

The Aegean and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age  
Interconnections, Intermediaries and Interpretations

Volume 1

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the  
University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
by

**Konstantinos Georgakopoulos**

September 2009

# CONTENTS

## VOLUME I

Abstract	vii
Acknowledgments	viii
Introduction	1
1. Geographical and chronological context	7
1.1. Geography	7
1.2. Aegean Relative Chronology	9
1.3. Aegean Absolute Chronology	10
1.4. Hittite Chronology	11
2. Methodology	12
2.1. General methodological issues	13
2.2. The ambiguous nature of the data	15
<i>i. Archaeological “facts”</i>	15
<i>ii. Historical “facts”</i>	16
<i>iii. Linguistic “facts”</i>	17
3. The political geography of western Anatolia during the second Millennium BC: the archival material	18
3.1. History of research	18
3.2. Hittite foreign policy	20
3.3. Western Anatolia during the first half of the second Millennium BC	23
3.4. The western Anatolian kingdoms: the period of independence	23

3.5. The Arzawa Lands: the period of vassalage	27
3.6. The case of Lukka Land	29
3.7. Conclusion	30
4. Case study sites	32
4.1. Müskebi	32
<i>i. Geographical information and physical environment</i>	32
<i>ii. Late Bronze Age tombs</i>	32
4.2. Iasos	34
<i>i. Geographical information and physical environment</i>	34
<i>ii. History of the excavations</i>	34
<i>iii. Middle Bronze Age</i>	34
<i>iv. Late Bronze Age</i>	35
<i>Minoan/ising elements</i>	35
<i>Mycenaean elements</i>	37
4.3. Miletos	38
<i>i. Geographical information and physical environment</i>	38
<i>ii. A brief history of research</i>	38
<i>iii. The Middle Bronze Age Miletos</i>	38
<i>Miletos III</i>	38
<i>The Aegean elements</i>	38
<i>The indigenous elements</i>	39
<i>iv. The Late Bronze Age Miletos</i>	40
<i>Miletos IV</i>	40
<i>The Aegean elements</i>	40
<i>The indigenous elements</i>	43

<i>Miletos V</i>	43
<i>The Aegean elements</i>	43
<i>The indigenous elements</i>	45
<i>Miletos VI</i>	45
<i>The Aegean elements</i>	45
<i>The indigenous elements</i>	47
<i>The possible Hittite/central Anatolian connection</i>	47
<i>v. Conclusion</i>	48
<b>4.4. Çine-Tepecik</b>	49
<i>i. Geographical information and history of research</i>	49
<i>ii. The Mycenaean cultural impact</i>	49
<b>4.5. Aphrodisias</b>	51
<i>i. Geographical information and history of research</i>	51
<i>ii. Middle Bronze Age Aphrodisias</i>	51
<i>iii. Late Bronze Age Aphrodisias</i>	52
<b>4.6. Ephesos</b>	54
<i>i. Ayasoluk</i>	54
<i>ii. Artemision</i>	56
<i>iii. Kuşadası – Yılanlı Burun – Kadı Kalesi</i>	56
<i>iv. Conclusion</i>	56
<b>4.7. Bakla Tepe</b>	58
<i>i. Geographical information and history of research</i>	58
<i>ii. Late Bronze Age material</i>	58
<b>4.8. Bademgediği Tepe (Puranda?)</b>	60
<i>i. Geographical information and history of research</i>	60

ii. <i>The Aegean/ised material</i>	60
4.9. Çeşme	63
i. <i>History of research</i>	63
ii. <i>Middle Bronze Age</i>	63
<i>Çeşme-Bağlararası Phase 2b</i>	63
<i>Çeşme-Bağlararası Phase 2a</i>	65
iii. <i>Late Bronze Age</i>	65
<i>Çeşme-Bağlararası Phase 1</i>	65
<i>The Mycenaean phase</i>	66
iv. <i>Conclusion</i>	66
4.10. Liman Tepe	68
i. <i>Geographical information and history of research</i>	68
ii. <i>Middle Bronze Age</i>	68
iii. <i>Late Bronze Age</i>	69
4.11. Beycesultan	71
i. <i>Geographical information and a brief history of research</i>	71
ii. <i>Middle Bronze Age</i>	71
iii. <i>Late Bronze Age</i>	73
4.12. Panaztepe	75
i. <i>Geographical information and a brief history of research</i>	75
ii. <i>The Late Bronze Age cemetety</i>	75
4.13. Troy	77
5. Sites with Aegean material in Anatolia	80
5.1. North-western Anatolia – North of the Gediz	80
5.2. Central-western Anatolia – Between the Büyük Menderes and Gediz	81

5.3. South-western Anatolia – South of the Büyük Menderes	82
5.4. Central Anatolia	84
5.5. Cilicia/Eastern Anatolia	86
5.6. Northern Anatolia /The Northern coast	88
5.7. Southern Anatolia/The South Coast	88
6. Anatolian objects in the Aegean	90
6.1. Crete	90
<i>i. Middle Bronze Age</i>	90
<i>ii. The case of Malia</i>	93
<i>iii. Late Bronze Age</i>	94
6.2. Mainland Greece	95
6.3. The Aegean Islands	98
6.4. The theory of a possible Hittite embargo against the Mycenaeans in the Late Bronze Age	99
7. The linguistic connection: Anatolian evidence in the Aegean scripts	101
8. The Ahhiyawa Question	105
9. Minoan Crete, relations with Anatolia and the Ahhiyawa question: A re-assessment of the evidence	118
9.1. Introduction	118
9.2. Minoanisation	120
9.3. Anatolian objects in Crete	121
9.4. Minoan presence in Anatolia	122
9.5. Minoans in the eastern Mediterranean context	125
9.6. Did the Minoans and Hittites know each other?	126

9.7. The LM IB destructions in Crete and the role of the Mycenaeans	127
9.8. The early Mycenaean presence in Aegean islands and in western Anatolia	129
9.9. The appearance of <i>Ahhiyawa</i>	130
9.10. Some linguistic evidence	131
9.11. Evaluation and interpretation of the existing information	133
9.12. The transition period in the Aegean. A view from the Egyptian and Hittite sources	134
<b>10. Mycenaeans in western Anatolia</b>	<b>139</b>
10.1. Introduction	139
10.2. The earlier periods	140
10.3. The 14 <sup>th</sup> and 13 <sup>th</sup> centuries: evidence for extensive contacts	141
10.4. Possible Anatolian – Aegean influences and interactions in fortification architecture	144
10.5. The geographical extent of Mycenaean presence in Anatolia	145
10.6. The character of the Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia	147
10.7. The ambiguous nature of Hittite archival material as an explanation of the Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia	149
<b>11. The role of western Anatolian in the Late Bronze Age: Problems, arguments and interpretations</b>	<b>154</b>
11.1. General issues	154
11.2. Western Anatolian reliefs and inscriptions: evidence for cultural and political autonomy	162
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>166</b>

## **VOLUME II**

<b>Appendix</b>	<b>171</b>
1. Ahhiyawa Texts	171
2. List of kings in western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age	197
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>199</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>201</b>
<b>List of maps and tables</b>	<b>237</b>
<b>List of figures</b>	<b>238</b>
<b>Maps and tables</b>	<b>253</b>
<b>Figures</b>	<b>257</b>



## Abstract

During the Late Bronze Age (*ca* 1600-1100 B.C), the civilisations and ethnic groups of the eastern Mediterranean developed close interactions. These led to the formation of alliances, treaties and cultural exchanges through diplomacy, war and trade between powerful kingdoms, independent cities and ambitious rulers. The aim of this thesis is to examine the range of relationships and contacts that existed between the Aegean and Anatolia within the broader context of the interactions of the eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age, emphasising the importance of western Anatolia as a connecting link in the transmission of various cultural characteristics. The starting point is the perspectives of the population of western Anatolia, while the archaeological material from the area and archival sources from Hittite archives and the Linear B tablets of Mycenaean Greece will also be studied. Another key issue is a critique of previous research, which has mainly focused on written sources, often largely ignoring archaeological data. This approach, based on post-colonial perspectives, aims to objectively map the archaeology of the study area during the Late Bronze Age. The data is presented in the form of selected case study sites followed by discussion of a number of key issues that relate the research themes to the data, including the definition of the identity of local western Anatolian populations and the Aegean presence and Hittite activities in the region.

The thesis is divided into 11 chapters. In Chapter 1 the geographical context is presented, while there is a brief analysis of the recent theories on Aegean and Anatolian chronology in the Late Bronze Age. Chapter 2 clarifies the methodological issues that are developed in this research and highlights characteristic examples that underpin the author's arguments. In Chapters 3 and 4 the political geography of western Anatolia during the second millennium, as described in the archival material from Hattusa, and the case study sites – thirteen in total – are extensively examined. The next Chapters, 5 and 6, deal with sites with Aegean material in Anatolia and Anatolian objects in the Aegean respectively, providing a summary of the latest available information. The linguistic context, another important aspect of Aegean – Anatolian contacts, and the Ahhiyawa Question, the most frequently discussed aspect of these relations, are examined in the following Chapters, 7 and 8 respectively. The chapters that follow, 9-11, are crucial to underlining the author's interpretations and ideas in this research. Specifically, in Chapter 9 a new approach to the question of Minoan – Anatolian relations through the re-evaluation of the existing evidence and an alternative suggestion concerning the origin of the first Ahhiyawa people from Crete are presented. Chapter 10 deals with the character of Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia and its importance in the cultural and political affairs of the area. The role of western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age is examined in Chapter 11. Finally, in the conclusion, a synopsis of the main arguments and suggestions for further research are proposed.

## Acknowledgements

This thesis could not have been completed without the aid and generosity of numerous individuals and organisations.

To begin with, I would like to thank IKY (Ιδρυμα Κρατικών Υποτροφιών – State Scholarships Foundation) for their financial support during the first three years of my research. Many thanks are also owed to the School of Archaeology, Classics and Egyptology, University of Liverpool, for their grant (Peet Travel Award) towards financing my fieldtrip in central Anatolia in May 2009.

Many friends and colleagues provided me with useful information and advice, helping me to overcome various obstacles: I would like to thank Dr. Vasif Şahoğlu not only for his hospitality in Ankara (May 2009) but also for his kindness in giving me a copy of his paper – not yet published at that time – about Çeşme. Dr. Angelos Papadopoulos was always a supportive friend who helped me a great deal during my first years in Liverpool with many issues concerning my research. Dr. Yannis Galanakis discussed many aspects of my thesis with me, while Sila Mangaloğlu-Votruba and Dr. Neyir Kolankaya Bostancı provided me useful information about Limantepe and Bakla Tepe respectively. Dr. Ourania Kouka was always a useful advisor, while Dr. Gareth Owens offered his advice on the linguistic part of this research with great enthusiasm. Professor Diamantis Panagiotopoulos helped me to understand through our discussions the cultural, social and political situation in Crete during the LMI – II periods. I am also grateful to Professor Hayat Erkanal for his permission to view and include here photographs from Limantepe, and to Dr. Tayfun Yıldırım for his permission to take photos of the vase of Hüseyidede at the Çorum Archaeological Museum. Professor Yannis Sakellarakis offered me his encouragement and assistance during our stimulating discussions. His interest in my topic and his innovative thoughts and ideas were a great motivation for me to continue this research more actively.

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Iris Tzachili, the person who, many years ago, introduced me to the Prehistoric Archaeology of the Aegean at the

University of Crete. During all these years she has been a supervisor, a collaborator in various projects and, most of all, a very good and supportive friend.

I cannot forget the people with whom I mainly, although not to say exclusively, have shared many good times during my stay in Liverpool. Specifically, Adina Dudau and Panos Grammatikopoulos, my housemates and my “people” all these years, Ellie Tsioli, a trustworthy friend and very good company during the last months, Vassilis Ioakimidis, Dimitris Tsovolos, Kosmas Panagiotidis, Vasiliki Pappa, Leonardo Lari and Francesca Biagi, all of them special friends and amazing people. I would also like to refer particularly to my fellow-students Ali Çifçi and Françoise Chircop, who variously offered me their aid.

A million thanks are owed to Susan Williams for proof-reading this text. Her comments and observations improved without doubt the final version of this thesis and I would like to stress that her contribution was more than important.

Moreover, I would like to thank Elpida Syngelaki for reviewing the English of my first texts, offering me her assistance in the illustration of this thesis and, generally, for her support and patience all these years.

Professor Christopher Mee, my second supervisor, guided me wisely and he has always been eager to discuss with me any aspect of my research, while he honoured me with his interest and trust.

I am enormously indebted to Dr. Alan Greaves, who has been not only a very cooperative supervisor but also a good friend from my first days in Liverpool. I do not exaggerate in saying that his contribution was more than crucial for this research. Alan is without doubt the ideal supervisor that any student could have.

This thesis would not have been possible without the love and encouragement of my family. Their financial, emotional and psychological support has undoubtedly been very crucial for me. I would like to express my special thanks to my sisters Aphrodite and Maria and particularly to my parents Charilaos and Evangelia, to whom I dedicate this work.

## Introduction

The interconnections and relationships that existed between ancient peoples is an intriguing topic. The Ahhiyawa Question and the possible relations between Mycenaeans and Hittites specifically, has been the focus of the author's research interest since his Masters dissertation. Upon starting research at the University of Liverpool his first goal was to explore further these contacts between the Aegean and Anatolian cultures – the Mycenaean and the Hittite, respectively. Both cultures have been subject to intensive study and are generally well understood through their archaeological and archival material.

In this research the aim of the author is to re-evaluate and re-interpret the broader Aegean-Anatolian relationships in the Late Bronze Age by examining the available archaeological and archival sources relevant to the topic. In particular, he focuses on the archaeological evidence retrieved from Mainland Greece, from the Aegean islands, and from 13 case study sites of western Anatolia. Moreover, he examines written sources from the Hittite and Egyptian archives. The original contributions presented in this thesis could be summarised as follows: firstly, the term Ahhiyawa may have originally referred to Minoans, before it was applied to Mycenaeans, and secondly, western Anatolia can be seen as an area with distinct cultural entities in the Late Bronze Age if one looks beyond the currently dominating Aegean-centric, Hittite-centric and Trojan-centric perspectives.

At this point it would be useful to note the work that has already been conducted in the field of Late Bronze Age western Anatolian Archaeology by previous scholars; most especially, Christopher Mee's articles (1978; 1998) on Aegean – Anatolian relations remain basic sources of information for any researcher. The annual newsletters in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (AJA) on the archaeology of Asia Minor/Anatolia/Turkey have offered updated information, while the preliminary reports in from *Kazı Sonuçlar Toplantısı* (KST) and *Araştırma Sonuçlar Toplantısı* (AraşST) have also enriched scholars' knowledge by offering primary evidence from various archaeological projects. Important monographs such as those about Beycesultan and Aphrodisias have also provided detailed information

on the material culture of key sites, while the activities and numerous publications of IRERP in the Izmir region, the German excavations at Miletos and the Italian excavations at Iasos have contributed enormously to the understanding of the archaeology of the area. Moreover, the recent excavations that have been undertaken by Turkish colleagues at various sites in western Anatolia such as Çine-Tepecik and Bademgediği Tepe offer important new potential for the further development of our understanding of the archaeological issues of the area beyond the coast. However, it should be noted that, in the author's opinion, there is as yet no book that deals with western Anatolia as a place of separate cultural entities. For example, the recent book *The Luwians* (C. Melchert (ed.) 2003) approaches the history of the population of the Late Bronze Age Anatolia from a Hittite perspective, utilising mainly archival material from Hattusa, rather than seeking to balance that material with archaeological evidence and Aegean-centric perspectives.

Moreover, it is necessary to note briefly the previous research into the so-called 'Ahhiyawa Question', a topic which still remains fundamental to researchers of Aegean–Anatolian interactions. Shortly after Emil Forrer (1924) first put forward his theory that the Homeric Achaeans were mentioned in the Hittite texts (see 105) both the adherents and the opponents of this idea enthusiastically promoted their arguments for or against Forrer's proposition. On the one hand, there were those who considered that 'Ahhiyawa' was used in connection with the Mycenaean world, or a part of it, and who have located Ahhiyawa in mainland Greece and/or on the Aegean islands and south-western Anatolia - specifically, Forrer (1924; 1928; 1930; 1937), Schachermeyer (1935), Hrozny (1943), Hammond (1959; 1967), Huxley (1960), Liverani (1962; 1963; 1988), Güterbock (1983; 1984; 1990), Bryce (1989a; 1989b), Gates (1995), and Hope-Simpson (2003). On the other hand, opponents of the Ahhiyawa=Mycenaean Greece equation have variously located Ahhiyawa in Thrace (Mellaart 1968; 1986b; 1993; Muhly 1974; Hoddinott 1981; Easton 1984; Macqueen 1986), the Troad (Mellaart 1958), and Cilicia/Pamphylia (Sommer 1932; Kosak 1980; 1981). Although a definitive solution to this problem can never be proven, the majority of scholars have generally accepted Forrer's suggestion.

It should also be noted that the topic of the Aegean-Anatolian interconnections was until recently strongly connected with the 'Ahhiyawa Question'. The scholars who have dealt with this question and its variations have also examined in their texts various aspects of the question of Aegean-Anatolian interactions. The priority, however, was the identification of Ahhiyawa and not of Aegean-Anatolian contacts from an archaeological perspective, some notable exceptions though should be mentioned (i.e Mee 1978; 1998; Aruz 1993). In recent years, however, the picture has changed; many scholars focus on the archaeological aspects of these contacts, and place emphasis on issues related to the material culture of both areas, while trying not to be influenced by the 'Ahhiyawa Question', as can be seen for instance in *Emporia* (R. Laffineur - E. Greco (eds.), 2005).

In the course of this research it became apparent that perpetuating previous Hittite-centric or Aegean-centric approaches to understanding these interactions and interconnections would probably add little new information and would serve only to exacerbate the complexity of current academic debate. A new approach was necessary and, although it was difficult to entirely avoid traditional schools of thought, the author has approached the situation differently. In this thesis he has attempted to make it clear that the Mycenaeans and the Hittites were not the only players in the intercultural exchanges taking place in the broader Aegean-Anatolian milieu. In his opinion it is important and necessary to seek to understand the local peoples' perspectives on their engagement with the broader Bronze Age world. In other words, it has been his objective to view all these different cultures and societies from their own perspectives, whenever possible.

For example, as will be discussed further below, the so-called 'Ahhiyawa Question' has been examined from a Hittite perspective, rather than from the more prevalent Mycenaean point of view. Detaching the above issue from the Homeric *Achaioi*, the author has attempted to understand how the Hittites might have perceived a people far to their west and surrounded by water. The conclusion of this new line of enquiry has been that the people of Hatti, or to be precise, the Hittite scribes, used the term 'Ahhiyawa' to describe the population of the Aegean in general throughout the period in question.

Moreover, the role of the local population of western Anatolia in the creation, development and transmission of various cultural characteristics in the broader area of the Aegean and Anatolia can be seen to have been much more important than previously thought. These local people decided on their needs, they served their own purposes, they adopted or rejected characteristics from neighbouring cultures at their own will and, finally, they constituted cultural entities in their own right.

At this point it is necessary to briefly examine the theories that have been put forward about the character (both cultural and political) of Western Anatolia.<sup>1</sup> To begin with, Keith Branigan's (1981: 23-33) models of Minoan 'colonies' (governed colony, settlement colony and community colony) are now widely recognized and have been used as a basis for debate surrounding the Minoan presence in western Anatolia (e.g. Greaves 2002: 67). However, such a discussion has no value in the cases of Iasos, Akbük-Teichioussa, Tavşan Adası, Çeşme and Didyma, (see Chapters 4-5) as there is not sufficient material to provide answers and only hypotheses can be put forward. But even for Miletos (see Chapter 4) there is still much scope for debate about the precise nature of the Minoan presence, because the very limited extent of the excavated area<sup>2</sup> is not sufficient to apply any of Branigan's models (Greaves 2007: 8).<sup>3</sup>

A different approach explains the phenomenon of the Mycenaean presence in the eastern Aegean – western Anatolian area in terms of acculturation. Mountjoy (1998) refutes the idea of any immigration from the Greek mainland, although she highlights the differences in the spread of Mycenaean influence in what she calls the 'Eastern Aegean – West Anatolian Interface'. She states that the Southern Interface

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'western Anatolia' in this thesis refers to the central – western and south – western parts of Anatolia. It should be noted here that although the Troad is geographically included in western Anatolia it is a different case study site, as will be argued elsewhere in this research.

<sup>2</sup> Only ca 3.5% of the settlement of Miletos has been so far excavated, while it has been estimated to cover 50,000m<sup>2</sup> (Greaves 2007: 8; 2002: 60; Mee 1978: 135-136; Niemeier 2005a: pl. 1).

<sup>3</sup> However, the excavator of the site is inclined to believe that Branigan's 'settlement colony' model applies in the case of Miletos (Niemeier 2005a: 9).

absorbed the Mycenaean culture more easily because it had already been exposed to much Minoan influence, and she especially highlights what she calls the 'East Aegean Koine'.

It is an undeniable fact that many scholars (i.e. Rowland 1987) tend to see western Anatolia in the way Cline (2008) sees Troy and the Troad, as a "contested periphery".<sup>4</sup> It is beyond the remit of this thesis to examine the validity of Cline's argument with regard to Troy; however it is useful to examine whether this model might reasonably be applied to western Anatolia. The term 'contested periphery' is defined as "a peripheral region for which one or more core regions compete" (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997: 37). The aforementioned term has geographical, political and economic implications, since such a region is almost always located between two larger political entities (empires, kingdoms etc.). Additionally, due to its geographical location a 'contested periphery' is also likely to be an area of intense military activity (Cline 2008: 12). First of all it must be made clear whether western Anatolia constitutes a peripheral region between two culturally and politically strong 'core' areas, the Aegean and Hittite central Anatolia in this case. As will be demonstrated in this thesis, the material culture from western Anatolia reveals that, except for some limited Aegean presence in the coastal zone, the influences from neighbouring cultures appear to have been minor. It is apparent that western Anatolia, at least in terms of its archaeological material, cannot be considered as a 'contested periphery' of either the Minoan/Mycenaean or the Hittite cultures. In addition, nobody can claim that western Anatolia lacked the necessary hinterland and natural resources to become a core area itself.

The author is aware of the above different models of the Aegean-Anatolian interaction, however he chooses to follow an alternative way. As will be analysed later (Chapter 2) the distinct 'local' Western Anatolian perspective is in-line with recent post-colonial approaches to archaeology.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cline argues that the concept of "a contested periphery" is a viable part of World Systems Theory. Generally speaking, this is a modern view of world affairs according to which there is a (social, economic and political) distinction between the core and peripheral nations. For an extensive analysis of the aforementioned theory: see Wallerstein 1974; 1980; 1989.



The thesis is divided into 11 chapters. In Chapter 1 the geographical context is presented, while there is a brief analysis of the recent theories on Aegean and Anatolian chronology in the Late Bronze Age. Chapter 2 clarifies the methodological issues that are developed in this research and highlights characteristic examples that underpin the author's arguments. In Chapters 3 and 4 the political geography of western Anatolia during the second millennium, as described in the archival material from Hattusa, and the case study sites – thirteen in total – are extensively examined. The next Chapters, 5 and 6, deal with sites with Aegean material in Anatolia and Anatolian objects in the Aegean respectively, providing a summary of the latest available information. The linguistic context, another important aspect of Aegean – Anatolian contacts, and the Ahhiyawa Question, the most frequently discussed aspect of these relations, are examined in the following Chapters, 7 and 8 respectively. The chapters that follow, 9-11, are crucial to underlining the author's interpretations and ideas in this research. Specifically, in Chapter 9 a new approach to the question of Minoan – Anatolian relations through the re-evaluation of the existing evidence and an alternative suggestion concerning the origin of the first Ahhiyawa people are presented. Chapter 10 deals with the character of Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia and its importance in the cultural and political affairs of the area. The role of western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age is examined in Chapter 11. Finally, in the conclusion, a synopsis of the main arguments and suggestions for further research are proposed.

In general, the first eight chapters deal with the available data and provide information about the time, the area and the material under review. The last three chapters include the author's original ideas, approaches and arguments on the topic based on a new evaluation and interpretation of the existing information.

# 1. Geographical and chronological context

## 1.1. Geography

The geographical area that will be examined in this thesis is the western part of Anatolia (Map 1). Generally speaking, this region covers an area extending along the Aegean coast from the Troad to the southern part of the peninsula and inland to the southwest of the Salt Lake/*Tuz Gölü*. For the most part, it is mountainous and hilly with small watered valleys (Bryce 2003a: 40; Georgiadis 2003: 5). In contrast to this general pattern, the Büyük Menderes (ancient Maeander River, ca 584 km long), the Küçük Menderes (ancient Kayster River, ca 95 km long), and the Gediz (ancient Hermus River, ca 400 km long) are major rivers that run across western Anatolia and drain into the Aegean (Thompson 2007: 88). Two horst ridges cut across western Anatolia: the Çeşme (ancient Erythrai) Peninsula in the north and the Samsun Dağı or Dilek Dağları (ancient Mykale) Peninsula in the south. These ridges divide western Anatolia into three main valleys. From north to south these are the Hermos valley (modern Gediz), the Kayster Valley (modern Küçük Menderes) and the Maeander Valley (modern Büyük Menderes) (Greaves 2010: 47).

As will be demonstrated in the following chapters, this area was home to some significant cultures, a place where interconnections, interactions and cultural exchanges took place. It should be stressed here that the author of this thesis considers that geography is defined by archaeology: that is to say, the archaeological material, not geography, defines the boundaries of cultural units. It will be discussed later where the 'meeting points' of the Aegean and western Anatolian cultures can be identified and why the civilisation that developed in the Troad cannot be classified for review in the present thesis, although the Troad belongs geographically within western Anatolia.

The area can be divided into two separate zones: coastal western Anatolia and interior western Anatolia. This division has not only geographical but also cultural criteria. In the coastal zone influences from the Aegean cultures can be observed, although the material culture remains predominantly Anatolian (the case of Miletos is different and will be extensively discussed later), while in the interior

the influences from any neighbouring cultures, Aegean or Central Anatolian, are generally less evident. The majority of the sites that will be examined in this research belong to the first zone, the coast.<sup>5</sup> During the Middle and Late Bronze Age these sites were either islands (i.e. Miletos<sup>6</sup>) or established on small peninsulas (i.e. Iasos<sup>7</sup>) or located close to the sea and to some extent isolated from the Anatolian heartland due to high mountains. These mountains do not allow Mediterranean climatic influences to extend inland more than approximately 100 km (Thompson 2007: 88), a fact that results in a continental climate in the interior of western Anatolia. On the one hand the mountains were a very divisive factor separating one community from another, however on the other hand they formed the sheltered bays and trade routes that were to be the basis of the local commerce. These mountains hindered north-south communications by land making the sea, the valley bottoms and the rivers appear much more attractive prospects for travel and transport (Greaves 2010: 48-49)

The topography of the ancient shoreline has drastically altered due to the deposition of sediment by the rivers. As a consequence, for example, the harbour of Ephesos is about 10 km from the present coast, as a result of the deposits by the Küçük Menderes, whilst the coastline around Miletos is today a flat alluvial plain due to the Büyük Menderes sedimentation (Greaves 1999: 57-58).

As will become clear in the following chapters, it must always be borne in mind that the sea played a central role in the life of the people and the cultures that emerged in the coastal western Anatolia. With the exception of some remarkable sites in the interior (Aphrodisias, Bademgediği Tepe, Beycesultan, Çine-Tepecik) all

---

<sup>5</sup> This happens for two reasons; firstly this is where the data has been most plentiful (see Methodology chapter below) and secondly because the theme of this research is to examine the interplay of cultures.

<sup>6</sup> For more information see Brückner *et al.* 2006.

<sup>7</sup> Although Iasos might have been an island in prehistoric times (see Baldoni *et al.* 2004: 10).

the other important Late Bronze Age settlements were very close to the sea.<sup>8</sup> The Aegean was the sea that connected people with different cultural and ethnic backgrounds, facilitating the exchange of ideas. Specific geographical information and contexts will be presented in more detail in relation to each case-study site (Chapter 4).

## 1.2. Aegean Relative Chronology

The Aegean Bronze Age is conventionally divided into three parts; for Crete the Bronze Age culture is termed 'Minoan', after the legendary king Minos of Knossos, for the Cycladic islands it is termed 'Cycladic', while for the Greek mainland it is termed 'Helladic' from the Greek word for Greece, 'Hellas'. Moreover, there are three chronological divisions – Early, Middle and Late – and three subdivisions, I, II and III (Shelmerdine 2008: 3).

The Aegean relative chronology depends chiefly on correlations among different ceramic types found in reliable stratified deposits (Shelmerdine 2008: 3). Despite the various problems – it can be seen for example that one period on Crete overlaps with one on the mainland – this system of chronology remains useful in making broad general comments and definitions. For the Middle and Late Bronze Age especially, correlations are generally easily established through the identification of imported pottery and Minoan, and later Mycenaean, stylistic influences over wide areas. The destruction deposits created by the eruption of Thera represent a useful fixed point, now coming to be regarded as a stage before the LM IA and LH I (Dickinson 1994: 16).

Furthermore, it should be noted that there are discrepancies between the Anatolian and Aegean Bronze Age. The duration of the Middle Bronze Age and Late Bronze Age are not the same in the two areas. More specifically, the end of the Middle Bronze Age in western Anatolia overlaps with the beginning of Late Bronze Age in the Aegean (Momigliano, *pers. comm.*).

---

<sup>8</sup> Although this may be a consequence of the methodologies used to find sites and the criteria for choosing sites for excavation (see chapter 2 and more specifically Greaves 2007).

### 1.3. Aegean Absolute chronology

One of the major difficulties that a scholar must deal with in the investigation of Late Bronze Age issues in the Eastern Mediterranean (and in the Aegean and Anatolia particularly) concerns the problem of determining absolute chronology for the periods under review. Considerable controversy has arisen in recent years because some new scientific methods have challenged the established chronological framework. It is beyond the remit of this thesis to present and analyse the arguments of each scholar who has been involved in these chronological issues, but brief reference to different positions of the major proponents is necessary.

With regard to the Aegean there has been continuous discussion about the absolute chronology of the area (Table 1). Two main theories about dating for the region have been expounded: the first one favours a lower chronology and is based on the ceramic typological criteria and on establishing ceramic synchronisms with Egypt and to a lesser extent Mesopotamia, while the second one is based on recent chronometric studies (i.e. dendrochronology, radiocarbon dating) and reflects a higher chronology (Shelmerdine 2008: 5). However, consensus has not yet been achieved and there is as yet no single chronological context accepted by all scholars. Aegean chronology, as mentioned above, is part of a broader discussion concerning chronological issues in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Bronze Age. This research follows the so-called 'traditional' chronology that has been suggested by Warren and Hankey (1989: 169), Treuil et al. (1996: 119-122), and Dickinson (2003: 46-52), which, as has been realised in the course of this research, is still the most widely accepted by academics. The author is aware of the challenge to this traditional chronology that has been posed in recent years by Betancourt (1987), Manning (1999), and Manning et al. (2006), using radiocarbon ( $^{14}\text{C}$ ) methods. These studies have faced substantial criticism because, as Cynthia Shelmerdine notes "although good carbon dates are available for the third millennium B.C. and earlier, those from later periods of the Bronze Age are less certain, for reasons ranging from oscillation of the calibration curve, which can give two different absolute date ranges for one radiocarbon age, to seasonal variation in different regions, to contamination by old carbon" (2008: 6). It should be noted that both camps agree on dates from

the end of LM IIIA1 onward and the main problem remains the absolute chronology of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries BC associated with the eruption of the volcano of Thera (Shelmerdine 2008: 6).

#### 1.4. Hittite chronology

It should be noted that there is no pottery typology for the region of central Anatolia as specific as that of the Aegean and a chronological system based on the Hittite ceramic sequences has proven particularly difficult to establish. Factors responsible for this are its general homogeneity and the slow evolution of diagnostic vessel type (Schoop 2006). Consequently, a relative chronology for the Hittite central Anatolia in terms of the existing relative chronology of the Aegean cannot be established. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the dates of the absolute chronology of central Anatolia are also problematic. Although the names of the Hittite kings are known,<sup>9</sup> in most cases it is difficult to establish a precise chronological context for many of them. New interpretations and revisions of the texts of the Hittite archives can often change the whole timeline of Late Bronze Age central Anatolia. In most of the cases the dates are schematisations based on a few known synchronisms and the use of a time span of twenty years per generation (McMahon 2002: 60). A characteristic example is that of Tudhaliya I/II. It is uncertain whether the exploits associated with an early New Kingdom Tudhaliya should be assigned to one or two kings of this name. He was possibly one and the same king (Niemeier 1999a: 145), although there is still dispute among the Hittitologists about the existence of this figure (McMahon 2002: 60). This is one of the issues in Hittite chronology that remains to be tackled. It need hardly be added that a precise chronology is considered the Holy Grail of Hittite history, as it is also of Aegean or Egyptian history. As far as Tudhaliya I/II especially is concerned the suggestion that he reigned in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century as many scholars assume (Cline 1996: 141; Niemeier 1999a: 145; Starke 1998: 191-192) is accepted by the author.

---

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that there is no pottery typology for this region as specific as that of the Aegean and it is necessary to rely mostly on historical records, which in this case are not the most reliable of sources.

In this research the dates that have been proposed by Astour (1989: 50-52, 68-69, 77), Cline (1996: 141; 1994: 121) and McMahon (2002: 60) will be used, although the author is aware of the slightly different chronologies that have been proposed by Bryce (2003b xi), Klinger (2007: 124) and others (Table 2).

To sum up, the absolute chronology of Hittite Anatolia and the Late Bronze Age Aegean is currently a subject of ongoing debate and consequently it is difficult to correlate events in Hittite history with the Aegean archaeology, especially for LH/LM II and LH/LM IIIA1. The author of this thesis is conveying his interpretation for the first appearance of Ahhiyawa in the Hittite texts based on the traditional dates, however he also provides elsewhere possible alternative scenarios (pages 168-169) that 'fit' in the higher chronology of both the Aegean and Anatolia. However, he believes that the main arguments about the Minoans and the appearance of Ahhiyawa developed in this research are, in most cases, not seriously affected by the acceptance of the new 'high' chronology.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. General methodological issues

In the course of this research it was realised that the study of the contacts and interconnections between the Aegean and Anatolian worlds would not be possible without the accomplishment of a particular task: it was more than a necessity to map the archaeology of south – western Anatolia, which proved to be the case study area. The best way to do that was to study the material itself in its context and then to examine the various interpretations that had been put forward. However, it was soon recognised that a number of ‘obstacles’ had to be dealt with.

To begin with, it is an undeniable fact that a major problem encountered by researchers of western Anatolian cultures is, in particular, the lack of excavations away from the coast. Indeed, with some noteworthy exceptions in the coastal zone, western Anatolia could be considered as *terra incognita* archaeologically. Several criteria have been used to identify sites for excavation on the west coast of Anatolia: predominantly these criteria have been dominated by the research interests of Classical archaeologists, including the desire to investigate the sites mentioned in the surviving corpus of Greco-Roman literature. Most of the excavated sites in western Anatolia flourished into later periods (Classical, Hellenistic, Roman). Some sites were chosen for excavation because of their accessibility (Jenkins 1992: 185). It should also be borne in mind that the excavations of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century had as a primary target to bring back sculpture for the museums of Europe. This led to the preference for coastal sites (Greaves 2007: 4). It is encouraging, however, that in the last 20 years an increasing number of excavations and archaeological projects has offered much new information about the prehistory of the area.

At this point another problem that had to be faced should be stressed: many of the theories and interpretations that have been put forward about the Late Bronze Age Anatolian affairs were misleading and distracting, and archaeologists, philologists and historians, Aegeanists, Hittitologists and pro-Troy oriented scholars expressed different and very often contradictory academic verdicts. It must be made clear that in his interpretations the author did not follow tactics that previous



researchers chose to use, for instance focusing mainly on the Hittite written sources (especially the Ahhiyawa Question and the Arzawan campaigns) without taking into consideration the material itself. Indicative of this trend is the continued use of the Ahhiyawa texts in order to draw conclusions about Mycenaean and Hittite presence and activities in western Anatolia. At this point it must be mentioned that content about Ahhiyawa appears in a sample of 28 texts while almost 25000 Hittite written documents have been unearthed. It is rather surprising to see that almost only one per thousand of the Hittite texts dealt with the Ahhiyawa Question. It seems that modern scholars pay much more attention to the Ahhiyawan issues than the Hittites did. For what was intended in this research the Hittite archival material was found to be rather distracting (although this does not mean that the value of the texts in various aspects of the Hittite culture is not recognised), and any possible influence from the texts was avoided as much as reasonably practicable.

In view of the aforementioned difficulties, a different approach was followed, presenting the data in the form of selected case study sites. In addition, a number of key issues were used to relate the research themes to the data, including: definition of the identity of the local western Anatolian population and its role in the broader geographical presence, the character of the Aegean presence and possible Hittite activities in the region.

The procedure that has been described led the author to realise an undeniable fact: The Aegean – central/western Anatolian interaction happened in a ‘Third Place’ in which we recognise that the local population’s agency had an important role (not to say the dominant role, as is clear in the case of Iasos – see Chapter 4.1). The local population was culturally and politically strong, making its own decisions and serving its own purposes. Adopting such an approach allows one to produce interpretations of the same dataset that differ from the current ones. The corollary of the adoption of this stance is the rejection of many assertions and methodologies. Additionally, the study of the material in its chronological context disconnected from ‘established’ theories (which, in the author’s opinion, lack sufficient documentation) for an early active Mycenaean presence in eastern Aegean – western Anatolia made him consider a Minoan connection for the first Ahhiyawa

references to be quite possible. Again the study and comparison of the Aegean and western Anatolian material culture offered the opportunity to better understand the nature of the possible Mycenaean presence in the area, namely when and where the mainlanders of Greece were settled, if indeed this happened. The author cannot deny that he is influenced by recent post-colonial approaches to archaeology e.g. Dommelen 1997; Gosden 2001. More specifically his consideration of the western Anatolian affairs through a local perspective escapes the traditional dominant Aegean-centric and Hittite-centric views. In other words, the author deals with the lack of acceptance of alternative world-views, as it is described by Nickolas and Hollowell (2008) – in this case the western Anatolian view – from the Aegeanists and the Hittitologists, who often highlight the role of the Aegean cultures and the Hittites respectively, while in most cases the active role of the western Anatolians to the creation, contribution and consumption of various cultural characteristics remains silent.

It is considered necessary to present some examples of how the data could be interpreted either way depending on the mental schema the researcher has when he/she practices an alternative approach.

## 2.2. The ambiguous nature of the data

### i) Archaeological “facts”

Archaeology cannot always provide answers; in some specific cases the interpretation of the archaeological material creates more problems than it can resolve. In western Anatolia the different way of dealing with the material can be seen through the approaches and interpretations of two scholars. More specifically, Wolf – Dietrich Niemeier (2005a) considers crucial the contribution of the Aegean world in the construction of the cultural identity of the area. He supports the idea of Aegean settlers (Minoans and Mycenaeans), who transmitted their cultural characteristics to the local inhabitants, incorporating in a way south – western Anatolia in the Aegean cultural and political sphere of influence. On the other hand, Ahmet Ünal (1991) states that the examination of the archaeological data from the excavations in western Anatolia shows that the Aegean influence on the material

culture of the area was relatively unimportant. Moreover, Penelope Mountjoy (1998) has recently put forward the theory of the “East Aegean – Western Anatolian Interface”, an area where a new cultural character has been created by the mixture and coexistence of various elements from both the Aegean and Anatolia (see below page 4). Three completely different interpretations have been based on the study of the same archaeological material. These interpretations of the same evidence are possible because of the inherent weakness of the material, i.e. lack of good statistical studies of *in situ* pottery.

## ii) Historical “facts”

At this point the author would like to highlight that he is aware of the various theories which have been recently expounded concerning possible links between the Hittite and the Aegean worlds. However, in his opinion, most of these theories based on linguistic and philological approaches seem less reliable than the information provided by the archaeological material and its interpretations. Hence these ideas will be cited and briefly mentioned in the present part of this research; however they will not be analysed further.

