-C. Boileau - R. Jung - H. Mommsen - M. Kerschner, The Provenance of Aegean- and Syrian-Type Pottery Found at Tell Kazel (Syria), *AgLev* 15, 2005, 15-47.

68. *Ibid.* 15; H. Mommsen - T. Beier - U. Diehl - C. Podzuweit, Provenance Determination of Mycenaean Sherds Found in Tell el Amarna by Neutron Activation Analysis, *JASc* 19, 1992, 295-302; A. Leonard - M. Hughes - A. Middleton - L. Schofield, The Making of Aegean Stirrup Jars: Technique, Tradition, and Trade, *BSA* 88, 1993, 105-123; H. Mommsen - T. Beier - A. Hein - C. Podzuweit - E. Pusch - A. Eggebrecht, Neutron Activation Analysis of Mycenaean Sherds from the Town of Ramesses II Near Qantir and Greek-Egyptian Trade Relations, in Ş. Demirci - A. Özer - G. Summers (eds), *Archaeometry 94: The Proceedings of the 29th International Symposium on Archaeometry, Ankara 9-14 May 1994* (Ankara 1996) 169-178; P. Mountjoy - H. Mommsen, Mycenaean Pottery from Qantir-Piramesse, Egypt, *BSA* 96, 2001, 123-155.

69. Badre - Boileau - Jung - Mommsen - Kerschner

op. cit. (*supra* n. 67) 15; F. Asaro - I. Perlman, Provenience Studies of Mycenaean Pottery Employing Neutron Activation Analysis, in *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium "The Mycenaeans in the Eastern Mediterranean," Nicosia 27th March - 2nd April 1972* (Nicosia 1973) 213-224; J. Gunneweg - T. Dothan - I. Perlman - S. Gitin, On the Origin of Pottery from Tel Mique-Ekron, *BASOR* 264, 1986, 3-16; J. Yellin - A. Maeir, The Origin of the Pictorial Krater from the 'Mycenaean' Tomb at Tel Dan, *Archaeometry* 34, 1992, 31-36; S. Hoffman - V. Robinson, Appendix: Neutron Activation Groupings of Imported Material from Tell Abu Hawam, in C. Zerner - P. Zerner - J. Winder (eds), *Proceedings of the International Conference Wace and Blegen - Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age 1939-1989. Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens, December 2-3, 1989* (Amsterdam 1993) 7-10; Leonard - Hughes - Middleton - Schofield *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 68); H. Mommsen - J. Maran, Production Places of Some Mycenaean Pictorial Vessels. The Contribution of Chemical Pottery Analysis, *OpAth* 25/26, 2000/2001, 95-106; French - Tomlinson *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 66).

70. Badre - Boileau - Jung - Mommsen - Kerschner *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 67) 15.

71. W. Burkert, *History in Tales and History of Tales: Reflexions on Homer*, n.d.

MYCENAE

Mycenae is regarded by many as the preeminent Late Helladic site and likely center of the realm of Ahhiyawa.⁷² Some of the arguments have been foreshadowed in the foregoing discussion of the claims of Thebes, namely the preeminent position of Argive pottery abroad and the dominant place of Mycenae with respect to contacts with Egypt and the Levant, to which we may add Cyprus, for it is only the Argolid which has strong ties with Cyprus in the 13th century B.C.⁷³

Further consideration of the general position of Mycenae is in order. First, there seems little doubt that Mycenae at the height of its power in LH IIIA1-III B1, c. 1420-1240 B.C., controlled at the least the entire Argolid, with Tiryns serving as the principal port.⁷⁴ The grandeur of the Mycenaean architectural project, the concentration at Mycenae of shaft graves and tholoi, the number of imposing structures outside its walls (such as Petsas House),⁷⁵ and its central position in a road network extending both north and south and including the Corinthia, all speak of the pivotal role of Mycenae.⁷⁶ Further still, we may note the astonishing similarity of pottery, administration, writing, architecture, jewelry, weapons, burial practices and iconography throughout the Mycenaean world, and especially the similarity of its palaces from Thebes to Pylos.⁷⁷ As to pottery, J. Maran has stated that "the Argolid was during the entire palatial period much more dynamic in the creation of new pottery forms and styles than Messenia and Boeotia."⁷⁸ It is difficult to believe that these great similarities do not emanate from a single center, or that the center in question is not Mycenae, even if the engine of transmission may be limited to the cultural impact of the predominant center – an illustration of what has been called the 'Versailles effect.'⁷⁹ The lack

72. Iakovidis *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 29) 190; Hope Simpson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 7) 205; Dickinson *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 6).

