

## ACHILLES, AENEAS AND THE HITTITES

*A Hittite model for Iliad XX 191-194?*

D.W. Smit

The present article defends the influence of KBo III 4 on Iliad XX 191-194. It has to be argued first that a 14th Century text in Hittite cuneiform is compatible to the Iliad at all, as the language of the poem was developed for the most part during the early Iron Age<sup>1</sup>, and did not reach its final stage before the later 6th Century<sup>2</sup>.

The first step is to show that contacts existed between Hittites and Mycenaean Greeks as early as the 14th Century, and that some reminiscence of the Bronze Age can be deduced from Greek Oral History. After this it will be argued that Iliad XX 191-194 can be labelled "unauthentic" on internal evidence, but that most of the details by which it conflicts with the rest of the poem are formulas or a figure of speech in KBo III 4, which records the same kind of events as XX 191-194 does, and in the same order. Finally I will give two models for transmission to Greece before the end of the Bronze Age.

In 1924 E. Forrer stated to have found Greeks in Hittite texts<sup>3</sup>, but met with vehement opposition. The argument was reversed in 1930 when Forrer argued that *Hittite Ahhijawa* hardly could be situated anywhere else than on the Greek mainland<sup>4</sup>. Although to some this too was unacceptable, the identification is now generally adhered to after the authoritative article by Güterbock in 1983<sup>5</sup>. Consequently, to name only two scholars whose views do not have to be adjusted by the re-datings of Hittite texts since the 1960's, Webster's routes for early

<sup>1</sup> The Iliad: A Commentary (G.S. Kirk, general editor), Volume I: books 1-4, Cambridge 1985 (hereafter *Kirk, comm.*), 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Kirk, comm.*, 5.

<sup>3</sup> E. Forrer, MDOG 63 (1924), 1-22; OLZ 27 (1924), 113-18.

<sup>4</sup> Kleinasiatische Forschungen I (1930), 253.

<sup>5</sup> H.G. Güterbock, The Ahhiyawa-problem Reconsidered, AJA 87 (1983), 133-8. As the king of Ahhiyawa was a Greatking (Güterbock 135-6 on KUB XIV 3 II 9-20) his realm cannot be situated within Anatolia.

eastern borrowing<sup>6</sup> have found more support than Finley's unconditional rejection of Hittite influences, which was based on views held before 1975<sup>7</sup>.

Homer does not mention the Hittites by their own name. The case for indirect reference still rests on the Keteioi, the Amazones (both defended by Garstang in 1929)<sup>8</sup> and the Halizones from Alybe<sup>9</sup>. The Keteioi (Od. XI 521) are supported since the decipherment of Linear B-texts by a series of personal names with the element *ke-t(i)*<sup>10</sup>, but little else of them can be said. Kirk, who rejects the Amazones, accepts Alybe on account of its silver<sup>11</sup>. The name of the Amazones was deduced by classical scholars from a rather incredible practice of amputation<sup>12</sup>. They were said to have come from Themiscyra, but Strabo, who knew this region very well<sup>13</sup>, pointed out that most accounts of them made no distinction between history and myth<sup>14</sup>.

In the Iliad, however, the Amazones represent a strong Anatolian power which held Bellerophon from moving eastward in the south (VI 186) and the Phrygians from moving eastward in the north (III 187-189). It is not easy to explain what other power than the Hittites could have come to attack these early Phrygians from east of the Sangarios. The misunderstanding about the fighting women may have been initiated by a nick-name for men of smaller stature, who fought in a way the Greeks did not like<sup>15</sup>.

The influence of the Bronze Age is perhaps more significant than has been assumed in some recent studies. Models derived from texts of this period may solve historical problems in general and may contribute to the interpretation of some passages in the Iliad in particular.

As an example of the former, the "Heroic" generation of 40 years

<sup>6</sup> T.B.L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London 1977<sup>2</sup>, hereafter *Webster*), 64f.

<sup>7</sup> M.I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, Pelican 1986<sup>6</sup> (C. 1979, hereafter *Finley*), 48 (n.); 182.

<sup>8</sup> J. Garstang, *The Hittite Empire* (London 1929), 172 (Keteioi); 86f. (Amazones).

<sup>9</sup> Webster, 67.