A recent theory has to do with the Hittite conquest of Lesbos (Mason 2008). He suggests that Lesbos was under Hittite control in the Late Bronze Age based on the Hittite texts that mention the ‘Deity from *Lazpa*’, which has been equated with Lesbos (Hawkins 1998: 2), and some rather dubious Greek myths of the historical period. In the author’s opinion this theory must be rejected mainly due to the lack of sufficient archaeological material. The complete paucity of Hittite evidence on the island does not allow any thought of cultural or political Hittite presence in Lesbos. Additionally, the occupation of such a huge island would have demanded not only infantry but also a navy. As will be presented below in this research, the Hittites lacked a navy and as is witnessed in their texts they could not arrest their Arzawan opponents who escaped to the neighbouring islands. Moreover, it is believed that although the people of Hatti reached the Aegean they never succeeded in establishing themselves in the area. To sum up, the hypothesis of a Hittite Lesbos is rather implausible.

It is known that many scholars consider the first millennium as the period when Eastern religion, mythology and literature began to influence Greece. However, according to some academics, there is evidence that this influence had started in the second millennium. More specifically, theories have been conveyed about a possible connection between the Greek Goddess Demeter and the Sun – Goddess of the Hittites (Collins 2002) or the Greek Goddess Athena and the Hittite Goddess Arinna (Teffeteller 2001), the Anatolian Telepinu and Dionysus (Tassignon 2001), the Luwian deity Pihassasi and the Greek Pegasos (Hutter 1995), Hesiod's *Theogony* and the Hittite Epic of Kumarbi (Gurney 2002: 196-197), the iconography of the cult centre at Mycenae and the Sword God in chamber B at Yazılıkaya (Morgan 2005: 169), and the Luwian ritual of Zarpiya and the Odyssey (Steiner 1971). Also interesting is the idea of *po-ti-ni-ja a-si-wi-ya* (*Potnia Assiwiya*/Goddess of Asia) who appears in Linear B (Morris 2001: 428-432). This should not be surprising if other incidents of syncretism in the ancient world in later periods are considered.

### iii) Linguistic "facts"

At this point it will be useful to illustrate how the linguistic, and generally speaking, the textual evidence is used and misused by presenting an example from the first Ahhiyawa texts. More specifically, the name *Attarissiya* is considered by many of those scholars who accept and promote the Homeric associations of the Ahhiyawa-Achaioi identification to be the Luwian version of the Mycenaean name *Atreus*, Agamemnon's father in Greek mythology. Without having a deep knowledge of linguistics, the author will attempt to give an alternative interpretation of this name again, using Greek mythology. Firstly, by omitting the Luwian ending *-ya*, we are left with the possible original Aegean version of the name (*Attarrissi*). Then, using the Linear B rule (if we consider that there was a similar rule in the Minoan language), the *-rr-* is transformed to *-l-*. In this case we have the version *Attalissi*. According to linguistic rules of the Indo-European languages the vowels play a less important role in the creation of a word, at an early stage at least, and the consonants show the real nature of the word. A good example could be the English word *wine*, which is *Wein* in German, *vino* in Italian, *vin* in French, *οἶνος* in Greek, *wijana* in Hittite. Leaving only the consonants in our case we have the word *ttlss*.

This version could be a form of the name *Talos*, the prehistoric creation of Hephaistos (Vulcan), the mythological first 'robot' that had the duty of protecting Crete from its enemies. This hypothetical suggestion may, at first, appear to be a radical departure from the prevailing interpretation, but it is no less reliable than the *Atreus* version (Gareth Owens, *pers. comm.*<sup>10</sup>). Following the same line of argument one could also say that it is tempting to claim that Attarissiya was probably the Hittite version of the Greek name *Ἀστερίων* (Asterion), one of the sons of Minos and king of Crete. The following examples reveal the high risk of connecting names of the Late Bronze Age and of later periods, while various interpretations can be given. It should be noted that even though the interpretation offered here cannot be securely established, qualified linguists consider that there is no reason to connect the freebooter commemorated in the Indictment of Madduwatta with the father of the *Atreidai* celebrated in Greek tradition. More specifically, Martin West believes that Attarissiya may very well be interpreted as *Atresias* or *Atersias* and not as *Atreus* (West 2007). Unfortunately, in the present case, the identification of the names *Attarissiya* – *Atreus* and *Tawagalawa* – *Eteocles* is considered almost certain by many scholars (Bryce 2005: 470, Niemeier 2006: 18, Latacz 2004: 293, Wiener 2007a: 15, footnote 100). For further information about the use and misuse of ancient Greek names in Late Bronze Age contexts see pages 149-150.

Nobody can deny that many common characteristics and beliefs which the people of Late Bronze Age eastern Mediterranean shared can be identified in literature and religious texts, which could be equally used as the archaeological material in many cases. However, it should be noted that these types of evidence provide answers to different types of questions. The author of the present thesis mainly focuses on the archaeological material in the examination of the Aegean-Anatolian interactions, while he uses linguistic and textual evidence only if necessary and in order to underpin several of his theories.

---

<sup>10</sup> In our meeting in October 2008 in Herakleion Dr. Owens found the 'linguistic' attempt of this author to interpret the name Attarissiya quite reliable and not out of the linguistic rules. We mutually agreed that it is just an assumption which cannot be proven, at least for the moment; however, it is a good start for further discussion on the 'Aegean' names that appear in the Hittite archives.

### 3. The political geography of western Anatolia during the second Millennium BC: the archival material.

#### 3.1. History of research

The political geography of western Anatolia during the second millennium BC is closely connected to Hittite history. As no archives or other written documents have yet been discovered in any site of western Anatolia,<sup>11</sup> the only information about history and political geography of this area is to be found in the Hittite archival material. It is therefore necessary to provide a brief critical overview of the history of research into the Hittite archives, to provide a context for understanding the use of this evidence.

Following excavations at the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century at the heart of the former Ottoman Empire, in central Anatolia the remains of a previously unsuspected civilisation were brought to light. A large quantity of clay and some bronze tablets were unearthed. The German archaeologist Hugo Winckler, the excavator of the site later to be identified as Hattusa, was able to read a number of these in the Akkadian language. However, the great majority of the tablets were in an unintelligible language that could not be read. The scholar who finally deciphered the language of the cuneiform script on the tablets found in central Anatolia was a Czech called Bedřich Hrozný. In the middle of the First World War he published a description of the language demonstrating that Hittite was an Indo-European language (Hrozný 1915). The agents of this culture, the Hittites, were not the insignificant Iron Age tribe referred to in the Bible, but the masters of an earlier powerful and widespread empire that extended across the Near East (Bryce 2002: 2-3; Klock – Fontanille 2005: 7-11). After the decipherment of the Hittite language many scholars started to reconstruct the political geography of the Anatolian peninsula in the Late Bronze Age.

---

<sup>11</sup> The round bronze seal in Luwian Hieroglyphic from Troy that was found in 1995 (Hawkins and Easton 1996; Latacz 2004: 49-51), the fragments of Linear A inscriptions from Miletos and the incised sherd from Çivril, nearby Beycesultan (see below pages 42 and 71 respectively) cannot be considered documents that contribute to the reconstruction of history and political geography of the area.

Western Anatolia has gradually become a testing ground for Hittitology. Interest in this area began with the putative connections between the so-called 'Arzawan' states and Ahhiyawa, which some scholars linked with Mycenaean Greece, or a part thereof<sup>12</sup>. The Ahhiyawa Question was - and still remains - one of the most debated topics among Hittitologists and Aegean archaeologists. A sub-question of this subject is the role of the indigenous western Anatolian population and their role in Hittite-Ahhiyawa interactions.

The main information concerning the political geography of western Anatolia is derived from the following Hittite texts:

- 1) *The Annals of Tudhaliya I/II* (KUB XIII 11,12)
- 2) *The Annals of Mursili II* (numerous different fragmentary versions, see Pantazis, 2006: 366-367 )
- 3) *The Alaksandu Treaty* (KUB XIX 6+KUB XXI, KUB XXI 5, KUB XXI 2+XXI 4, KUB XXI 3, HT 8)
- 4) *The Tawagalawa Letter* (KUB XIV 3, AU I)
- 5) *The Millawanda Letter* (KUB XIX 55 + KUB XLVIII 90)
- 6) *The Manapa-Tarhunta Letter* (KUB XIX 5 + KBo XIX 79)
- 7) *The Kupanta – Kurunta Treaty* (numerous different fragmentary versions, see Pantazis, 2006: 373)

There are also other occasional references in various documents but it could be said that they do not contribute significantly to resolving to the puzzle of the political geography of western Anatolia.

### 3.2. Hittite foreign policy

To begin with, it is necessary to discuss Hittite foreign policy in order to better understand the political situation that existed in the broader area of the Near East during the second Millennium BC. For this research project it is first of all necessary to establish the positioning of the so-called Great Powers or Great

---

<sup>12</sup> See below for the aspects of the so-called Ahhiyawa Question (Chapters 8-9 and Conclusion).

Kingdoms<sup>13</sup> and the less powerful kingdoms in relation to one another, and how these states interacted with each other.

The years that followed the foundation of the Hittite Kingdom (*ca.* 1650 BC) were crucial to its existence (see Table 2, page 255). During this time the Hittite kings had to fight hard for the survival of their state. Various invasions by hostile forces such as Kaska took place during the first period of the Hittite kingdom, the so-called Old Kingdom. Finally, during the 15<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries the Hittites succeeded in defending their state and had confronted all their enemies. However, things changed and this weak kingdom developed into a powerful empire. The Hittite New Kingdom<sup>14</sup> became a Near Eastern super power (Bryce 2003b: 30-33). From this point on, the main aim of Hittite foreign policy would be the maintenance of internal and international stability. It was essential for all the kingdoms of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean to preserve the established political *status quo*. The other Great Powers had more or less the same way of thinking and there was a usually unspoken, although sometimes an explicit mutual agreement concerning the resolution of potential problems. Only in extreme situations, such as the Battle of Qadesh or Hittite-Mitanni conflicts, were their differences not solved peacefully.

For the purposes of this thesis it is necessary to stress that the rulers and royal families of this period had supreme power within the states and could directly influence political developments according to their wishes. In the language of diplomacy there were two different categories of rulers in the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean:

---

<sup>13</sup> These terms are frequently used by Hittitologists and have become accepted when referring to Egypt, Hatti, Mitanni, Assyria and Babylon, i.e Bryce (2003b: 7, 48, 133) who characteristically mentions the 'Great Powers club'.

<sup>14</sup> The "Hittite New Kingdom" is the era which commenced with the reign of Tudhaliya I/II (*circa* 1450/30 BC) and lasted until the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century BC. During this period Hatti was transformed gradually into an empire reaching its greatest heights and could realise military activities far from the homeland – both in the far west of Anatolia and once more into Syria.



i) Subordinate rulers. These were local nobles who could assert their power in a small area by virtue of the endorsement of the ruler of the neighbouring Great Power. Such a vassal King was considered a 'son' and the Great King as his 'father'.

ii) Rulers of equal rank. A king of a Great Power was considered the 'brother' of another Great King.

The subordinate Kings had obligations that had to be fulfilled if they wanted to avoid the 'anger' of their 'Lord'. They could keep their thrones only if a Great King desired it. The usual obligations were military support with infantry and/or chariots in case of war; providing continuous information about the movements of enemies; taxes and tributes; and the return of fugitives, especially those who were suspected of seditious activities against the legitimate authorities (Beckman 1999: 5).

Marriages and gift exchange were common practices between the royal families of the Great Powers. The purpose of this policy was to avoid wars, to instigate alliances and to maintain domestic stability (Beckman 1999: 5). However, each Great Power tried to calculate ways to augment its influence in the international field. A kind of 'Cold War' existed in which everybody wanted to both get close to, and to defeat, the other.<sup>15</sup> In this context, the Hittites tried to create a zone of interest in northern Syria, often confronting diplomatically, or sometimes by military operations, the efforts of the other powers of the period (mainly Egypt and Mitanni, and after its fall, Assyria) in the broader area. But apart from this, Syria was the area where most of the Great Powers had common frontiers, so it was not only a field of continuous conflicts but also a place of meetings and contacts between them.

Furthermore, the kings of Hatti considered the creation of a security network in western Anatolia a priority, in order to protect their territory from hostile attacks (Bryce 2002: 9). Additionally, they had the possibility of intervening in the conflicts

---

<sup>15</sup> There were various ways for the Great Powers to achieve their purposes; a popular one was the creation of buffer states between themselves, which acted as agents of the policy of their overlord.

among the local rulers, by targeting further expansion in the area through military campaigns.

### 3.3. Western Anatolia during the first half of the second Millennium BC

In the first 350-400 years of the second millennium BC there are limited written sources concerning western Anatolia. The archives of the Assyrian *kharum* (mainly the site of Kanesh, which has provided almost 21.500 tablets, Bryce 2003b:20-24) of central Anatolia, which are a major source of information about south east Anatolia, unfortunately do not make any reference to western Anatolia. Only after the foundation of the Hittite Kingdom do the first occasional references to western Anatolia start to appear. The earliest reference to Arzawa<sup>16</sup> dates from the period of the Hittite king Hattusili I (ca 1650-1620 BC). According to the archives Hattusili marched against Arzawa and took from it cattle and sheep (Bryce 2003a: 46). That was the beginning in historical sources of the enduring conflicts between Arzawa and Hatti. It must be noted that, in the earlier years of the Hittite Kingdom, the political situation in Anatolia was very unstable, so no single power came to predominate<sup>17</sup> and each kingdom or ethnic group tried to gain advantage by means of conflicts with its neighbours.

### 3.4. The western Anatolian kingdoms: the period of independence (15<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C)

In the early decades of the 14<sup>th</sup> century there were five separate, independent but ethnically linked, kingdoms or states in western Anatolia: Wilusa,<sup>18</sup> Seha River Land, Hapalla, Mira-Kuwalliya and Arzawa Minor, the political centre of the region before its differentiation into separate kingdoms (Bryce 2003a: 35, see maps 2-4 on pages 252-253). The importance of this kingdom is apparent: this is why the Hittites called the whole region Arzawa in their archives. It was the core of

---

<sup>16</sup> For the location of Arzawa and, generally, the Arzawa Lands see 154.

<sup>17</sup> As will be demonstrated below the Hittites, although powerful in the later periods, never succeeded in subjugating the whole of Anatolia, despite the claims of the Hittite scribes.

<sup>18</sup> An alternative version of the Wilusiya that appears in earlier texts.

resistance to the Hittite authority and the place from where the most important anti-Hittite activities originated. The Arzawan kingdoms covered an area of western Anatolia extending along the Aegean coast from the Troad southward to the Maeander river and inland to the southwest of the Salt Lake (Bryce 2003a: 40). These peoples were Luwian-speaking – a language of Indo-European origins related to Hittite. Although Arzawans and Hittites had common origins and similar languages, most of the time they were rivals.

The first known ruler of an Arzawan kingdom was Kupanta-Kurunta, king of Arzawa Minor. At the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century four of the Arzawan kingdoms (all but Mira) created an alliance of western Anatolian states under the leadership of Kupanta-Kurunta but they were defeated by Tudhaliya I/II (Bryce 2003a: 48). Hapalla may have been the first Arzawa land to become subject to Hittite overlordship (Bryce 2003a: 55). Moreover, Tudhaliya undertook a campaign against an anti-Hittite coalition of twenty-two states, probably in north-western Anatolia, the so called *Assuwan Confederacy*. Wilusiya was a member of this coalition. The Hittites were once again victorious and as far as we know this coalition never reformed. Moreover, it should be noted that there was some possible Mycenaean involvement in this conflict. A Mycenaeanised bronze sword (fig 3.1), discovered in 1991 near the Lion Gate at Hattusa, bears an inscription in Akkadian and it can be dated to this period. According to the inscription the sword was dedicated to the Storm-God by Tudhaliya after his victory over Assuwa. It was probably part of the king's booty from his Assuwan campaign (Niemeier 1998a: 42-43). A possible explanation is that either Mycenaean and Assuwan troops fought side-by-side or that the Hittites' rivals used Mycenaean weapons.<sup>19</sup> Tudhaliya was the first Hittite king to become substantially involved in western Anatolian affairs, managing to eliminate the ambitions of Arzawa Minor for domination in the Anatolian peninsula, at least for the time being. But this victory did not establish a

---

<sup>19</sup> For an extensive discussion and an alternative interpretation suggested by the author of the present thesis see below (Chapter 9).

permanent Hittite authority over the conquered areas. The western Anatolian kingdoms retained their independence.

During the following years, the threat from the Arzawa Lands, especially from Arzawa Minor against Hatti, remained. Under the leadership of their king, Tarhuntaradu, the Arzawans invaded the Hittite territory during the reign of Tudhaliya III. Given that many attacks followed from all directions (the so called *concentric invasions*), the Hittite kingdom was almost destroyed (Bryce 2003b: 32). For a short period Arzawa Minor obtained a dominant role in the Anatolian peninsula. This is apparent in the royal correspondence between Amenhotep III and Tarhuntaradu: the Egyptian ruler wrote seeking a daughter of Tarhunadaru in marriage as the basis for an alliance between Egypt and Arzawa. This is a clear indication that the pharaoh considered Arzawa the main power and Tarhuntaradu the next Great King of the Anatolian region (Bryce 2003a: 56).

However, this was evidently the peak of Arzawan influence in Anatolia. Tudhaliya's successor, Suppiluliuma I, managed to drive enemy forces away from the Hittite homeland and restored power. He conquered the Lower Land<sup>20</sup> in order to create a buffer zone between the Hittite territory and the Arzawan Lands that would, on one hand, protect Hatti and, on the other hand, provide a possible base for future campaigns in the west. Suppiluliuma was probably the most successful Hittite king, though there is no clear evidence of any treaty concerning the political situation in western Anatolia. As a result it may be concluded that he did not manage to subjugate Arzawa Minor completely. Its next leader, Anzapahhaddu, gave asylum to Hittite subjects, ignoring Suppiluliuma's demand to return them. The Hittite king sent a military force under the command of Himuili, because he was concentrating on destroying the kingdom of Mitanni on the eastern frontiers. The Hittite forces confronted many difficulties but finally succeeded in beating the Arzawans and re-establishing Hittite authority over the Land of Hapalla, which had become an independent kingdom again during the *concentric invasions* (Bryce 2003a: 57). Even

---

<sup>20</sup> The traditional westward extent of the Hittite land, somewhere in the Konya region (Singer 1983: 208).

so the Arzawa lands remained a potential threat to Hittite territorial security and a more permanent solution was needed.

During the reign of the next Hittite king, Mursili II, Arzawa Minor again formed an anti-Hittite alliance in the broader region of western Anatolia, under the leadership of its current king, Uhhaziti. He was formerly an ally of Suppiluliuma but soon became a steadfast enemy of the Hittite kingdom. Moreover, he had the total support of the king of Ahhiyawa (see below), who strongly wanted to achieve a more active role in western Anatolian affairs, encouraging anti-Hittite activities. The Ahhiyawan base in the area, Millawanda/Millawata,<sup>21</sup> was undoubtedly a solid ally of the Arzawan kingdom. As we know from Mursili's *Annals*, the Hittites undertook a military campaign and conquered Millawanda, sacking it (Cline 1994: 122). However, Uhhaziti continued to threaten the Hittites' interests in the area by persisting in not handing over refugees to Hittite authority. This offence gave the Hittites the reason they needed to start a new military campaign against Uhhaziti, this time under the leadership of Mursili. These military operations lasted two full campaigning seasons. According to Mursili's claims the Gods gave him their assistance and a thunderbolt struck both Uhhaziti's city Apaša and Uhhaziti himself, rendering him incapable of fighting. His son Piyama-Kurunta replaced him and the crucial battle between the Arzawans and the Hittites took place at the river Astarpa in Walma, on the frontier of the two kingdoms. The Hittites were victorious once again and, as a result, occupied Apaša without resistance. However, Uhhaziti had been able to escape capture, fleeing to nearby islands that probably belonged to the king of Ahhiyawa. The last nucleus of Arzawan resistance was the city of Puranda,<sup>22</sup> where the defence of the city had been undertaken by Tapalazunawali, another of the sons of Uhhaziti. During the following campaigning season Mursili captured the city and beyond this point the independent kingdom of Arzawa Minor is not referred to in the Hittite archives,

---

<sup>21</sup> Classical Miletos. This identification is now considered certain by most scholars (Niemeier 1999: 70-72).

<sup>22</sup> The site of Bademgediği Tepe was identified by the excavator R. Meriç as the city of Puranda of the Hittite texts (Meriç and Mountjoy 2002: 79-83). However, there is a certain amount of doubt about this identification (see page 62).

possibly because it ceased to exist (Bryce 2003a: 61). Its territory was shared among the other Arzawan Lands and Mira-Kuwaliya conquered its greater part. From this moment on the Arzawa Lands became Hittite vassal states.

### 3.5. The Arzawa Lands: the period of vassalage

After his complete victory against the kingdom of Arzawa Minor and before his return to the homeland, Mursili had to arrange western Anatolian affairs so as to better serve Hittite interests. Firstly, according to his *Annals*, he transported almost 65,000 inhabitants of the defeated kingdom to Hittite territory. This depopulation was, presumably, his radical solution to the 'Arzawan problem'. Moreover, he imposed vassal status upon the Seha River Land. Its king, Manapa-Tarhunta, son of the previous king Muwawalwi, had gained his throne as the result of the active involvement of Mursili, who supported him after a dispute with two of his brothers. Manapa-Tarhunta, however, joined forces with Uhhaziti during the conflict with Hatti. This was a serious act of disloyalty for which Mursili was ready to punish him, but Manapa-Tarhunta's mother begged him for mercy and the Hittite king decided to forgive him and to allow him to rule as a vassal king (Bryce 2003b: 122).

Furthermore, Mursili concluded treaties with other vassal rulers he himself had installed. So Targasnalli became the king of Hapalla and Mashuiluwa became the king of Mira-Kuwaliya. It is noteworthy that, according to the treaties, the vassal rulers had the same enemies and friends as the Hittites, the king of Hatti reserved the right to judge legal disputes between them and, perhaps most importantly, they were forbidden to quarrel or engage in hostilities with one another (Bryce 2003a: 63). The Hittites had managed to establish their authority in western Anatolia. The vassal rulers may have been loyal but the local population was still hostile to them, and was presumably awaiting the first opportunity to revolt.

Putting all this information together, it can be concluded that according to the Hittite texts one of Mursili's greatest achievements was the imposition of Hittite control over a large part of western Anatolia. It is no exaggeration to refer to *Pax Hethitica* in the region, a relative peace which lasted for at least two decades, until

the end of his reign and probably into the first years of his successor Muwatalli (Bryce 2003a: 67).

A new disturbance in the area was instigated by the activities of Piyamaradu, probably Uhhaziti's grandson. According to the Hittite archives he was a rebel Hittite subject, but in reality he was an Arzawan prince (Bryce 2003b: 203) who wanted to achieve his political goals in the former kingdom of Arzawa Minor. During the first years of Muwatalli's reign, Piyamaradu gained control of the kingdom of Wilusa, in north-western Anatolia, and possibly collaborated with Ahhiyawa. Wilusa was probably the only vassal kingdom of the area that had remained loyal to the Hittites for many years. This is apparent in the treaty between Muwatalli and Alaksandu, the legitimate king of Wilusa, who lost his throne after Piyamaradu's activities (Bryce 2003b: 203-207).

In this period Millawanda developed a substantially Mycenaean character (Niemeier 1999a: 151; 2005a: 11). Bryce considers that this happened because the Hittite king allowed it to do so, believing that this Ahhiyawan base would satisfy the territorial ambitions of the Ahhiyawans in Anatolia, and he does not rule out the possibility that the king of Hatti attempted to tackle this problem diplomatically, because he was focused on Syrian affairs and the conflict with Egypt (Bryce 1989: 302). However, the author believes that is too risky to connect the Aegean influence on Millawanda with any Hittite political action, while it is also difficult to suggest that this was conscious expansionism on the behalf of Ahhiyawa (for an extensive discussion on this topic see Chapter 10). The ruler of the Seha River Land in this period, Manapa-Tarhunda, remained loyal to his overlord and attempted to dislodge Piyamaradu from Wilusa, but his military forces were defeated. Piyamaradu's activities continued for decades and his field of action was the area from Wilusa to Lukka. His son-in-law, Atpa, was the ruler of Millawanda. The Hittite king Muwatalli and his successors, Urhi-Teshub and Hattusili III, all tried to arrest him, but he escaped capture by finding temporary refuge with the Ahhiyawan king. Under these conditions it was impossible for him to be arrested by the Hittite forces. A significant source of information about Piyamaradu's activities is the so-called Tawagalawa letter. In this letter, Hattusili complains to his "brother", the king of Ahhiyawa, about

Piyamaradu's enterprises, sending a suggestion of cooperation between the two kings in order to devise ways to deal with this specific problem. It is possible that Piyamaradu was given over to Hatti after a while and Hittite authority was re-established in the area (Bryce 2003b: 203-210).

### 3.6. The case of Lukka Land

Another Luwian-speaking ethnic group in western Anatolia was known by the name of *Lukka*. Information about these people comes from a number of Hittite, Egyptian and Ugaritic texts (Mellink 1995: 34). But unfortunately none of these sources provides any specific information about their political organization or the names of their kings (if indeed they had kings). From the texts we can conclude that the Lukka Lands included a region which extended westward through Lykia from the western end of Pamphylia. The classical name of the region (Lycia) was almost certainly derived from the term Lukka (Mellink 1995: 34).

According to the texts Lukka was a member of the Assuwa confederation, and this is the first appearance of this name in the Hittite sources. The inhabitants of Lukka had a reputation as seafarers who often acted as pirates. A diplomatic crisis in the relationship between Egypt and Alasiya occurred, according to a letter from the Amarna archive, when the Lukka people raided Egyptian territory and Amenhotep accused the king of Alasiya of collaboration with the pirates. The Cypriot king refuted the pharaoh's accusations, claiming that his own country had suffered in recent years from the same piratical activities. Furthermore, the Lukka appeared to have cooperated with Attarissiya<sup>23</sup> in pirate attacks against Cyprus (Bryce 1992: 128-129; 2003b: 69; Moran 1992: 111).

It is also generally accepted that the Lukka were one of the ethnic groups that participated in the Sea Peoples' invasions of the eastern Mediterranean. The Egyptian sources make clear references to this name. Of particular note is the letter written by Ammurapi, the last king of Ugarit, to the king of Alasiya. Ammurapi was in

---

<sup>23</sup> A man from Ahhiyawa who created problems in western Anatolia during the reign of Arnuwanda I. For further information see below.



a desperate situation and could not send any assistance to his Alasiyan counterpart, as the latter had requested, because his own kingdom was in great danger. The enemy was already *ante portas* and all his troops were in the Land of Hatti while all his ships were in the Lukka Land (Astour 1965: 255; Bryce 2003b: 228).

Prior to this period the Hittites kings had claimed that the Lukka people become at least nominal subjects of Hatti at the time of the vassalage of the other Arzawan kingdoms. It is difficult to accept or dismiss this claim without further proof, but even if subjected to vassalage, the Lukka peoples evidently remained openly hostile to Hatti.

It is important to note that sometimes the Hittites used the term 'Lukka' not only for a specific region in the southwest of Anatolia but also to refer generally to the Luwian-speaking peoples (Bryce 2003a: 43-44). There are possible analogies to this usage. The term "Hurrian" might be used of any Hurrian-speaking groups or any Hurrian occupied regions. Similarly, according to Homer, the term *Achaioi* connoted not a specific Mycenaean kingdom, but the Greek-speaking peoples in general (Bryce 2003a: 43).

### 3.7. Conclusion

"The nature of ancient texts often allows us to find what we want to prove" (Ünal, 1991:18)

A topic such as the political geography of western Anatolia during the second millennium BC presents a set of obstacles that need to be overcome. The main problem concerns the paucity and unreliability of sources covering this part of the Anatolian peninsula<sup>24</sup> for a period of almost a millennium. Another significant obstacle is the objectivity and accuracy of the sources. The vast majority of the archives concerning the area of western Anatolia come from Hittite central Anatolia. It is probable that on the one hand the Hittite scribes ignored the local

---

<sup>24</sup>The changing role of the Anatolian peninsula between the east and the west is extensively examined by Özdoğan (2007).

circumstances, both political and geographical, to a certain extent, as it was an area outside the Hittite core; on the other hand their main purpose was to serve the aims of their ruler, in other words for pure propaganda.

Moreover, supposing that one can see beyond the political propaganda of the texts, it is impossible to use the necessary geographical information to accurately restore the boundaries and limits of the kingdoms and states in western Anatolia. This is why there is a great deal of debate and dispute among scholars who have tried to map the western Anatolian Bronze Age states.

Of only one thing can one be certain: *Arzawa, Lukka, Wilusa, Mira-Kuwaliya, Seha River Land, Hapalla, Millawanda, Assuwa, Masa and Karkisa* were states, kingdoms, cities or extended geographical areas beyond the western Hittite frontiers. The exact location of each one is subject to discussion. In some cases two or more scholars agree on the location of the names mentioned above, but there still remains a significant degree of doubt that prevents their definitive identification. Modern maps that attempt to set out the political geography of the area demonstrate how much the opinions of various scholars can differ about the location of the names mentioned in the Hittite texts (Maps 2-4).

Taking into account the state of knowledge based on the Hittite texts for the states of western Anatolia one could draw the conclusion that they were powerful entities that for many centuries threatened the territorial integrity, and sometimes even the very existence, of the Hittite Empire. However, the Hittites, according to their texts, were always victorious and finally succeeded in subjugating the western Anatolian states and making them a part of their kingdom. The archaeological record for the area, however, can be read to show a different picture, one that will be presented elsewhere in this thesis (Chapter 11). As one cannot be certain about the reliability of the Hittite archival sources only the interpretation of the archaeological finds can shed more light on the topic of the political geography of western Anatolia.

## 4. Case study sites

The sites are presented in geographical order, from south to north (Map 5).

### 4.1 Müskebi

#### *i. Geographical Information and physical environment*

The largest Late Bronze Age cemetery in western Anatolia is located on the Halikarnassos peninsula. The present name of the area is Ortakent, although the site itself is known as Müskebi. It is situated in a fertile inland plain. To the north the plain is limited by high hill slopes and to the east the scenery is dominated by Pazar Mountain. To the west gentle slopes and the plain can be seen, while to the south the extensive plain broadens out with a slight downward slope ending at the sea in the far background (Georgiadis 2003: 42).

#### *ii. Late Bronze Age tombs*

Forty-eight chamber tombs of the Mycenaean standard type have so far been excavated and were dated to the LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC (Niemeier 1998a: 40). They had short, steep *dromoi* and narrow *stomia* and a kind of rough plaster appears to have been applied to them in order to make the walls of the chamber more stable (Georgiadis 2003: 75).

Thirty-six tombs were used during the LH IIIA2, twenty-four in LH IIIB and only four during the LH IIIC, while nine cannot be securely dated (Georgiadis 2003: 75). The tombs contained both burials and cremations. All of the cremations<sup>25</sup> (three) date to LH IIIA2 – B and they represent the earliest Mycenaean context at the site. It seems possible that this custom came to the Aegean coast from central Anatolia and was then introduced to the Mycenaean world (Iakovidis 1970: 43-57).

---

<sup>25</sup> The custom of cremation entered the Aegean world some time in the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Its Anatolian origin has been supported by many scholars and it was probably transmitted across to the Dodecanese, from where it was distributed to Crete and to mainland Greece (Mee 1998: 138-139; Melas 1984: 28-33).

The grave offerings appear typically Mycenaean. The pottery encompasses a wide range of Mycenaean vessels: piriform jars, stirrup jars, *amphoriskoi*, jugs, an *alabastron*, flasks, *askoi*, basket vases, *kylikes*, bowls, cups and mugs. The bronze objects consist of seven spears, three knives, a razor and a dagger with characteristics of Sandar's type H (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 69, 76; Georgiadis 2003: 42, 75, 83; Mee 1978: 137-142; 1998: 138-139).

## 4.2 Iasos

### *i. Geographical Information and physical environment*

The prehistoric coastal site of Iasos lies to the north of the Halikarnassos peninsula and south of Miletos. It is located on a rocky peninsula (fig 4.2.1) that might have been a small separate island in the Late Bronze Age, in the shelter of a deep and extensive bay, known as the Gulf of Mandalya. The ancient settlement of Iasos corresponds to today's village (fig. 4.2.2) of Kiyıkıslakık (Georgiadis 2003: 42; Baldoni *et al.* 2004: 10; Momigliano 2005; 217; 2006: 81).

### *ii. History of the excavations*

The first excavations at the site were conducted in 1960 by an Italian Archaeological Mission. The director of these excavations was Doro Levi who was succeeded by Clelia Laviosa (1975-1984). The latter was, in turn, succeeded by Fede Berti. It must be noted that in addition to excavations, the Italian Mission has also carried out much restoration and conservation work over the years (Baldoni *et al.* 2004: 47-49; Momigliano 2006: 81).

### *iii. Middle Bronze Age*

The most ancient finds at the site date back to the Chalcolithic and possibly even to the Neolithic period. During the Early Bronze I-II phase (3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BC), Iasos shows evidence of interaction with the cultures of the Cycladic islands. The site appears to have been a meeting point between Anatolian and Aegean cultures for several millennia (Baldoni *et al.* 2004: 32-33).

No evidence has been found so far demonstrating occupation of the site during the end of the Early Bronze Age and the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age. However, a number of buildings that were discovered in the area of the Roman Agora (fig. 4.2.3) and near the so-called Basilica date to the later Middle Bronze Age. Inside Building F (fig. 4.2.4) – which dates to the Late Bronze Age and is an almost square-shaped construction – there are remains of walls and paving belonging to the final phases of the Middle Bronze Age (Baldoni *et al.* 2004: 70-71.). There are three

different pavement levels, with many inner partitions. The ware that was discovered in the layer sandwiched between the latest and middle floor of Building F, which was identified as 'Middle Minoan' or 'Kamares' or 'Kamares imitation' pottery by the first excavators (Laviosa 1983: 183) of the site turned out to belong to the southeast Aegean Light-on-Dark and Dark-on-Light pottery (fig. 4.2.5) and dates to MM IIIB/ LM IA (Momigliano 2006: 82-83; 2007: 263-264; 2009: 20-21, 27). Pottery of this type was widespread in Miletos, Kos and Rhodes at the same period, while the island of Kos was one of its manufacturing centres (if not the only one). This ware indeed resembles Kamares pottery because it was inspired by the early Neopalatial pottery from Crete (MM III – LM I) that included vessels decorated in Light-on-Dark and evolving from the pottery tradition of Protopalatial Crete (Momigliano 2007: 257, 263, 265, 268; 2005: 219; Belli *et al.* 2005: 106-107). However, three Minoan imports that go back to the Protopalatial period have been identified: fragments of two cups (fig. 4.2.6) with parallels at Knossos and other sites of Crete usually dating to MM IIB and MM IIIA, and a body fragment from a fairly large hand-made vessel (fig. 4.2.7). Macroscopic and petrographic analyses suggest an origin from the Mesara (Momigliano 2005: 219). However, it must be noticed that most of the ceramic material seems to be of Anatolian type (Momigliano 2001: 272), and, according to Mee, the local ware resembles the pottery found at Aphrodisias and Elmalı of the same period (Mee 1978: 129).

#### iv. Late Bronze Age

##### *Minoan/ising elements*

During the Late Bronze Age the Aegean characteristics of the settlement increased. A reference to the date of Building F has already been made above. The building itself has a very thick perimeter wall, with right-angled corners, and can be compared to a Middle Minoan house found at Kousses in Crete in the Messara region (Belli 1999: 680). Moreover, other similarities in plan can be observed in building complexes in eastern Crete such as Block Γ (fig. 4.2.8) at Palaikastro and blocks A, B, Γ, Δ at Gournia as well as some building complexes at Mallia (Belli 1999: 679-680). The material from Building F provides the majority of information about

Late Bronze Age lasos. Over 11000 sherds weighting almost 210 kg were found from the 3 excavated levels between 1969 – 1973: about 80 more or less complete or restorable vessels and other finds, including Minoan type conical cups (fig. 4.2.9), loom-weights and spindle-whorls, as well as several imports from Crete, the Cyclades – possibly 12 imports dating to the Middle Bronze Age – Late Bronze I (Momigliano 2005: 220) and Dodecanese – three vessels originating from Rhodes, and hundreds of sherds of SE Aegean Light-on-Dark and Dark-on-Light ware (Momigliano 2005: 221-2) that have already been mentioned above. These shed light on the Aegean influence in material culture, even though much of the pottery continues to be of Anatolian type (Momigliano 2001: 15; Momigliano 2002: 18). The local Anatolian pottery (fig. 4.2.10) consists of a red washed ware, some of which may date from the final phase of the local Middle Bronze Age (Benzi 1999: 272). It is noteworthy that some of the Minoan pottery seems to be imported from Miletos, judging from its characteristic fabric (Momigliano *et al.* 2001: 273). The destruction of the building has been dated to the LM IA period. Evidence from the excavations suggests that Building F was destroyed not long before the eruption of the Santorini volcano. A thick layer of *tephra* – volcanic ash – is still visible in the area just outside the northwest corner of the building (Baldoni *et al.* 2004: 71-72).

Shortly after this destruction a new rather poor structure, known as Building B, was erected on the top of the *tephra* layer. Its pottery consisted of several examples of locally made Minoan type conical cups, dating to Late Minoan-Late Bronze Age I period (possibly LM IB). The building was destroyed by fire and this destruction marks the end of Minoan influence on the site (Baldoni *et al.* 2004: 72; Momigliano 2009: 136).

The question of the character of Minoan presence at lasos must at present be left open. Momigliano considers that the active presence of Minoan settlers is a simplistic explanation and wonders whether the Minoan characteristics of the settlement should be attributed to Cretan emigrants, to people from other minoanised areas such as Miletos or the Dodecanese or to the local population which behaves and does things in a manner that is comparable to behaviours and practices that originated in Crete (Momigliano 2009: 18-19). Additionally, she

suggests the presence of Minoan artisans – masons and potters – at lasos (Momigliano 2009: 23, 32).

### *Mycenaean elements*

The earliest Mycenaean pottery dates from the LH II-III A1. The majority of the pottery dates to LH III A2 and LH III B, while the LH III C is scarcely represented (Benzi 1999: 273). Despite the abundance of Mycenaean pottery there are no architectural remains that can be securely dated to this phase (15<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> centuries BC). The pottery (fig. 4.2.11) consists of *kylikes*, deep and stemmed bowls, *kraters*, *amphoroid kraters*, goblets, mugs, *kalathos*, *alabastron* (Mee 1978: 129; Benzi 2005: 207-214). The motifs include papyrus, flower, antithetic stem and tongue, octopus, whorl shell, rosette, running and antithetic spiral, wavy line, zigzag, tricurved arch and panel, of which octopus and whorl shell are the most common (Mee 1978: 129-130). Preliminary research from the East Basilica deposits shows that 1.5% of the ware consists of Canonical (supposedly 'imported') Mycenaean pottery, 8.5% accounts for Plain and Monochrome pottery of Mycenaean style and 90% represents the local ware made in the red micaceous clay characteristic of the East Aegean. The LH III C ware is made in local fabrics. The pottery of Anatolian type represents just a tiny proportion of the finds. It is unknown whether the Bronze Age settlement was destroyed or abandoned (Benzi 2005: 206).

Five terracotta figurines provide evidence for Mycenaean ritual activity. They come from mixed contexts from the Agora and the area of the Stoa of Artemis and are made from local micaceous clay. They are badly preserved and this makes it difficult to assign them securely to specific types (Benzi 1999: 275-276).

The conclusion drawn from the pottery seems to be that during the LB III the material culture of the site was largely Mycenaean (Benzi 2005: 206). However, even in respect of its pottery we cannot say that lasos itself was Mycenaean (Mee 1998: 139).