73. J. Maran has suggested that the noteworthy Cypriot ties with Tiryns in LH III B may have required Hittite consent, given the predominant Hittite role along the Near Eastern coast in this period (personal communication of 27 November 2006).

74. J. Maran has noted the dependence of Tirynthian architecture on Mycenae. J. Maran, Mycenaean Citadels as Performative Space, in J. Maran - C. Juwig - H. Schwengel - U. Thaler (eds), *Constructing Power: Architecture, Ideology and Social Practice, Geschichte Forschung und Wissenschaft* 19 (Hamburg 2006) 82-84.

75. K. Shelton, personal communication of 5 November 2003; K. Shelton, The Excavation of Petsas House at Mycenae: Drinking and Dumping, paper presented at the *Archaeological Institute of America 104th Annual Meeting* (New Orleans 3-6 January 2003).

76. See generally J. Wright, The Social Production

of Space and the Architectural Reproduction of Society in the Bronze Age Aegean during the 2nd Millennium B.C.E., in Maran - Juwig - Schwengel - Thaler (eds), *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 74) 49-69.

77. Sherratt *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 28) 215. The great tholos tomb at Orchomenos so closely resembles the Treasury of Atreus at Mycenae that Dörpfeld thought them both by the same architect (Kelder *op. cit.* [*supra* n. 3] 157).

78. J. Maran, personal communication of 19 April 2006, for which I am most grateful. See also the conclusions of P. Mountjoy, *Regional Mycenaean Decorated Pottery* (Rahden 1999) 15-58.

79. M. Wiener, Crete and the Cyclades in LM I: The Tale of the Conical Cups, in R. Hägg - N. Marinatos (eds), *The Minoan Thalassocracy: Myth and Reality. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 31 May - 5 June, 1982, ActaAth* (Series 4) 32 (Stockholm 1984) 17.

of major change in certain elements of the package over 150 years is notable as well. The similarity of personal names contained in the Linear B tablets is also worth considering, particularly in light of the possibility of interlocking ruling families which it raises. Lastly, there is the matter of the tradition. If, as M. West suggests, the Homeric epics were intended for later Thessalian and Euboean audiences, the predominance of Mycenae in them is all the more striking.⁸⁰

One final matter requires consideration, namely the concentration on present evidence of Hittite influence, particularly in the realm of architecture, at Mycenae and Tiryns. The similarities of the corbelled vaults of the Hattusa postern gates (based on P. Neve's typology) with those of the late 13th-century Argolid have been stressed by Maran, who believes that the technological evidence points to contacts on a high political level.⁸¹ Others have pointed to the general Kastenmauer construction of fortification walls,⁸² the working of the stones with tubular drills⁸³ and the use of pendulum saws.⁸⁴ (Greek legends speak of the west Anatolian origin of the Atreid dynasty at Mycenae and the construction of the walls of Tiryns by giants from Lycia. As to the giants, of course geographical terms migrate, but the more obvious source of the legend is the prowess of Lycia in the building of monumental tombs in the Classical and Hellenistic periods.⁸⁵) It is unlikely, especially given the relationships discussed, that the Hittite correspondence, which covers every polity along the Mediterranean coast, would not mention the Mycenaean sites of the Interface, and indeed Mycenaean Greece in general. (The relative scarcity of Mycenaean pottery found in the Hittite heartland around Hattusa does not seem significant in this context, for it is unlikely that perfumed oil and wine would have been carried long distances overland and up mountains in fragile containers, nor is it likely that merchants would have carried open vessels long distances as gifts. Rather oil and wine are generally only carried long distances by water, and drinking vessels are exchanged through merchants', captains' and/or sailors' trade.)