<sup>10</sup> M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (Cambridge 1973<sup>2</sup>), index: ke-ti-ro, ke-to, ke-to-ro (Knossos); ke-ta, ke-ti-ro, ke-to (Pylos); ke-ti-de-(qe) (Mycenae).

<sup>11</sup> Kirk, comm. sub Iliad II 856-857.

<sup>12</sup> A-mazones (breast-less): Strabo 11.5.1; cf. Kirk, comm. sub Iliad III 187-189.

<sup>13</sup> Strabo was born in Amasia (12.3.14).

<sup>14</sup> Strabo 11.5.3.

<sup>15</sup> Compare Iliad I 254 (=VII 124) and II 235 (=VII 96) which call all Greeks *women of Achaiis*.

may have been doubted since Herodotus<sup>16</sup>. It has been assumed to be only poetical, having little to do with history. Consequently, Greek genealogies, by themselves at least inaccurate for having divine persons as the dynasties' founders, were either thought to reflect a much shorter period or rejected as unhistorical altogether<sup>17</sup>. As a result of this, Oral History was considered to have preserved more events of the early Iron Age and less of the Bronze Age, if any at all.

The Hittite king Tuthalijas IV (ca. 1240-1210), however, stated his genealogy from Suppiluliumas I (ca. 1365-1325) onwards. In doing so he mentioned only a direct line of three generations in ca. 125 years from father to son, by-passing two side-lines and three kings<sup>18</sup>. There are good reasons why the length of a royal generation surpassed that of the normal generation of ca. 25-33 years for commoners<sup>19</sup>.

As for the Iliad, it has been defended that references in Homer to hoplite fighting need be late, since the political reforms which made city-states depend on hoplite armies of free citizens must have taken place after the end of the Dark Age.

ERIN.<sup>MES</sup>.UKU.US fighting in phalanx formation are known from the Third Millennium<sup>20</sup>, so the fighting-technique could have been introduced into Greece at any period, before it was rediscovered in the 8th Century<sup>21</sup>. Moreover, the same sociological background assumed necessary for the Greek hoplites appears in KUB XXIII 68+ Obv. 26 (early 14th Century), in which king Arnuwandas (I) reduced the number of these soldiers the city of Ismirika had to provide from 150 to 60, on the condition that they were all *free* citizens and no unfree persons or hired soldiers were among them<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> Herodotus 2.53; cf. discussion of Wade-Gery's idea in Kirk, comm. 3-4.

<sup>17</sup> A.M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece* (Edinburgh 1971), 10-16; O. Murray, *Early Greece* (London 1986<sup>3</sup>), 16.

<sup>18</sup> The Bronze Tablet par. I, published by H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Bogazköy* (Wiesbaden 1988). The royal names on the seal-print found in 1986 (P. Neve, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1987, 400-3, Abb. 19a/b) may represent four generations over a period of ca. 165 years, but one of the names is missing.

<sup>19</sup> None of the kings in the direct line from Suppiluliumas I to Suppiluliumas II was his father's eldest son. In the Iliad Priamos and Nestor still rule their kingdoms, although they are too old to fight. In the sociological context of the Dark Age in Greece, which is the period to be bridged by the genealogies, a preference for a younger son may have extended a basileus' generation as well.

<sup>20</sup> S.N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (Chicago 1963), 74.

<sup>21</sup> A row of heavily armored soldiers is depicted on the 12th Century Warrior Vase.

<sup>22</sup> On the Ismirika-treaty see A. Kempinsky & S. Kosak, *Welt des Orients* 5 (1969/70), 191-217.

It is to be established next that Iliad XX 191-194 is “not in line” with anything else in the poem, before we can proceed to external evidence in order to determine the age of this passage more precisely.

This would require an analytic view on the Iliad as presented by Leaf almost a century ago<sup>23</sup>. Leaf’s doubts on the authenticity of the entire fight between Achilles and Aeneas were fundamental to his “Menis”-idea<sup>24</sup>. I do not share Kirk’s methodological objections to this approach<sup>25</sup>, as we do not know *what* material from “developing oral epic tradition” was adapted by the “exceptional monumental composer” or how it can be dated<sup>26</sup>.

When due respect is given to the methodological difficulties in dating any passage to a specific period in absolute chronology, as observed by Finley<sup>27</sup>, only the method of internal analysis remains. In this way specific passages can be dated “younger” or “older” than the rest of the poem<sup>28</sup>. A fair example of a “younger” story is what is said of Neoptolemos in the Odyssey, which obviously is not in line with what is said of Achilles’ son in the Iliad<sup>29</sup>.