## 4.3 Miletos

### i. Geographical Information and physical environment

When one refers to archaeological sites close to the sea it must be borne in mind that the geographical setting may have changed through the time for various reasons. The appearance and location of Miletos were completely different in prehistoric times from nowadays. Today the site is located almost 7 km from the coast (Mee 1978: 134) because it was subject to silting by the Maeander (modern Büyük Menderes) river which left it isolated from the sea on a large alluvial plain (Greaves 1999: 57-58; Thompson 2007: 88). However, in the Middle and Late Bronze Age the site of Miletos was on an archipelago of islands (Greaves 1999: 57).

### ii. A brief history of research

Excavations at Miletos started in 1899 under the directorship of Th. Wiegand and continued during the 1930s and 1950s under C. Weickert as well as in the 1960s and 1970s under G. Kleiner (Weickert 1940: 325-332; 1957: 102-132; 1959/60: 1-96; Mee 1978: 133-134; Niemeier 2005a: 1). The first prehistoric levels were brought to light in 1907 (Mee 1978: 133). A new excavation and research project on early Miletos was begun in 1994 by B. and W.-D. Niemeier (Niemeier 2005a: 1). The excavations revealed – as far as the prehistory and protohistory of the site is concerned – Neolithic, Chalcolithic and Early, Middle and Late Bronze Age levels (Niemeier 2005a: 1, fig. 4.3.1). However, only the Middle and Late Bronze Age levels that concern the subject of this research will be examined, despite the great interest of the previous periods. The remnants of the Bronze Age settlements were mainly found in the area of the Temple of Athena (Mee 1978: 133; Niemeier 2005a: 1).

### *iii. Middle Bronze Age Miletos*

#### *Miletos III*

#### *The Aegean elements*

The excavations of the Middle Bronze Age levels of Miletos revealed a significant level of Minoan influence. This period incorporates the settlements Miletos III - IV.

The current excavator, W.-D. Niemeier, dates the first Minoan contacts with Miletos in the MM IA period, i.e. to the beginning of the Old Palace Period or shortly before (Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 546).

The period of Miletos III settlement dates to the MM IB-MM II. The Minoan pottery from the settlement includes fragments (fig. 4.3.2) of Kamares ware, dark-faced incised ware (fig. 4.3.3), domestic ware locally produced (a tripod cooking pot (fig. 4.3.4), legs of similar vessels, a scuttle, small handleless cups) and discoid loomweights (fig. 4.3.5) of the Minoan standard type (Niemeier 2005a: 3). Moreover, the discovery of one of the kilns where this pottery was fired is particularly important. It belongs to the Minoan cross-draught kiln type with parallel channels leading out from a firing chamber (fig. 4.3.6). This example and another one from Kos are the only kilns of this type that have been found outside Crete (Niemeier 2005a: 3). It is worth mentioning that the Minoan wares from Miletos III compose less than 2% of the ceramic assemblage and they were all found in deposits with Middle Bronze Age Anatolian pottery (Raymond 2005a: 96).

Furthermore, two seals (a button of horn with a representation of a Cretan goat (fig. 4.3.7) and a hemicylinder (fig. 4.3.8) of greenish serpentine with two circles with a central point as its seal motif) and a clay sealing (of local clay with a two-hole hanging nodule, fig. 4.3.9) provide evidence for Minoan administration in the settlement. The excavator dates these finds from MM IA to MMII period (Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 553; Niemeier 2005a: 3).

### *The indigenous elements*

The local western Anatolian pottery was dominant during the Miletos III period of settlement. The most characteristic pottery (fig. 4.3.10) was the red slip ware (Niemeier 2005a: 3), that appears similar to the pottery of the Middle Bronze Age palace of Beycesultan (Greaves 2002: 45). Unfortunately, the majority of western Anatolian pottery from the site has not yet been published.

#### *iv. Late Bronze Age Miletos*

##### Miletos IV

##### The Aegean elements

The next phase of the settlement equates to the time of the Cretan New Palaces (MM III – LM IB/II) and corresponds to the so-called first building period of the earlier excavations (Niemeier 2005a: 4). According to the excavator this period must be divided into two sub-periods, Miletos IVa and Miletos IVb. The first one ended in destruction connected with the Thera eruption (Greaves 2002: 53-54; Niemeier 2005a: 5). In the Miletos IV period an abundance of Minoan elements is visible.

As far as the decorated pottery is concerned, the great majority consists of imported Minoan ware from different areas of Crete. It includes fragments of LM IA pottery (ripple pattern and spiral decorated), fine LM IB-vessels ('Marine Style', fig. 4.3.11), products of Knossian workshops, and Standard Tradition Ware (fig. 4.3.12), which derives from LMIA and is rarely found outside Crete (Greaves 2002: 50; Niemeier 2005a: 5). Moreover, there are pottery imports (fig. 4.3.13-15) in smaller quantities from the Cyclades, from the Greek mainland, from Cyprus and painted pottery that belongs to the south-east Minoanising Aegean Light-on-Dark and Dark-on-Light Wares which were produced on the island of Kos (Niemeier 2005a: 5).

An issue that remains to be tackled concerns the domestic pottery. In the area of the Temple of Athena fragments of almost 8000 conical cups<sup>26</sup> (fig. 4.3.16) and about 530 complete ones have been found so far (Greaves 2002: 51; Kaiser 2005: 194; Niemeier 2005a: 6; Weickert 1940: 328-329). The pottery is made from the characteristic local clay and includes the typical shapes of Minoan domestic ware (fig. 4.3.17) such as tripod cooking pots, bridge-spouted jars, fire stands, scuttles, oval mouthed *amphorae*, *askoi*, fire-boxes and loomweights<sup>27</sup> of the disc-shaped

---

<sup>26</sup> It must be noted that the conical cups could also have served ritual purposes, therefore it cannot be said with certainty that they were part of the domestic pottery repertoire.

<sup>27</sup> It hardly needs to be added that it has not yet been shown that discoid loomweights are an exclusive Minoan phenomenon, so the question of whether these items were evidence of further

Minoan standard type. It is useful to note that the fragment of a clay potter's wheel (fig. 4.3.18) of Minoan type provides evidence for Minoan pottery production (Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 547; Niemeier 2005a: 6).

Recent research enlightens the issue of the imported pottery. The scuttles from periods III and IV have neither southwestern Anatolian nor substantial eastern Aegean *comparanda*, but definite Cretan parallels (Raymond 2005b: 187). Three explanations have been given for this influence; according to the first one the local production imitated Minoan style. A second explanation is that some Minoan ceramicists were brought to work in Miletos, perhaps as support for an enclave colony. Finally, a third explanation is that both Anatolian and Aegean ceramicists may have copied this vase shape from a metal prototype. (Raymond 2005b: 188). The possibilities listed above comprise part of a broader discussion about a phenomenon, or rather phenomena, that occurs in specific sites of the south Aegean during this period: the so-called *Minoanisation* (for a brief examination of this phenomenon see page 120).

As far as Miletos is concerned the ceramic evidence from the site indicates that although there is no proof of the importation of an ethnicity, there is proof of Aegean ideas at work (Raymond 2005b: 190).

Pottery is not the only Minoan/ising element of the settlement that is found in this period. According to the excavator a courtyard with a central mudbrick altar (fig. 4.3.19) – a typical Minoan feature – with four phases formed the centre of a sanctuary complex (Niemeier 2005a: 6). However, a mudbrick platform comparable to that found at Miletos from Acem Höyük (Öztan 2003: 43-44, fig. 10) shows that one needs to be very careful about such an interpretation because images, practices and behaviours considered 'typically Minoan' are also found in Anatolian contexts

---

Minoanisation must at present be left open (Greaves 2002: 51). Loomweights of this type have been noted from Alanya, which is far to the east on the south coast of Turkey (Greaves, *pers. comm.*).

(Greaves 2010: 191). Thirteen simple plaster offering tables were unearthed in various rooms of this complex as well as burnt bones of goats, sheep and cattle with cut marks (Niemeier 2005a: 6).

Moreover, other indications for Minoan cult practices come from the fragments of a rounded plastered offering table (fig. 4.3.20), small animal clay figurines (fig. 4.3.21), for example bulls, a fragment of a conical *rhyton* with an appliqué representation of a lioness running (fig. 4.3.22), fragments of Minoan stone vessels of ritual use, such as a serpentine vessel, a flat-based *rhyton* and an alabaster chalice. A carbonised chair (fig. 4.2.23) with a fragment of a conical *rhyton* and a set of drinking vessels next to it, found in the sanctuary, provides evidence for the ritual of 'enacted epiphanies'. Niemeier connects and compares all the above with various Minoan objects that have been found in Crete and Mainland Greece (Niemeier 1998b: 34; 2005a: 6-7).

Furthermore, additional evidence for cult activities includes the fragments of Minoan frescoes that have been found at the site. A spiral frieze (fig. 4.3.24), a griffin's wing (fig. 4.3.25), blue papyrus (fig. 4.3.26), and white Madonna Lilies on a red ground (fig. 4.3.27) have, according to the excavator, religious connotations (Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 548; Niemeier 2005a: 7).

Some further finds shed more light on the question of a Minoan presence at Miletos. Six fragmentary Linear A inscriptions (fig. 4.3.28), all of them on vessels of LM IA date – five of the vessels were made of local clay, one fragment appears to be south-central Cretan – support the arguments for the actual use of Linear A at Miletos, at least for commercial purposes (Niemeier 2005a: 7), while the possible religious significance of the inscriptions cannot be ruled out (Greaves 2002: 53; Owens 1999: 592).

Further indications of Minoan influence on the site include a Minoan-type disk-shaped marble balance weight with six circles (fig. 4.3.29). Parallels are found in stone-disk shaped weights from Knossos and Praesos in Crete. Two Minoan seals found in the sanctuary, a cushion shaped seal of black serpentine (fig. 4.3.30) and a

lentoid of pink quartz (fig. 4.3.31) support the theory of Minoan administration of the site (Niemeier 2005a: 8).

As far as architecture is concerned the examples that have been found in Miletos IV are not well-preserved. The wall facades appear to be Minoan in technique with blocks of which only the visible face was smoothed. Similar wall facades come from Palaikastro (Block B, fig. 4.3.32) and Kato Zakros in Crete (Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 548; Niemeier 2005a: 8). No evidence for burial customs in Miletos IV has been found so far (Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 547).

No traces of a Minoan cemetery have been found so far. However, the current excavator of the site believes that it was under the archaic settlement on Kalabaktepe, just to the south of the Mycenaean cemetery (Greaves *pers. comm.*). It must be noted that cemeteries are very elusive on many sites of this date on Crete.

#### *The indigenous elements*

According to the excavator's calculation ca 95% of the pottery is of Minoan character, and only 5% local south-western Anatolian pottery, that consists of beaked jugs and carinated bowls of buff ware with red wash, having parallels in Beycesultan IV A (Niemeier 1999b: 67-69; Niemeier and Niemeier 1999: 547). The Milesian pottery, although heavily influenced by Minoan pottery style, maintained strong bonds with the regional style of south-western Anatolia (Greaves 2002: 51).

Miletos IV faced destruction similar to a series of destructions in Crete and on the Aegean islands that is generally connected to the rise of the Mycenaean power and the end of Minoan predominance in the Aegean in this period (Niemeier 2005a: 10).

#### *Miletos V*

##### *The Aegean elements*

At the beginning of this period the character of the site becomes, according to the current excavator, predominantly Mycenaean. The earliest Mycenaean pottery dates to LH IIIA1, however the majority of the Mycenaean ware dates to

LHIIIA2 and comes from the destruction level of the Period V settlement. It is remarkable that almost all pottery of the period is Mycenaean. The domestic undecorated pottery consists almost exclusively of Mycenaean types like lipless bowls, tripod cooking pots and *pithoi* and this appears to indicate that Mycenaeans were the settlers in Miletos V (Niemeier 2005a: 10).

The other finds from the settlement support the theory of Mycenaean settlers. Female terracotta figurines of the *psi*-type, as well as terracotta animal figurines (fig. 4.3.33) indicate evidence for Mycenaean ritual (Niemeier 2005a: 13). As far as the architecture is concerned, two well preserved houses provide important information. House A (fig. 4.3.34) appears to belong to the type of the Anta-House with open vestibule, while House B (fig. 4.3.35) seems to belong to the type of *Oikos* 2 type with closed vestibule (Niemeier 2005a: 11). In the south-eastern part of this house a rounded clay hearth was found, comparable to clay hearths in Mycenaean houses at Mycenae and Tiryns. However, it must be noted that the Anta House has also a long tradition in western Anatolia and rounded clay hearths like the Mycenaean ones have been found in Middle Bronze Age Beycesultan (Greaves 2002: 57; Niemeier 2005a: 11).

Remarkably, eight potters' kilns constructed with mudbricks have been found in Miletos V and belong to two different types. The five kilns of the first type are round and have a central pillar or two benches in the chamber. Parallels can be identified in mainland Greece from the Middle Helladic period on as well as in Anatolia at Liman Tepe and Kocabaş Tepe in the Middle Bronze Age (Niemeier 2005a: 12). The second type (fig. 4.3.36) consists of a series of parallel channels and is Minoan in origin. The eight kilns found in Miletos V form one of the greatest concentrations known from the Bronze Age Aegean and indicate that the settlement was an important pottery production centre. Mycenaean pottery produced at Miletos was exported to southwestern Anatolia, to the Halikarnassos – Bodrum peninsula. The settlement ended in a heavy fire-destruction of which a level of burnt debris with a thickness of c. 30 cm extends over the entire excavated area. The destruction appears to have been man-made, rather than natural in origin (Greaves 2002: 59; Niemeier 2005a: 11-12).

It is worth mentioning that during the excavations of 1973 the remains of what initially appeared to be a Mycenaean 'megaron' were uncovered. The building was interpreted as a "residential complex centering on a court", a possible 'palace' (Mellink 1974: 114, Mee 1978: 136). However, re-excavation of the building subsequently revealed that it was part of the rebuilding that took place after the destruction of the city by the Persians in 494 BC (Greaves 2002: 56).

### *The indigenous elements*

As mentioned above, the two houses found at Miletos V could have been inspired either by Mycenaean or western Anatolian architectural forms. The Anatolian pottery of this period is undecorated, often with a red wash and consists of cups, jugs and bowls. It is very similar, although not identical, to that from Beycesultan (Greaves 2002: 58). It should be noted that one has to be very careful when referring to the character of the settlement in this period. All that remains is the destruction deposit and not a stratified progression. As only very few undisturbed Mycenaean contexts have been found, while there are only 'snapshots' of destruction and most of the data comes from old excavations, the situation remains complicated. The ratio for instance of recognizable Mycenaean forms, both decorated and undecorated, to undecorated Anatolian forms, was not recorded (Greaves 2002: 57-58).

Thus, the author is fully aware that the idea of a dominant Mycenaean culture in this period cannot be securely established. Yet a certain amount of doubt remains about the precise nature of Mycenaean presence. Hence, without having sufficient knowledge of the material of the site, the Aegean or western Anatolian presence cannot easily be defined.

### *Miletos VI*

#### *The Aegean elements*

The Mycenaean presence does not cease to exist after the destruction of Miletos V. The new settlement, Miletos VI, was rebuilt in early LHIIIB and ended in LHIIIC. There are pottery imports from the Argolid as well as locally made ware. In this



period pottery from Miletos was exported to other sites in western Anatolia, mainland Greece and the Levant (Greaves 2002: 60-63). A well of Miletos VI provided a group of Mycenaean type domestic vessels made in local clay (Niemeier 2005a: 12, 4.3.37). Two kilns (fig. 4.3.38) that dated to this period were found in excavations 500 m. south of the Temple of Athena and belong to the second kiln type of Miletos V (Niemeier 2005a: 12).

The domestic architecture consists of houses all but one of which are not well-preserved. The best preserved house appears to belong to the type of the Corridor House, with a central corridor dividing the house into two parts (fig. 4.3.39). Houses of this type have been found all over the Mycenaean world during 14<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries BC (Niemeier 2005a: 11).

The existence of a cemetery in this period is of great importance because it provides further evidence for burial rites. Eleven tombs were found on the east slope of the hill Değirmentepe, 1.5 km south – west of the settlement. The tombs (fig. 4.3.40-41) appear to have been of characteristic Mycenaean rock-cut type with *dromos* and *stomion* (Mee 1978: 133). Most of the offerings are of Mycenaean character. They include pottery (fig. 4.3.42) of LHIIIB-C that consists of typical Mycenaean forms such as kylikes and a krater, jewellery – flat beads of blue glass with a volute (fig. 4.3.43) and gold rosettes (fig. 4.3.44) –, bronze artifacts such as a sword of type F 2 A (Niemeier 1999a: 153), two socketed spearheads and two horse-bits. Moreover, three swords of non – Aegean type were found: two with Near Eastern style rod – tanged handles<sup>28</sup> and one with a Hittite style hilt (fig. 4.3.45) (Greaves 2002: 64; Niemeier 2005a: 13).

The final destruction of the Late Bronze Age settlement occurred in the LHIIIC period, although the reason for it still remains unclear (Greaves 2002: 64).

---

<sup>28</sup> Swords of this type are known from Levantine sites like Alalakh and Ugarit. It must be noted that during the 13<sup>th</sup> century the above area was under Hittite political control, consequently a Hittite origin of the Değirmentepe swords cannot be ruled out (Niemeier 1999a: 153-154).

### *The indigenous elements*

It is not possible for the moment to provide any information on the ratio of Anatolian to Mycenaean pottery since the undecorated Anatolian pottery from the old excavations has not been published (Greaves 2002: 63).

### *The possible Hittite/central Anatolian connection*

One of the most impressive features of the settlement in this period is the fortification wall to the north (fig. 4.3.46). Its square towers at regular intervals, cross walls, and generally, its construction, appear to have more in common with the contemporary Hittite style of construction (the so-called *Kastenmauer* type, fig. 4.3.47) than the so-called 'Cyclopean' style that is typical of Mycenaean mainland Greece (Greaves 2002: 60).

A lenticular flask (fig. 4.3.48) dating to c. 1400 B.C. of a form known from Hittite sites, which was found south of the Temple of Athena (Parzinger 1989: 429-431, fig. 5), is the only central Anatolian ware that has been found at Miletos so far, although a fragment of a locally made LHIII B2 *krater* (fig. 4.3.49) carries a rare pictorial representation of a Hittite Horned – Crown, a symbol of kingship in Hittite iconography (Greaves 2002: 63; Niemeier 2005a: 20; Weickert 1959/60: 63-66). This representation could be interpreted as a kind of Hittite artistic influence in Miletos VI (Greaves 2002: 63). Next to the Horned – Crown there is a bird's head, which, as the excavator suggests, may have been part of the imitation of an inscription in Luwian Hieroglyphic (Niemeier 2005a: 20). Moreover, another evidence of Hittite influence could be an arrow-like sign incised on a fragment of a locally made *pithos*-neck (Niemeier 2005a: 12, fig.4.3.50), if it is indeed a Hittite and not a Linear B sign, which is also possible (Schiering 1979: 79, pl. 22.3). It is also important to bear in mind the Hittite sword (-s) from Değirmentepe cemetery and its possible implications.

## *v. Conclusion*

Miletos is probably the most important case study site of this research. Due to its geographical position it was a site in western Anatolian territory with strong Aegean elements over time, not to mention the central Anatolian/Hittite cultural 'involvement'. In other words, this site contains all these characteristics that are examined in this thesis: Aegean, western and central Anatolian links. It is the place which connects elements from three different cultural entities (Aegean, western Anatolia, and central Anatolia). More specifically, Miletos III appears to be the beginning of the transition from a predominantly Anatolian to a predominantly Aegean material culture. Miletos IV seems to be almost completely dominated by Minoan material culture, while Miletos V has not yet proven as much 'Aegean' as the settlement of the preceding period, although it could be assumed that the current evidence points to the conclusion that Mycenaean material culture was dominant at the site. Finally, Miletos VI was identifiably Mycenaean in material culture; however the appearance of strong Hittite/central Anatolian evidence is also more than apparent.

## 4.4 Çine-Tepecik

### *i. Geographical information and history of research*

Çine-Tepecik is a relatively recently identified site that has yielded significant results about the Aegean presence in Anatolia. It is located on the plain of Çine Çayı (classical Marsyas River), one of the southern tributaries of the Büyük Menderes (Meander River), in the Aydın Region (36 km south – east of Aydın), on the edge of the Çine valley. Excavations at the site have been conducted since 2004 under the direction of Sevinç Günel. The levels that have so far been unearthed belong to the Chalcolithic, Middle Bronze and Late Bronze Age (Günel 2008a: 130-131).

### *ii. The Mycenaean cultural impact*

It is rather surprising that among the local Monochrome Reddish – Buff ware there are quantities of Mycenaean pottery, although this site is not very close to the coastal zone, where the majority of the Aegean material in Anatolia is concentrated; however, it should be noted that due to its geographical position the site had easy access to the sea, as the river is a natural passage to the south. It should be noted that Çine-Tepecik is located on a natural communication route at the point where the Çine Çayı River turns into a wide plateau. In this geographical area the cities of Alinda and Alabanda have been identified with the cities Iyalanda and Waliwanda respectively, both of which are mentioned in the Hittite texts (Garstang 1943: 41-2). The Hittite archives also state that during their campaigns Mursili II and Hattusili III reached the western shoreline via Marsyas.

The Mycenaean pottery (fig. 4.4.1) dates to LH IIIB – C and consists of two groups: Fine Ware and Medium Fine Ware. It comprises both local and imported wares. The shapes include characteristic Mycenaean vessel forms such as bowls with globular bodies and S – shaped rims, deep bowls, carinated bowls, stirrup jars, mugs, *kraters*, *amphoriskoi*, and *pyxides*. Most of the Mycenaean pottery was concentrated in the western and southern areas of the site, within the architectural structures of the settlement (Günel 2008a: 132-135; Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 289-290).

Most of the above information was received from Professor Sevinç Günel, to whom the author is most grateful. For a short review in English see the web page of *Current Archaeology in Turkey* (<http://cat.une.edu.au/page/cine-tepecik%20hoyuk>), while for extensive reports in Turkish see Günel 2006 ; 2007; 2008b.

## 4.5 Aphrodisias

### *i. Geographical information and history of research*

Aphrodisias was a prosperous city during the Hellenistic, Roman and early Byzantine periods and was named after the goddess Aphrodite (Joukowsky 1986: 21). It was renamed Stavropolis in the Christian era, because of the pagan associations of the previous name (*σταυρός* means cross in Greek). Due to the impressive remains (fig 4.5.1) from these periods the city is one of the most visited tourist sites in Turkey. However, the Chalcolithic and Bronze Age levels of the site show that a prehistoric culture had previously flourished at the same location.

Aphrodisias is located in the Karacasu Valley, next to the Geyre Çay (ancient Dandalas River), a southern tributary of the lower Büyük Menderes (Greaves 2008: 252; Kadish 1969: 49; Thompson 2007: 88). Excavations started in 1961 under the direction of Kenan Erim, while the pre-classical levels were first excavated in 1966, with trial trenches, followed by annual excavations from 1967 to 1973. The prehistoric settlement extended over two höyük mounds – Pekmez (fig. 4.5.2) and the acropolis (fig. 4.5.3) respectively – in the otherwise flat area of the classical city, while prehistoric material was also found in the area of Kuşkalesi, south of the acropolis (Greaves 2009: 252; Joukowsky 1986: 35-36) and under the *agora* during the excavations in 2008 (Greaves *pers.comm.*). The majority of this prehistoric material belongs to the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age periods; however, the available data from the subsequent Bronze Age periods emphasise the continuing role of the site in the broader cultural context of second millennium south-western Anatolia, although there is no evidence that it was ever a regional centre, like Beycesultan.

### *ii. Middle Bronze Age Aphrodisias*

The Middle Bronze Age period at Aphrodisias begins ca. 2000/1900 B.C. and ends ca. 1600 B.C (Joukowsky 1986: 161). Destruction of the site took place at the end of the Early Bronze Age; however the settlement was rebuilt in the Middle Bronze Age. Due to the poor preservation of the architectural remains a coherent

picture of building activities cannot be provided, although Martha Sharp Joukowsky has proposed that Complex C Trench 7 (fig. 4.5.4) appears to be part of a *megaron* (Joukowsky 1986: 173, figs. 192, 483). It is noteworthy that there is little change in the ceramic repertoire from the preceding period (EB III B) and cultural continuity is apparent (Joukowsky 1986: 161, 173, 466; Thompson 2007: 90). The Middle Bronze Age pottery (fig. 4.5.5) constitutes 5% of the prehistoric wares at the site with the most common shapes being bowls and cooking pots, while *pithoi* and jars have also been identified (Joukowsky 1986: 363-365). A figurine that was found in a Middle Bronze Age context was initially considered to be a local version of a Mycenaean type *psi* figurine (Erim 1970:22; Mellink 1970: 163). However, further examination suggests that “no direct correspondences can be found for this figure” (Joukowsky 1986: 216). At the end of the Middle Bronze Age the site is marked by the appearance of a new ceramic tradition and the abandonment of some parts of the acropolis mound (Thompson 2007: 90). It is doubtful whether the Late Bronze Age material is in direct sequence with Middle Bronze Age deposits because there is a possible chronological gap between the two periods (Joukowsky 1986: 160-176; Thompson 2007: 90).

### iii. Late Bronze Age Aphrodisias

The beginning of the Late Bronze Age period at Aphrodisias traditionally dates to ca 1600 B.C., while the end dates to approximately 1200 B.C. The pottery (fig. 4.5.6) of this period makes up 11% of the total sample of the fragments found at the site and consists mainly of bowls of various types and cooking pots, while jars and *pithoi* also have been identified (Joukowsky 1986: 366-367). During the Late Bronze Age the use of a gold micaceous wash at Aphrodisias is very common (Thompson 2007: 90). The complete lack of Mycenaean pottery indicates the site’s cultural independence from coastal influences during this period (Joukowsky 1986: 162). Moreover, the absence of any Hittite pottery may also support the hypothesis of cultural independence from central Anatolian influence. The potters of the prehistoric site evolved a quite independent style because of this lack of imports (Mee 1978: 124), although it is noteworthy that the decoration of some fragments of painted wares could have been inspired by Mycenaean LH IIIA-C motifs, such as

cross-hatching, wavy, horizontal and diagonal lines, spiral, circular, semi-circular and herringbone designs (Marchese 1976: 411; 1978: 20-30). The hypothesis of this Mycenaean styled, but locally made, pottery appears feasible although neither the shapes nor the motifs reveal more than a limited knowledge of Mycenaean type pottery (Mee 1978: 124; 1998: 141). This is in contrast to sites where close imitations of Mycenaean wares have been found (e.g. Tepeçik Çine). The Iron Age and Lydian periods follow the end of the Late Bronze Age.

Generally speaking, Aphrodisias and Beycesultan share a certain unity and coherence; however, the picture at prehistoric Aphrodisias is clouded due to the overburden of classical occupation phases, making it difficult to obtain horizontal exposures of the prehistoric levels (cf. Greaves 2007). What should always be borne in mind is that direct cultural bonds between Aphrodisias and both the Hittite and Mycenaean cultures are lacking (Joukowsky 1986: 460-461). It is significant to emphasise the strong and independent cultural character of Aphrodisias because, as in the case of Beycesultan (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 100), it could be interpreted as the result of conscious resistance to Hittite efforts for expansion in western Anatolia, whatever the Hittite archives may mention for various victorious campaigns in the so-called Arzawa Lands.

The conscious rejection of Hittite influence in Aphrodisias and Beycesultan could be strengthened by an *ex silentio* argument; the lack of mass grain storage, which is a feature of clearly Hittite sites. Andrew Fairbairn suggested in his detailed study of grain storage at the site of Kaman-Kalehöyük in central Anatolia that the construction of five large round crop storage structures dating approximately to 1700-1400 BC (Kaman phase IIIB), which are very similar to the large silos found at Hattusa, probably reflects centralised control of grain supply by the Hittite authorities (Fairburn and Omura 2005: 18-22; Fairburn 2005: 131-133). The absence of these constructions at Aphrodisias and Beycesultan, where they had different, domestic level grain storage practices (Greaves 2008: 259-260) probably comprises another aspect of the cultural independence in south-western Anatolia.



## 4.6 Ephesos

The city of Ephesos is well-known for its ruins from the Classical, Roman and Hellenistic periods, as well as for being a significant early Christian centre. However, the prehistoric material from the broader area that has so far been found provides important information not only about the local Anatolian culture but also about the prevalence of Aegean and the penetration of central Anatolian elements. The name of the city appears in the Hittite archives as Apasa,<sup>29</sup> the capital of the western Anatolian kingdom of Arzawa Minor. Ephesos, although a coastal site in the Late Bronze Age, now lies about 10 km from the present coast due to alluvial deposits by the Küçük Menderes. The Aegean and central Anatolian finds of the Late Bronze Age come from several sites in the broader Ephesos area: Ayasoluk, Artemision, and Kuşadası – Yılanlı Burun – Kadı Kalesi.

### *i. Ayasoluk*

An unexpected find came to light during the excavations and restorations at the Basilica of St. John in 1963. A grave was found approximately 37 metres south of the defensive wall of the Byzantine town at a depth of 25cm. Only a few stones were preserved so it was difficult to establish an exact plan of the grave. However, it may have been a chamber tomb. The finds consisted of 2 *kraters*, a *rhyton*, a flask, a flat flask with handles and some sherds from another *krater* (fig. 4.6.1). All the finds are of Mycenaean character. Similar pottery has been found in other sites in western Anatolia and Rhodes and it can be dated to the LH IIIA2 period. Moreover, the medieval castle produced remains of a Late Bronze Age wall (fig. 4.6.2) and Mycenaean sherds (fig. 4.6.3) (Büyükkolancı 2007: 21-22; Georgiadis 2003: 42; Gültekin and Baran 1964: 122-123; Mee 1998: 139; Mellink 1964: 157-158). The finds are now at the archaeological museum in Selçuk.

---

<sup>29</sup> The identification is considered almost certain by the majority of scholars (e.g. Hawkins 1998: 1, 10, 14, 22-24). It is believed that Ephesos is the hellenised form of Apasa. However, Bammer suggests that Apasa was not Ephesos but Ilicatepe, a site south of Kusadası, with visible fortification walls of the so-called Cyclopean style (Bammer 1986/87: 23-28).

Moreover, Mustafa Büyükkolancı (2008: 53, fig. 26) states that two, rather questionable,<sup>30</sup> Mycenaean *tholos* tombs (fig. 4.6.4) have been discovered in Ayasoluk. If the two round constructions prove to be *tholos* tombs, then the broader area of Ephesos (it should also be borne in mind the *tholos* tomb from nearby Colophon, see page 81) offers the only examples of this specific funerary architectural type that have been found in Anatolia so far.

Two cult installations, which have been published recently, raise questions about the cultural contacts between western Anatolia and the Hittite civilization. Specifically, a spring sanctuary (fig. 4.6.5) that is located on the north side of Ayasoluk, just to the south of which lies the temple of Artemis, is believed to have been inspired by Hittite parallels (Bammer and Muss 2007), such as the spring sanctuary from Eflatun Pınar (fig. 4.6.6) near Konya (Mellaart 1962). It should be noted that a Late Bronze figurine of a Hittite 'priest' (fig. 4.6.7) has also been found in the broader area (on the north side of Panayırdağ), and implies further Hittite cult activities (Hanfmann 1962). Moreover, a Late Bronze Anatolian style rock relief has been found at the site of Balık Boğaz on Büldüldağ, south of the city, which features a human figure flanked by antithetical animals, one of which is a deer (İçten and Krinzing 2004; Greaves 2010: 191-192). The presence of two Hittite or Hittite inspired cult installations in central western Anatolia, at the area where Apasa, capital city of Arzawa Minor, was alleged to be located, is really impressive. One might wonder whether it was a cultural characteristic that the local population adopted and included in its religious practices or whether it indicated the active presence of some emigrants, exile aristocrats, merchants or diplomats from Hittite central Anatolia, who felt more at home by worshipping their own gods.

---

<sup>30</sup> Michael Kerschner gave a paper in Oxford in which he speculated that they are Dark Age grain storage silos that Büyükkolancı has misinterpreted as tombs (Greaves, *pers. comm.*).

## *ii. Artemision*

Mycenaean pottery and the head of a Mycenaean terracotta figurine<sup>31</sup> (fig. 4.6.8) have been reported from the area of the *Peripteros* Temple at the Artemision site. Bammer has suggested that there is continuity of cult from the Mycenaean to the historic era due to the finds discovered close to the temple. Another remarkable find is a Minoan-looking, rather than Mycenaean, double-axe (fig. 4.6.9) that probably dates to the Old Palace period (Bammer 1990: 141-142; 1994: 38; Bammer and Muss 1996: 26-27; Gates 1996: 319; Georgiadis 2003: 42).

## *iii. Kuşadası – Yılanlı Burun – Kadı Kalesi*

Several Mycenaean sherds have been reported from Kuşadası (Schachermeyer 1962: 357). A LHIII globular stirrup jar, now in Selçuk Museum, was acquired from a resident of Kuşadası (Alzinger 1972: 22).

The excavations in 2001 at the Byzantine castle of Kadı Kalesi near Kuşadası, 25 km south of Ephesos, brought to light a figurine of a Hittite god, with his right arm raised, a so-called 'Smiting God' (Greaves and Helwing 2004: 141). Moreover, a sondage inside the south-eastern gate of the castle produced Mycenaean LH III C pottery that has a scene of birds taking flight (Greaves and Helwing 2004: 141).

## *iv. Conclusion*

Although the Aegean/ising material which has been found in the area cannot be considered a bombshell, as similar finds have been discovered in several coastal sites of western Anatolia, the appearance of Hittite finds and cultural elements is rather surprising, as the only Hittite traces in western Anatolia are identified in Miletos (see above, page 47). Was it a conscious adoption and 'consumption' of foreign – in this case Hittite – cultural characteristics by the native population of the area? And if so, why were these the only people in western Anatolia who chose to include in their cultural repertoire central Anatolian elements?

---

<sup>31</sup> This figurine presents similarities with the so-called "Lord of Asine", the terracotta figurine in the Museum of Nauplion.

Alternatively, is it possible to imagine a number of Hittites as a component of the population of the broader Ephesos area? The Hittite documents refer to some aristocrats, who had been exiled<sup>32</sup> in western Anatolia as alleged enemies of the king, as well as to some delegates of the Hittite kingdom who negotiated on behalf of their ruler. It seems reasonable, if Ephesos was indeed the Late Bronze Age capital city of Arzawa Minor, to suggest that Apasa concentrated at this interregional centre many 'foreigners' from both the Aegean and central Anatolia. Further research in the future will hopefully shed more light on this topic.

---

<sup>32</sup> Banishing dangerous opponents was a common practice among the Hittite high rank officers. Even the king Uhri-Teshub was exiled, when his uncle Hattusili III seized the throne of Hattusa (Bryce 2003b: 213-215)

## 4.7 Bakla Tepe

### *i. Geographical information and history of research*

The site of Bakla Tepe lies c.4 km north of Colophon, on a rocky hill close to the village of Bulgurca. Excavations have been carried out by the IRERP<sup>33</sup> under the supervision of Prof. Hayat Erkanal. Four architectural levels dated to the Late Chalcolithic period have been revealed, while a fortified settlement and a cemetery dated to the Early Bronze Age I have been investigated. Moreover, a pithos cemetery and few rectangular dwellings dated to the Late Early Bronze Age II (Erkanal 2004: 87-91; Georgiadis 2003: 43).

### *ii. Late Bronze Age material*

A rectangular chamber tomb (fig. 4.7.1) with a long-walled *dromos* has recently been excavated on the highest point of a low flat hill and produced local and Mycenaean pottery dating to LH IIIB. The proportion of Anatolian to Aegean pottery is 75:25%. The wares can be classified in four groups: 1) local undecorated pottery 2) imported Mycenaean pottery 3) local imitations of Mycenaean decorated pottery (fig. 4.7.2) 4) Local Mycenaean-style undecorated pottery. The forms represented include stemmed bowls, *kylikes*, and *alabastra* (Erkanal 2004: 87-91; Erkanal and Özkan 1998: 399-405; Georgiadis 2003: 43; Mee 1998: 140; *IRERP web page*-[http://www.geocities.com/irerp\\_tr/frames.html](http://www.geocities.com/irerp_tr/frames.html)).

A considerable quantity of burnt human and animal bones was found among the pottery as well as many small partly melted bronze animal figurines, which are indicative of a funerary pyre. The other finds in the tomb included lily-shaped ivory plaques (fig. 4.7.3) from a necklace, an ivory spindle whorl, an ivory comb, a gold pin, a piece of a gold necklace in the shape of a shell, and a stone seal. The lily-shaped

---

<sup>33</sup> Izmir Region Excavation and Research Project. It is a regional archaeological programme supported by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture of Turkey and it includes the excavations at Panaztepe and Liman Tepe as well as the rescue excavations at Bakla Tepe, Kocabaştepe and Çeşme-Bağlararası ([http://www.geocities.com/irerp\\_tr/frames.html](http://www.geocities.com/irerp_tr/frames.html), viewed by the author on the 11<sup>th</sup> October 2008).

plaques, the comb and the golden shell necklace are common finds in the Aegean and they can be considered to be products of the Myeneaeen world (Erkanal and Özkan 1998: 401-405; Georgiadis 2003: 43, 84; Mee 1998: 140).

The rectangular shape of the tomb as well as the *dromos* are also commonly seen in the Aegean world but this is a unique find in western Anatolia (Erkanal and Özkan 1998: 401-402). Unfortunately, as is commonly the case, the tomb had been recently destroyed by local villagers who re-used the stones (Dr. Neyir Bostancı, *pers. comm.*).

According to the excavator the chamber was probably built by the inhabitants of the Late Bronze Age settlement of the neighbouring hill of Kocabaş Tepe, which is located 2 km south of Bakla Tepe (Erkanal 2004: 87-88).

## 4.8 Bademgediği Tepe (Puranda?)

### *i. Geographical information and history of research*

This site is located on a hilltop (A. Greaves, *pers. comm.*) of central Western Anatolia in the plain of Torbalı, a few kilometres north of the classical site of Metropolis and excavations have been conducted there since 1999 under the direction of Prof. R. Meriç. The choice of Bademgediği Tepe as a place of a fortified settlement was primarily due to its strategically important situation. The site dominates the area between Ephesos and Smyrna (Meriç 2007: 29). The layers that represent the Late Bronze Age are levels II – VI (fig. 4.8.1).

### *ii. The Aegean/ised material*

Level II provided the great majority of the Mycenaean pottery (fig. 4.8.2-3) – which is locally made – from the site. Almost 800 sherds have been found so far; these form a small percentage of the total pottery assemblage at Bademgediği Tepe (Meriç and Mountjoy 2002: 83). All phases of LH IIIC are present; however there is nothing earlier. It is the only site on the west Anatolian coast that has produced such a large corpus of LH IIIC pottery (Meriç and Mountjoy 2002: 83). One of the most remarkable finds is a *krater* portraying rowers in a ship (fig. 4.8.4). Some other pictorial pieces are decorated with birds or fish (Meriç 2003: 88). The closed shapes comprise jugs, amphorae and *hydriae*. There are also sherds of a stirrup jar, one sherd that can be assigned to a rounded *alabastron*, one to a strainer jug and one to an *amphoroid krater* (Meriç and Mountjoy 2002: 83). The open shapes consist of deep bowls, ring-based *kraters* and many sherds from the one-handed conical bowl FS 242. The latter is a characteristic shape of LH IIIC Middle and Late. It is interesting that only a few examples have been published from settlement sites in the Aegean, while the shape is common in the settlement at Tarsus in south-east Anatolia. There are also examples of the large *kalathos* (Meriç and Mountjoy 2002: 83-84). Level II is so far architecturally the best-stratified level. There are three successive building phases 1 metre in depth along the fortification wall, which surrounds the wall (Meriç 2003: 87).

The local pottery of the period consists of Orange-brown and Red Wares, Grey Ware, Gold Wash Ware and Creamy Ware. The examples of the two first types compare well with pottery from the Late Bronze Age levels at Aphrodisias and Beycesultan I. There are also similarities in the pottery (Meriç 2003: 88) found at Troy (Troy VIh, VIIa, VIIb).