80. M. West, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, *JHS* 108, 1988, 151-172.

81. J. Maran, *Architektonische Innovation im spämykenischen Tiryns - Lokale Bauprogramme und fremde Kultureinflüsse*, in A. Kyriatsoulis (ed.), *Alt-hellenische Technologie und Technik von der prähistorischen bis zur hellenistischen Zeit mit Schwerpunkt auf der prähistorischen Epoche. Tagung 21.-23. 03. 2003 in Ohlstadt/Obb., Deutschland* (Weilheim 2004) 270-274; see also Maggidis *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 56); U. Thaler, *Ahhiyawa and Hatti: Palatial Perspectives*, in S. Antoniadou - A. Pace (eds), *Mediterranean Crossroads* (Athens 2007) 291-323.

82. Sp. Iakovidis, *Late Helladic Citadels on Mainland Greece*, *Monumenta Graeca et Romana* 4 (Leiden

1983) 106; Niemeier 1998 *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 4) 43; P. Grossmann, *Zur Unterburgmauer von Tiryns*, *AA* 1967, 100.

83. Niemeier 1998 *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 4) 43; Neve *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 18) 405.

84. Niemeier 1998 *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 4) 43; E.-L. Schwandner, *Der Schnitt im Stein: Beobachtungen zum Gebrauch der Steinsäge in der Antike*, in A. Hoffmann - E.-L. Schwandner - W. Hoepfner - G. Brands (eds), *Bautechnik der Antike, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut: Diskussionen zur archäologischen Bauforschung* 5 (Mainz 1991) 218-223.

85. Thuc. 1, 9, 2; Strabo 8, 6, 11; Paus. 2, 25, 7-8; Apol. 2, 2, 1, noted in Cline *op. cit.* (*supra* n. 19) 69.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Relations between Mycenae and the rest of the Greek Mainland, the Aegean and the Anatolian Interface surely did not remain fixed over two centuries, particularly given the uncertain outcomes of succession, plague, famine and war. In the Interface alone, we have textual evidence of all these factors at work. Change in relationships is evident as well. Arzawa is independent of complete Hittite rule at times, as shown by Arzawa's diplomatic correspondence with the pharaoh in Egypt reflected in the Amarna Tablets,⁸⁶ but not at others. The fortunes of Millawanda change as well.⁸⁷ At times relations between Ahhiyawa and the Hittites are seemingly tense, if not hostile; at other times, relations seem friendly. Both earlier Minoan and later Iron Age evidence show that both shores of the Aegean were connected, and also that they were partly unified when there was an imperial power.⁸⁸ Moreover, joint colonizing ventures such as marked later Greek efforts are conceivable between Mycenaean centers, especially given the links noted above.

All things considered, the preeminence of Mycenae and the Argolid in the 14th to 13th centuries B.C. seems clear. Accordingly, Mycenae must be considered the likely center in this period of the state known to the Hittites as Ahhiyawa.⁸⁹

MALCOLM H. WIENER

86. M. Georgiadis, *The South-Eastern Aegean in the Mycenaean Period: Islands, Landscape, Death and Ancestors*, BARIntSer 1196 (Oxford 2003) 112; O. Gurney, *The Hittites* (London 1990) 22.

87. Niemeier 1998 *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 4).

88. Wiener *loc. cit.* (*supra* n. 65).

89. I trust the Honorand will be content with this conclusion.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ
ΚΕΝΤΡΟΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΟΣ

ΣΕΙΡΑ ΜΟΝΟΓΡΑΦΙΩΝ

6

ΔΩΡΟΝ

ΤΙΜΗΤΙΚΟΣ ΤΟΜΟΣ ΓΙΑ ΤΟΝ ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΗ
ΣΠΥΡΟ ΙΑΚΩΒΙΔΗ

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ
ΔΕΣΠΟΙΝΑ ΔΑΝΙΗΛΙΔΟΥ



ΑΘΗΝΑ 2009

© ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ
ΚΕΝΤΡΟΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΟΣ
Αναγνωστοπούλου 14
106 73 Αθήνα
Τηλ. 210-3664612 – FAX 210-3602448

ISSN 1106-9260
ISBN 978-960-404-160-2