The bulk of pottery from levels III-V consists of local Anatolian pottery (fig. 4.8.5). A sherd from Level III identified as LM IIIA2 suggests a date of ca. 1375-1300 B.C. (Meriç 2003: 89; 2004: 31). The main groups are: 1) Grey Ware, which seems to be in the North West Anatolian tradition. The most typical shapes are bowls, cups, *kraters* and spouted 'teapots'. The incised wavy lines and horizontal line on the *kraters* and a Grey ware flask resemble those of Late Troy VI. The pottery has also similarities to the ware found at Beycesultan Level III. 2) Orange – brown and Red Ware, Gold Wash Ware and Creamy Ware. They are represented in almost the same proportions as Grey Ware. Large *kraters*, bowls and plates are quite common. In level III there are a few plates similar to the Trojan A 49 in Orange – brown and Red Wares. Some plate forms may also be compared with ones found at Beycesultan Level II (Meriç 2003: 89-90).

Two LM IA sherds date the earliest level (VI) of the excavation. The majority of the pottery belongs to the local western Anatolian ceramic tradition and consists of Red-coated or washed carinated bowls, similar to ones in level IV at Beycesultan, Grey Ware, Gold Wash Ware, and Creamy Ware. Remains of the fortification wall of Cyclopean masonry<sup>34</sup> are preserved in this layer (Meriç 2003: 81, 84, 91).

---

<sup>34</sup> The author has serious doubts whether the wall is indeed of Cyclopean masonry. This term "is commonly used with reference to the style of building with huge unworked or slightly worked stone boulders that weight several tons" (Nossov 2008: 14). As can be seen from the first publications of the site the poor preservation of the defensive wall does not allow the type of its masonry to be precisely defined. So the use of term Cyclopean masonry in this case is extremely risky. Moreover, it is felt that the above term cannot be used for such an early period (LM IA).



### *iii. Identification with Puranda of the Hittite texts*

The excavators have taken into account the Hittite archives that refer to a fortified Arzawan city in central western Anatolia called Puranda and they have identified this site with it (Meriç 2004: 31). However, the author believes that it is rather early to make such identification while the excavation is still ongoing and without having written and strong archaeological evidence from the site itself which will no doubt verify the above hypothesis.

One may observe again that as far as the archaeological material is concerned this is a typical western Anatolian site; however, although it is located a certain distance from the coast a strong Aegean influence during the latest phases of the Late Bronze Age is apparent .

## 4.9 Çeşme-Bağlararası

### *i. History of research*

One of the best and most well-organised excavations (fig. 4.9.1) that the author has personally seen in western Anatolia has been undertaken by IRERP, under the supervision of Professor Hayat Erkanal, at the touristic city of Çeşme-Bağlararası. The excavation began in 2002 close to the modern harbour of Çeşme and it has provided important information about many aspects of Anatolian and Aegean prehistory during the Middle and Late Bronze Age (Şahoğlu 2007: 309-310).

### *ii. Middle Bronze Age*

#### *Çeşme-Bağlararası Phase 2b*

Phase ÇB 2b (fig. 4.9.2) is the earliest of the settlement so far and dates to within the MM III according to the Aegean chronology. The settlement is characterized by a well-organised plan with large groups of houses (nine so far) separated by two streets.<sup>35</sup> The houses consist of single rooms and were constructed of mud brick on local limestone slabs that were used as foundations. A plastered surface covered the inner faces of the walls, while the houses were constructed independently of one other and almost every house had its own walls. The plastering on the house walls could be interpreted as being influenced by Minoan architecture (Şahoğlu 2007: 310, 319). Another significant feature of the architecture is the use of double walls. It should be noted that almost every house had an oven located in the far left interior corner. In addition, one or two in situ jars were found, some in secondary use and sunk into the ground, while in other houses a hearth was located next to the oven (Şahoğlu 2007: 311).

The most important buildings that have been excavated so far are Houses 13, 14, 19, 20 (fig. 4.9.3) and the Wine House, a building that appears to be one of the earliest examples of wine production<sup>36</sup> and storage in the eastern Aegean, as the

---

<sup>35</sup>For a summary see Greaves and Helwing 2004: 240-241.

<sup>36</sup>For parallels in the Minoan world see Kopaka 1993.

finds that were discovered in it indicate. In the front room some evidence is associated with wine production, i.e. a circular plastered basin linked to a smaller plastered pit. The first feature was probably the press while the smaller pit was the place where the juice was collected. Moreover, the storage rooms of the house strengthen the arguments for its function as a place of wine production; apart from the pottery that was found (bowls, jars and a lid) the floor and the four walls of the central room were plastered indicating the use of the room as a cistern where wine was kept (Erkanal and Karaturgut 2004: 156-157; Şahoğlu 2007: 311-315; Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 290).

The majority of the pottery was local, and in this phase there were few imported ceramics. This local pottery displays strong central Anatolian influences, paralleled at nearby Liman Tepe (Şahoğlu 2007: 316). The groups that dominate are the buff-slipped and red-slipped vessels – characteristic pottery groups in the broader area that have been found at Panaztepe, Kocabaş Tepe, Liman Tepe – while coarse-ware vessels, serving as cooking pots, are also widespread. An important assemblage that was unearthed in the Wine House consists of buff-or-red-slipped trefoil jugs (fig. 4.9.4) and hemispherical cups (fig. 4.9.5) that were used as drinking vessels and have been interpreted as the equivalent of the Minoan conical cups on the western Anatolian coastline (Şahoğlu 2007: 315-316). Moreover, various sherds and vessels were discovered in the street adjacent to the Wine House. The most characteristic are two face-pots with quite large dimensions that were used as storage vessels, large trefoil-mouthed jugs, bowls, a *pyxis*, a jar and an imported footed vessel. The imported pottery from this phase is yellowish and has a soft fabric. One dark-slipped lid (fig. 4.9.6) has been classified as an import. It is probably of Theran origin and it belongs to the group known as ‘dark-faced incised pottery’. The top of the lid is decorated with impressed concentric circles and incised lines. Sherds of similar lids have been found in various other parts of the site (Şahoğlu 2007: 315-316).

The period appears to have ended with an earthquake. The consequence of this natural disaster was the collapse of many buildings of the settlement (Şahoğlu 2007: 311).

### *Çeşme-Bağlararası Phase 2a*

This phase represents the continuation of the cultural traits of phase 2b and it must have been short-lived. During this period the remaining part of the destroyed buildings were reused and their doorways were blocked with vertically placed stones. The existence of many stone, plastered and clay basins in this phase point towards the arrangement of facilities for food preparation, production, and, above all, storage (Şahoğlu 2007: 317). The pottery continues to be the same as the previous phase without any significant changes. The predominance of local buff-slipped pottery of western Anatolian style is complete and no new shapes are introduced, while the small quantity of imported pottery vessels have the same characteristic as the greyish yellow wares of the previous phase (Şahoğlu 2007: 317). Vasif Şahoğlu suggests that the discovery of a dagger from this phase offers evidence for metallurgical production and activities within the settlement; however the author of the present thesis believes that a single metal object is not sufficient to justify any connection to metallurgical activities. The date of the end of this phase remains unknown. The destruction of a building by fire may provide a clue as to how the site met its end, but this question must at present be left open due to lack of firm evidence (Şahoğlu 2007: 317).

### iii. Late Bronze Age<sup>37</sup>

#### *Çeşme-Bağlararası Phase 1*

The Level 1 phase at Çeşme is contemporary with LM IA on Crete and preserves only fragments of walls and pits, while there is a total lack of any architectural units. The greater part of the pottery from the pits consists of the characteristic Anatolian buff-slipped wares and the most common shape is the bead-rim bowl. Moreover, cups with flat bases are abundant and replace the semi-globular cups of the previous phase. Another significant group of pottery consists of incense burners, very similar to the ones known from the Theran wall paintings (Şahoğlu 2007: 317).

---

<sup>37</sup> It should be noted that the Aegean Late Bronze Age is late Middle Bronze Age in Anatolian terms.

One of the most interesting features of this phase of the settlement is the imported pottery that displays a wide variety of forms and fabrics. The Minoan imports are characterised by their high quality. A jug, a cup and some sherds in ripple ware (fig. 4.9.7) belong to this group and the possibility that some of these objects have been produced in central Crete cannot be ruled out. Furthermore, loomweights of the so-called Minoan discoid type were found in the pits, as well as a faience bead, a glass bead, an ivory inlay and a gold wire (Şahoğlu 2007: 317-318).

Cycladic and southeastern Aegean 'Minoanising' ware dating to the LM IA period forms the largest imported pottery group at the site. Dark-on-light pottery is in abundance, while some light-on-dark sherds (4.9.8) also occur. Some of the imported wares are thought to have a Theran origin. Moreover, a unique find in this part of the Aegean is a Cycladic white-slipped jug, bearing geometric motifs. The settlement was abandoned after level 1 and there is no evidence so far to suggest a reason for its end (Şahoğlu 2007: 317).

### *The Mycenaean phase*

A pit from an excavated area of the northwest part of the main excavation provided material contemporary with the LH IIIA2 – IIIB1 periods. This pit is dug into the Middle Bronze Age levels and contains local buff-slipped pottery along with imported painted Mycenaean ware. This pottery consists of *kylikes*, stirrup jars, bowls and spouted bowls. These finds show the possible existence of a Late Bronze Age settlement in the vicinity, although the intensive modern habitation in the area makes further investigation difficult. Any occupation layers have been truncated by later settlement activity and only this single pit survives (Şahoğlu 2007: 310; Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 290).

### *iii. Conclusion*

The material culture of Çeşme-Bağlararası displays a local western Anatolian character but with close relations to both the central Anatolian and Minoan worlds. The pottery is predominantly local Anatolian – more than 90% - however, the

imported wares from the south-eastern Aegean, the Cyclades and Minoan Crete<sup>38</sup> as well as the locally made pottery of Minoan style highlight the fact that this harbour settlement had strong links with an extensive trade network that included many sites and areas, while it is possible that a significant Minoan population may have resided there, together with the local population (Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 290). It must also be born in mind that Çeşme-Bağlararası is the northernmost settlement on the western Anatolian coast where traits of Minoan culture in terms of pottery is identified (Şahoğlu 2007: 317).

The existence of a settlement dating to the Middle and Late Bronze Age is considered of great importance by the local authorities. The construction of a shelter that covers the excavated area, as can be seen (fig. 4.9.9), reveals both the will and determination to protect their local cultural heritage.

---

<sup>38</sup>It must be noted that among the Anatolian sites known to have Minoan/ising pottery, the concentration at Çeşme-Bağlararası is second only to Miletos (Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 290).

## 4.10 Liman Tepe

### *i. Geographical information and history of research*

A remarkable prehistoric site of central western Anatolia is Liman Tepe. It has been excavated since 1992 by Hayat Erkanal, as a part of the IRERP research project. As the modern name *Liman* ('port') *Tepe* ('hill') reveals, the site is located close to the sea, on the southern coast of the Bay of Izmir and it is situated within the İskele quarter of Urla. It is in the shape of a peninsula, now partly covered by the modern settlement, facing Karantina Island and it was obviously the prehistoric precursor to Klazomenai as may be seen from its vicinity to this well known ancient Ionian city. It is a site with habitation from the Late Chalcolithic up to the end of the Late Bronze Age (Erkanal 2008a: 179-180). Although the better known periods archaeologically are the Chalcolithic and the Early Bronze Age, the Middle and Late Bronze Age periods of the site contribute equally to the archaeology of the Aegean and western Anatolia.

### *ii. Middle Bronze Age*

Middle Bronze Age remains have been found both on the northern and southern sides of the modern road at Liman Tepe. In the northern part there are several oval shaped buildings, possibly of wattle-and-daub. These structures are always associated with ovens and various goods which reflect certain forms of production at the site and many artefacts associated with textile production and metallurgical activities have been recovered from this area. Remains to the south of the main road, however, reflect monumental structures whose function still awaits clarification and the present evidence suggests a function other than production. The earliest phase of the Middle Bronze Age is characterized by 'matt painted' and Grey Minyan wares, along with the abundant buff wares. 'Matt Painted' wares disappear in the following phases while the latter two continue into the Late Bronze Age (Gates 1995: 222, Gates 1996: 303, 277-335; *IRERP web page* – [http://www.geocities.com/irerp\\_tr/frames.html](http://www.geocities.com/irerp_tr/frames.html)).

### *iii. Late Bronze Age*

The Late Bronze Age levels were uncovered for the first time during the 1997 season (except for a well dating to the 14th century B.C. which was discovered during the 1993 season), while during his visit to the site in August 2007<sup>39</sup> the author saw the recently excavated Bronze Age buildings (fig. 4.10.1-2) which were unearthed during the 2006 excavation season. The houses contained storage jars. Three layers of the Late Bronze Age were identified in Liman Tepe covering the time span from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIC (fig. 4.10.3). Three pottery kilns (fig. 4.10.4) belonging to the LH IIIA2 layer were uncovered - one of them was only partially seen in the trench's profile (Erkanal and Aykurt 2008: 227-231). Together with the pottery kiln found in 1979 (Erkanal and Erkanal 1983) which most probably belongs to the same layer, four pottery kilns have been found in Liman Tepe from the Late Bronze Age (Votruba-Mangaloglu, *pers. comm.*<sup>40</sup>). Their parallels are known from other sites of the Aegean e.g. Kocabas Tepe and the closest parallels come from the second Late Bronze Age layer of Miletos (Niemeier 2005a: 12). The archaeological remains of the period are mainly contemporary with the LH III period in the Aegean. A foot-shaped andiron was found in 2006 (*Current Archaeology in Turkey web page* – <http://cat.une.edu.au/page/liman%20tepe>). The Mycenaean pottery (fig. 4.10.5) makes up 5 to 10 per cent of the total pottery assemblage, while the local imitations are much greater in number compared to the imports – although without analysis it is difficult to say which ones are 'imports' (Votruba-Mangaloglu *pers. comm.*; Erkanal 2008b). A child buried in a pot of Troy VIIb type was found in a disturbed Late Bronze Age deposit (Greaves and Helwing 2001: 505). The head of a Mycenaean female figurine (fig. 4.10.6) that could belong to the *Phi*, *Psi* or *Tau* type (Günel 1998; 1999), stone seals and some jewellery ornaments are among the distinct finds from this level at Liman Tepe (Gates 1995: 222). Another figurine of *Psi* type was found in

---

<sup>39</sup> The author is grateful to Professor Erkanal for permission to visit the site. The finds from this season's work will be reported in *KST* and are referred to here with the kind permission of Professor Erkanal.

<sup>40</sup> Sıla Votruba-Mangaloğlu is currently preparing her thesis on the Late Bronze Age material from Liman Tepe at the University of Ankara under the supervision of Professor H. Erkanal.



2001 excavations in a pit. It is a locally made example and its head is missing. (Erkanal *et al.* 2003: 426, 436, fig.7).

Detailed reports about the progress of the excavations at Liman Tepe have been annually published since 1992 in *KST* and *AraşST*. English summaries appear online on the *IRERP Home Page* and *Current Archaeology in Turkey*.

## 4.11 Beycesultan

### *i. Geographical information and a brief history of research*

The site is a twin-peaked mound (fig. 4.11.1-2) in the Çivril valley, west of an old bend of the Büyük Menderes (fig. 4.11.3), about 5 km southwest of the modern town of Çivril (Thompson 2007: 88). The excavations were carried out from 1954 to 1959 by the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara under the direction of Seton Lloyd. Both the pottery and architectural remains reveal that Beycesultan was probably the most important administrative centre in the broader area of southwestern Anatolia during the Middle and Late Bronze Age. Various theories have been proposed regarding the connection of the site with names of cities mentioned in the Hittite archives (e.g. Pantazis 2007: 446-448). However, due to the lack of written sources<sup>41</sup> about the site itself it is impossible for any theory about the name or the history of the city to be confirmed or rejected. Despite the importance of the site during the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age, it is the Middle and Late Bronze Age levels that concern this research and will be examined here.

### *ii. Middle Bronze Age*

The introduction of 'palaces' took place in the Middle Bronze Age at Beycesultan (Lloyd and Mellaart 1962: 10; Thompson 2007: 90). The so-called 'Burnt Palace' (fig. 4.11.4-5) and the five-room *megaron*/temple building in Area R (fig. 4.11.6) of Level V are dated from ca.1900 to 1750 B.C (Lloyd and Mellart 1965: 3-7, 39). A destruction layer marks the end of Beycesultan V, which is connected by the excavator with a Hittite invasion<sup>42</sup> under the leadership of Labarna or Hattusili I (Lloyd and Mellart 1965: 73-74). The pottery displays a seeming continuity in

---

<sup>41</sup> It is surprising that not a single piece of any inscribed material has been found in a site comparable in size and importance with the most important Aegean and Anatolian centres of the period. However, this fact might be accidental, as an inscribed sherd with an incised Hieroglyphic Luwian sign was found at the mound at Çivril (10 km. away) betraying a knowledge of writing in the broader area (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 93)

<sup>42</sup> The aforementioned theory seems to be without foundation since no evidence that connects the destruction level with a Hittite invasion has been found.

development from the Middle Bronze to the Late Bronze Age with two-thirds of the shapes following the tradition (Thompson 2007: 90; Lloyd and Mellaart 1965: 69). The pottery (fig. 4.11.7) retains a decidedly local character, typical of Middle Bronze Age south-western Anatolia in general (Thompson 2007: 94; Lloyd and Mellaart 1965: 69-70) and the shapes – shallow hemispherical incurving or carinated bowls, chalices and jars – are heavily influenced by metal prototypes (Joukowsky 1986: 466). The site maintained its membership of a shared south-western culture marked by regionalism (Lloyd and Mellaart 1965: 74-76; Thompson 2007: 94).

A long discussion among scholars started when it became clear that the 'Burnt Palace' at Beycesultan shared some architectural features<sup>43</sup> with the near-contemporary Minoan palaces, such as a rectangular central courtyard, a stairway leading out of the main courtyard giving access to an upper storey, lightwells, halls with pillars and columns similar to the Cretan ones, and upper floors with important rooms (Bittel 2007: 96-97, Lloyd and Mellaart 1965: 18, 33, 62). Additionally, the erection of a heavy wooden post or pillar on a clay pedestal in a building of religious character in Area R provides one more parallel with the earliest religious cults in Crete (Lloyd and Mellaart 1965: 45). It has been suggested that these similarities provided evidence for close relations and strong cultural bonds between the two areas and, in the author's opinion, this possibility cannot be ruled out. However, the poor preservation of the architectural remains of the 'Burnt Palace' does not allow for further speculation. For instance it cannot be said with certainty that the wooden remains of the palace provide sufficient evidence for the existence of columns. Additionally, the lightwells could also be seen as a characteristic of the local western Anatolian architecture without having any relation to Crete (Bittel 2007: 97).

---

<sup>43</sup> It has also been suggested that the design of the palace of Acemhöyük indicates close connections with Minoan Crete; however, there is a radical difference in that the Minoan palaces look inward on to a central court while the palace of Acemhöyük looks outward (Burney 2006: 3).

### iii. Late Bronze Age

Late Bronze Age Beycesultan (levels III-I) was marked by a 'renaissance' in the ceramic industry and is characterized by a destruction and the introduction of new pottery styles in level II (Thompson 2007: 90; Mellaart and Murray 1995: 1, 57,93). Late Bronze Age Beycesultan continued to interact and share pottery styles with its neighbours; however these correlated more closely with the south and the east than the north and west (Thompson 2007: 94, Mellaart and Murray 1995: 101-104, maps 1-4).

Burnished ware with a red, buff, red-brown or brown slip as well as ware covered with a blackish-brown wash constituted the dominant pottery group of Beycesultan III (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 1). Lustrous ware was less common; however, it can also be considered typical of the period, while a fragment (fig. 4.11.8) of a Mycenaean stirrup-jar, which dates to LH IIIA/B, is a unique import at the site (Mellaart 1970: 63, 65; Mellaart and Murray 1995: 1, 93). Fourteen new shapes appeared during this period. Among the innovations are some of the most characteristic shapes from Late Bronze Age south-western Anatolia such as chalices, goblets, fruitstands, beer-mugs, *askoi*, kraters and stamped *pithoi* (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 2).

Lustrous ware was to become the characteristic pottery of Beycesultan II, amounting to about 90% of all the pottery found. The rest consisted of burnished ware and of plain, coarse kitchenware (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 21). The most characteristic shapes (fig. 4.11.9) were a large variety of chalices and fruitstands, beak-spouted, trefoil and quatrefoil mouthed jugs, carinated bowls, simple bowls, *askoi* and *pithoi* (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 22). Sherds of a lentoid vessel thought to be a central Anatolian painted pilgrim flask were found in the same level. Initially, at the time of its discovery, the aforementioned vessel was described by the excavators as 'imitation Mycenaean' (Thompson 94-95, Mellaart 1970: 63; Mellaart and Murray 1995: 22). A new palace at Beycesultan, the so-called 'Little Palace', less impressive than its Middle Bronze Age predecessor, offers a parallel to many Mycenaean palaces (Pylos, Mycenae, Tiryns) across the Aegean (Mellaart and

Murray 1995: 21). A destruction marks the end of Beycesultan II (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 56).

After the burning of the 'Little Palace', the next period (Beycesultan I) revealed a lot of changes in the ceramic industry, with some features finding parallels in central Anatolia (Mellaart 1970: 65; Mellaart and Murray 1995: 93) perhaps indicating increased contact with this region later in the Hittite period (Thompson 2007: 95). A new burnished wheel-made pottery with a bright range of colours appeared, which coexisted with the old red, grey and gold lustrous ware. The new burnished ware has close parallels with the Hittite pottery of Büyükkale IIIA-B (ca. 1265-1200 B.C.) and might have been introduced to the site by newcomers. Additionally, for the first time since the Middle Bronze Age plain, coarse kitchen wares appeared in quantity (Mellaart 1970: 65; Mellaart and Murray 1995: 56), while 24 new shapes emerged in Beycesultan I (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 57).

An isolated building, called by the excavator a 'Megaron' was built, however its architectural remains are undistinguished (Mellaart and Murray 1995: 56). After the destruction of Beycesultan IA the site was reoccupied in the Middle Byzantine period (Mellaart 1970: 67).

Generally speaking, Beycesultan retains a south-western Anatolian cultural identity (Thompson 2007: 97). It can be said that, on the basis of the current evidence, the external connections of the site were limited and a distinctive local culture flourished without significant influences from the neighbouring cultural spheres.

## 4.12 Panaztepe

### *i. Geographical information and a brief history of research*

A prehistoric site that was identified in 1985 and has provided much information about burial customs in western Anatolia is Panaztepe. It is located on the delta of the Gediz (Hermos) River, between Menemen and Foça (ancient Phocaea) on the south side of an ancient bay and may originally have been on a small island, while today it is ca. 10 km inland from the Aegean Sea (Çınardalı – Karaaslan 2008: 58; Mellink 1987: 13).

### *ii. The Late Bronze Age cemetery*

The cemetery is characterised by a variety of burial customs that reveal influences from Aegean and Anatolian burial practices. Specifically, 19 *tholoi*, 16 jar burials, 12 cist graves, 3 composite graves, 2 stone box graves, 2 urn burials, 1 miniature *tholos* grave and 1 rectangular chamber tomb have been so far excavated. Unfortunately, the tombs were partially looted. The *tholoi* (fig. 4.12.1) are oval structures and they have short *dromoi* and doorways to the southwest, blocked by stone packing (Erkanal 1986: 255-259; 1987: 345-350; Erkanal – Öktü 2008: 73; Erkanal and Erkanal 1986: 69-72; Ersoy 1988: 59-80; Georgiadis 2003: 44; Greaves and Helwing 2003: 94; Mellink 1987: 13). A wall that has been recently found, running in a north-west/south-east direction, divides the cemetery into two. Almost all graves located to the northeast of the wall have their entrances facing southwest, while those located to the southwest of the wall have their entrances facing southeast (Erkanal – Öktü 2008: 73; Greaves and Helwing 2003: 94). No other parallel dating to the Late Bronze Age has been found anywhere else in this region (Georgiadis 2003: 44).

According to Mee the construction of circular stone-built *tholoi* does not necessarily imply Mycenaean influences and he points out that only two such *tholos* tombs have been identified in the Aegean (one on Mykonos and one on Tenos) while the majority of these circular tombs have been excavated in the south-western Peloponnese and not on the east coast. He suggests that the local communities in

this area of Anatolia had developed their own distinctive practices, which evidently continued through to the case of the Submycenaean cemetery of Çömlekçiköy (Mee 1998: 142).

Multiple burials, inhumations and cremations in jars among the walls demonstrate the variety of the burial customs. The pottery of the site consists of local Anatolian pottery (fig. 4.12.2), locally produced Mycenaean and imported Mycenaean wares dating from LH IIIA to LH IIIC. The most characteristic shapes are stirrup jars, *pyxides*, lentoid flasks and three-handled jars (fig. 4.12.3). Various grave offerings such as bronze spearheads, knives, arrow-heads and tools, gold, silver, glass and stone jewellery, and sealstones have been reported (Erkanal and Erkanal 1986: 69 – 72; Ersoy 1988: 59-80; Gates 1994: 259; 1995: 222; Georgiadis 2003: 44; Greaves and Helwing 2003: 94; Mellink 1987: 13; 1988: 114; 1989: 117; Mee 1998: 140).

According to one theory, local Anatolians were buried in the graves with Mycenaean offerings that were the result of commercial activities and were not evidence of Mycenaean colonisation (Ersoy 1988: 82).

#### 4.13 Troy

Although the famous Homeric city and its broader area are geographically part of western Anatolia, the present author considers Troy to be a different case study site, and it will only be briefly examined here.<sup>44</sup> The site is located on the hill of Hisarlik in north-western Anatolia, south-west of the Dardanelles.

It could be argued that Troy can be examined as a unique phenomenon in the cultural history of ancient Greece and the modern western tradition and not merely as a simple archaeological site. Homer created a legend which survived thousands of years and it still remains attractive.<sup>45</sup> The influence of the Homeric tradition was deep in both ancient and modern 'western societies' – the Romans for instance claimed an origin from the Trojan hero Aeneas (Virgil, *Aeneid*) and perhaps the name *Troy* is one of the few ancient names which still arouses so much discussion. It is worth mentioning that many important historical persons such as Xerxes, Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Caracalla, Constantine and Mehmet II went out to visit the site and pay their respects (Cline 2008: 13).

The 'discovery' by Heinrich Schliemann at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century of the prehistoric 'cities' built in succession to each other was a landmark in the history of archaeology. Wilhelm Dörpfeld continued the excavation for a short period of time (1893-94). The systematic excavation that started after Schliemann's era in the 30's under the direction of Carl Blegen provided a considerable amount of information. For many years Troy was the only important excavation in western Anatolia. After a long period of inactivity, excavations re-opened in 1988 under the direction of Professor Manfred Korfmann. The results of the new campaign, especially those covering the period that equates to the Late Bronze Age, were really useful as the

---

<sup>44</sup> Numerous books, articles, essays are continuously being published about every aspect of Trojan archaeology, a fact that reveals the "enduring fascination" of the site and its significant influence on archaeologists. Troy and its relations could be the subject of many theses and it is beyond the purpose of this research to refer further to an already well studied topic.

<sup>45</sup> It is significant that many popular books, novels and movies have dealt with Troy and the Trojan War in general, while *Troy*, the most recent film on this subject, released in 2004, was a box office hit.



stratigraphy was clarified and in the years that followed new information was added to the archaeological map of the area. However, in a symposium that was held at the University of Tübingen, Korfmann was sharply criticised for alleged misinterpretation of the data and insufficient methodology (Dieter and Kolb: 2003: 86). Since then, Korfmann's supporters and opponents have quarrelled about the validity of their respective arguments.

This excavator of Troy and, after his passing, his adherents, considered that the site was the political capital of a significant regional power in western Anatolia, which could probably be identified as Wilusa (Homeric *Ἰλιον/Illion*), while it occupied a pivotal position in the trading networks (Easton *et al*: 2002). The challengers of this position dismiss these arguments; they convey doubts about whether late Troy VI was a city at all and consider it to have been an aristocratic residence, with a *primus inter pares* as a leading political figure, while they believe that the identification with Wilusa is only hypothetical and that there is no evidence to suggest a dominant role in trade (Dieter and Kolb: 2003).

Putting aside the importance of Troy as a palatial and commercial centre, it is useful to say a few things about the connections of the site with both the Aegean and Hittite worlds. Surprisingly, no LM I pottery has been found so far at Troy and it seems that the Minoan influence was never as strong in that area as it was further south (Mountjoy 1998: 33-34). A Minoan bronze figurine, which is now in Berlin, was said to have been found in the Troad (Niemeier 2005b: 200).

However, a relatively large amount of Mycenaean pottery has been found at Troy. The majority of this pottery is locally made or has an East Aegean – West Anatolian provenance (Mountjoy 1997a), while chemical analysis has shown that certain sherds come from the Greek mainland (Mommsen *et al*. 2001: 173 ff.). Mycenaean ware is first attested in Troy VI<sub>d</sub>, contemporary with LH IIA, and most of it has a linear or patterned decoration, although there is a remarkable exception, a LH IIIC *krater* with pictorial decoration (Mountjoy 1997b). It must be stressed that local Grey Ware is the most characteristic pottery of Troy VI, while the Mycenaean wares constitute only 1%-2%, a fact that rules out the possibility of Mycenaean settlers (Mee 1978: 146-147; 1998: 144; Mountjoy 1998: 35; Pavuk 2005).

Mycenaean pottery at Troy, either locally made or imported, is characterised by both open and closed shapes, including, *inter alia*, cups, *kylikes*, piriform jars and stirrup jars (Mee 2008: 371). Contacts between Troy and Mycenaean Greece may have continued until Troy VIIb2, as the link between the local Knobbed Ware and the hand-made burnished pottery which appears in early LH IIIC contexts reveals (Mee 1984: 54), although Mee is more dubious about it now and suggests a link with Italy (Prof. C. Mee, *pers. comm.*).

Mycenaean pottery dating to LH IIIA2 and IIIB1 has also been found at the cemetery of Beşik Tepe, eight kilometres outside Troy. The cemetery is characterised by a variety of burial types (among others *pithos* graves, cist graves, and chamber tombs), while the local pottery predominates. Beşik Tepe also functioned as Troy's ancient harbour (Korfmann 1986; Pavuk 2005: 274 -275).

Since no Hittite objects have been found in Troy the major connection with the central Anatolian world remains the name *Wilusa* that appears in the archives of Hattusa. According to the Hittite scribes Wilusa was a state in western Anatolia almost always friendly with the Hittites, as is obvious from the treaty between the Hittite king Muwatalli and the local ruler Alaksandu (for further information see Chapter 8, pages 112-113).

Blegen argued that the legendary Homeric city was Troy VIIa. Topics such as the historicity of the Trojan War, although very interesting and of crucial importance for the archaeological research, are beyond the remit of this thesis. A general bibliography of key works about Troy is also included with this research although the author has not specifically referred to these publications in the text. *Studia Troica* is the journal which has dealt with the subject of Troy since 1991.

## 5. Sites with Aegean material in Anatolia

Apart from the case study sites presented in Chapter 4 there are various locations in Anatolia that have produced Aegean and/or Aegeanising material, mainly pottery.<sup>46</sup> For practical reasons a geographical division of these sites will be followed.

### 5.1. North-western Anatolia – North of the Gediz

**Çerkes Sultaniye – Bağyoglu:** A Mycenaean LH IIIB jar was found in a native *pithos* burial at Çerkes Sultaniye. The Argolid seems the most likely source. (Mellink 1959: 295; Blackman and Cook 1964-5: 44; Bittel 1967: 19; Boysal 1967: 48, pl. 22; French 1964: 260; Hanfmann and Waldbaum 1968: 52-53; Mellaart 1968: 188).

**Eğriköy:** Two doubtful pieces of Mycenaean pottery come from Eğriköy (French 1969: 73).

**Elaia – Kazıkbağları:** A Mycenaean sherd is reported from Elaia (Mellaart 1968: 188).

**Larisa on the Hermus – Buruncuk:** A single unstratified LH IIIC sherd from the 1902 excavations was a part of a jar or jug (Boehlau and Schefold 1942: 169).

**Phocaea – Eski Foça:** Several Mycenaean sherds have been reported (Sartiaux 1921: 122, Bittel 1934: 92-93; 1967: 19; Özyiğit 2001: 6; 2004: 442-443).

**Pitane – Çandarlı/Kocabağlar:** Several Mycenaean sherds are reported from various prehistoric sites in the broader area of Kocabağlar. A Mycenaean octopus stirrup jar comes from the same area, from the cemetery of ancient Pitane, and dates to LH IIIC (Perrot and Chipiez 1894: 923-931; Bittel 1950: 22; Mellink 1963: 189; Mee 1978: 143-144).

---

<sup>46</sup> A complete catalogue of the Aegean material in various sites of Anatolia has been compiled by Christopher Mee (1978) and still remains a valuable resource for the researcher. In this chapter the available updated information about the above material found in various sources is also included.

Pergamon: A sword (fig 5.1.1) left by Arthur Evans in the Ashmolean museum is said to have come from Pergamon and it is classified in Sandars' class H (Sandars 1963: 140, 153, pl. 27:52).

Şarköy: A sword and several axes that were found amongst a hoard of metal objects at Şarköy are possibly Mycenaean (Mellink 1985: 558).

## 5.2. Central-western Anatolia – Between the Büyük Menderes and Gediz

Colophon – Değirmendere: A small Mycenaean *tholos* tomb (3.87 m diameter, maximum height 1.70 m. above the floor of the tomb, fig. 5.2.1) dating to the LH IIIB/C period was unearthed in 1922 west of the ancient city of Colophon, in the area of the modern village of Değirmendere. Due to the unstable political situation and the war that followed the fragments of pottery from the tomb were lost. Although the position of the tomb was determined it is no longer visible. A number of Mycenaean sherds were also found but were also lost during the civil strife (Bridges 1974: 264-266).

Moreover, a knife (fig. 5.2.2), a silver pin and a blue glass paste bead were discovered in a grave at the foot of a hill near to Colophon (Greenwell 1902: 6, fig. 5-6). The knife is similar to a knife from lalysos (fig. 5.2.3), now in the British Museum (Sandars 1963: 140).

Erythrai – Reisdere: Some Mycenaean sherds are said to have been found on a small peninsula about 8 kilometres from Erythrai between the villages of Şifne and Reisdere (Mellink 1968: 134).

Gavurtepe – Alaşehir: Two Mycenaean sherds have been identified at this site. The first one was probably part of a flask, the second sherd was possibly from an *askos* or a *rhyton* (Boysal 1967: 17-18, 46-47; Mellink 1991: 138).

Izmir: A Mycenaean (?) sword (fig. 5.2.4) of Sandars' type B – which could be dated to LHI – was discovered in the Roman Agora. Being unstratified, the sword could possibly be from a disturbed tomb (Bittel 1942: 175; Bittel and Schneider 1943: 203; Sandars 1961: 27-28). A stone mould (fig. 5.2.5) acquired in Izmir, now in the museum of Berlin, might be either Minoan or Mycenaean (Furtwängler and Löschke

1886: 34). Moreover, a Minoan female bronze figurine, which is now in Frankfurt, was said to come from Izmir (Niemeier 2005b: 200).

Old Smyrna – Bayraklı: A number of unstratified Mycenaean sherds are reported from excavations at the area of Old Smyrna (Cook 1952: 104-105; Mellink 1973: 178; Mee 1978: 142 – 143). Moreover, a Minoan/Mycenaean (?) seal (fig. 5.2.6) from the same area, now in the Ashmolean Museum, is reported (Kenna 1960: 141, No. 375, pl. 14).

Sardis – Sart: A number of sherds have been identified as Mycenaean; however, only a crater and a deep bowl might actually be Mycenaean, either LH IIIB or IIIC (Hanfmann 1967: 25-26).

Smyrna – Bayraklı: Five Mycenaean sherds from the broader area of Bayraklı are now in Izmir Museum, dating to LH IIIC1/C2 (Özgünel 1983: 709-715).

Tire – Ahmetler: A Mycenaean LH IIIA2 *pyxis* is reported from this site (Mee 1998: 138; Mellink 1989: 117).

### 5.3. South-western Anatolia – South of the Büyük Menderes

Didyma – Yenihisar/Didim: Minoan pottery is reported (Naumann 1963: 24; Schattner 1992).

Düver: Pyxides and a jug have been reported from the cemetery at Düver (Mee 1998: 141). Some squat *alabastra* dating to the LH IIIB period, now in the museum of Burdur, are said to have come from the prehistoric cemetery near Düver at the north end of Yasirli Lake (Mellink 1969: 212).

Halikarnassos – Zephyrion: Mycenaean pottery has been mentioned from the place called Zephyrion in the Classical period, a name that is found in the Linear B tablets (Briese and Pedersen 2004: 404; Briese *et al.* 2006: 438).

Knidos: Middle Minoan pottery ranging from fine painted wares to coarse cooking pots was found in Knidos. The pottery dates from Middle Minoan I to Late Minoan I. The shapes are identical to those from Crete and seem to indicate a Minoan settlement rather than imports (Mellink 1978: 321). However, Momigliano reports

that in the summer of 2004 she saw two prehistoric sherds in the Italian Tower of the Bodrum Museum (where the finds from Love's excavations are kept): a sherd of south-east Aegean Light-on-Dark ware – another case in which the south-east Aegean Light-on-Dark pottery has been mistaken for Kamares pottery – and a fragmentary Early Bronze Age II/III red-polished cup (Momigliano 2007: 209). Several sherds from the 1968 excavations have been identified as Mycenaean (Love 1969: 18).

Mylasa – Milas: Mycenaean material, including a vase, dating to LH II and III is said to have been found in Mylasa during the Swedish excavations at this site. However, the presumed Mycenaean sherds from the above area have never been published (Winter 1887: 230, Hanfmann 1948: 139 -140, 145, Hanfmann and Walbaum 1968: 53).

Myndos – Gümüşlük Beldesi: Mycenaean pottery was found on the acropolis of Gümüşlük Beldesi, which is located 18 km west of Halicarnassus at the western tip of the peninsula. Remains of a tower with cyclopean walls were also unearthed (Şahin 2005: 184; Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 317).

Pilavtepe: A Mycenaean type chamber tomb is said to have been found during road works at Pilavtepe, 10 km from Milas on the road to Bodrum. The finds, now in the Milas museum, consisted of 23 clay vessels dating to LH IIIA2 – IIIB, faience beads, a serpentine lentoid etc. (Niemeier 2005a: 30, ref. 324; Sevinç Günel *pers. comm.*).

Pisidia: Several sherds from an old survey at Pisidia have been identified as Mycenaean, however only three of them are likely to be Mycenaean (Pace 1923-24: 394 -401; Mee 1978: 143).

Sarayköy Hüyük: A possible Mycenaean sherd is reported (Birmingham 1964: 30).

Stratonicea – Eskihisar: A carinated bowl and a stirrup jar, now in the museum of Eskihisar, are said to have come from a tomb or tombs near the theatre of Stratonicea (Hanfmann and Walbaum 1968: 51-52). They could be either Submycenaean or LH IIIB-C (Mee 1978: 144; Hope Simpson 1965: 193).

**Tavşanadası:** This is a very small island (fig. 5.3.1) close to the coast of the Milesian peninsula, 10 km from Didyma. Several sherds of Minoan type domestic pottery have been mentioned (Greaves 2002: 55; Joukowsky 1986: 722; Niemeier 2005a: 10), although this appears to be yet another case in which south-east Light-on-Dark pottery has been mistaken for Kamares pottery (Momigliano *pers. comm.*).

**Teichioussa - Akbük:** The site of Akbük-Teichioussa lies 14 km west of Didyma and just south of Herakleia ad Latmos, near the modern village of Akbük. On the two small peninsulas of Kömüradası and Saplıadası (fig 5.3.2-3) several sherds of Minoan pottery (fig. 5.3.4) have been found among the bulk of local Anatolian ware, while in Kömüradası architectural remains exposed along the shore have been ceramically associated with LM I (Voigtländer 1986: 613-615, 622-624, 642-653; Voigtländer 1988: 605, 607-608; Greaves 2002: 55; Mee 1998: 137-138; Mellink 1989: 117). However, as Momigliano notes, the published material suggests an association between south-east Aegean Light-on-Dark pottery and LM IA (Momigliano 2007: 267). Even today, as observed during the author's recent visit to the site, it is possible to find prehistoric sherds (fig. 5.3.5) on the surface at Kömüradası, which is only about 1m above the sea level.

#### 5.4. Central Anatolia

**Fraktin – Gümüşören:** The more recent of the two Hittite levels at Fraktin is considered to be contemporary with Hattusili III and his queen Puduhepa (Özgüc 1948: 267). A globular Mycenaean stirrup jar was found on the floor of a house of this level and it dates to a developed phase of the LH IIIC. Moreover, a curved single edged knife shares common characteristics with knives from Colophon, Ialysos and Siana (Sandars 1963: pl. 54, 56-57).

**Hattusa – Boğazköy:** The inscribed Mycenaean sword that was found close to the Lion Gate has already been analysed (page 24). A fragment of a metal belt (fig. 5.4.1) that was found in the Hittite capital is interesting on account of its design and technique. It consists of a sheet of silver enclosed between two sheets of bronze. The outer sheet has a design of spirals (reminiscent of Aegean design) which is picked out with gold wire. Similar belts were worn in Crete, while polychromy in

metals is best known in the daggers from the shaft graves of Mycenae, although this technique was also known in Syria (Boehmer 1972: 70-71, 73, fig. 179; Frankfort 1996: 236-7). Moreover, a sherd of a Mycenaean kylix (fig. 5.4.2) dating to LH IIIA – B was found in 1970, although it was only recognized as such in 2002 (Genz 2004: 77-78). A rather surprising discovery has been made recently in Hattusa; it is said that fragments of wall paintings of Mycenaean style have been discovered in Büyükkale (Wiener 2007: 14).

**Hüseyindedede:** An object that has caused a lot of discussion among scholars is a vase that was recently found in a small temple at Hüseyindedede (fig. 5.4.3) in central Anatolia in a context that has been dated to the reign of Hattusili I (ca. 1650-1620 B.C). The most interesting characteristic of this vase (5.4.4) is its pictorial decoration: a bull-leaping scene. The relief frieze around the neck of the vase (fig. 5.4.5-7) consists of thirteen human figures, including two female dancers, two cymbal players, female and male, a man playing a lute, three other cymbal players, two performing acrobats, a leaper on the bull's back, accompanied by an attendant in front, and another lutanist. It is without doubt part of a religious ceremony (Taracha 2002: 9-10, fig. 5.4.8).

This is the only known bull-leaping depiction in Hittite art, whereas it is a common subject in Minoan iconography. However, it must also be noted that beyond Crete and the Aegean, similar representations have been found in sealings in Syria (Collon 1994), as well as in Egypt (Morgan 1998: 21-22). Although this iconographic subject is absent from the Hittite repertoire there are Hittite texts mentioning bull-games. This textual evidence clearly associates these games with ritual (Taracha 2002: 13). Taking into account all the above, one cannot be sure whether the bull-leaping constituted a link between Crete and central Anatolia, was a subject which the Hittites found in the neighboring Syrian cities and included it in their repertoire, or was an Anatolian subject as the textual evidence suggests.

**Kuşaklı:** Three Mycenaean sherds dating to the LH IIIC period were found in Kuşaklı, south of Sivas in 2003 (Genz 2004: 79), while a fragmentary LH IIIA2 *pyxis* is also reported from the excavation season of 2004 (Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 299).



**Maşat Hüyük – Yalinyazı:** The majority of the pottery from this site is Hittite while Mycenaean ware is also attested. The Mycenaean pottery is of the LH IIIA2/B type and consists of fragments of flasks, stirrup jars and *pyxis*, one flask and one small stirrup jar. The Mycenaean imports are suggested to have come either from the Levant/Cyprus or from the Black Sea via Samsun (Mellink 1974: 110; 1975: 204, 208; 1981: 469; 1984: 450; 1985: 558; Özgüç 1978: 65-66, 127-128; 1982: 31, 102-103). A recent project has dated three pieces of wood from the site to 1375 +4/-7 B.C using the method of dendrochronology (Kuniholm *et al* 2005: 46).

**Üç Hüyük:** A Mycenaean sherd is reported from this site (Mee 1978: 147).

### 5.5. Cilicia/Eastern Anatolia

**Antioch-on-the-Orontes – Sabuniye:** Late Mycenaean pottery has been reported from Sabuniye together with a 14<sup>th</sup> century Mittani seal and Cypriot White Slip ware (Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 306).

**Boz Hüyük:** Hittite burnished ware as well as Mycenaean pottery has been identified at the site (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 150).

**Çitnoğla Çiftlik Hüyüğü:** A Mycenaean bowl was found in this small mound. No other second millennium pottery has been found (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 152).

**Gavurköy:** One Mycenaean sherd is reported from this Roman site (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 155).

**Hesigin Tepe:** Hittite burnished and local Base Ring ware as well as Mycenaean pottery is mentioned from this site (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 156).

**Islankadı Çiftlik:** LH IIIC pottery is reported (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 158).

**Kazanlı:** Several sherds from Kazanlı (almost 50), now in Adana museum, have been identified as Mycenaean (Gjerstad 1934: 151; Garstang 1938: 18). One of these dates to the LH IIIA (French 1975: 74) and it is the earliest Mycenaean sherd from Cilicia. However, the majority belongs to the LH IIIC (Mee 1978: 132).

**Kilise Tepe:** Several fragments of LH IIIC Mycenaean bowls and cups have been reported from this site. They are stored in the Silifke Museum (Postgate 1997: 9; 1998: 13).

**Mersin – Yümüktepe:** Two sherds from levels V-VI have been identified as Mycenaean (Garstang 1939: 100-102; 1953: 242-243, 256). A sherd from level IV is Mycenaean and dates to either LH IIIA2 or IIIB (Mee 1978: 133).

**Soloi/Pompeiopolis:** Mycenaean LH IIIB and IIIC pottery is reported from Soloi Hüyük together with Cypriot ware and a LB II local assemblage characteristic of the Hittite Empire. Foundations of a fortification wall dated to the Hittite period were also unearthed. The site is considered to be a possible candidate for the Hittite port town of Ura, known from textual references (Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 308).

**Soyali Hüyük:** Several Mycenaean LHIIIC sherds are reported from this site (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 169).

**Sultan Tepe:** Hittite burnished and Mycenaean sherds are reported (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 169).

**Tarsus:** The published Mycenaean pottery – 875 sherds – from this site (a possible candidate for the capital of Kizzuwatna of the Hittite archives) belongs almost without exception to LH IIIC and comes from the LBIIb levels. Of the registered LBII pottery the Mycenaean constitutes some 40%, however there is no doubt that less of the Anatolian is published and the exact proportion of Mycenaean to Anatolian pottery cannot be defined. Stylistically, as French points out, the pottery seems to follow its own development; however it retains its contacts with the Mycenaean mainland. There is much in common with the Mycenaean pottery from Cyprus (French 1975; Mee 1978: 145, 150; 1998: 145).

**Tell Ta 'Yinat:** A group of locally produced version of Mycenaean LH IIIC pottery was found together with central Anatolian painted wares in 2004 at Tell Ta 'Yinat, nearby Alalakh (Yıldırım and Gates 2007: 306).

**Tilan Hüyük:** Mention has been made of a Mycenaean stirrup jar (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 171).

**Vesli Hüyük:** Mention has been made of Mycenaean surface sherds (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 172).

**Zeytinli Höyük:** Hittite and Mycenaean sherds are reported from this site (Seton Williams 1954: 135, 174).

#### **5.6. Northern Anatolia /The Northern coast**

**Kastamonu:** A sword (fig. 5.6.1) that was found in a cave named Buz Mağarası, near Kastamonu, is considered to be Mycenaean, Sandars' class B, although it has also been suggested that it could be of Hittite manufacture. It is dated to LH IIIA1, like the swords found in Hattusa and in the Agora of Izmir (Ünal 1999: 209-221).

#### **5.7. Southern Anatolia/The South Coast**

**Beylerbey:** A Mycenaean sherd has been identified at Beylerbey, near Elmalı (French 1969: 73).

**Dereköy:** A Late Bronze Age cemetery from Dereköy produced a *pyxis* and a piriform jar of Mycenaean shape (Birmingham 1964: 30; Mee 1978: 126).

**Gödelesin Hüyük:** Two sherds from this site, now in the British Museum, are thought to be Mycenaean (Bittel 1967: 20).

**Halkapınar:** Mycenaean pottery has been reported from this site (Bammer and Muss 1996: 26).

**Limyra:** Several sherds north from the cenotaph of Gaius Caesar might be LH IIIB/C (Mellink 1983a: 435).

**Telmessos /Fethiye:** A Mycenaean stirrup jar (fig. 5.21) is published in the BM vase catalogue (BM Cat Vases A1030) and its registration number is GR1884.2-9.3. It is recorded as having come from Telmessos and having been purchased by Sir William Ramsay in 1884. There is no further information about the acquisition. However, the stirrup jar itself dates to the LH IIIB period and is in the so-called 'Simple Style'

characteristic of examples found in the eastern Mediterranean (Furtwängler and Löschke 1886: 33; Stubbings 1951: 23; Bittel 1967: 20).

Üç Hüyük: A Mycenaean sherd is reported from this site (Mee 1978: 147).

Further discussion about the character of the Aegean presence on the above sites will follow in Chapters 9 and 10.

## 6. Anatolian objects in the Aegean

This chapter will deal with objects that can be identified as coming from either western or central Anatolia that have been found in the Aegean in Middle and Late Bronze Age contexts. The distribution of these objects is examined by dividing, for practical reasons, the area of the Aegean into three separate territorial entities: Crete, mainland Greece and the Aegean islands.

### 6.1. Crete

#### *i. Middle Bronze Age*

A small wingless sphinx statuette (Herakleion Museum no. 384, fig. 6.1.1) was found in a late MM III – early LM I context at Ayia Triadha. It has a circular depression in the centre of its back. This object has raised many questions about its use and origins. Parallels can be drawn in Mesopotamia and Anatolia. The Mesopotamian examples appear to have been used either as lamps or, less likely, as inkwells. The monumental Hittite sphinxes (fig. 6.1.2) from Alaca Höyük may display some stylistic similarities (Evans 1930: 420-427) while it should be borne in mind that small sphinx statuettes are known from Late Bronze Age contexts elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean. As Cline points out these objects were used in Egypt, Cyprus and Syro-Palestine as weights, pendants and seals. It seems that the sphinx statuette at Ayia Triadha was an import from the Eastern Mediterranean or, alternatively, a Minoan object based on Mesopotamian or Egyptian prototypes. However, a central Anatolian/Hittite origin cannot be ruled out (Cline 1991a: 133-134).

A similar object was found in a late MM III – early LM I context at Tylissos (Evans 1930: 425-427, fig. 6.1.3). This sphinx (Collection Dr. G. F. Reber) is almost identical to the one found at Ayia Triadha, although it has two circular depressions in the centre of its back (fig. 6.1.4). The authenticity of this object has been under discussion and it seems quite possible that the Tylissos sphinx is a copy of that at Ayia Triadha (Cline 1991a: 137).

At this point it is appropriate to make reference to some other objects of uncertain origin that were found in Crete in MM III – LM I contexts (Cline 1991a:

138). One is a cylinder seal from Mavrospeleio (Herakleion Museum no. 1334), another one from Tylissos (Herakleion Museum no. 1189) and some steatite fragments suggested to have come from the curled locks of a large composite head of a sphinx (Herakleion Museum no. ?) that were found at Knossos. An Anatolian or Near Eastern origin for these objects cannot be ruled out although it seems more likely that they may have been the products of Minoan workshops.

A silver lobed *kantharos* from Gournia (Herakleion Museum no. 201, fig. 6.1.5) reveals a possible relationship between Minoan metalwork and central Anatolian forms. It comes from House II of the settlement and it dates to MM I. The vessel has a flat conical base, a swelling body with a carination at the widest part, and an offset rim formed into four convex lobes. Similar types of vessels have been found in central Anatolia (fig. 6.1.6). It seems that initially this form had a strong impact on the Minoans and they borrowed it directly from central Anatolia (Davis 1977: 87-90). It is noteworthy that in the last Cretological Congress it was announced that a clay *kantharos* similar to this one from Gournia was found in a Minoan shipwreck off the small island of Pseira, close to the northern coast of Crete.<sup>47</sup>

Another group of objects that is of particular interest consists of some artifacts of Minoan manufacture possibly influenced by Anatolian prototypes. To begin with, the case of a group of Middle Minoan sealings from Phaistos is probably the most significant. They display remarkable stylistic affinities to sealings from Karahöyük in central Anatolia. In particular, the appearance of the sphinx, griffin and lion is the clearest evidence for the appropriation of foreign motifs in Crete. A bearded sphinx, which is depicted in relief on a clay vessel from Karahöyük, is considered to be the type of object that could have inspired the sphinx relief vase from Malia (Aruz 1993: 38). Moreover, according to Jean-Claude Poursat, the ivory sphinxes from Acemhöyük may provide the prototypes for the long curls of the Minoan examples (Aruz 1993: 38). It is possible that western Anatolia may have been

---

<sup>47</sup> E. Chatzidhaki, speaking at the Xth Cretological Congress, Chania, 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2006; Chatzidaki and Betancourt 2006: 35-36.

the immediate source for all aspects of sphinx imagery on Crete. Similar examples have been cited for the origin of the Minoan griffin and its relation to the central Anatolian prototypes.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that a group of lions on the Phaistos sealings has close parallels to Anatolian seals from the major *karum* sites of the 1b period, particularly from Karahöyük. A good example that highlights the similarities is a seal impression portraying two antithetical lions posed with a leaf motif between their heads (fig. 6.1.7). Eric Cline has proposed a central Anatolian origin for this sealing (Cline 1991a: 133).

Notable affinities are similarly identified in the Phaistos and central Anatolian repertoires in relation to the rendering of spirals (fig. 6.1.8), interlacing patterns and the loop circle, as well as in the use of the double and triple line. The above elements highlight a link between Crete and central Anatolia. According to one theory: “the Phaistos examples may have been local copies on the bullae of sacks or documents which arrived from Anatolia” (Watrous 1987, 70). Eventually, a few such sealings were brought to Phaistos and the Cretans produced new objects for their own use, based on these Anatolian prototypes. Joan Aruz argues that there are indeed obvious similarities in the sealings of the two areas (Aruz 1998: 307). But “these similarities remain confined to a more general use of geometric rather than figural images” (Aruz 1993: 50). She suggests that the Minoans probably appropriated their administrative system from the East and, as a result, they also adopted some eastern symbols and images, ignoring their specific significance in the broader Near Eastern-Anatolian context. It should also be noted that the sealings from Karahöyük are considered products of central Anatolia but of the pre-Hittite period.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> In this case a possible Minoan – central Anatolian, but not necessarily Hittite, link is referred to. It is difficult to be definite about the cultural character of a central Anatolian site at the time of the emergence of the Hittite state. The prominent culture of this period was Hattian, which contributed to the formation of the Hittite civilization by offering a great deal of cultural elements. Even though the site was not Hittite, it is located within an area where, at a later period, the Hittite Empire was to develop. It is also important to recognise the existence of possible networks between these two areas.

## ii. The case of Malia

Another object that is considered to have a Hittite/Anatolian origin comes from Malia. It is an axe in the form of a leopard (fig. 6.1.9) in brown schist and is dated to the Middle Minoan period, although with some uncertainty. It has been suggested by Davis that this axe looks 'foreign' in comparison with the Minoan stone industry and it is possibly an imported object. The surface of the object is decorated with a net of spirals, a characteristic that is not as common in Crete as it is in Anatolia. The incised circles on the face and leg of the leopard have many parallels (fig. 6.1.10) in Hittite central Anatolia. Moreover, the repeated V motif on the Malia axe has no parallels in Crete whereas it is common in Anatolia (Davis 1977: 85; Akurgal 1962: pl 31).

Moreover, a group of 'Anatolianising' vessels that reproduced Anatolian shapes was found on the Isle of Christ, near Malia, among *pithos* burials of the MM I period. Two of these vessels (fig. 6.1.11) are identical in shape to the Gournia *kantharos*, mentioned above, and the imitation rivet heads on one of them indicate its dependence on a metallic model (Davis 1977: 89). The Anatolian example that is closest to these Minoan examples is the cup in the Berlin Antiquarium, no. 31357 (Davies 1977: 91, fig. 6.1.12).

Another interesting fact about the relationships between Malia and Anatolia that could prove useful for future research is the result of lead isotope analyses of copper found in the metal workshops of Quartier Mu. According to a recent study 42% of the copper came from Anatolia (Poursat and Loubet 2005: 120). This is probably the reflection of a putative trade route along which Anatolian metals were imported to Crete (Niemeier 2005b: 201).

Another recent discovery that has renewed interest in Minoan-Anatolian relationships and has testified to overseas contacts is the neutron activation analysis of 60 obsidian artifacts from Quartier Mu. One of the obsidian sources is located in East Göllü Dağ, in central Anatolia. Five obsidian items were shown to have been sourced from there. It is evident that Malia is the site where the majority of the Anatolian objects and elements are concentrated (Carter and Kilikoglou 2007: 117,



126-128). Whether this indicates a special commercial relationship between the Middle Minoan Malia (and specifically Quartier Mu, where the majority of the above objects was found) and Anatolia, or even a connection of a political nature, cannot yet be determined. However, the fact that most of the Anatolian influences at Malia appear during this period cannot be underestimated. Future research will probably reveal more information about the role of this site in broader Minoan – Anatolian contacts.

### *iii. Late Bronze Age*

Although many objects from Egypt and the Near East have been found in Minoan Crete, only a few artifacts can be securely attributed to an Anatolian/Hittite origin. The term 'Anatolian/Hittite' objects is included in this research because one of its main aims is to observe firstly the possible links between the broader area of the Aegean and Anatolia, and then to identify the different ethnic, political or cultural groups, whenever and where a distinction of this kind can be established. In particular, 63 imports from the Eastern Mediterranean have been found in LMI A – B contexts: 39 come from Egypt, 10 from Syria – Palestine, another 10 from Cyprus and only 2 from Anatolia and 2 from Mesopotamia. The imports from Anatolia consist of a ceramic flask from Kommos and a steatite figurine from Ayia Triadha (Cline 1999: 118). As has been shown above, the sphinx from Ayia Triadha could also be dated to MM III.

However, the site of Kommos provided evidence for further contacts between Crete and Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age. The fragments of a reddish-brown burnished class of pottery (fig. 6.1.13) that dates from LM II to LM IIIB suggest a southwestern Anatolian origin, in all probability from one or more coastal sites in the general vicinity or the Gulf of İzmir, in the area that was known as the Arzawa lands in the Hittite texts (Rutter 2006: 148). The surface colours, the surface treatment, and the profiles of the rims and necks on closed shapes of the reddish-brown burnished jugs from Kommos are common at sites such as Panaztepe, Bayraklı, and Limantepe. Moreover, the distinctive knobbed decoration of some other fragments (fig. 6.1.14) has distant parallels on large jars and cooking bowls

from Beycesultan levels V and IVC (Rutter 2006: 148-149). The high frequency of the Anatolian jugs from Kommos suggests that these vessels may have been used to transport a particular product from coastal Anatolia to Minoan ports (Rutter 2006: 149). The existence of contacts of a political nature between Crete and the Arzawa Lands is also considered possible (Rutter 2006: 151). An extended analysis on this matter will follow in the specific chapter of the Minoan-Anatolian relationships.

## 6.2. Mainland Greece

Anatolian evidence is also identified in mainland Greece. However, nothing has been found in Middle Bronze Age contexts as it has in Crete: everything dates to the Late Bronze Age.

A silver stag *rhyton* from Mycenae (NMA no. 388, fig. 6.2.1), that was found in Shaft Grave IV and dates to LHI, is said to be of Hittite origin (Cline 1991a: 135; Dickinson 1977: 53, 81; Karo 1930: 94; Koehl 1995: 61-62). The *rhyton* has a spout centrally placed on its back (6.2.2). Zoomorphic *rhyta* have a long history in Anatolia, with stags in particular being considered sacred. Most famous are the stag statuettes in metal at Alaca Höyük, dating to the third millennium B.C. From the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards many ceramic *rhyta* in the shape of stags, lions and bulls have been found at various Hittite sites. However, although the best artistic parallels come from Anatolia it should be noted that the stag was also favoured in northern nomadic art (in the Caucasus region) and that four-legged animal *rhyta* were also made in Late Bronze Age Cyprus and the Aegean itself. That is why an origin from any of these areas cannot be ruled out (Cline 1991a: 135-136; Koehl 1995).

According to the label in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens, where this item is currently on display, “the silver deer is a tribute from the Hittite kings, who dominated Asia Minor, to their Mycenaean equivalents”. This clearly implies royal gift exchange, a common practice among the courts of the Eastern Mediterranean and Mesopotamian kingdoms during the Late Bronze Age.

Personally, the author believes that the above theory is not well established or entirely convincing. Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier has suggested that the stag came to

Mycenae via Crete through royal gift exchange (Niemeier 2005a: 11). In the author's opinion it is likely that the Hittites may have ignored the existence of a small, although rising, kingdom in mainland Greece in that early period. A single object found in Mycenae, even in the so-called 'royal' tombs, does not prove the existence of any contacts between the two. The author is instead inclined to believe that this item was traded by foreign merchants, possibly Minoans<sup>49</sup> who had obtained it through their commercial contacts with the Near East and eastern Mediterranean world in general, to a member of the local Mycenaean elite, who realised that an object like this would 'upgrade' his social status.

Another find from the same grave that has been identified as a central Anatolian object, or influenced by central Anatolian motifs, is a gold pin (NMA no. ?) with its head in the form of an Argali sheep (fig. 6.2.3-4) that is native to Anatolia (Cline 1994: 68, 142; Higgins 1980: 70-71). However, there is a certain amount of doubt concerning the 'Anatolian' origin of this pin. An object that represents an animal of a particular region does not necessarily imply a provenance from that same region. The representations and depictions of lions, leopards or monkeys – animals that did not exist in the broader Aegean region in that period – in frescoes, seals and small objects across the Bronze Age Aegean are, in most cases, locally produced artifacts.

A steatite semi-bulla found at Mycenae in LH IIIA2 Chamber Tomb 523 (NMA no. 6511, fig. 6.2.5) is also said to be of Hittite origin. The inscribed signs appear to be those used in Hieroglyphic Luwian, a language and script used in both western and central Anatolia. Parallels to these symbols have also been found in both Anatolia and North Syria, so a Hittite origin is again only a possibility (Cline 1991a: 136; Boardman 1966: 47).

---

<sup>49</sup> The Minoan artifacts that were also found in the Shaft Graves and, generally, the Minoan influence on the early Mycenaean material culture should be taken into account.

Two very interesting artifacts come from Mycenaean graves in Attica which date to LH IIIA. These are shoe – shaped *rhyta* from Glyfada (fig. 6.2.6) and Pikermi (fig. 6.2.7) respectively (NMA no. 8557 and 15879). They are very elaborate, being decorated with lines, spirals, small squares, and semicircles. A very close parallel comes from Kültepe (fig. 6.2.8). It has been suggested that such ‘shoes’ represented the divine in Hittite iconography, and in art only gods and high ranking aristocrats are depicted wearing them. The owners of these *rhyta* in Attika may have been aware of the symbolic character of the objects and consequently put them in their graves (Gurney 1954: fig. 24; Papadimitriou 1955: 94-96; Paschalidis 2002/3; Stubbings 1947: 55, fig. 24); Vassilikou 1995: 265-266).

A semi-bulla of haematite (NMA no. 8184, fig. 6.2.9) was found in tomb 24 of the Mycenaean cemetery of Perati in a LH IIIB/C context. It is inscribed with a variety of signs in Hieroglyphic Luwian, Linear A or Linear B, and Cypro-Minoan. The name of the owner was usually inscribed on Hittite bullae. The object from Perati was considered to be of Hittite origin; however, after further research this possibility has been considered most unlikely (Cline 1991a: 139; Iakovidis 1970: 317-320).

It is also necessary to mention the case of a silver ‘Smiting God’ statuette, originally found at Nezero, Thessaly (Ashmolean Mus. no. AE 410, fig. 6.2.10), purchased by A. Evans and now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. Parallels to this statuette have been drawn with a figurine from Dövk, near Sivas in central Anatolia. However, an origin from Syro-Palestine cannot be ruled out. A Hittite origin for this statuette must therefore be seen only as a possibility (Cline 1991a: 135). However, the date of its context is unknown and its provenance is uncertain. It is also doubtful whether it is a Late Bronze Age creation or a modern forgery (Cline 1991a: 135; Muhly 1980: 153-154).

A few more objects like three cylinder seals from Tiryns, Mycenae and Thebes respectively and a ‘Smiting God’ from Tiryns have been considered to be Hittite. However, recent research has ruled out this possibility and suggests a different origin for the above objects (Cline 1991a: 137–139).

### 6.3. The Aegean Islands

The most remarkable Anatolian/Anatolianising objects from the Aegean have so far been found on Rhodes. The size of the island, which was the seat of the king of Ahhiyawa according to some scholars (e.g. Mountjoy 1998), its proximity to the Anatolian mainland, and its many prosperous Mycenaean communities might well have contributed to the development of a broader commercial and cultural network focused around the island.

More specific evidence comes in the form of a semi-bulla (BM no. 108, fig. 6.3.1) found in a probable LH III context in tomb 33 at Ialysos. It was made of red serpentine and it was inscribed on both sides with a few Hittite signs and a number of other signs of unknown nature. Similar objects have been found throughout Anatolia (at Hattusa, Alaca Hüyük, Beycesultan, and Tarsus) and northern Syria (at Alalakh, Carhemish and Ugarit), so the origin of the Ialysos semi-bulla cannot be defined with absolute certainty (Benzi 1992: 207, 223; Cline 1991a: 136; Boardman 1966: 47-48).

A cylinder seal (Inv. No 6511, fig. 6.3.2) of hard stone found in LH IIIC New Tomb 17 at Ialysos (Benzi 1992: 206, 265) displays notable similarities to a steatite cylinder seal, now in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum (Inv. No. 1995, fig. 6.3.3). The manner of representing the figures in outline form only as well as their gestures are comparable on both seals. Unfortunately, the Istanbul seal has no recorded provenance. Both seals are better paralleled by seals from Alalakh and Ugarit than by seals from central Anatolia. Although the Ialysos seal is apparently of Hittite manufacture it cannot be determined whether it is of central Anatolia or north Syrian origin (Cline 1991a: 136–137). Additionally, a possible Anatolian ceramic *amphoriskos* (Exc. no. 2731) of grey bucchero ware was found in an LH IIIC1 context at the same site (Cline 1994: 68, 180).

A cylinder seal (Inv. no. B7202, fig. 6.3.4) from Artemision, Delos, of uncertain date but most probably of Late Bronze Age date appears to be inscribed with a number of signs that resemble Linear A or B, Cypro-Minoan and Hittite script. No

parallels can be found from central Anatolia; however, Cline has argued that a Hittite origin cannot be ruled out (Cline 1991a: 137).

An Anatolian ceramic beaked jug (Inv. no. 376) found in an LH IIIA context has been reported from Eleona on Kos (Cline 1994: 68, 203; Lambrou-Philipson 1990: 379; Mee 1982: 87).

#### 6.4. The theory of a possible Hittite embargo against the Mycenaeans in the Late Bronze Age

It is surprising that the Hittite/Anatolian objects are so few in comparison to the total number of Egyptian/Near Eastern objects that have been found in Late Bronze Age Aegean contexts. The same picture exists in Late Bronze Age central Anatolia; the Egyptian/Near Eastern objects that have been unearthed so far cannot compare to the few Aegean/Mycenaeans objects in numbers. Eric Cline has propounded the theory that a Hittite embargo was in place against the Mycenaeans, prohibiting any exchange of goods between the agents of the two cultures. In support of his theory he mentions the content of one tablet (KUB XXIII 1 IV) dating to the reign of Tudhaliya III (1240 – 1215 BC). It is a treaty with Šaušgamuwa of Amurru. The Syrian ruler is instructed by Tudhaliya not to allow the ships of Ahhiyawa to “sail to him”. This could be interpreted as being the result of an ‘embargo’ against the Mycenaeans. The local ruler is expected to act as an agent of the Hittite authority and to obey his sovereignty. This tablet also appears to prove the existence of financial embargos, even in the Late Bronze Age (Cline 1991b: 6).

However, the author believes that this theory is without sufficient foundation. Firstly, even if the hypothesis of an embargo for a short period of time is accepted, a certain amount of doubts remains about the duration of any such anti-Mycenaean actions. It is difficult to believe that, as seems to be indicated by the tablets referring to the Ahhiyawa question, for a period of almost 200 years Mycenaean-Hittite relations were completely hostile. The picture obtained from the Hittite archives is quite different (see *Ahhiyawa Question* chapter). The royal correspondence between the king of Ahhiyawa and the king of Hatti reveals that the

two counterparts had particularly good relationships for long periods of time. Therefore, the indication from the Hittite archives is not supportive of Cline's theory.

Another possible explanation of the apparent lack of Anatolian objects in the Aegean and vice versa could be a trade in perishable goods (textiles, raw materials, agricultural products) that leave no archaeological traces. Cline himself considers that this is a viable alternative argument which could explain the above phenomenon (Cline 1994: 71). It is also possible, especially for not only the Mycenaean but also merchants from the eastern Mediterranean, that trade with Egypt and the Syrian coastal cities was more profitable and easier – due to geographical factors – than the commercial activities with the Hittite kingdom.

## 7. The linguistic connection: Anatolian evidence in the Aegean scripts

Apart from archaeological data from excavations, written sources can also shed light on the question of interconnections between the Aegean and Anatolia. In this context it is interesting to examine possible evidence of Anatolian influence in the Aegean scripts. Linear A, the script of Minoan Crete, is as yet undeciphered. The fact that Mycenaean Linear B developed out of Linear A makes it possible to 'read' but not to 'understand' the contents of the Minoan inscriptions.

Despite these difficulties it has been possible to define the meaning of some words (Owens 2007: 73, 217). One of these, which has a possible link with Anatolia, is the word *tu-ru-sa* – 'tyrant', c.f. *tarwana* in Hittite and *τύραννος* in Greek, first attested in the poems by Alcaeus in the 7<sup>th</sup> century (Owens 2007: 321). Another example is the word *a-su-ja*, found in a tablet at Hagia Triada (HT 11) and dating to LM IB and possibly to be interpreted as 'Assuwa' (see the following paragraphs about the history of this word) offering a possible correspondence in Aegean documents (Morris 2001: 426).

It is known that in Mycenaean Greece the tablets of Linear B are concerned almost exclusively with information of an economic nature. However, we can elicit some apparently insignificant information that might be useful for the further investigation of the contacts between the agents of the Aegean and Anatolian cultures. More specifically it has been argued (Duhoux 1988: 79; Chadwick – Baumbach 1963: 190, 214) that the words *e-re-pa* (KNP Sd 0412, PY Va 482), which can be interpreted as 'elephant' and *ku-no-wa* (RY Ta 642), which means 'blue' in all variations probably have a Hittite origin. The equivalent Hittite words are *lahpa*-and *kuwanna* (Houwink ten Gate 1973: 143). Moreover the word *ke-ra-so* which is interpreted as *kerasos*/'cherry' may have originated in the Pontic area (northern Anatolia) of the Black Sea (Duhoux 1988: 79; Chadwick – Baumbach 1963: 209). Some other scholars have also identified several names and place names on the Linear B tablets associated with Anatolia.<sup>50</sup> Filling the archaeological vacuum by

---

<sup>50</sup> This procedure is sometimes convincing, sometimes not, because all words are open to various interpretations. Attempts to equate sites of the Late Bronze Age Aegean with various cities and regions that are known from the classical period without taking into account the archaeological data,



using only linguistics is both an extremely dangerous and totally hypothetical task. Nevertheless, it will still be useful to look at these words that are considered relevant to geographical names of the eastern Aegean and western Anatolia, which lie on the edges of the two cultures.

It should be stressed that the precise meaning of many words in the Mycenaean vocabulary is still unclear; however, there are some words, which, in the present case, show an Anatolian connection and can be defined with certainty. These words will be presented here as well as those words with uncertain etymology but with a possible Anatolian connection.

Firstly, the word *a-si-wi-jo* (KN Df 1469.B, PY Cn 285, PY Eq 146.11, MY Au 653.5, MY Au 657.11),<sup>51</sup> which means *Ἀσιος*, 'man of Asia' (Scafa 1999: 271) as well as the variations *a-\*64-ja = Ἀσῖαι*, 'women of Asia' and *a-\*64-jo = Ἀσιος or Ἀσιοι*, 'man/men of Asia' (Cline 1994: 131). The name *Asia* refers to Lydia in its earliest attestations by Greek authors and to western Anatolia in a later period and is thought to derive from the name *Assuwa* of the Hittite archives (Cline 1994: 131).

Another word whose meaning is considered certain is *mi-ra-ti-ja* (PY Aa 798, PY Aa 1180, PY Ab 382.B, PY Ab 573.B, PY Ad 380, PY Ad 689) = *Μιλήσῃαι*, 'women of Miletos' (Cline 1994: 130). Moreover, in the recently published archive of Linear B from Thebes the word *mi-ra-ti-jo* has been found (TH Fq 177.2, 198.5 TH Fq, TH Fq 214, TH Fq 244.2, 244.2 TH Fq, TH Fq 254 [+] 255.10, TH Fq 269.3, TH Fq 276.6), 'the man from Miletos' (Aravantinos *et al.* 2001: 356, 379). The tablets from Thebes indicate that a *mi-ra-ti-jo* has been involved in ritual activities and he possibly had an important role at the palace (Niemeier 2003: 104). It is interesting to note the presence of multiple references to Milesians at centres on the Mycenaean mainland given the strong Mycenaean influence on the site (see Chapter 4.3). Two words that can be identified with certainty are the words *ki-ni-di-ja* (PY Aa 792, PY Ab 189.B, PY An 292.4, PY Ad 683), which means *Κνίδῃαι*, 'women of Knidos' – a site with

---

although tempting, run the risk of misinterpretation. Only in a few cases (Miletos/Millawanda for instance) can we assume that the prehistoric name is identified with the classical, and even then not necessarily with certainty.

<sup>51</sup> KN= Knossos, MY=Mycenae, PY=Pylos, TH=Thebes.

Aegean/ising archaeological traces – (Scafa 1999: 272) and *i-wa-so* (PY An 519.8, PY An 654.17, PY An 661.3) or the alternative *i-wa-si-jo-ta* (PY Cn 3.5) associated with *lasos* (Scafa 1999: 272), a site where Minoan and later Mycenaean presence has been archaeologically identified (see chapter 4.2). In both cases the identifications with these places in the tablets of Linear B could be possible given the Mycenaean influence in the material culture.

An interesting case is the word *a-pa-si-jo* (PY Sa 767), *Εφέσιος*, ‘the man from Ephesus’ (Scafa 1999: 271). According to the Hittite archives the city of *Apasa* was located in western Anatolia, the capital city of the kingdom of Arzawa and a constant enemy of the Hittites on their western frontier. Nowadays scholars tend to accept that the Arzawan city was located in the area of classical Ephesus (Bryce 2003a: 39; Morris 2001: 426; Mountjoy 1998: 47) and that the two names had the same origin.

Another word that seems to appear in both Aegean and Anatolian archives is the word *ru-ki-ja/ru-ki-jo* (PY An 724.13, 415.11 PY Jn, PY Gn 720), which means *Λυκία* - ‘Lycia’ / *Λύκιος* – ‘man from Lycia’ (Scafa 1999: 271). The word *Lukka* appears in the Hittite archives and characterises the area and the people (‘fractious’ to the Hittites) of a part of south-western Anatolia that was later called Lycia (Bryce 2005: 54). The Greek legends that connect the Giants that constructed the fortification walls of Tiryns with Lycia as well as the activities of the pirates from the same area will be examined below (see page 109).

Apart from western Anatolian placenames, there are also references to some Aegean islands, specifically *ra-mi-ni-ja* (PY Ab 186.B) and *ra-mi-ni-jo* (PY An 209.2, 328.4 PY Cn. PY Cn719.6) which are interpreted as *Λήμνος* / ‘Lemnos’ and *Λημνιος*, ‘man of Lemnos’ respectively (Scafa 1999: 275). It is noteworthy that the recent archaeological material found on the island, especially in Koukonissi (Dr. C. Boulotis, pers. comm.), Poliochni and Hephaestia (Cultraro 2005; Privitera 2005) suggests a Mycenaean interest, which can be explained by the crucial geopolitical position of the island in the north-western Aegean, very close to the Dardanelles and the Black Sea.

Additionally, the word *i-mi-ri-jo* (KN Dd 1186) is connected to Imvros, and *ki-si-wi-ja* (PY Aa 770, PY Ab 194.B, PY Ad 675) and *ki-si-wi-jo* (60.2 KN V) to Chios (Scafa 1999: 272 – 273, 275).

## 8. The Ahhiyawa Question

The so-called *Ahhiyawa Question* is one of the most controversial topics of the Late Bronze Age Anatolian – Aegean relationships and has caused a great deal of discussion, disagreement and even conflict among scholars. This chapter will begin with a text-by-text commentary and a review of the evidence. Subsequently the author's personal interpretation of the first references to Ahhiyawa will be analysed.

Since 1924, when Emil Forrer first hypothesised that the pre-Homeric Greeks appeared in the Hittite texts, there has been near-continuous debate between scholars of Aegean and Anatolian archaeology trying to shed new light on different aspects of this question. Forrer drew attention to a number of references in the Hittite texts that mentioned a land called Ahhiyawa and its king. 25 fragmentary tablets provide information about this mysterious land and its people. The poor state of preservation of these fragments, as well as the vague nature of the content of the tablets had, in many cases, allowed multiple interpretations of their meaning to be made. Seven of the texts are historical; six are letters, one is an indictment, seven are divination texts, two are administrative texts, one is a prayer and one a treaty (Ünal 1991: 18).

According to Forrer's theory the Ahhiyawa of the Hittite texts equated to the Greek word *Ἀχαια/Achaia*, the term by which the Greeks are referred to in Homer's epics (Bryce 2003: 200; 1989a: 297). Since then the Ahhiyawa question has been a topic of controversy not only because of debates over the identification of the Ahhiyawa with the Homeric Greeks, but also over the location and extent of this kingdom, for which various locations in Greece and Asia Minor have been proposed.<sup>52</sup> Today, 85 years after Forrer's initial identification, although the majority

---

<sup>52</sup> Mycenae, Rhodes, Miletos, Cilicia, Caria, the islands of south – eastern Aegean, the coastal zone of western Anatolia, Crete, the broader area of Troy, Thrace, and southern Anatolia are possible locations of Ahhiyawa that have been proposed so far by various scholars (Mountjoy 1998: 49-51, Niemeier 1998a: 19-25). It is characteristic that "The number of articles and special studies, monographs and colloquium dealing with these questions is larger than those dealing with the main bulk of Hittitological studies" (Ünal 1991: 17).

of the scholars accept the equation Ahhiyawa=Mycenaeans there are still a significant number of academics who strongly disagree with it.

The earliest mention of Ahhiyawa comes from a fragmentary text (KUB XXIII 13) dating to the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century and mentions the king of Ahhiyawa in connection with the Seha River Land and Arzawa. This text may be translated as either “the king of Ahhiyawa withdrew/retreated” or that someone “took refuge with/relied upon the king of Ahhiyawa”. The text would indicate that the king was actually present in the broader area encouraging anti-Hittite activities (Bryce 1989b: 10; Cline 1994: 121; Ünal 1991: 18).

The next mention of Ahhiyawa was recorded during the reign of Arnuwanda (1420/1400 – 1400/1380) and refers to an incident that took place during the reign of his father, Tudhaliya I/II (1450/1420 – 1420/1400). According to this ‘Indictment of Madduwata’ (KUB XIV 1 + KBo XIX 38) a ‘Man from Ahhiya’ (the older name of Ahhiyawa), called Attarissiya, interfered in western Anatolian affairs encouraging anti-Hittite activities (Bryce 1989a: 298-299). Attarissiya is considered to be the equivalent of the Greek name Atreus<sup>53</sup> according to some scholars. More specifically, when Attarissiya – whom the Hittites apparently considered a significant and dangerous enemy, although the precise nature of his influence is ill-defined – attacked Madduwatta, a local ruler in western Anatolia, the Hittite king helped him to defend his country. However, after a short period of time, Madduwatta made an alliance with Arzawa, the most important opponent of the Hittites in the area, and with his former enemy Attarissiya, conducted anti-Hittite military operations. The Hittite sources mention 100 chariots under the command of Attarissiya. One of the most impressive aspects of this cooperation was the raid against Cyprus (Alasiya in the Hittite text), which according to the Hittite archives was under direct Hittite

---

<sup>53</sup> The author of the present thesis suggests an alternative interpretation, while many other names have been also proposed (see pages 131-133).

control at that time (Bryce 1989a: 298-299; Mellink 1983b: 139; Niemeier 2003: 104).<sup>54</sup>

It has been suggested that the two allies, who were both land-based powers, had used the naval and military experience of the Lukka people, who were famous as pirates during the Late Bronze Age as attested by the Amarna Letters during the reign of Akhenaten (Bryce 1989a: 309).

The Ahhiyawans were perhaps involved in a war between Tudhaliya I/II and the Assuwa confederation in northwest Asia Minor. Although the Annals of the Hittite king do not make any reference to this particular incident, some evidence does support the suggestion that 'Mycenaean' (or rather, 'Aegean') involvement in that conflict took place. In an extremely damaged and fragmentary letter (KUB XXVI 91) there is information about a victory by Tudhaliya over Assuwa, as well as a reference to the King of Ahhiyawa, a man from the same area, and the islands that belonged to this same king.<sup>55</sup> However, due to the fragmentary nature of the text and its poor state of preservation, it is not possible to speculate further about this (Cline 1996: 144; Niemeier 2003: 104).

Before going on to examine the possible involvement of the Mycenaeans in this war, it is first necessary to examine the precise nature of this conflict. According to the Annals of Tudhaliya I, the king of the Hittites marched against Assuwa when he realised that this coalition of 22 city-states had launched a hostile action against him during his campaign against Arzawa, Hapalla and the Seha River Land. He

---

<sup>54</sup> However, the few Hittite objects that have been found so far in Cyprus do not confirm the theory of Hittite control over the island as is conveyed in the archives from Hattusa. One should be more critical and bear in mind the specific conditions that existed in this period of time. The ignorance of scribes who did not have sufficient information or geographical knowledge about the places they described in the tablets, as well as the palatial propaganda, which was targeted to prove the superiority of the royal family and of the Hittites generally, should be taken into account when examining conquests and occupation of foreign land in the Late Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean.

<sup>55</sup> Possibly some of the islands of the eastern Aegean.

himself led his army against Assuwa - destroying its military forces completely according to the Annals. After that, he abolished its independence and, again according to his own claims, took 10,000 soldiers, 600 chariots and a large number of civilians away to Hattuša. The ruler of Assuwa and his son Kukkuli were among the prisoners. The latter later became a vassal king under Hittite sovereignty in the same area. However, Kukkuli then instigated a new rebellion against the Hittites, which also failed, and the rebel Kukkuli was sentenced to death (Cline 1996: 140-141). The fact that Assuwa was an independent political entity is also implied by Egyptian sources. The name *Isy* or *A-si-ja* in the archives of Thutmose III (1479 - 1425 BC) has been identified with 'Assuwa'. It is possible that contacts between Egypt and Assuwa were aimed at creating difficulties for their common enemy, the Hittites.<sup>56</sup> It is also intriguing to note that *Isy* is mentioned in the company of Keftiu (Crete):

"I have come to let You smite the West, Keftiu and Isy being in awe, and I let them see Your Majesty as a young bull, firm of heart, sharp of horns, whom one cannot approach."

Thutmose III's Hymn of Victory (trans. Cline 1997: 193)

The reference to the king and the man from Ahhiyawa in the archives of Tudhaliya I is not the only evidence that implies a Mycenaean/Aegean interference in the conflict between the Hittite kingdom and Assuwa. An inscribed sword (dating to the late 15<sup>th</sup> century) that was found in Hattuša was probably booty from the campaign against Assuwa as the inscription itself makes clear. Whether this Aegean involvement was direct (i.e. involving the active participation of Aegean soldiers in

---

<sup>56</sup> In the author's opinion, this theory is not yet well established and fully convincing. This is a period of Hittite history in which the Hittites were struggling to stabilize their position in Anatolia and they were far from being considered a super-power of such might in the Near East that it would rankle with the Egyptians and cause hostility. It seems reasonable that these contacts had rather the character of 'knowing each other better' through cultural and commercial exchanges such as, for instance, the case of Keftiu. Placing a political interpretation on these relationships is over-stretching the evidence. However, the Egyptian references to Assuwa could be helpful for Hittite chronology. The links between Assuwa and Thutmose III as well as between Assuwa and Tudhaliya I/II would be a possible indication that the reigns of the two kings may have overlapped to some extent (Cline 1996: 141, note 28 and 144, note 44).

the war) or indirect (i.e. the provision of weapons for use in the war against the Hittites) is difficult to say. In this context one might also mention the possible representation of a Mycenaean/Aegean warrior in full battle array incised on a Hittite bowl from a late 15<sup>th</sup> – early 14<sup>th</sup> century context at Hattuša (8.2). The characteristics of the helmet he wears are all reminiscent of representations of Aegean helmets (Bittel 1976: 9-14; Niemeier 2003: 104-105; 2007: 19; Ünal 1999: 215). This appears to date from the period of the activities of Attarissiya in western Anatolia and the king of Ahhiyawa in Assuwa (Niemeier 1999a: 150).

Moreover, the frequent appearance of the word *A-si-wi-jo* in the Linear B tablets is possibly to be associated with the arrival of refugees in Mycenaean Greece following the campaign of Tudhaliya and the end of the political entity that had formerly existed in northwest Anatolia. The refugees may have brought with them the deity that is called *po-ti-ni-ja a-si-wi-ja* (Potnia Asiwija=Goddess of Asia) who appears in a tablet (PY Fr 1206) from Pylos (Cline 1996: 144; Watkins 1998: 203). However, this theory cannot be securely established and it remains, at best, a conjectural suggestion.

Bearing in mind all of the above, it would be reasonable to ask what was the motivation for Mycenaean/Aegean involvement in this conflict, and possibly, against the strong Hittite kingdom. Possible theories include the access to the Black Sea, a region rich in agricultural products and metals, while a recent theory suggests the possibility of strong dynastic links between the royal families of Mycenaean and Assuwa (Cline 1997:203-206). According to ancient authors such as Strabo (VIII.6.11), Apollodoros (II.2.1) and Pausanias (II.16.3) seven Giants from Lycia helped Proteus to construct the walls of Tiryns. Proteus' wife was Antia, the daughter of Iovatis, king of Lycia, who helped Proteus by providing him with an army to occupy Tiryns. In addition, Thucydides (I.9.2) mentions that Pelops, father of Atreus, came to Greece from Asia (see also on page 102 for the origin of the name Asia). These incidents show that in the Greek mythological tradition the dynasty of the Atreides was linked to Anatolia, particularly its north-western part, and, consequently, to Assuwa. Therefore, Mycenaean warriors or mercenaries may have been helping Assuwa in their rebellion against Tudhaliya II as a reaction to his campaigns in the Achaean



dynast's ancestral homelands. However, it has been argued that this theory, although attractive, might also have served as a convenient excuse while any underlying economic and political motivations remain undocumented (Cline 1997: 202-206).

It is interesting to note that during the reigns of Tudhaliya III (1400/1380 – 1360/1343), Suppiluliuma I (1380/1340 – 1343/1322-18) and Arnuwanda II (1340/1339 – 1322/1318) there is not one single reference to Ahhiyawa in the Hittite archives. This was a period of great expansion for the Hittite kingdom, during which it defeated and incorporated the territory of the kingdom of Mitanni in northern Syria, thereby becoming an even greater power in the sphere of the Near East.

The next reference comes from the reign of Mursili II (1339/1306 – 1322-1318/1290). A tablet (KUB XIV 2) mentions that during the reign of Suppiluliuma I the Great King sent his wife (the mother of Mursili) into exile in the land of Ahhiyawa. The reason that led the Queen to be exiled is not clear. However, we do have evidence of friendly relations existing between Hatti and Ahhiyawa at this time and only a friendly state could safeguard persons who had created problems for the Great King of Hatti, and Suppiluliuma seems to have believed that Ahhiyawa was a faithful ally at the time (Huxley 1960: 5-6; Ünal 1991: 30). It is noteworthy that even if the truth of this event is accepted it should also be noted that by this point almost 70 – 80 years had elapsed since the last appearance of the word 'Ahhiyawa' in any of the surviving Hittite archives. In the author's opinion this is not accidental and the reason for this will be demonstrated later (see pages 137-138).

However, these potentially friendly relations were soon about to come to an end. In his Annals, Mursili II indicates that the enemies of the Hittites took advantage of the inexperience of the new king and made general attacks against the Hittite territory. Part of the text (15 KUB XIV I) refers to an alliance that had been established in western Anatolia and involved Arzawa, the kingdom of Ahhiyawa and Millawanda. This is the earliest text in which there is a reference to the involvement of Ahhiyawa with the king of Millawanda. After defeating his enemies in the east, Mursili turned to the west and sent his army against Millawanda in the third year of

his reign (1316 BC). According to the sources, the city was destroyed (Cline 1994: 122; Niemeier 2003: 105). This disaster has been equated to the late 14<sup>th</sup> century BC/LH IIIA2 destruction of Miletos (Mee 1998: 142; Niemeier 2005a: 12) (see page 44).

The same year Mursili also led his military forces against Arzawa. Here, he defeated his enemies in a battle and he seized the capital city of Apasa without difficulty. According to the 'Ten Years Annals' of Mursili (KBo III 4, II 28-32, 3-5 III), the King of Arzawa, Uhhaziti, left his homeland and fled to the neighbouring islands, which belonged to the kingdom of Ahhiyawa, and he eventually died there, in exile. Thus, the Hittite king had conquered the kingdom of Arzawa. However, shortly afterwards, control of Millawanda passed again to the kingdom of Ahhiyawa. This probably happened during the reign of the next Hittite king, Muwatalli II (Cline 1994: 122; Niemeier 1999a: 151).

Another fragmentary text (KUB V 6, II 57, 60) relating to Ahhiyawa comes from the reign of Mursili. This text does not provide any specific historical information, but there is mention of the Hittite king suffering an illness. Specifically, the god of Ahhiyawa (probably a cult image) and the god of Lazpa (identified as the island of Lesbos) were sent to help the king, who was ill but did not know what proper ritual to perform for these deities (Cline 1994: 122; Huxley 1960: 5). The interpretation of this fragment presents many difficulties. As has been seen so far the relations between Mycenaeans and Hittites during the reign of Mursili are characterised as being hostile, sometimes approaching open confrontation. However, here the Hittite king appears to be requesting the assistance of the god of Ahhiyawa, the god of his supposed enemies. We do not know what Mursili's situation was or whether he was so frustrated by the failure of his own deities that he commanded foreign gods to be brought in that might help him to be cured. It is probable that at this specific period in time there was a truce between the two rivals, a brief period of 'friendship', possibly represented here as the transfer of the foreign god to the ailing king. Perhaps it is this illness that caused the diplomatic reconciliation and speeded up the procedures that led to a subtext of a truce.

After Mursili's death Muwatalli II (1306/1282 – 1296/1273 BC) became the new king. During his reign the Hittites turned their attention to their south-eastern border, in the region of northern Syria. The imperialistic policy of the Hittites as well as the active interest of Egypt in the same region caused a military conflict between the two superpowers of that period. The greatest battle that the world had ever seen took place at Qadesh in Syria. The two kings, Muwatalli and Ramses II of Egypt were both present. The aftermath of this battle is beyond the purpose of this research; however, generally speaking, no real victor emerged from this conflict.

References to Ahhiyawa are also present from this period in Hittite history. In two fragmentary texts (KUB XXI 34 and KUB XXXI 29) there are references to the land of Ahhiyawa, Mira (one of the countries of the broader Arzawa region) and Tarhuntassa (Hittite province in southern Anatolia). These texts probably represent a list of political entities in Anatolia and their boundaries based on geographical criteria i.e description of mountains, rivers, and lakes. This seems to imply that Ahhiyawa possessed territory in western Anatolia; however it cannot be assumed that this means that the seat of the kingdom of Ahhiyawa itself was located in this region (Bryce 1989a: 302; Cline 1994: 123).

It is also worth mentioning that the Hittite sources highlight that Arzawa was in a permanently hostile situation with Hatti. At the same time Wilusa remained a faithful vassal of the Hittite kingdom following the war in Assuwa, as the so-called 'Alaksandu Treaty' (CTH 76), between Muwatalli II and Alaksandu<sup>57</sup>, ruler of Wilusa, indicates. This treaty stabilised the situation in north-western Anatolia and allowed the Hittite king to focus his attention on matters concerning his kingdom's relations with Egypt. Also, it should be noted that in the period of the 'Alaksandu Treaty' there is no reference to conflicts with Ahhiyawa. This may indicate another period of truce between the two sides by mutual agreement. For example it might be reasoned that at this time the Hittites withdrew from Millawanda, which passed again to

---

<sup>57</sup> The similarity of the names Wilusa and Ἴλιον/Ilion, the Homeric Troy, as well as Alaksandu and Ἀλέξανδρος/Alexander, an alternative name of Πάρις/Paris, son of King Priamos in the Iliad, shows that the connection of this area with the Aegean world and its influence on it is may be more significant than is usually thought.

Ahhiyawan hands, in order to focus on their affairs in the Near East (Bryce 1989a: 302; Niemeier 2002:21).

The next Hittite king was Urhi-Tesub, otherwise known as Mursili III (1282/1275 – 1273/1266). In a fragmentary text (KBo XVI 22) there is a reference to the king of Ahhiyawa and his actions in western Anatolia. This text may possibly imply that the ruler of Ahhiyawa had not given any assistance to Mursili and his son Šippa-ziti during the civil war against Hattusili II. Another text (KUB XXVI 76) from the same period makes reference to Ahhiyawa and its king, while there are also mentions in the same text of Egypt and Karchemis (Cline 1994: 123; Ünal 1991: 19).

Hattusili II (1275/1250 – 1266/1235) finally succeeded Mursili III. The most complete and informative text relating to Hittite – Ahhiyawa relations comes from this period. It is the so-called ‘Tawagalawa Letter’ (KUB XIV 3 I, II). Unfortunately, only the third tablet of the letter has been preserved. It was written by a Hittite king to the king of Ahhiyawa. The latter is addressed “my brother”, a standard term of address between the sovereign kings of the time, such as the rulers of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Mitanni and Hatti (Güteborg 1983: 135).

The Letter provides information about the ‘crimes’ – in the Hittite eyes – that were committed by one Piyamaradu, a local prince, who was probably a grandson of Uhhaziti, the old king of Arzawa. His actions started during the reign of Muwatalli II and continued for several decades thereafter, causing serious problems for Hittite policy in western Anatolia. According to the text, Piyamaradu conducted anti-Hittite activities across western Anatolia, from Wilusa in the north to Lukka in the south. The base of his operations was Millawanda, which was under the dominion of Ahhiyawa, while the text provides us with the information that after the destruction of Mursili II the control of the city passed again to Ahhiyawa. The ruler of Millawanda was one Atpa, a local leader, vassal to the king of Ahhiyawa and Piyamaradu’s father-in-law. Hattusili tried to arrest his opponent and he went to Millawanda, possibly with the intention of restoring Hittite power in the broader area. However, Piyamaradu escaped by boat, managing to avoid capture. Although the king of Ahhiyawa had promised to hand Piyamaradu over to his counterpart, he did not

fulfill that promise. For this reason the Hittite ruler sent the letter conveying his complaints to his “brother”. At the same time he assures the addressee that he has given his *protégé* guarantees of safe-conduct (Güteborg 1983: 136; Niemeier 2003: 106; 1999: 151 -152). Another reason for complaint is the ‘rudeness’ of the king of Ahhiyawa, who did not send any gift or greeting through his envoy, when he visited Hattusili’s court (Cline 1994:123)!

Both the content and the style of the letter reveal the efforts being made by the Hittite king to show a conciliatory mood. It seems that the powerful Hittite ruler was being forced to appear patient and to tolerate somewhat unacceptable behaviour by the recipient of the letter. Moreover, it is apparent that while the Hittite troops could sack Millawanda without difficulty, as they had done in the past, the geographical position of Ahhiyawa made any attempt to attack it impossible. The Hittites knew that after their return to their homeland, Ahhiyawa would be able to regain possession of Millawanda, so they preferred to negotiate. Eventually, as stated in a later fragmentary text, Hattusili achieved his goal and caught Piyamaradu (Güteborg 1983: 136; Niemeier 2003: 106; 1999: 151-152).

Tawagalawa appears to have been the brother of the king of Ahhiyawa and his representative in the Ahhiyawan territory in western Anatolia. According to the most widely held dominant theory, his name appears to be a Hittite version of the Mycenaean name *Ετεφοκλεφης/Ετεοκλής* – ‘Eteocles’. The text mentions that Tawagalawa had personal contacts with the Hittites; more specifically he once rode a chariot with the Royal charioteer of Hattusili, a member of the Hittite aristocracy (Niemeier 2003: 106; 1999: 151-152). Following this line of thought it is possible to conclude that at that time personal contacts and reciprocal visits between representatives of the Hittite empire and the kingdom of Ahhiyawa were very common (Niemeier 2003: 106). However, what is also apparent from the interpretation of the text is that the rulers of Millawanda were local princes, subjects of the king of Ahhiyawa, and they acted as his agents – having either friendly contacts with the Hittites, or otherwise conducting hostile activities against them. The ruler of Ahhiyawa defended his interests in western Anatolia using a combination of diplomacy and war. If his men were not sufficient in number for

military operations, he would cause problems using the local rulers who had their base in Millawanda, encouraging them to challenge the power of the Hittite empire (Bryce 1989b: 12).

The friendly mood of the Hittites during the reign of Hattusili II can also be detected from another event which is described in a fragmentary text from the archives of Hattusa (KBo II 11). It is a letter that was sent by the Hittite ruler to an unknown king (probably the vassal king of Arzawa). The king of Hatti mentions that he expected a gift from the king of Ahhiyawa, but he did not know what the situation was and whether the envoy had sent anything, or not. It becomes apparent that the exchange of gifts, as well as the general atmosphere that existed during that period, suggests at least peaceful, if not even friendly, relations (Cline 1994: 124; Bryce 1989b: 8).

The next Hittite ruler was Tudhaliya III (1250/1220 – 1235/1215). From the period of his reign comes the Treaty with Šaušgamuwa of Amurru (KUB XXIII 1 IV). The latter was instructed by Tudhaliya not to allow the ships of Ahhiyawa to “sail to him”. This phrase was the starting point of the discussion of whether a Hittite embargo against the Mycenaeans took place during the Late Bronze Age (Cline 1991: 6-9; Mee 1998: 143. See also Chapter 6.4). According to the wording of the treaty, the kings of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria and Ahhiyawa were all equal to the king of Hatti. However, it seems that the name of the king of Ahhiyawa was subsequently erased at a later date. Various interpretations have been proposed for this. The simplest consists of a possible mistake by the scribe, who classified the king of Ahhiyawa among the most powerful rulers of this time but then, having realised his mistake, erased the name Ahhiyawa from the list. However, according to the most popular theory the name of the king of Ahhiyawa was erased after losing possession of Millawanda. The loss of this foothold in western Anatolia automatically meant the decline of Hittite interest in Ahhiyawa (Bryce 1989b: 16-17).

This interpretation is supported by another text of the same period, the so-called ‘Millawanda Letter’ (KUB XIX 55 + KUB XLVIII 90). This letter was sent by Tudhaliya III to an unknown vassal ruler of western Anatolia, whom the Hittite

monarch addresses as “my son”. The text refers, *inter alia*, to the definition of the territory of Millawanda. Either the king of Mira or the ruler of Millawanda may have been the recipient of this letter. If the addressee was the latter, it becomes clear that the sovereignty of Millawanda had passed to the Hittites. On any other occasion Tudhaliya would not have been able to define its borders (Bryce 1989a: 303-304; Niemeier 2003: 106).

Archaeological evidence about the Hittite/central Anatolian influences on architecture (especially the defensive wall), pottery and other finds from Miletos during this period is reviewed in Chapter 6.3.

The name of Ahhiyawa appears one last time during the reign of Tudhaliya in a text that refers to a conflict in western Anatolia (KUB XXIII 13). A local ruler, Tarhunaradu of the Seha River Land, rebelled against the Hittite authority with the encouragement of the King of Ahhiyawa. However, the latter failed to send the aid that he had promised. This fact highlights the inadequacy of the Ahhiyawan forces to campaign and conduct overseas military activities. The rebellion of Tarhunaradu failed and the Hittites consolidated their position in the broader area (Niemeier 1999a: 152-153).

The later Hittite archives do not mention Ahhiyawa. This is a fact that needs explanation. Supposing that the equation Mycenaeans = Ahhiyawa is right, it should be borne in mind that at this time the bearers of Mycenaean culture had to deal with various problems in mainland Greece. Just before the final destruction of the palaces and the so-called ‘Dark Age’ the Mycenaeans made efforts to assure their survival. However, the disaster for the Mycenaean palatial centres occurred shortly afterwards. And around the same time the mighty Hittite empire was also to share the same fate.

A few documents from the last days of Hattusa mention the name Ahhiyawa; however, they are very fragmentary and consist only of a few words so they cannot provide any information about the question that has been dealt with above. Nevertheless, as long as excavations in the old territory of the Hittite kingdom continue and new interpretations of the Hittite documents come to light nobody can

rule out that new evidence about the Ahhiyawa question may appear in the near future.



## 9. Minoan Crete, relations with Anatolia and the Ahhiyawa question: a re-assessment of the evidence

### 9.1. Introduction

The issue of Minoan-Anatolian relationships has been so far focused on interaction in a coastal zone of the south-west part of Anatolia. In most cases, systematic research into Aegean-Central Anatolian contacts during the Late Bronze Age has taken the so-called 'Ahhiyawa Question' as its starting point. The existing widely accepted equation of Ahhiyawa=Mycenaeans<sup>58</sup> has now been adopted by the majority of scholars (for an extensive list of the academics who support the aforementioned equation see Niemeier 1998a: 20-21, fig. 3). Like many scholars, the author too is convinced that the people and country mentioned in the Hittite texts as 'Ahhiyawa' were located somewhere in Mycenaean Greece during the later phases of the Late Bronze Age. It is also an undeniable fact that the vast majority of researchers who have engaged in discussion of the Ahhiyawa Question have so far focused their attention mainly on Mycenaean 'perspectives' on the problem.

In contrast to such approaches, the author is inclined to believe that the Hittites initially used the term 'Ahhiyawa' to describe the bearers not of Mycenaean culture but of Minoan. To support this theory, evidence will be cited that goes back to the Middle Bronze Age and demonstrates a higher level of contact than might previously have been recognised between Minoan Crete and Anatolian cultures, including that of the Hittites. The primary aim is to present archaeological data in support of this argument. However, although the author is aware of the fact that linguistics are not as central to this argument as archaeology, an alternative interpretation of the word *Ahhiyawa* – a fundamental term to the researchers who have a special interest in that period – that underpins the above idea, and is consistent with the new interpretation offered here, will also be suggested.

---

<sup>58</sup> Further discussion of how the term "Mycenaeans" is defined appears in the chapter on Mycenaean-Anatolian relations (Chapter 10).

Before outlining the arguments, it is necessary to provide a chronological context for the period being examined, that of the appearance of Ahhiyawa in the Hittite archives. The absolute chronology of this period is still an object of much scholarly and scientific discussion and remains to be precisely defined, and for this reason all dates given here are approximate. The fundamental problem remains that there are dating issues on both sides of the debate – there is no certainty of either the dates of the individual Hittite kings, which would provide a chronology for their reigns and the events in the Hittite state archives of Hattusha, or of a more general chronology for the Aegean.<sup>59</sup>

**Comparative chronology of Crete, mainland Greece and the Hittite kingdom, ca. 1450-1375 (low chronology)**

	<b>CRETE</b>	<b>MAINLAND GREECE</b>	<b>HATTI</b>
1450/1425	LM II	LH IIB	Tudhaliya I/II ca 1450/1420- 1420/1400
1400/1390	LM IIIA1	LH IIIA1	Arnuwanda I ca 1420/1400- 1400/1380
1375/1370	LM IIIA2	LH IIIA2	

At this point, it is necessary to introduce a brief parenthetical discussion of terminology.

---

<sup>59</sup> For an extensive discussion on the Aegean and Hittite chronology see Chapter 1.

## 9.2. Minoanisation

The increase of Cretan imports and the imitation and adoption of various specific characteristics of Minoan civilisation (architectural, ritual and generally cultural features) is described by the term Minoanisation, a complex phenomenon that took place in certain areas of the Middle and Late Bronze Age Aegean and can be defined as concerning people's behaviour and ways of doing things in a manner that is comparable to the behaviours and practices that originated in Crete (Momigliano 2009: 17).

'Minoanisation' includes various social and cultural processes such as acculturation, colonisation, emulation, and trade. It cannot be explained by a single interpretative model, although many efforts have been made to do this in the past. For example, the traditional 'Minoan Thalassocracy' model<sup>60</sup> and its variants – based on a colonialist approach (Branigan 1981), and the 'Versailles effect' - the cultural influence of Crete in the local ruling classes - is compared to the widespread influence of the Versailles court in 18<sup>th</sup> century Germany (Wiener 1984), or the religious overlordship of Minoan Crete (Marinatos 1984), while some new approaches have recently emerged, such as the 'New competitive environment' (Davis and Gorogianni 2008) and the study of ceramic imports found at various sites, which highlights the hypothesis that a great deal of Minoanisation in the Aegean is the result of relatively small networks of intra-regional trade and emulation processes (Momigliano 2005: 223-224; 2008: 33).

Various sites in the Aegean have been examined as paradigms of Minoanisation (Rutter 2008): Akrotiri (Knappet and Nikolakopoulou 2005: 175-184), Ayia Irini (Davis 1992: 708-712) and Phylakopi (Davis and Chery 1984) in the Cyclades, Kastri in Kythera, Trianda (Davis 1992: 748-750; Marketou 1998) and Seraglio (Davis 1992: 748, 750) in the Dodecanese, Miletos and Iasos in western Anatolia. The range of Minoanisation varies from site to site; Kastri for example

---

<sup>60</sup> Evans' vision of a Minoan empire (Evans 1928: 229-252). The idea of a Minoan thalassocracy in the Aegean derives from Thucydides (1.4).

appears to have a fully Minoan character from the late Prepalatial period onward (Broodbank 2004: 56, 75-81), while the Cretan influence in Akrotiri could be interpreted as being the result of a gradual cultural 'colonisation', without postulating 'colonists' from Minoan Crete *per se* (Knappet and Nikolakopoulou 2008: 38). The range of Minoanisation in Miletos and Iasos has already been examined in the relevant chapters.

### 9.3. Anatolian objects in Crete

To begin with, the Anatolian objects in Crete,<sup>61</sup> as previously referred to, consist of a small wingless *sphinx* from Ayia Triadha dating to MM III – LM IA (page 90), a similar *sphinx* of the same date from Tyliossos (page 90), an axe in the form of a leopard from Mallia dating with some uncertainty to the MM period (page 93), and five obsidian items from the same site that have been shown to be sourced from East Göllü Dağ, in central Anatolia (page 93-94). It is also noteworthy that according to a recent study 42% of the copper at Mallia came from Anatolia (page 93). Furthermore, the fragments of a reddish-brown burnished class of pottery known from Kommos that dates from LM II to LM IIIB suggest a southwestern Anatolian origin (pages 94-95).

Some other objects that have been found in secure contexts in Crete equate to the MM III – LM I and may have been the products of Minoan workshops, but an Anatolian or Near Eastern origin cannot be ruled out. These include cylinder seals from Mavrospeleio and Tyliossos, and some steatite fragments that are suggested to have come from the curled locks of a large composite head of a sphinx, found at Knossos (page 91).

A silver lobed *kantharos* from Gournia, found in a context that is dated to MM I (page 91), and a similar object that was found in a Minoan shipwreck off the small island of Pseira (page 91) reveal a possible relationship between Minoan metalwork and central Anatolian forms. Additionally, a group of Middle Minoan sealings from Phaistos display remarkable stylistic affinities to sealings from

---

<sup>61</sup> For further information on these objects see Chapter 6.

Karahöyük in central Anatolia (pages 91-92). This connection implies not only stylistic/cultural interactions but also the possible adoption of administrative and political systems. Furthermore, a group of 'Anatolianising' vessels that reproduced Anatolian shapes was found on the Isle of Christ, near Mallia.

In this context it is also worthwhile to make comparisons with Beycesultan, where the similarities in architecture and in size between the Minoan palaces and the so called 'Palaces' of that site are still far from being an undeniable fact that connects the two cultures (see Chapter 4.11.); however, this must be kept in mind as a possible indirect influence.

#### 9.4. Minoan presence in Anatolia

The cases of Miletos and Iasos and the possibility of Minoan influence on them have already been examined. Minoan pottery has also been discovered at various sites along the western Anatolian coast (see relevant chapter). It is also important to note the Minoan/ising objects that have been found in the region. These include the double axe from Ephesos, the metal belt from Hattusa, the female figurines from Izmir and the Troad, and probably the Aegean swords and the 'Aegean' warrior on the bowl from Hattusa (see further analysis below). A possible Minoan influence for the bull-leaping scene on the vessel from Hüseyindede has also been mooted.

Is it possible to claim that the Minoans exerted any form of cultural influence over the neighbouring indigenous population of Anatolia? A look at the map reveals that the Minoan presence in western Anatolia was focused only in certain selected coastal areas, without any penetration of the interior, as can be concluded from examining the archaeological material. Why did the Minoans choose these specific sites (if it is accepted that Minoan traits can be interpreted as evidence of an active Minoan presence)?<sup>62</sup> A possible answer is that these settlements may have been

---

<sup>62</sup> It is possible that these sites have been actively selected by researchers? It is not accidental that most of the prehistoric excavations in western Anatolia have been conducted as part of larger excavation projects on classical sites. Only recently have archaeologists turned their attention to exclusively prehistoric excavations (For further information see Greaves 2007: 7-8).

founded in important places for commercial activities, especially when the demand for metals grew considerably after the foundation of the Old Palaces (Niemeier 2005a: 4). Miletos for example seems to have been the final destination of a significant commercial route<sup>63</sup> related to the metals coming from the Anatolian interior (Niemeier 2005a: 4). The acquisition of Anatolian metals is proposed as a significant factor in Minoan activity there by Niemeier. Moreover, if it is accepted that they had political control of these sites, they could have defended themselves more easily against a possible attack.<sup>64</sup>

Another question that arises is that of why the Minoans selected these sites instead of other ones closer to regions of strong commercial interest, for instance harbours in Cilicia or in north-western Anatolia to control trade from the Balkans and the Black Sea. It is known that during the Minoan Neopalatial period the Hittites gradually took political control of the Cilician coasts. The existence of a powerful pre-existing military/political authority perhaps deterred the Cretans from founding settlements or *emporía*. It is possible that the Minoans confronted a similar situation in north-western Anatolia. Antagonism with the conjectured Trojan hegemony would have deterred them from any thoughts of installing settlements in the area. In the author's opinion, although the dangers of an *ex silentio* argument are recognised, it appears that the situation in the south-western Anatolia offered better opportunities for the Cretans. The apparent lack of a strong political structure made them the predominant power in the area. Here they had the possibility to fill the vacuum<sup>65</sup> and they did so by establishing their presence on the coast, especially on the Milesian peninsula. It must also be said that the apparent Minoan presence on the islands of Lemnos (Cultraro 2005: 243; Privitera 2005: 229,231; Boulotis, *pers.comm.*) and Samothrace (Matsas 1991; 1995), in the northern Aegean, where according to recent

---

<sup>63</sup> The location of sites such as Miletos on trade routes made them attractive (Mee 1998: 137).

<sup>64</sup> It must be borne in mind that Miletos was probably an island (Greaves 1999: 57-58) in this period, like Tavşan Adası and İasos, while Akbük-Teichoussa was on the edge of a small peninsula. That means that they had obvious advantages as far as their defence is concerned.

<sup>65</sup> Not necessarily by establishing political domination. Cultural influences could also be seen as evidence of Minoan presence.

discoveries there is significant Cretan influence despite their distance from Crete, could be the result of the absence of any other major power in that region.

Another issue that needs consideration is the character of the Minoan presence. Did the Minoans dominate the local population or was there a kind of coexistence and collaboration? Keith Branigan's (1981: 23-33) models of Minoan 'colonies' (governed colony, settlement colony and community colony) are now widely recognized and have been used as a basis for debate surrounding the Minoan presence in western Anatolia (e.g. Greaves 2002: 67). However, such a discussion has no value in the case of Iasos, Akbük-Teichioussa, Tavşan Adası, Çeşme and Didyma, as there is not sufficient material to provide answers and only hypotheses can be put forward. But even for Miletos there is still much scope for debate about the precise nature of the Minoan presence, because the very limited extent of the excavated area<sup>66</sup> is not sufficient to apply any of Branigan's models (Greaves 2007: 8).<sup>67</sup>

Taking all this information together, it can be concluded that the objects, in the form of pottery as well as the artistic imitations and inspirations derived from western and central Anatolia, demonstrate that a level of cultural contact between Crete and Anatolia undoubtedly existed. The Anatolian elements in Middle Bronze Age Crete are evidence of relationships on a regular basis that might also have included contacts of a political nature. This image is enriched by the Minoan or/and Minoanising pottery and objects found in Anatolia, while the active presence of Minoan settlers in Miletos cannot be ruled out. A political aspect to these contacts cannot be excluded, though if this is true, it is difficult to define the 'ethnic' or even the cultural identity of the people with whom the Minoans<sup>68</sup> communicated. Were they western Anatolians ('Arzawans'), pre-Hittite central Anatolians (Hattians or

---

<sup>66</sup> Only ca 3.5% of the settlement of Miletos has been so far excavated, while it has been estimated to cover 50,000m<sup>2</sup> (Greaves 2007: 8; 2002: 60; Mee 1978: 135-136; Niemeier 2005a: pl. 1).

<sup>67</sup> However, the excavator of the site is inclined to believe that Branigan's 'settlement colony' model applies in the case of Miletos (Niemeier 2005a: 9).

<sup>68</sup> Even the term 'Minoans' itself is sometimes problematic as there is insufficient evidence to identify the "ethnicity" of the population of Crete in the Bronze Age. For a very thorough review of this topic see Momigliano 2009.

Assyrian merchants), early Hittites, some of these or all of these? This question must at present be left open. During the first phases of the Late Bronze Age, a period that marked the supposed acme of Minoan power, influences and imports from Anatolia apparently declined but never ceased. It is at this juncture that the first written sources to mention the people of Ahhiyawa must be remembered (see below). These references appear in the crucial transitional period that marks the fall of Minoan domination (either cultural or political) over a great part of the Aegean and the emergence of Mycenaean power.

#### 9.5. Minoans in the eastern Mediterranean context

At this point it seems appropriate to convey some thoughts about Minoan and eastern Mediterranean interconnections as an analogy to what was happening in the eastern Aegean. It has been observed that traces and influences of the Minoan and, generally speaking, the Aegean world are identifiable in almost every important ancient cultural centre of the eastern Mediterranean. Only in Anatolia, and especially in its central part, do these influences seem to be negligible. In Egypt for instance the frescoes from Tell el-Dab'a and the Keftiu paintings from the Theban tombs have been discovered (Bietak 1995; Matthäus 1995, Panagiotopoulos 2001), in the broader area of Syria the frescoes from Kabri and Alalakh testify Minoan/Aegean influence<sup>69</sup> (Niemeier and Niemeier 1998), and in Cyprus the so-called Cypro-Minoan script reveals a Cretan connection (Smith 2003).

There are also various references to the Minoans in texts from different areas of the Eastern Mediterranean. Some texts of Zimri-Lim of Mari, which date to the 18<sup>th</sup> century BC, mention men and objects from Caphtor (*Kap-ta-ra*). This name is usually identified with Crete. Another text from the same city refers to the redistribution of tin, coming from the east, to merchants from the west, including men from Caphtor (Cline 1999: 124; Wiener 1987: 262). Other texts list objects of Caphtorian manufacture, ranging from vases and leather sandals to weapons. Moreover, as

---

<sup>69</sup> It should be noted here that these frescoes could have been the products of travelling fresco-painters ('gastarbeiters') commissioned by local elites – an analogous situations to that found in Iasos.



noted above, references to Crete and the Minoans are found in texts and tombs of Egypt from 17<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> century. The *Keftiu* appear in tomb paintings, geographical lists, papyri, stelae, annal entries etc (Cline 1999: 124).

#### 9.6. Did the Minoans and Hittites know each other?

The answer to this question may prove somewhat complex. First of all it must be made clear that the Minoans and the Hittites coexisted for a long period of time in the broader eastern Mediterranean context and it is possible that their contacts varied over time. What can securely be said is that central Anatolia and Crete had limited contact relative to their links with Egypt and the Near East, especially during the period of the emergence and initial development of the Hittite kingdom (ca. 1700-1600 BC). In this chapter the author proposes a hypothesis, which can be reasonably substantiated by the evidence that at this particular period of time Minoan civilisation was at its peak, whilst the Hittite kingdom was still trying to establish itself (see Chapter 3 on Political Geography in Anatolia). Crete had developed commercial links with neighbouring cultures by importing raw materials and by exporting fine objects. Moreover, Cretan artisans (Aslihan Yener's '*Gastarbeiter*', responsible for the Minoan style frescos at Alalakh, or Momigliano's suggestion of the presence of Minoan artisans – masons and potters – at Iasos (Momigliano 2009) – if it is accepted that they were working for the palaces – were traveling and working in Egypt, Syria, the Levantine coast and, generally, the Near East. If so, it raises the question of why were Egypt and the Near Eastern kingdoms preferred as commercial partners by the Minoans in the eastern Mediterranean? By this time the land of the Pharaohs and the hegemonies in the Near East had a long established tradition of political power, culture and high status in the eastern Mediterranean. By contrast, the Hittites were comparative newcomers trying to establish their position in the broader area. Thus began a long process of development for the Hittite kingdom, leading to its eventual transformation into a super-power almost three centuries later. However, in the period currently being examined the Hittites were still on the cultural and political margins of the other kingdoms and states of the eastern Mediterranean. Furthermore, the hegemonies of western Anatolia, known later as the Arzawan kingdoms, were weak and without any

political importance in comparison to Egypt and to the cities of the Syrian coast. It could be assumed, although the author recognises that it is a very speculative theory, that the Minoans (either as a unified 'Minoan state'<sup>70</sup> or separate palatial elites) preferred to exchange their products with the elites who ruled Egypt and the cities of Syria in order to gain profit and recognition from the most important 'players' on the international 'political' scene. They considered that the contacts with these areas would be more profitable in various ways, not just commercially.

The situation changed during the reign of Tudhaliya I/II (the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century). As has already been noted, he was the first Hittite king who actively became involved in western Anatolian affairs (for further information see Chapter 8). During his reign the Hittites, according to their own written sources, reached the Aegean and, consequently, came into contact with its cultures. Before examining the nature of this Hittite-Aegean interaction it is necessary to review the situation in the Aegean at this period.

#### 9.7. The LM IB destructions in Crete and the role of the Mycenaeans

The end of the LM IB witnessed great changes throughout the Aegean. The Minoan palaces, except Knossos, and other major Minoan sites were destroyed, and evidence that something new had occurred appears across the island of Crete. Various theories have been suggested to explain the destruction of the palaces. The most cited explanations include: a Mycenaean conquest of the island (Hood 1985; Popham et al. 1974: 254-257; Popham 1994; Driessen 1990); physical disasters such as fires, earthquakes, the eruption of Thera and subsequent tsunamis (Marinatos 1939), or internal conflicts between the rulers of Knossos and those of other palaces (Hallager 1988; Niemeier 1984).

---

<sup>70</sup> It has been argued that the increasing importance of Knossos in the Neopalatial Period led to an internal *Pax Minoica* in Crete while the Knossian cultural influence spread over the island – or at least the greater part of it (Wiener 2007b).

The supporters of a Mycenaean invasion and conquest of the island consider that innovations in burial customs - the so-called 'Warrior Graves',<sup>71</sup> in pottery – mainly the so-called *Ephyrean*<sup>72</sup> pottery, and the appearance of Linear B texts<sup>73</sup> must be attributed to the mainlanders, who gradually took over control of the island and finally conquered it. However, this author and some other scholars believe that the new elements that appear in LM II should not be perceived as evidence of Mycenaean conquest but they should rather be attributed to either an influence from mainland Greece or a new perception of already familiar forms and types of pottery and funeral practices that led to further development and evolution.

Evidence of Knossian authority over the island includes the so-called 'replica rings'<sup>74</sup> that were found across Crete in destruction deposits dating to the LM IB period. These rings are interpreted as symbols of the power of Knossos palace and – according to recent petrographic analysis – their sealings are all stamped on the same type of clay with a provenance from north-central Crete, an area that roughly includes Knossos (Prof. Diamantis Panagiotopoulos, *pers. comm.*). Moreover, Argiro

---

<sup>71</sup> The burial customs of the Minoan aristocratic class at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age must be ignored, because as yet no unrobbed rich LMI tomb has been found. The change probably – as Sandars wrote – “appears more dramatic than it was” (Niemeier 1984: 211). Laura Preston has recently shown that, based on analysis of the burial customs during the Final and Post-Palatial period, the case for a large scale “invasion” of mainlanders in Crete is almost impossible to substantiate (Preston 1999; 2004).

<sup>72</sup> The shape of the *Ephyrean* type goblets seems indeed to have been adopted from the mainland in the early LM II. However, the adoption of only one vessel type of mainland origin is not sufficient to prove a Mycenaean domination (Niemeier 1984: 210).

<sup>73</sup> The introduction of Greek as the language of the palatial bureaucracy in Knossos in the late 15<sup>th</sup>-early 14<sup>th</sup> century has been doubted. A number of scholars believe that the tablets belong to the LM IIIB period (Niemeier 1983; Rutter – [http://projectsx.dartmouth.edu/history/bronze\\_age/](http://projectsx.dartmouth.edu/history/bronze_age/)). At this point it should be noted that Jan Driessen has suggested that some tablets from Knossos date to the LM II period, that there is no unity of the archives and the tablets of Linear B can occur in many contexts – he argues that they may belong to three different destruction deposits, from LM II to LM IIIB (Driessen 1995: 244-246; 1997).

<sup>74</sup> These are large gold rings depicting bull-leaping, chariots and combat scenes. 53 impressions from ten of these rings were found at six different LM IB sites. It is considered that the use of these rings to stamp documents on other sites means that LM IB Knossos exercised some authority over those sites (Weingarten 1997: 784, Hallager 1996: 207-209, 239, Betts 1967: 20)

Nafplioti has recently presented the results of strontium isotope ratio analysis of human dental enamel and bone from the *Warrior Graves* and other burials in Crete dating from LMII onwards that demonstrate that the hypothesis of a Mycenaean invasion in Crete after the LM IB destructions can be rejected (Nafplioti 2008).

In Crete, firm evidence for the presence of Mycenaeans seems to appear around the time of the transition from LM IIIA1 to 2 with the appearance of a *Megaron* at Ayia Triadha and Tylissos in LM IIIA2 (Niemeier 1984: 213-214).

On the islands of the Dodecanese and on the Carian-Ionian coast Minoan influence seems to have existed essentially without interruption until LM IIIA. Trianda for instance was abandoned in LM IIIA2 (Mee 2008: 368) while Karpathos still had connections with Crete in LM IIIA2 (Niemeier 1984: 214).

In conclusion, the above evidence can be summarised as follows: Although Mycenaean participation in the LM IB destructions cannot be ruled out – it must be noted that according to a recent theory the mainlanders helped the rulers of Knossos to take over the rest of the island, and some of them stayed and introduced new features (Rehak and Younger 1998: 149) – the author is inclined to believe that despite the irregularities caused by the destructions and the appearance of new elements in the material culture, a Minoan ruling class continued to dominate the island.

#### 9.8. The early Mycenaean presence in the Aegean islands and western Anatolia

Identification of the transition from the Minoan to the Mycenaean presence in the broader Aegean area is important for this research. Starting with the islands in the northern Aegean, it can be observed that the earliest Mycenaean pottery from Lesbos dates to LHIII A1, while the pottery from Chios and Lemnos goes back to LHIII A2 (Mee 1988: 301). A notable example appears to be the small island of Psara, west of Chios. The earliest pottery from the Mycenaean cemetery at Archontiki dates to LH IIA while the majority of the ware dates to LH IIIA – B (Achilara 1996; Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 62, 80; Mountjoy 1998: 34).

In the Dodecanese, there was already a strong Minoan presence. In Rhodes, the Mycenaean replaced the Minoans without obvious conflicts or destructions and this could be interpreted as the result of acculturation, a gradual and willing 'Mycenaeanisation' of the Cretan settlers (Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 77), especially after the disruption of the link between the Minoan settlers and their homeland during LM IIIA1. Indicative of this is the case of Trianda on Rhodes, where Minoan LM IIIA1 and Mycenaean LH IIIA1 pottery coexisted and there was evidently no problem of civil unrest within the population (Mee 1988: 301). Moreover, the earliest Mycenaean pottery (a few sherds) from Ialysos is dated to LH IIB (Georgiadis 2003: 87). Pottery from this period appeared at various sites on Kos and Karpathos, while LH IIIA2 pottery has been found on Kalymnos and other smaller islands (Mee 1988: 301).

The situation in western Anatolia does not differ greatly. The most important Aegean influence has so far been identified at Miletos. The earliest Mycenaean pottery here has been dated to LH IIIA1, with a significant increase in amount during the LH IIIA2 /LH IIIB1, when the settlement took on a strong Mycenaean character (see Chapter 4.3). The earliest Mycenaean pottery from Iasos is dated to the LH IIB/LH IIIA period, but the levels are too disturbed for secure information (see Chapter 4.2). The pottery from the cemetery of Müsgebi is dated to the LH IIIA-C period, while the Mycenaean pottery from the chamber tomb of Ayasoluk at Selçuk near Ephesus belongs to the LH IIIA2 period (see Chapter 4.6).

#### 9.9. The appearance of *Ahhiyawa*

According to the Hittite state archives of Hattusa the first references to *Ahhiyawa* come from the 'Madduwatta Indictment' (for further information see Chapter 8), which is dated to the reign of king Arnuwanda I (1420/1400-1400/1380) and describes events that took place during the reign of his father, Tudhaliya I/II (1450/1420-1420/1400). The activities of Attarissiya have been mentioned elsewhere in this research. According to the text of the indictment, the king of Hatti complains to Madduwatta, a ruler in western Anatolia under Hittite overlordship, about the crimes of the latter during the reign of the previous Hittite king, Tudhaliya.

In particular, when Attarissiya, the man from Ahhiya (an older version of Ahhiyawa) attacked Madduwatta, the Hittites supported their vassal ruler. But the latter later became an ally of Arzawa, the most important enemy of the Hittites in the region. Moreover, he created a new alliance with his former enemy, Attarissiya, and together they made a foray into Cyprus.<sup>75</sup>

#### 9.10. Some linguistic evidence

Although in the history of this debate the emphasis placed on linguistic and literary arguments has caused a disproportionate amount of heated debate, distracting scholars from the proper study of the archaeological material, it is necessary to include some comments about the nature of the word *Ahhiyawa* itself. It is accepted as a fact by many scholars that this word should be equated with the Homeric *Achaioi* and consequently with the inhabitants of Mycenaean Greece. However, none have so far sought to provide an explanation of the word itself. Viewed from the perspective of the Hittite capital of central Anatolia, the word might be expected to have conveyed the Hittite perception of a people of the Aegean and this may relate to the form of the word itself. Is it more reasonable to interpret the name *Ahhiyawa* as a Hittite version for a name that was used by the indigenous population of the Aegean to describe themselves, or is it more likely that the writers of the Hittite archives used a word from their own language that was related to some characteristic of this land and its people?

The etymology of the word *Ahhiyawa* must first be considered. The Indo-European root *Ach-* is connected with water. Many names of rivers and lakes, such as Inachos - *Ἰναχος*, Acheloos - *Αχελώος*, Lake Acherousia – *Αχερουσία*, and others have this root (Sakellarakis and Sakellarakis 1997: 47). Even in the Hittite language the word *akw-anzi* means 'they drink' (Gurney 1990: 99), while the Luwian word *aku--* means 'to drink' (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995: 607). This association with water endures into Latin (*aqua*) and even into modern Indo-European languages

---

<sup>75</sup> A possible indication of a Minoan fleet or a part of it? For activities on a large scale such as in the case of Cyprus it was essential to have both a powerful army and fleet.

(e.g. *acqua* in Italian, *agua* in Spanish). Given the widespread usage of the *Ach-* root to indicate water it is worth considering whether and, if so, how the word *Ahhiyawa* might relate to some physical characteristic of the land. Although densely populated with islands and people, the Aegean region is dominated by water, i.e. the Aegean sea itself, and it seems reasonable to suggest that the Luwian/Hittite name for the people of the Aegean was something like 'Sea People', i.e. 'Ach-...'. At this point it must be noted that the name Πελασγοί – 'Pelasgians' was commonly used by the ancient Greeks in order to describe the older inhabitants of Greece. What it is above all important to mention is that this name is strongly connected with water as it probably derives from the word Πέλαγος-Pelagos which means 'Sea' e.g. Αιγαίο Πέλαγος/ 'Aegean Sea' in Greek (Dr. Gareth Owens, *pers. comm.*, Liddel – Scott 1940: 1356-1357).

Assuming a central Anatolian perspective on the question again, could the name 'Ahhiyawa' have been attributed by the Hittite scribes to representatives of both the Minoan and Mycenaean cultures of the Aegean?<sup>76</sup> There are precedents for the Hittites labelling diverse ethnic groups with a single name. For example, the Hittites referred to the people of western Anatolia as 'Arzawa', ignoring the fact that this region consisted of numerous separate political or ethnic entities (Arzawa Minor, the Seha River Land, Wilusa etc.). Another example is the word 'Hurrian', a general term used by the Hittites for the description of not only the kingdom of Mittanni but also of the nomadic tribes who lived in the same area (Bryce 2003a: 43; 1989b: 3-5). In this context, it is quite possible that the Hittite scribes used 'Ahhiyawa' to describe the people of the Aegean, be they Minoans or Mycenaeans.

Moreover, it may be remarked that the place-name *Achaiwia*, very similar to the Hittite *Ahhiyawa* and the Homeric *Achaioi*, appears on a tablet of Linear B from Knossos (C 914). This is the only evidence, but no similar reference can be found

---

<sup>76</sup> The hypothesis of a plausible identification of Ahhiyawa with the Minoanising centres of the south-eastern Aegean has been also suggested by Melas (1988: 118), however there was no further investigation of the matter.

anywhere else in the Linear B archives (Bryce 1989b: 4). Crete is the only place in the Aegean world where a word connected to Ahhiyawa appears.

#### 9.11. Evaluation and interpretation of the existing information

Putting this information together, it seems logical to suggest that the archaeological material demonstrates that the active Mycenaean presence in the eastern Aegean and western Anatolia dates from after the first references to Ahhiyawa in the Hittite archives. A closer examination of the data reveals that islanders from Crete were still active in the above area at the time of these first references and they may possibly have been involved in conflicts between the local population and the Hittites (campaign of Tudhaliya I/II in Assuwa,<sup>77</sup> see Chapter 3 on Political Geography in Anatolia).

The Aegean swords that were found at Hattusa (Cline 1996) and Kastamonu (Ünal 1999) date to the late decades of the 15<sup>th</sup> or early decades of the 14<sup>th</sup> century and belong to Sandars' Type B classification (the sword from Izmir was not found in context). Although they have been characterized as 'Mycenaean', the earliest examples of this type have been found in Crete, dating from MM II (Sandars 1961: 22-24), and a Minoan origin cannot be ruled out (Dr. Barry Molloy, *pers. comm.*). It is therefore reasonable to suppose that these swords and the so-called 'Mycenaean warrior'<sup>78</sup> on the Hittite bowl from Hattusa might just as convincingly imply Minoan military involvement in western Anatolian affairs, as much as Mycenaean. Is it not therefore possible to postulate, given the equivocal nature of much of the evidence, that it was the Minoans and not the Mycenaeans, as has previously been thought, who were the Aegean people who first became embroiled in Anatolian affairs and were first referred to by the Hittite scribes as 'Ahhiyawa'?

---

<sup>77</sup> It is significant to mention that the word *Assuwa* was known to the Minoans as it appears in a tablet of Linear A from Aya Triada (see chapter of linguistic connection).

<sup>78</sup> The so-called "Mycenaean warrior" could be a depiction of an Aegean or western Anatolian warrior in general and not specifically of a Mycenaean one (Angelos Papadopoulos, *pers. comm.*). This is another case where the 'established Mycenaeanisation' of an object is doubted (in this case a Mycenaean warrior seen through the eyes of a Hittite artisan).



And what was the character of the Mycenaean presence? It could be assumed that the role of the mainlanders during this period of the Minoan domination throughout the Aegean was to fill the vacuum in the areas which the Minoans – for their own reasons – never reached (i.e the Psara island case).

To sum up, it has been suggested here that after Tudhaliya's campaigns in the Arzawa Lands the Hittites came into contact with the Aegean populations, possibly Minoans, who were already installed in Anatolia or had at least heavily influenced the behaviour of some of the local population. These Aegeans, when they became involved in the conflict between the Hittites and the native Anatolian people, supported the latter, as both the archival material and the archaeological finds testify. In the author's opinion, an intervention by Crete under the lead of Knossos cannot be ruled out – it must be added that during the above period (LM II) Knossos was undoubtedly the most powerful polity in the southern Aegean (Rutter 2006: 151), so it can reasonably be assumed that it was in a position to undertake overseas activities across the Aegean. Rutter has recently argued that "the name Ahhiya or Ahhiyawa was originally applied by the Hittites to the LM II-III A2 early kingdom centered at Knossos". However, although he tends to accept the 'Cretan solution' for the appearance of Ahhiyawa, he considers that this happened when a Mycenaean administration came to power at Knossos (Rutter 2006: 151).

#### 9.12. The transition period in the Aegean: a perspective from the Egyptian and Hittite sources

An interesting aspect of what one might call the 'transition period' in the Aegean (the gradual replacement of Minoan domination by the Mycenaeans) is provided by some Egyptian sources that date back to the reign of Amenhotep III (ca. 1390-1252), which could possibly shed more light on this issue. As already noted, depictions of *Keftiu* (Minoans/Aegeans carrying artifacts and products mainly from the Aegean) in several Theban tombs of the 15<sup>th</sup> century B.C. have been considered to be the result of connections and interaction between these two peoples at the time of the acme of Minoan commercial activities in the Eastern Mediterranean. In the next century references to the Aegean can also be identified from other sources.

More specifically, the site of Kom el – Hetan contains a significant amount of information that confirms the contact between Egypt and the Aegean. An inscribed list (fig. 9.12.1), known as the *Aegean List*, on the base<sup>79</sup> of a statue from the mortuary temple of Amenhotep III consists of fourteen names that can be identified with Aegean sites. Two names on the right of the front of the base are separated from the others by a double cartouche of Amenhotep III; *Keftiu*<sup>80</sup> and *Tanaja* (a word frequently correlated with the Mycenaeans, *Δαυαοί* – *Danaoi* in Homer). *Amnisos*, *Phaistos*, *Kydonia*, *Mycenae*, Boetian Thebes,<sup>81</sup> *Knossos*, *Nauplion*, *Kythera* and various other places also appear in the list (Astour 1966; Cline 1998: 236-238; Edel 1966: 33-60; Haider 1996: 144; Kitchen 1965: 5-6; O' Connor 1996: 56-60; Strange 1980: 21-27; Wachmann 1987: 95-99).

The existence of this list has stimulated much discussion. Among the various theories that have been expounded, the idea of an Egyptian embassy to the Aegean is considered quite convincing (Cline 1998: 245; Wachmann 1987: 96-97). In the author's opinion, the coexistence of the names *Keftiu* and *Tanaja* in the same context probably suggests that the Egyptians at the time of Amenhotep III were aware of the fact that two different and distinctive entities, at least culturally if not to say politically speaking, inhabited the Aegean. They probably recognized that the islanders and the mainlanders of the region that equates with modern southern Greece and the Aegean were competing for hegemony of the area, and both possibly had spheres of influence; however, according to the *Aegean List* it was clear that the Mycenaeans had not yet overcome Minoan power in the Aegean.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Unfortunately the base was accidentally destroyed some time after 1975 (Cline 1998: 237).

<sup>80</sup> During the reign of Amenhotep III the term *Keftiu* appears five times, while the term *Tanaja* is found three times (Cline 1998: 239).

<sup>81</sup> Edel has argued that the name d-y-q-e-i-s, which appears in the *Aegean List*, equates to Thebes (Edel 1988: 30-35).

<sup>82</sup> The author would like to highlight that the possibility that there were several Minoan and Mycenaean states that competed each other for the domination in the Aegean cannot be ruled out. What seems clear from the *Aegean List* is the fact that the Egyptians could probably recognise the differences between two cultural entities.

Another list, engraved on column drums in Amenhotep III's Amon temple at Soleb in Nubia includes the names *Keftiu* and *Tanaja*, as well as the names *Hatti*, *Arzawa*, *Qadesh*, *Sangar* (Babylonia), *Naharina* (Mitanni) *Tunip*, and *Ugarit* (Cline 1998: 240; Edel 1980: 65-68; Strange 1980: 20-21; Vercoutter 1956: 78-79). Additionally, another topographical list from the Amon-Ra temple at Karnak has the name *Tanaja* between the names *Hatti*, *Arzawa*, *Sangar* and *Naharina* (Cline 1998: 241; Edel 1966: 37, 51; Haider 1988: 11-12). It becomes apparent that each list includes the known world located to the north of Egypt (Cline 1998: 242).

At this point it must be noted that fourteen objects inscribed with the cartouche of Amenhotep III or Queen Tiye were found at six sites in the Aegean (Mycenae, Ayios Elias, Ialysos, Ayia Triadha, Khania and Knossos) revealing the strong cultural, commercial and probably political links between the two regions. It has been suggested that many or all of them arrived in the Aegean in the LH/LM IIIA1 period, during the reign of Amenhotep III, as royal gifts. It is also possible that these royally-inscribed items arrived together, in a single voyage (Cline 1987: 11-13; 1994: 39; 1998: 247). The probable link between these objects and the Aegean List can be suggested from the fact that four of the six sites where the aforementioned objects were found are named at Kom el – Hetan: Knossos, Phaistos/Ayia Triadha,<sup>83</sup> Kydonia and Mycenae, where up to nine of these objects<sup>84</sup> (at least six and possibly nine faience plaques, fig. 9.12.2) were discovered in LH IIIA and LH IIIB contexts (Cline 1987: 8-11; 1990: 200-212; 1994: 39; 1998: 247).

An Egyptian embassy, if it did occur, was directed towards Mycenae as the presence of the majority of the above items indicates. It is possible that the Egyptians, realising that an old world (that of the Minoans), or at least its political presence, was about to finish, preferred to create closer relations with the agents of a new, vigorous culture in order to serve their own interests. A similar purpose

---

<sup>83</sup> Cline equates the two sites, but in the author's opinion a certain amount of doubt remains about this equation.

<sup>84</sup> A new plaque fragment, originally discovered during Mylonas' excavations in 1975, was recognised by K. Shelton in 2000 in the Nauplio Museum (Philips and Cline 2005: 320).

seems to have led to the marriage of Amenhotep III with the daughter of Tarkhundaradu of Arzawa (Moran 1992: 101-102). It has been suggested that Amenhotep III became involved in the affairs of the Aegean and Anatolia to prevent the growing power of the Hittites, who under the command of Suppiluliuma I became a threat to Egyptian interests (Cline 1998: 248-249). Although this theory does not appear to be without foundation, it must nevertheless remain a very tentative suggestion.

As a final point it can be assumed that the alleged mission from Pharaonic Egypt to the Aegean would probably have served a dual purpose: to reaffirm connections with the Minoans, an old trading partner, and to establish relations with the rising power in the Aegean, the Mycenaeans (Cline 1998: 248).

The Hittite archives offer a very interesting perspective on the Aegean 'transition period'. It is noteworthy that the first mention of 'Ahhiyawa' appears during the reign of Arnuwanda in relation to an incident that took place when his father Tudhaliya was still king. The next reference to Ahhiyawa dates to the reign of Mursili II, almost 80-100 years later. It is conceivable that this lack of sources in the Hittite archives reflects the turbulent situation in the Aegean and the possible interruption of contacts between both areas during the process of replacing Minoan domination by Mycenaean. Moreover, the author believes that the above fact must also be combined with the situation of the Hittites at this time. The first decades of the 14<sup>th</sup> century were the period of the so-called *concentric invasions* (see Chapter 3). The Hittite kingdom was almost destroyed and for a short period of time Arzawa became the dominant power in Anatolia (this fact also explains the marriage between Amenhotep III and the daughter of the Arzawan king, as has been mentioned above).

Bearing the above in mind the situation could be summarised as follows: when the Hittites first came into contact with Ahhiyawa, they possibly interacted with the agents of Minoan culture, which dominated in the Aegean. However, after a long and turbulent period in both the Aegean and central Anatolia these links were interrupted. When the Hittites restored their power in the area and again started

interacting with western Anatolia and the Aegean, the Mycenaeans had already established their domination over the islands and perhaps also controlled some points on the Anatolian coast. From this point on, all the Hittite references to Ahhiyawa refer to the Mycenaeans.

The Egyptian sources, although they differ from those of the Hittites, could be interpreted in the same way. Only the mention of the name *Keftiu* in the 15<sup>th</sup> century indicates interactions with the Minoans, while the reference to both *Keftiu* and *Tanaja* during the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century could be seen as evidence of the turbulent situation in the Aegean and the struggle between the Minoans and Mycenaeans for dominance.

## 10. The Mycenaeans in western Anatolia

### 10.1. Introduction

It has already been demonstrated in this thesis that the Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia has become closely connected to the so-called *Ahhiyawa Question*. A high level of contact between the royal courts of Mycenae and Hattusa has come to be considered almost certain by many academics since the first appearance of the name 'Ahhiyawa' in the Hittite texts. The hypothesis that Ahhiyawa equates to a Mycenaean Greek state is now generally accepted by the majority of scholars. The major issues that need to be examined are the character of the Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia and the precise definition of the Hittite-Mycenaean relations, topics that will be analysed in this chapter by taking into account archaeological data and making specific references to the Hittite archival material only if and when necessary.

The first general observation that can be made is that western Anatolia was a 'secondary' field of activity for both the Mycenaeans and Hittites. The kings of Hatti were focused almost exclusively on Near Eastern affairs for most of the Late Bronze Age - mainly with efforts to reduce either the power of Egypt or the influence of Mittani and Assyria, attempting at the same time to subordinate the smaller kingdoms in Syria and Mesopotamia and to challenge the so-called 'super - powers' of the time (see Chapter 3) - while the Mycenaean 'wanakes' and/or elite seem to have preferred others than the Hittites as partners in their external commercial relationships.

Additionally, as is apparent from the study of the data, one thing is certain: the Mycenaean presence in Anatolia varied spatially and chronologically. The level of Mycenaean-Anatolian contacts differed from period to period and from site to site. That is why the author feels that it is necessary to provide a brief review of the available sources with regard to the contact between the two neighbouring cultures, starting with the earlier phases.

## 10.2 The earlier periods

During the LHI period both the Hittites and the mainlanders of the Aegean tried to stabilise their position and to create organised kingdoms. It seems that their main concerns were, firstly, to consolidate their authority and secondly, to develop external political and commercial links. As a result, their external relations appear to be minimal in comparison with those of later periods. The central Anatolian/Hittite objects – the silver stag and pin previously referred to – from the Shaft Graves (where Minoan influence on the artifacts is more apparent, see Dickinson 1984) have certainly not been considered to be conclusive proof of an existing Mycenaean-Hittite link, especially of a ‘royal’ nature (see page 95). However, it is difficult to imagine that in a short period during the 16<sup>th</sup> century the royal courts of Mycenae and Hattusa exchanged valuable gifts (although no objects from this period have been found in Hattusa that could possibly be identified as ‘Mycenaean’ gifts), that these contacts then suddenly ceased, and that relations then re-started 150-200 years later. As has already suggested in this research (see page 95-96), the aforementioned objects from the Shaft Graves probably arrived in Mycenae through merchants (probably Minoans) who were acting as intermediaries in order to ‘satisfy’ the needs of an emerging elite. Additionally, although the Hittites had begun to record neighbouring ethnic groups (i.e. Arzawa) at this period, there is no evidence for any reference to the Mycenaeans or to the Aegean world in general in the Hittite archives.

The following periods, LH IIA and LH IIB, appear to be a ‘hiatus’ in Anatolian/Hittite-Mycenaean relations. There is insufficient material, either archaeological or archival, to indicate that these two cultures were in contact. Only a few fragments of Mycenaean pottery have been found in the broader eastern Aegean-western Anatolia region from this time. Specifically, these include: Rhodes (two chamber tombs in the cemetery of Trianda dating to LH IIB), Kos (Eleona – Langada), Psara (LH IIA sherds from Archontiki), Iasos – LH IIB or LH IIIA1 pottery (Benzi 2005: 205) – Troy, Miletos, Liman Tepe and Mylasa (Georgiadis 2003: 36, 40, 44; Mee 1988: 301; 2008: 372; Mountjoy 1998: 34; Vanschoonwinkel 2007: 43). During this period the vast majority of the Aegean pottery found in the Dodecanese

and western Anatolia is Minoan and/or Minoanised (Mountjoy 1998: 33-34). It seems probable that the Mycenaeans were not actively involved in Aegean trade and that their contacts with eastern Mediterranean states at this time must have been indirect, without doubt via Crete (Mee 2008: 381). It is possible that Minoan domination of the Aegean deterred the mainlanders from attempting to make contacts with Anatolia; however, as Mee argues, it is difficult to imagine why the Minoans would have imposed such an embargo or how it could be enforced (Mee 2008: 381). It should be noted that at this time the first references to Ahhiya(wa) appeared in the Hittite sources (the Indictment of Madduwata and activities of Attarissiya in western Anatolia), which in the author's opinion should be equated with the agents of Minoan culture, as has already been extensively analysed.

Alternatively, if one accepts the current predominant theory, the first Mycenaeans appeared in the Dodecanese and western Anatolia and encouraged anti-Hittite activities by offering their military services to the local population, while the scribes of Hattusa mentioned them for the first time in their texts. Attarissiya in this context was probably a Mycenaean leader who was trying to become an important player in the political affairs of the eastern Aegean – western Anatolia.

### 10.3. The 14<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries: evidence for extensive contacts

However, this picture changed dramatically during the 14<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, a period in which Mycenaean civilisation reached its apogee, and whose main features could be briefly summarised as follows: a centralised palatial economy, a social pyramid under the *wanax*, a hierarchy of settlements, each dependent on the residence of the local *wanax*, and specific ways of thinking that are reflected iconographically (Kilian 1990: 445-447).

During the LH IIIA1 Mycenaean presence in the eastern Aegean – western Anatolia became more intensive, evidence for which includes: chamber tombs on Rhodes (Paradisi, Tolo), the use of the Eleona and Langada cemeteries on Kos, a chamber tomb at Ephesos, and Mycenaean pottery from Ialysos, Kos, and Miletos. However, it should be borne in mind that there is also LM IIIA1 pottery from a number of sites such as Ialysos, Eleona and Langada, Karpathos (Georganas 2000:



23-24; Karantzali and Papachristodoulou 2005: 363; Mee 1988: 301; Mountjoy 1998: 34-37). As Mee points out “there is no sudden transmission but a steady escalation in the level of Mycenaean activity” (Mee 1998: 138). Although this period could be considered as the first Mycenaean expansion across the Aegean, the mainlanders were not yet in a position to influence decisively the cultures of eastern Aegean – western Anatolia, which retained in many cases their strong Minoan and local cultural characteristics.

During LH IIIA2 there is a remarkable increase in the number of sites with Mycenaean material in the eastern Aegean – western Anatolia. More specifically, Mycenaean pottery of this period has been found at 24 sites on Rhodes, while 59 tombs were in use at Ialysos. A similar picture emerges in the other islands of the Dodecanese (Kos, Astypalaia, Kalymnos, Leros, Patmos and Syme), while Kasos, Karpathos and Saros still retain a Minoan character (Bosnakis 2005: 341; Georganas 2000: 23-24; Karantzali 2005; Karantzali and Papachristodoulou 2005: 363; Mee 1988: 301-302; Melas 1983; 1985: 177-182; Mountjoy 1998: 34-37, 51; Zervaki 2005: 376, 378). Additionally, Mycenaean pottery from this period is found at Troy, Mylasa, Kusadası, Tire – Ahmetler, Çerkes – Sultaniye, Akbük, Erythrae and Old Smyrna, while Menemen – Panaztepe, Liman Tepe, Ephesos, Müskebi, Miletos, Iasos, and Colophon provide more intensive evidence of Mycenaean cultural influence (Mee 1988: 302; 1998: 138).

Mycenaean pottery of LH IIIA2 also reached Egypt in quantities, especially in Amarna, where 1500 to 2000 sherds have been found so far (Kelder 2005: 144-145; Merillees 1998: 153), while the name Tanaja appears in Egyptian written sources. From the period of Akhenaten’s reign comes a papyrus, which shows a battle scene and depicts, among others, warriors who seem to have been wearing boars’ tusk helmets and oxhide tunics of possible Mycenaean derivation (Schofield and Parkinson 1994). In addition, it is interesting to note that the bulk of Mycenaean pottery found in Cyprus dates from this period onwards<sup>85</sup> (Cadogan 2005: 316). The

---

<sup>85</sup> It is beyond the remit of this thesis to examine the character of the Mycenaean presence in Egypt and Cyprus; however the author believes that it is important to show that the intensive contacts that

above information points to the conclusion that this was a period when commercial activities, at least, were taking place between the Aegean and other parts of the eastern Mediterranean.

It is worth mentioning that objects from Anatolia or influenced by Anatolian prototypes have been found in the Aegean in LH IIIA contexts; specifically, the two shoe-shaped rhyta from Attika and a similar one from Chania, a steatite semi-bulla from Mycenae, a semi-bulla from Ialysos, a jug from Kos (see Chapter 6). Perhaps surprisingly, the Hittite archives still remain silent about Ahhiyawan activities during the aforementioned period.<sup>86</sup>

Mycenaean material from LH IIIB comes from Miletos (with its cemetery at Değirmentepe), Ialysos, Müskebi, Panaztepe, Liman Tepe, Çerkes – Sultaniye, Didyma, Telmessos/Fethiye and a few more sites inland (see Chapters 4-5). Unexpectedly, after LH IIIA2 Mycenaean material is absent from Ephesos and the broader area, but reappears in LH IIIC. In the south – eastern Aegean fewer burials appear at Ialysos in LH IIIB but the tombs are still wealthy, while the level of prosperity does not seem to have changed. However, the settlement of Trianda was abandoned in LH IIIA1, possibly after disastrous floods (Karantzali 2003: 514-515). The number of burials in cemeteries on the rest of the island remains unchanged. Eleona-Langada in Kos has more tombs in LH IIIB than in the previous period, while Mycenaean pottery of this period has been found at the cemetery of Pigadia in Karpathos (Georganas 2000: 23-24; Mee 2008: 368-369; Mountjoy 1998: 35)

A semi-bulla from Perati has been found in a LH IIIB/C context, while some sherds from the group of Anatolian pottery from Kommos date to LM IIIB. It should also be noted that the vast majority of the references to Ahhiyawa come from this period.

---

existed, as the material culture reveals, between the above areas and the Mycenaean world started in LH IIIA1-2.

<sup>86</sup> It can be suggested that this is because Mycenaean activity was purely commercial, while the main concern of the Hittite scribes was to record political events and to produce religious texts.

The period that follows the collapse of the Mycenaean palatial centres and the dissolution of the Hittite Empire, LH IIIC, offers only sporadic information, mainly due to the lack of identified sites. The stratigraphy from Troy, Miletos, Iasos and other sites remains uncertain, while Müsgebi is the only cemetery site with LH IIIC pottery published so far. Mountjoy supports the idea of an East Aegean *koine* in her Lower Interface (the only exception to this picture is Rhodes, which had a completely different pottery style), which evolved from the east Aegean LH IIIB pottery (Mountjoy 1998: 50-63). In Cilicia there is a remarkable increase in the amount of LH IIIC pottery, although sporadic contact must have occurred during LH IIA to LHIII B (Mee 1978: 150). Many LHIIA and LH IIIB tombs were reused in LH IIIC at Ialysos and it is possible that newcomers arrived from the Greek mainland or other sites on the island (Mee 2008: 369). Other sites with LH IIIC material on Rhodes are Kalavarda – Tzitzo, Kalavarda – Aniforos, Vati and Pylona. The cemeteries of Eleona and Langada on Kos show an increase in the number of burials; at Eleona almost all the earlier (LH IIIA and IIIB) tombs were reused, while at Langada there is also construction of new ones. Additionally, the fourth city of Seraglio is dated to LH IIIC and there are also a few published vessels from the cemetery at Pothia on Kalymnos (Thomatos 2006: 256-257).

#### 10.4. Possible Anatolian – Aegean influences and interactions in fortification architecture

At first glance it appears that the construction technique of several Mycenaean fortifications shows parallels, in terms of construction, dimension and appearance at least, to the fortification architecture of the Hittite capital. These similarities have caused a great deal of discussion about a possible link between the two cultures. This debate has attempted to provide an explanation for the transmission of the common architectural features of the architectural traditions in these two regions, if indeed there was such a connection, often by citing philological sources. For example, Bryce suggested that western Anatolian craftsmen, who knew Hittite fortification techniques, offered their services to the Mycenaean *ἀνακτες/anaktes* (kings) following the defeat of Arzawa Minor in the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century (Bryce 1999: 259-263).

Other scholars have postulated that the Hittites influenced Mycenaean fortification architecture in either a direct or indirect manner, via coastal cities of western Anatolia such as Miletos (Iakovidis 1983:106; 1999: 199; Scoufopoulos 1971: 101-106; Trisch 1968: 129-131. See also page 42 for details of the Late Bronze Age Milesian fortification wall). These influences include the Cyclopean masonry, the direct-access gate, corbel vaulted-galleries, and underground spring passages, while there are also similarities in the working of the stones with tubular drills and with pendulum-saws (Cline 1991: 2; Neve 1989: 405; Niemeier 2003: 105; Schwander 1991: 218-223; Wright 2006: 35; 208: 250-251). In addition, the closeness of the parallels between the Lion Gates at Mycenae and Hattusa (fig. 10.4.1-2) is significant and it has been suggested that lions might have represented the authority of the royal house (Cline 1991: 2, Niemeier 2003: 105). It is possible that the idea of fortification programmes on a grand scale was adopted from the Hittite heartland (Rutter- [http://projectsx.dartmouth.edu/history/bronze\\_age/](http://projectsx.dartmouth.edu/history/bronze_age/)). However, in terms of scale as well as architectural detail there are many differences between these two regional traditions. The Cyclopean masonry system of the Mycenaean palaces is a distinctive technique and quite dissimilar to that of the Hittite fortifications, where polygonal masonry was extensively used (Wright 2006: 35). Perhaps, as the majority of scholars accept, the most likely source of inspiration for Mycenaean fortification systems is the earlier defensive systems seen at Cycladic sites such as Phylakopi and Ayia Irini of Kolonna on Aegina (Hope Simpson 2006: 26-29; Rutter-[http://projectsx.dartmouth.edu/history/bronze\\_age/](http://projectsx.dartmouth.edu/history/bronze_age/)), while as Wright (2005: 196) notes "although the architecture of Mycenaean fortifications was likely to have been influenced by knowledge of that of the Hittites, the employment of offsets to mark sections of construction is distinctly Mycenaean".

#### 10.5. The geographical extent of Mycenaean presence in Anatolia

If the Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia is examined geographically it can be summarised as follows: In northwestern Anatolia, north of the Gediz River, there is sporadic contact, while the Mycenaean pottery is found in a mainly Anatolian context (Mee 1978: 148). In western Anatolia, between the Büyük Menderes and the Gediz, the archaeological material shows more intensive contacts

at Liman Tepe, Çeşme, Ephesos and Panaztepe. However, one cannot speak of any obvious Mycenaean influences here as Anatolian elements predominate. On the south coast contacts appear to be minor, although it should be noted that the number of known prehistoric sites in this region is negligible (Mee 1978: 150). An interesting situation appears in central Anatolia: although until recently central Anatolia was considered to be a region without any significant Aegean traces, the author is inclined to support a slightly revised view due to the new discoveries from Hattusa (see pages 84-85). Sherratt and Crowel's assertion that in central Anatolia there is "a strong inverse correlation between the amount of Late Helladic IIIA-B pottery and the degree of Hittite control" (Sherratt and Crowel 1987: 345) needs to be further clarified and reconsidered. Further research in the future will probably shed more light on the degree of Aegean influence in the heart of the Hittite homeland.

There is no doubt that the majority of Mycenaean finds are concentrated in coastal western Anatolia, south of the Büyük Menderes. Miletos, Iasos, and Müsgebi among other sites provide evidence for intensive contacts between the Mycenaean and the local Anatolian population. The archaeological material indicates that the Mycenaean had possibly installed themselves at the aforementioned sites, however the possibility of coexistence with native populations cannot be ruled out (Mee 2008: 373), and in the author's opinion this is the most probable scenario. In addition, based on the amount of Mycenaean material that was found at the site he considers that Çine – Tepecik should also be included in the list of sites in western Anatolia where it is likely that some Mycenaean had installed themselves. However, in general, the extent of Mycenaean settlement was without doubt restricted and the idea of a large-scale colonisation cannot be supported by the archaeological evidence (Mee 1998: 140-141). Mycenaean interest was focused on the south-west coast of Anatolia, just opposite the Dodecanese, and trade seems the most reasonable explanation for this (Mee 1998: 141; 2008: 372).

The evidence from inland south-western Anatolia, south of the Büyük Menderes, shows limited contacts. In this region, with the notable exception of Çine-

Tepecik, there is a strong local tradition, as can be seen from the archaeological material from Aphrodisias and Beycesultan.

The first evidence of Mycenaean contact with Anatolia consists of a few LH IIA sherds from Miletus and Clazomenae. By LH III A1 Mycenaean pottery had also reached Iasos and Ephesos and the number of sites increased again in LH IIIA2. The focus of Mycenaean activity was the south-west coast, where there were close links with the eastern Aegean islands (Mee 2008: 372).

The situation north of the Büyük Menderes River appears to be more complicated. At Ephesos a tomb contained LH pottery with Minoan and Mycenaean decorative motifs, while Anatolian and Mycenaean terracotta figurines were found in the sanctuary of Artemis, indicating evidence of early cult activity (see Chapter 4.6). The only Mycenaean *tholos* tomb in western Anatolia has been found in Colophon (see page 81), while the cemetery at Panaztepe, just south of the Gediz River, provided evidence of a heterogeneous mixture of burial architecture and customs (Mee 2008: 372).

Inland, the situation differs; Mycenaean finds (pottery and metalwork) are reported only sporadically. Even fewer Mycenaean imports in central Anatolia means that evidence for trade between the Mycenaean and the Hittites appears to be minimal, although it seems that they were well aware of each other, as the archives from Hattusa indicate (Mee 2008: 373-374).

According to the texts Ahhiyawa controlled some territory in Anatolia and also some islands, consequently the settlements in the eastern Aegean and western Anatolia could have formed the nucleus of the kingdom. The assumption that the Mycenaean and the Hittites came into contact seems reasonable, however it can be suggested that they did not enjoy a particularly close or productive relationship (Mee 2008: 374).

#### 10.6 The character of the Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia

Various theoretical interpretations have been proposed so far about the definition of the character of Mycenaean presence in south – western Anatolia. To

begin with, it has been suggested for instance that an extensive immigration from mainland Greece took place in the south-eastern Aegean during the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first decades of the 14<sup>th</sup> centuries BC. The reason for this was the turbulent situation and the conflicts between early Mycenaean chiefdoms which led some Mycenaean refugees (aristocrats according to Niemeier) to seek new land to settle (Niemeier 2004: 2005a: 16). As a result the Dodecanese and a part of south – western Anatolia were partially or totally ‘Mycenaeanised’. Although tempting, the above theory provides unsatisfactory explanations about crucial aspects of the alleged Mycenaean immigration. Specifically, although there is evidence for ‘Mycenaeanisation’ of the Dodecanese, the case of south-western Anatolia is by no means the same. Of all the sites in the area only Miletos and Müsgebi provide any firm evidence for Mycenaean settlers, although it must be taken into consideration that there is not yet adequate information about the proportion of Anatolian and Aegean archaeological material. As Ünal points out Mycenaean pottery forms perhaps only 5% of the Late Bronze Age pottery in Miletos,<sup>87</sup> 2% at Troy and only 0.6% at Panaztepe. These low percentages are surprising, he says, because so little is known about the abundant local pottery, which has been largely ignored on excavations and surveys (Ünal 1991: 22-24).

Moreover, it should be noted that, as has been shown above, the diffusion of Mycenaean cultural traits began in LH IIIA1, while a significant increase in Mycenaean sites took place in LH IIIA2. In fact, the active Mycenaean presence in the area only dates to after the first decades of the 14<sup>th</sup> century.

A different approach explains the phenomenon of the Mycenaean presence in the eastern Aegean – western Anatolian area in terms of acculturation. Mountjoy (1998) refutes the idea of any immigration from the Greek mainland, although she highlights the differences in the spread of Mycenaean influence in what she calls the ‘Eastern Aegean – West Anatolian Interface’. She states that the Southern Interface absorbed the Mycenaean culture more easily because it had already been exposed

---

<sup>87</sup> Niemeier states that the recent excavations showed that the Mycenaean pottery of Miletos V makes up 95% of the total sample (Niemeier 1998b:33-34).

to much Minoan influence, and she especially highlights what she calls the 'East Aegean Koine'.

The author's opinion is that the possibility of Mycenaean settlers/emigrants in some areas of western Anatolia, as Niemeier suggests, possibly at Miletos and Müsgebi and probably in Iasos and Çine – Tepecik, cannot be ruled out. However, he believes that most of the Mycenaean traits should be attributed to a process of acculturation, as Mountjoy suggests, and a selection of cultural elements that fitted to the beliefs of the local communities. Neither can he say that he completely agrees with Mountjoy's Interface theory because he believes that the Dodecanese were almost fully Mycenaeanised from LH IIIA2 onwards, while on the opposite shores a local Anatolian material culture predominated.

#### 10.7. The ambiguous nature of Hittite archival material as an explanation of the Mycenaean presence in western Anatolia

The question of how information from written sources should be evaluated and interpreted in correlation with the archaeological material has been examined elsewhere in this research; however some illustrative examples from texts which date to the period of Mycenaean expansion in the eastern Aegean may prove useful.

An interesting aspect, for instance, of the Ahhiyawa – Hittite correspondence<sup>88</sup> concerns the recent new interpretation of a Hittite text that deals with a dispute over islands off the coast of Wilusa. A forebear of the king of Ahhiyawa, named *Kagamuna*,<sup>89</sup> gave his daughter in marriage, and consequently the islands (discussed in the letter as having come into the possession of Ahhiyawa), to the then king of Assuwa (Taracha 2006: 145; Melckert 2006). Latacz (2004: 244) equates the name of the Hittite text with *Kadmos*, the name of the legendary king of Thebes. According to Janko a better equation, if still highly conjectural, is

---

<sup>88</sup> This example was not included in Chapter 8 on the Ahhiyawa Question as it seems preferable to use it here in order to highlight the point that the author wishes to make now.

<sup>89</sup> Prof. A. Yener, to whom the author is grateful, first brought this piece of information to his attention during the Transanatolia Conference (31<sup>st</sup> March – 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006, London).



Agamemnon (Janko *pers. comm.* with Wiener, as cited in Wiener 2007: 16-17, footnote 113). It raises once again the question of how linguistics and the standards by which one objectively evaluate such interpretations<sup>90</sup> can be used in order to clarify obscure aspects of Aegean – Anatolian contacts. It should be noted that there are several ‘Greek’ candidates for each of the Ahhiyawan<sup>91</sup> names: ‘Attarissiya’ has been commonly equated with Atreus, but also with Atreides (West 2004), Atreion, Atreseias, Atrestos, and Atharsios. The name ‘Tawagalawa’ has been interpreted as Etewoklewes or Eteokles by many, but as there is no initial vowel the Greek names Deukaleus, Deukalion, Teukros, and Thawaklewes are also suggested. The name ‘Kagamuna’ has as equivalents the names Agamemnon, Aga+kamon, or Kadmos, as has been mentioned above (Steiner 2007: 592).

Is it just as feasible that the above names were Anatolian, and that the Greek equivalents were interpretations of foreign names? Or were these names actually Greek, and the forms found in the cuneiform text Hittitisations of them? (Güterbock 1986: 35) A certain amount of doubt remains and the question must be left open at the moment. A similar case can be seen in the Tawagalawa Letter. Specifically, the ruler of Millawanda was Atpa, son-in-law of Piyamaradu. The name Atpa is surely non-Greek and it appears that a non-Mycenaean had the supreme power over a site which, as the excavator W.–D. Niemeier states, had a completely Mycenaean character (see above). Was Atpa a local Anatolian who ruled Millawanda as a vassal

---

<sup>90</sup> It is significant that even the adherents of the equivalence of the names Ahhiyawa and Akhaiwiya admit that an undeniable linguistic proof of identity cannot be established (Steiner 2007: 591). See also the interpretation of the name Ahhiyawa suggested by the author of this text (pages 131-133).

<sup>91</sup> Even the name Ahhiyawa, as Steiner points out, is likely to be Luwian or at any rate Anatolian, and the seeming similarities to the name Akhaiwiya/Achaia could be purely coincidental (Steiner 2007: 605). As Dickinson points out “there are related cases of the application of the name of the first population group encountered to what was later perceived to be a much larger group: in the Near East the term Yawani = Ionians was used for all Greeks, while the Romans’ Graeci does not relate to any name used by a large section of the Greeks. There is certainly not an *a priori* reason to imagine that all “Mycenaeans” called themselves by a single ethnic name” (Dickinson forthcoming).

of the king of Ahhiyawa or did he exercise some kind of autonomy? And if the majority of the population was Mycenaean how was an Anatolian ruler accepted by his subjects?

Another commonly cited example that reveals the ambiguous nature of the texts is the case of Lesbos. According to the Hittite texts Lazpa island was clearly a part of the Hittite Empire, and this opinion has been widely adopted by many scholars (e.g. Hawkins 1998: 23, Mason 2008; Singer 2008) without objection, although as has already been mentioned (page 16), Hittite material has not yet been found on the island. Spencer (1995: 272) argues that Lesbos was “very much an extension of the Anatolian cultural tradition”, while R. Janko saw good Anatolian wares from the east coast (Thermi) but good LH IIIB from the Gulf of Kallone; the Anatolian disappears in LH IIIC, whereas Apotheka is an entirely Helladic settlement with LH IIIC tombs (Janko *pers. comm.* with Wiener, as cited in Wiener 2007: 17). As is obvious, the presence of western Anatolian archaeological material does not mean in any way that an island was occupied or controlled by the Hittites. An analogous example can be seen in the alleged Hittite ‘occupation’ of Cyprus in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century (Güterbock 1984: 119), as is stressed in the Madduwata Letter (see Chapters 3 and 8), even though it is not justified by the archaeological material. In the author’s opinion this is again in both cases an exaggeration by the Hittite scribes, who probably served the propagandistic purposes of their king.

If it is hard to define the presence of the known archaeological culture of the Mycenaeans in western Anatolia, then the status of Ahhiyawa is an even more complicated case. Issues such as the location<sup>92</sup> of Ahhiyawa or what territory the king of Ahhiyawa actually controlled have been already discussed and will not be repeated in this part of the research, although some other topics need to be examined further.

---

<sup>92</sup> The author is inclined to believe that the centre of Ahhiyawa shifted from time to time (a theory that has been put forward by Cline 1994: 69), but that from the Hittites' point of view they were still dealing with the same political entity (Dickinson, forthcoming).

In the Tawagalawa Letter the king of Hatti addresses the king of Ahhiyawa as 'brother', which can be interpreted as addressing his equal in status. However, Dickinson points out that the Egyptian Pharaohs addressed rulers of far smaller states as "brothers" when they needed to accomplish a specific objective (Dickinson, forthcoming). In the Amarna letters, for example, the kings of Egypt and Alasiya address each other as 'brother' (Moran 1992: 104-112) although their power cannot be compared. This probably happened because Cyprus was the major source of copper for Egypt and the concept of 'brotherhood' meant, inter alia, the expectation of the exchange of valuable gifts – copper in this case (Dickinson, forthcoming; Wiener 2007: 17).

Again in the Tawagalawa Letter the Ahhiyawa king is called a 'Great King'. There is no other example of the king of Ahhiyawa being accorded this status (Dickinson, forthcoming), and the case of the treaty between Tudhaliya IV and the king of Amurru which refers to the ruler of Ahhiyawa as a Great King is under discussion. As Steiner points out, the 'great kingdom' of Ahhiyawa is restricted to the reigns of Mursili III/Urhi-Tesup and Hattusili III (Steiner 2007: 602). Hattusili was a usurper of the throne, which he probably achieved with the help of the king of Ahhiyawa, as implied by the Hittite sources. He was a clever diplomat, as shown by his having negotiated a peace with Egypt. He can be imagined to have been capable of satisfying the king of Ahhiyawa by formally promoting him in rank in order to get his support in troublesome western Anatolia (Steiner 2007: 602). As a whole the evidence points to the fact that the 'great kingdom' of Ahhiyawa was a product of the diplomacy of Hattusili III (Steiner 2007: 603). Although the above Hittite references seem to show that Ahhiyawa was a formidable power influential in the *far west of Anatolia* (Melchert 2006: 1), the reality seemed to be different.

A final (?) mention of Ahhiyawa comes from a non – Hittite context. A text from Ugarit, sent to king Ammurapi of Ugarit by Suppiluliuma II (1213-1185 B.C.) and the Great Scribe Penti-Sharruma mentions the name Hiyau(wi)?, which denotes merchants or representatives of Ahhiyawa, who awaited the ingot-laden Ugaritian ships led by a representative of the Hittite king at some port of Lukka (Taracha 2006: 144; Singer 2006: 250ff). It should be noted that although Mycenaean pottery was

imported into Ugarit in large quantities, surprisingly there is no other mention of Mycenaean agents except for this.

## 11. The role of western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age: Problems, arguments and interpretations

### 11.1. General Issues

At the outset of this research the author imagined that one of the main objectives of this thesis would be to recognise how important was the role of the native people of western Anatolia in the transmission of various cultural influences and ideas from central Anatolia to the Aegean and vice versa. However, having reviewed the evidence it is now evident that the situation was different and more complicated than had initially been thought and that Late Bronze Age western Anatolia was not only a conduit for the spread of ideas but also a place of several separate cultural identities in their own right.

It is generally accepted that it was not possible to accurately define the political geography of western Anatolia for many years.<sup>93</sup> Only recently has David Hawkins (1998) succeeded in presenting a model, which redefines the boundaries of the political entities of the area, although serious objections by other scholars remain (i.e. Easton 1984; Mellaart: 1986a; 1993; Pantazis 2006; Ünal 1991, see maps 2-4). The puzzle of historical geography was also partly resolved after the discovery (in 1986), in a state of almost perfect preservation, of a cuneiform inscription on a bronze tablet from Boğazköy, which refers to a treaty between Tudhaliya IV and Kurunta and confirms that Tarhuntassa stretched as far west as Parha (a name that equates with classical Perge and appears elsewhere in the same context as the Lukka Lands) and the Kastaraya/classical Cestros River. In addition, the publication of a hieroglyphic inscription of the same Hittite king from Yalburt showed that the Lukka Lands were centred on classical Lycia (Bryce 2003: 42; 2005: 304, 352; 2003: 42; Hawkins 1998: 1; Melchert 2003:5; Yağci 2006: 884-885)

Scholars dealing with Middle and Late Bronze Age western Anatolia face considerable difficulties. The most important, in the author's opinion, is the lack of a

---

<sup>93</sup> For a complete review of the various opinions regarding the political geography of western Anatolia see Melchert 2003: 5-7.

secure evidence base from excavations, a fact that has resulted in limited available archaeological material and, consequently, insufficient quantitative data (Greaves 2007: 5-6).

At many sites the discovery of Bronze Age levels has been incidental to the primary aim of investigating Classical ruins:<sup>94</sup> Miletos, Colophon, Metropolis – Bademgediği Tepe, Ephesos, Kadı Kalesi, and Didyma are the best examples of this. However, this rule is not universal and there are remarkable exceptions: Iasos, which was originally chosen for its potential to answer questions about the connections between Caria and Bronze Age Aegean and Bakla Tepe, which was a rescue excavation (see Chapter 4). Dedicated prehistoric excavations have only recently begun, especially in the broader area of Izmir (the activities of the Izmir Region Excavation and Research Project). There had been no major systematic excavation of a prehistoric site in the upper Büyük Menderes Valley system since Beycesultan in the 1950s and Aphrodisias in the 1960s and 1970s until the start of the excavations at Çine-Tepecik (Greaves 2007: 5). In addition, it should be noted that, until recently, systematic surveys had been ignored as a method of research, which could help in the identification of prehistoric sites (Greaves 2007: 7). The most important survey has been so far conducted by Sevinç Günel in Aydın and Muğla provinces (for more information see Günel 2005).

At this point it is necessary to note that, although the broader area of Lycia has been included in this research, it is rarely referred to. Its cultural and political role during the Late Bronze Age is certainly felt to have been important, even though often overlooked; however, in the Lukka Land of the Hittite texts, there are well-researched classical sites but only a few earlier ones. More specifically, Karataş (Elmalı), Hacımusalar (Choma) and Çaltılar (fig. 11.1.1-3) are the only non classical

---

<sup>94</sup> In many cases the Bronze Age levels are overlain by Classical ones. A remarkable exception is the site of Bademgediği Tepe (see Chapter 4.8), which is not overlain by its Classical counterpart, Metropolis (Greaves 2007: 7).

sites known so far (S. Williams<sup>95</sup> *pers. comm.*). The first season of the Çaltılar project took place in August – September 2008 and the ceramic material included, among others, fragments of red – slipped carinated bowls closely comparable to Middle and Late Bronze Age examples from other Anatolian sites (Momigliano *et al.* 2008: 28-29).

It is a fact that, still, there is not much known about the hinterland of the major coastal sites, so much so that Turan Efe has referred to southwest Anatolia as a *terra incognita* (Greaves 2007: 7).

In the course of this research it was realised that there are two approaches, or three if the Trojano-centric point of view is added,<sup>96</sup> to interpreting the various cultural and political phenomena in Late Bronze Age western Anatolia: namely the Aegeo-centric and Hittite-centric points of view. Many Aegeanists examine the Aegean influence in Anatolia based on the material found there, often overlooking the possibility of Anatolian influence in the Aegean. One explanation is that many Aegean archaeologists are not familiar with the Anatolian material from the Aegean islands, which consists mainly of undecorated pottery and has only recently been identified as a part of this material (e.g. the Anatolian pottery group in Kommos, Crete).

On the other hand, Hittitologists focus mainly on references in the Hittite archival material, often overlooking the almost complete lack of Hittite material from western Anatolia, as the examples of Beycesultan, Aphrodisias and the coastal sites reveal (with the remarkable exception of Ephesos, a case which will be discussed later in this Chapter). The perception that the Hittites were the natural rulers of Anatolia, while the remaining inhabitants were their ‘loyal’ or ‘disloyal’

---

<sup>95</sup> Susan Williams is currently a PhD student at the University of Liverpool and her doctoral research is about the study of the role of transhumance in both rural and urban economies in ancient Lycia.

<sup>96</sup> Troy dominated discussions of the interactions between the Aegean and Anatolia for much of the twentieth century (Şahoğlu 2004: 97).

vassals<sup>97</sup> is long established (Mellaart 1986a 215-216; 1986b: 74-75). However, a careful look at the Hittite archives reveals that the Hittite kings, although presenting themselves as an ideal of power and might, never accomplished the total subjection of the Arzawa lands. The principle of *divide et impera* was popular among the Hittite rulers who fomented differences between the local rulers of western Anatolia in order to serve their own interests (Mellaart 1986a: 215-216).

The author agrees with the opinion of James Mellaart, who states that Hittitologists have been particularly eager to believe every single word a Hittite king or his scribes pronounced, without considering the effects of claims and propaganda. He also wonders whether the rulers of Hatti tell only the truth or ignore and omit many unfavourable events. A typical example that strengthens this argument is the claim of Mursili that he conquered 'all the Arzawa', as it was never again referred to in the Hittite archives, meaning that this country ceased to exist. However, Arzawa is mentioned as an important Anatolian state in Egyptian texts of the period of Ramses III, some 140 years later, c. 1175 (Mellaart 1993: 416). It should also be borne in mind that the Hittites, obviously in order to serve propaganda purposes, claimed that they had occupied Alasiya (Cyprus), while this theory has been refuted by the archaeological data coming from the island. In addition, a pro-Hittite bias looks obvious in the case of the participation of western Anatolian warriors (from Masa, Karkisa, and Lukka) on the Hittite side in the battle of Qadesh. The above fact does not prove Hittite control over these people or countries, as has been suggested, because these groups could well have fought as mercenaries, as the example of Sardana who fought alongside the Egyptians reveals. A comparable paradigm can be seen in the activities of Carian and Ionian mercenaries of later times (Singer 1983: 206). A characteristic example which clearly shows the use and misuse of propaganda can be seen in the Egyptian and Hittite sources. Both parties claim that they triumphed on the battlefield; however the reality was completely different and the situation that existed in the area of Syro-Palestine (spheres of influence of both

---

<sup>97</sup> Mellaart successfully points out as a parallel Scotland's war of independence against the three Edwards of England, who regarded that country as a "disloyal vassal", although the population north of the border had a different opinion (Mellaart 1986b: 75).



Egyptian and Hittite vassal states) did not change radically. Without having any knowledge of written sources from the western Anatolian kingdoms,<sup>98</sup> so as to compare their content with the Hittite archival material, it is extremely difficult to consider the texts of the Hittite scribes as a reliable basis for historical reconstruction. Greaves has successfully pointed out that “historical records can be positively misleading” (Greaves 2008: 19), a statement which applies to the Hittite texts in many cases.

The available data concerning the western Anatolian cultural and political affairs now needs to be examined. Archaeology reveals that during the second half of the second millennium BC several significant local cultures had flourished in the western part of the Anatolian peninsula. The major centres were Beycesultan, Aphrodisias, Ephesos (Ayasoluk) and Miletos, where remarkable settlements had been developed.<sup>99</sup> The Hittite archives testify to a society of powerful kingdoms, often openly hostile to the authority of Hattusa. The most important was the kingdom of Arzawa Minor which, according to the Hittite scribes, came into close contact with both the Aegean and central Anatolian civilisations. Beycesultan has been suggested as the capital city of Arzawa, though this question remains unanswered for the moment due to the complete lack of written evidence from the site (see Chapter 4.11.). Ephesos has also been proposed as the alleged capital of Arzawa and the Late Bronze Age remains of the site support this hypothesis. In addition, a new discovery that has recently come to light underpins the above

---

<sup>98</sup> However, it is the author’s belief that future excavations may very well reveal the capital cities of the western Anatolian kingdoms and possibly their written records. Apart from Apasa, the capital city of Arzawa Minor, which is believed to equate to Ephesos (see below, Chapter 4.6), the fortified Middle and Late Bronze Age site of Kaymakçı is considered to be a strong candidate for the capital city of the Seha River Land (Greaves *pers. comm.*, discussion with Dr. C.H. Roosevelt of Boston University, director of the Central Lydia Archaeological Survey (CLAS) - <http://www.bu.edu/cias/> during the 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Archaeological Symposium, 25-29 May 2009 held at Pamukkale, Turkey).

<sup>99</sup> At this point it is useful to highlight how current research on Late Bronze Age Anatolia perceives the role of material culture in general; the informative and really useful book on the area entitled *The Luwians* (C. Melchert ed., 2003) devotes only four pages to the art and architecture of Late Bronze Age Anatolia, while history based on the Hittite sources and linguistics monopolises most of the 340 pages of the text.

theory. More specifically, a clay analysis of the so-called *Arzawa Letter* (correspondence between Amenhotep III and Tanhuntaradu, ruler of Arzawa) from the Amarna archive strongly points to a northern Ionian (an area where the kingdom of Arzawa is located) origin for the tablet (Aro 2003: 286; Goren *et al* 2004: 45-47).

As has already been seen, most of the scholars who deal with western Anatolian affairs in the Late Bronze Age mainly focus their attention on the question of the Aegean presence in the broader area, as can be identified from both the archaeological finds and the archival material. Many academics consider that the Aegean cultural elements have played a significant role to the formation of the specific cultural character of the area. However, some other scholars (e.g. Ünal 1991) have argued that the Aegean contribution was rather unimportant and believe that their 'Aegean-centric' colleagues very often exaggerate in highlighting the importance of Aegean finds in order to underpin their theories, while at the same time ignoring the fact that, in most of the Bronze Age sites in western Anatolia, the Aegean finds comprise only small groups compared to the bulk of the local material.<sup>100</sup> Another alternative theory that has recently been put forward argues for an 'East Aegean – West Anatolian Interface', especially in the south – western coastal zone, which comprises a specific cultural entity where the syncretism and coexistence of various cultural elements from both the Aegean and western Anatolia dominates. The Mycenaean characteristics could be attributed to either the acculturation of the local population or to a mixed population with a major Anatolian component (Mountjoy 1998; Sherratt 2001).

Moreover, there is also the Hittite point of view: the archives of Hattusa highlight the fact that western Anatolia belonged to the sphere of interest of the kings of Hatti, who had established a network of local vassal rulers in order to control the area. It must be noted that, although there are many references to the so-called *Arzawa Lands* in the Hittite archival material, Hittite/central Anatolian finds, with the exception of those from Ephesos, appear only sporadically in the

---

<sup>100</sup> For further information about this approach see Ünal 1991.

region (one sherd from Miletos, a few sherds from Beycesultan). At this point, the author wishes to raise another issue: the apparent disproportion between the image that is given by the Hittite archives – of mighty kingdoms in western Anatolia – and what has been found archaeologically in the same area. To be exact, both the social and administrative structure as well as the power of the kingdoms of western Anatolia appear to be at least ‘hidden’ if the archaeological data is examined. It must be noted that for an area which, generally speaking, equates to the size of mainland Greece only a few significant settlements (Beycesultan, Miletos, Troy, Liman Tepe, Çeşme, Çine-Tepecik, and Bademgediği Tepe) have been excavated. The capital cities of at least five Arzawan kingdoms, as presented in the Hittite written sources, wait to be unearthed. Moreover, it is noteworthy that not a single palace or anything that resembles one (with the exception of the so-called ‘palatial buildings’ from Beycesultan) has been found so far in the broader area of western Anatolia and this fact differentiates the image of this region from the palatial centres of the Aegean and central Anatolia.

In other words, most scholars approach the study of Late Bronze Age western Anatolia from one of two different perspectives; either through a perception connected to the Aegean and its significant role, or the prospect of a Hittite central Anatolia. In any case, the majority of researchers investigate the possible influence of the aforementioned areas in western Anatolia without taking into account the fact that influences and ideas originating from there might also have had an effect on neighbouring cultures. This inconsistency becomes clear from the fact that, although the powerful western Anatolian kingdoms of the Hittite written sources interacted diplomatically and politically at a high level with both the Aegean and central Anatolian worlds, the current archaeological image tends to highlight only the possible cultural influence of their neighbours on the so-called Arzawa Lands. It is important to see that, while the texts present this communication as a two-way process,<sup>101</sup> archaeology ignores this fact. To sum up, according to the current inclination of academic research, the civilisations of western Anatolia appear to have

---

<sup>101</sup> See also Greaves 2007: 4.

been pressed into accepting various cultural influences without exercising any on their neighbours.

It is remarkable that the archives from Boğazköy refer to thousands of prisoners from Arzawa who had been installed in the Land of Hatti after the victorious campaigns of the Hittite kings, while there is also mention of thousands of Arzawans who fled to Ahhiyawa after a Hittite victory. It is difficult to imagine that these people did not influence the inhabitants of their new homelands in any way.

Having examined recent theoretical approaches, the author concludes that there is an interpretative framework, which describes quite accurately both the cultural and political roles of western Anatolia in the second half of the second Millennium BC. In a recent conference (Transanatolia 2006) Alan Greaves supported the idea that Bronze Age Anatolia was not a passive conduit for communications between East and the West, but a region of great diversity and an active participant in such communications (Greaves 2007: 1-2). However, Anatolia is metaphorically considered by many scholars as a 'bridge' (a word that most of the time implies passivity), which connects its neighbouring cultures. In other words, they are denying the people of that area their agency as individuals and societies (Greaves 2007: 3-4).

As has so far been realised the perception is exactly the same for the Late Bronze Age western Anatolia. However, as has already been demonstrated in this thesis, many paradigms set aside the above stereotypical aphorism; the case of the cemetery of Panaztepe for instance proves the innovative spirit of the native people, who succeeded in completely amalgamating various cultural traits (i.e. inhumations and cremations, the type of tombs) from both the Aegean and Anatolia (Greaves 2007: 2). For the Mycenaean influence particularly, Mee states that in Panaztepe "we see how communities could exploit and manipulate Mycenaean contacts and culture" (Mee 2008: 373). The statement of Greaves that Anatolia was "an independent and diverse region in its own right" and a "diverse region that was an active participant in various exchanges between East and West" (Greaves 2007: 3-4) could also successfully apply to the case of western Anatolia.

## 11.2. Western Anatolian reliefs and inscriptions: evidence for cultural and political autonomy

One may wonder whether the archaeological material of western Anatolia can provide evidence that implies a cultural and/or political autonomy of the area. The answer to this question seems to be positive. A monument that has played a significant role in the understanding, if not the partial 'decipherment', of the political geography of western Anatolia is the so-called Karabel relief. The successful reading of its Luwian Hieroglyphic inscription by David Hawkins in 1997 shed more light on the political situation of western Anatolia in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century, offering a sufficient interpretative model (although not for all scholars) concerning the boundaries of the local states and kingdoms (Hawkins 1998). More specifically, Karabel (fig. 11.2.1) lies inland from Izmir on a pass across the Tmolos range between Ephesos and Sardis. A male figure (fig. 11.2.2) is depicted standing with a bow in his right hand and a spear in his left. He wears a tunic and a cone-shaped hat. Although it was long believed that the above figure should be the representation of a Hittite king (Akurgal 1962: 116; Mayer – Opificius 1996: 173), it was proved, as will be demonstrated below, that the figure was a local ruler. The inscription (fig. 11.2.3) can be translated as:

*Tarkasnawa, King of Mira (land).*

*(Son of) Alantallis, King of Mira land.*

*Grandson of (...), King of Mira land.*

The Karabel relief is dated to the second half of the 13th century and Tarkasnawa was a contemporary of the Hittite king Tudhaliya IV. According to the Hittite sources the king of Mira was a vassal ruler, more or less a 'puppet' of the Hittite king, who established him on the throne of this kingdom (Ehringhaus 2005: 87-91; Hawkins 1998). However, as has already been mentioned, the fact that the archives of the western Anatolian kingdoms, which might have reflected a different picture, have not yet been found does not make the Hittite documents the most reliable written sources....

Another relief, unfinished, is located at Akpınar (fig. 11.2.4) on Manisa Dağı (Sipylos Mountain), near Manisa and it is attributed to a western Anatolian workshop. It was originally thought to be of a seated goddess, therefore it was referred to as the Goddess Kybele in the years that followed. However, it eventually proved to be a male figure with a bear (fig. 11.2.5), possibly a representation of a god. Next to it are inscribed the names *Ku(wa)lanamuwa*, 'son of the King' and *Zuwalla* (possible partial reading, fig. 11.2.6). A date in the 14th or 13th century is generally accepted (Ehringhaus 2005: 84-87; Niemeier 2003: 105-106; Güterbock and Alexander 1983; Salvini and Salvini 1996).

A few years ago, in 2000, a group of carved hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions from a rock shelter known as Surat kaya (fig. 11.2.7-8) in the Beşparmak Mountain (ancient Mount Latmos) was discovered by Anneliese Peschlow-Bindokat. One of the groups of signs mentions the *Land of Mira*, while some of the other symbols refer to *Kupanta-Kurunta*, 'Great Prince' (fig. 11.2.9). It is known that the above person was the adopted son of Mashuiluwa, king of Mira, who was married to a Hittite princess, a daughter of Suppiluliuma I. The inscriptions date to the end of the 14th century BC (Ehringhaus 2005: 91-94; Niemeier 2002a: 19-20; 2002b: 297; 2003: 106; Peschlow-Bindokat and Herbordt 2001).

According to earlier researchers the reliefs from Karabel and Akpınar can possibly be attributed to Hittite sculptors, or at least to local sculptors who were heavily influenced by the Hittite tradition of central Anatolia. This fact proves that this specific style had dominated outside the Hittite homeland and it can be interpreted as a manifestation of central Hittite power or at least as a sign of Hittite influence on local authorities (Bittel 2007: 186; Gurney 2002: 204,206; Orthmann 1975: 105). One might also argue that the style of the aforementioned reliefs indicates not only the influence of, but also the actual involvement of, the Hittites in western Anatolian affairs. However, the author is inclined to believe that the local rulers would probably have imitated the style of their powerful neighbours in order to create the image of an ideal kingship, as the Hittites did. A comparable example is offered by the behaviour of some of the native western Anatolian satraps (e.g. Mausolus) during the Persian period in the area, who invited Greek sculptors to

construct their monuments (e.g. the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus). The possibility that the rock monuments could have a Luwian rather than a Hittite origin should also be considered since the first datable rock relief is attributed to Muwatalli II (beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century). Therefore, the lack of a definite chronological order does not necessarily give priority to the Hittite monuments (Aro 2003: 288).

A similar process might possibly have also taken place at Iasos. The 'Minoan' characteristics that appear in the settlement are possibly to be attributed to the desire of the local elite to 'consume' Minoan-style architecture and pottery executed in local material by, probably, itinerant Minoan potters and architects (Momigliano 2009). Moreover, the lack of massive storage structures in Aphrodisias and Beycesultan can possibly be seen as a conscious rejection of foreign, and Hittite in particular, influence. As becomes clear in all cases, the native population of western Anatolia selected the cultural characteristics that served their own particular purposes.

However, one may argue that the strong Mycenaean and Hittite cultural elements that appear in Ephesos do not support the above picture. It must be borne in mind though that even if it is accepted that foreign cultural influence was strong enough to alter the character of the area this was undoubtedly an exception. Apasa, the capital of Arzawa Minor, is believed to have been located in that region and in that case one cannot rule out the possibility of Mycenaean and Hittite diplomats and merchants who had probably settled in the city.

Bearing in mind all of the above, the situation can be summarised as follows: despite the various methodological approaches that have periodically been proposed by Aegeanists and Hittitologists, based mainly on a more or less 'marginalised' role for western Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age in comparison with the Aegean and Hittite central Anatolia, its character has proved to be more dynamic than has been generally thought. Despite the absence of extensive prehistoric excavations and quantitative data, the archaeological material indicates that the local western Anatolian cultures, which chose in some cases to adopt cultural characteristics mainly from the Aegean world, basically developed without

significant dependence on external influences. Western Anatolia can be considered without doubt to have been a place of several distinctive cultures in their own right.



## Conclusion

In the course of this research, the author's attempt to shed more light onto Aegean – Anatolian relationships in the Late Bronze Age through the existing archaeological and archival material has brought to his attention various aspects of the Aegean (Minoan and Mycenaean) and Anatolian (Hittite and western Anatolian) cultures that needed to be examined more closely in order to fully understand the nature of the above contacts. Without claiming he has been completely objective in his approach – every scholar has his/her own 'subjective' methods and way of thinking – he examined the Late Bronze Age Aegean - Anatolian affairs from an alternative point of view (influenced by post-colonial approaches, as mentioned above), neither Aegeo-centric nor Hittito-centric but rather from a 'western Anatolian' perspective.

This practice was more than a necessity because, as has been made clear in this thesis, the population of western Anatolia was not a passive recipient of the cultural influences; on the contrary the local people participated actively in a broader network of cultural interconnections. This method was also applied to the idea of viewing each of the region's powers from their own perspective recognising that by doing so it will be possible to evaluate and interpret their contacts and relations. Following this principle some *basic conclusions* were reached, which can be summarised as follows:

The agents of Minoan culture were, especially during the Neopalatial period, active participants in important commercial and cultural networks that had been developed between the Aegean world and various regions of the eastern Mediterranean, including western Anatolia. They had certainly established their cultural influence in the eastern Aegean, whereas traces of their presence can also be identified in some sites in the coastal zone of western Anatolia. Some aspects of their activities were evidently recorded by the Egyptians (mentions of 'Keftiu') and Syrians (references to 'Kaptara') and, as the author of this thesis suggests, they can all be argued to appear in the Hittite archives of the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century under the name of 'Ahhiyawa', a name that was given by the Hittites to the

inhabitants of the Aegean region in general. Intense commercial enterprises and cultural exchanges took place during this period, whilst possible military ventures and interference by the Minoans in the western Anatolian – Hittite conflict (e.g. the campaign of Tudhaliya I/II against Assuwa, the activities of Attarissiya in coastal western Anatolia and the alleged attack against Cyprus) cannot be ruled out. This was probably one of the last resurgences of Minoan power as a political entity before the Mycenaeans took over dominance in the Aegean.

After a period of disturbance the agents of Mycenaean culture seem to have established strong commercial and cultural networks with parts of the west coast of Anatolia and the eastern Mediterranean more generally. The process of 'Mycenaeanisation' was intensive around the Aegean, so much so that numerous islands might be considered to be partly or fully 'Mycenaeanised', while the possibility of Mycenaean settlers on the Anatolian coast cannot be ruled out. The name 'Ahhiyawa' seems to have re-appeared in the Hittite archives at this time, in this case to characterise the Mycenaeans, who were the new dominant power in the Aegean, which, as has been argued here, was known by them as 'Ahhiyawa'. It has been shown that in the Hittite archives Ahhiyawa was always mentioned in connection with the activities of Arzawa and other western Anatolian states, and it therefore seems probable that political contacts may have existed between Hittite and Ahhiyawan (in this period, Mycenaean) diplomats.

The archaeological material suggests that Western Anatolia was without doubt a place of several separate cultures in their own terms. Indigenous populations can be seen to have chosen carefully which external cultural influences they could adopt, or adapt, in order to serve their own purposes in ways that were consistent with their own cultural values and behaviours. In this context, however, western Anatolians consciously rejected, as can be seen in the case of Aphrodisias and Beycesultan for example, everything which seemed to be 'foreign' to their behaviour and mentality. Despite the references from Hattusa, western Anatolia had never been completely subordinated by the Hittite Empire and was by no means part of the Hittite sphere of cultural influence. This conscious cultural resistance had also never allowed Minoan/Mycenaean influences to penetrate

beyond certain sites of the coastal zone, although the case of Çine-Tepecik suggests that some questions remain unanswered and further research in the future will shed more light on this topic.

Various scenarios in Aegean-Anatolian interactions can be correlated to the relative and absolute chronology in both areas. The chronology in the crucial period of the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century B.C. affects the events and defines in some extent the political geography of western Anatolia and the Ahhiyawa Question, at least in its first phase. Possible case scenarios can be summarised as follows:

Scenario 1) High Aegean chronology – High Hittite chronology: The LM II dates from 1490 to 1430 B.C., while the LM IIIA1 dates from 1430 to 1390 B.C. The period of the reign of Tudhaliya dates from 1450 to 1420 and his successor Arnuwanda's from 1420 to 1400. According to this scenario 'Ahhiyawa' could equally refer to the agents of either Minoan or of Mycenaean culture. It is the period that witnesses the gradual decline of Minoan power and the beginning of Mycenaean dominance in the Aegean region.

Scenario 2) High Aegean chronology – Low Hittite chronology: The LM II dates from 1490 to 1430 BC, while the LM IIIA1 dates from 1430 to 1390 BC. The period of the reign of Tudhaliya dates from 1420 to 1400 and his successor Arnuwanda's from 1400 to 1380 BC. According to this scenario the agents of Mycenaean culture appear to be the most likely candidate for attribution to the name 'Ahhiyawa' in the Hittite archives, however we cannot rule out the possibility of an equation with the Minoans.

Scenario 3) Low Aegean chronology – High Hittite chronology: The LM II dates from ca 1450/25 to 1400/1390 BC, while the LM IIIA1 dates from 1370/60 to 1390 BC. The period of the reign of Tudhaliya dates from 1450 to 1420 and his successor Arnuwanda's from 1420 to 1400 BC. According to this scenario the active Mycenaean presence in the eastern Aegean and western Anatolia dates from after the first references to Ahhiyawa in the Hittite archive. Consequently, the term 'Ahhiyawa' should be applied to the agents of Minoan culture.

Scenario 4) Low Aegean chronology – Low Hittite chronology: The LM II dates from ca 1450/25 to 1400/1390 BC, while the LM IIIA1 dates from 1370/60 to 1390 BC. The period of the reign of Tudhaliya dates from 1420 to 1400 and his successor Arnuwanda's from 1400 to 1380 BC. According to this scenario the term 'Ahhiyawa' could be equally applied to either Minoans or Mycenaeans (a similar case to Scenario 1).

Following this line of thought a general conclusion can be drawn with regard to all of the above scenarios: the equation 'Ahhiyawa'=Minoans in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century is the only possibility in Scenario 3, while it cannot be ruled out in any of these, although it is least likely in Scenario 2. Accordingly, the equation Ahhiyawa=Mycenaeans is excluded according to Scenario 3, but is quite possible in number 2 and probable in numbers 1 and 4.

As Mee (1998: 145) has stated, the Aegean-Anatolian cultural interface is complex but will become clearer, especially if current excavations prove able to resolve some of the most obvious questions, such as the proportion of different types of pottery at excavated sites – Minoan: Mycenaean and Aegean: Anatolian.

The author's belief is that Aegean-Anatolian relations will be better understood in the future only if they are included in the context of a broader multicultural eastern Mediterranean milieu. It would be very interesting to examine possible Aegean – Anatolian interactions in certain ports of definitely multicultural character in Egypt, Cyprus and Syro-Palestine e.g. Ugarit. It is known from written sources that Hittite merchants were acting in such places as agents of their king, while at the same time a huge amount of Mycenaean pottery was imported, even though there is no mention in the archives of the city of the specific activities of Mycenaean merchants. However, the possibility cannot be ruled out that some agents of the Aegean culture were acting in Ugarit as private merchants, as their forerunners, the Minoans, had done. In such a case, the author considers it quite possible that the Aegean people and Anatolians (i.e. the Hittites and western Anatolians) came into close contact and exchanged ideas and knowledge in an environment that encouraged the development of such activities – it should not be

forgotten that texts of more than ten different scripts and languages came to light from Ugarit and an early form of alphabet had also developed, as a result of all these international fertile contacts and interconnections.

The basic idea that has been developed and applied in this thesis, namely viewing firstly each culture and society of the broader Aegean-Anatolian region from their own perspectives, and then interpreting their relations with one another and their neighbours, therefore seems to work successfully.