### *Iliad XX 191-194*

After the introduction to the fight between Achilles and Aeneas (XX 156-177) Achilles speaks to Aeneas. He wonders about his opponent’s motives (178-186) and then recalls an earlier meeting, at which he took Aeneas’ cattle and drove him off mount Ida (187-190).

191 *Thence thou fleddest forth to Lyrnessos, but I*  
192 *laid it waste, assailing it with the aid of Athena and Father Zeus,*  
193 *And the women I led captive and took from them their freedom,*  
194 *But thyself thou wast saved by Zeus and the other gods. (Loeb).*

<sup>23</sup> W. Leaf, *A Companion to Homer* (London/New York 1892, hereafter *Leaf*).

<sup>24</sup> Leaf, 25 “... on such fundamental discrepancies ... we can depend ... to dissect the Iliad”; 330f. Cf. A.T. Murray, Loeb sub Iliad XX 272 on the misunderstanding of Achilles’ shield and Webster (243) on Aeneas’ linguistically late pedigree.

<sup>25</sup> Kirk, comm. xv.

<sup>26</sup> In Snodgrass’ view Homer is a poet “who depends on predecessors of *many* periods”, *JHS* XCIV (1974), 125 (author’s italics).

<sup>27</sup> Finley, 151 (Appendix I) “... there is no key with which to distinguish the historical from the fictitious”.

<sup>28</sup> Finley accepted Patroklos as “younger” (152) and the “Theban” Hector as “older” (44), without giving criteria.

<sup>29</sup> In the Iliad the son is a boy who needs his father’s support (XIX 327f., XXIV 467). Neoptolemos is a fully grown warrior in Od. XI 506-537, cf. A.T. Murray (Loeb) sub Iliad XXIV 765.

Superficially the story is in line with the general idea to stress Achilles' heroism but to keep Aeneas alive. However, there are many discrepancies between these four lines and the rest of the Iliad:

1. *In Aeneas' account of the meeting (XX 89-96) he does not take refuge in Lyrnessos.*

In XX 89-96 Achilles takes the cattle, drives Aeneas from Ida (90-91) and sacks Lyrnessos and Pedasos (92). Zeus (but no other gods) gives Aeneas strength and "swift knees" (92-93), thus saving him from Achilles and Athena (without Zeus), who "ever went before him (=Achilles) and set a light of deliverance" (93-94).

2. *Athena is never mentioned before Zeus*<sup>30</sup>.

3. *Athena and Zeus give active support to Achilles.*

XX 94-95 says why it is impossible to stand against Achilles in general, not how he needed divine support to sack a small town. Elsewhere in the Iliad the greatest hero is only supported actively by a god when fighting another god (XXI 210-382). Athena only protects him twice against Hector (XX 438-441; XXII 226-238 and 294-299).

4. *Briseis, who is part of the central theme, was captured from Lyrnessos (II 690, XIX 60), but is not mentioned among the many captured women.*

5. *Aeneas' escape is unconventional.*

Aeneas' "swift knees" of XX 92-93 belittle Achilles, who is swift-footed par excellence. He is only outrun by the disguised god Apollo (XXI 595-XXII 20), while his greatest human foe Hector can only keep his distance as long as Apollo supports him<sup>31</sup>. It would have been less conflicting if Aeneas was saved in some more supernatural way, as in V 311-317 (saved by Aphrodite), V 344f. (Apollo) or XX 318f. (Poseidon). The "other gods" are still to discuss whether Aeneas will live or not in XX 294-317.

A third version of the meeting is in the late summary of the Kupria, in which the taking of the cattle and the sack of the city are recorded independently as well. Lyrnessos is set on a par with Pedasos "and many of the neighbouring cities"; Briseis is introduced at last, but she is separated from Achilles' raids by other events.

It would be premature to classify Aeneas' hiding within the walls of Lyrnessos and his miraculous escape after the sack of the city as late

<sup>30</sup> Athena: sent by Hera (I 194, II 167); sent by Zeus at Hera's request (IV 85, IV 128); cooperates with Hera (V 736=VIII 387, XX 314); acts alone (VIII 793f., XI 437, XX 438f., XXII 214f.). I am indebted to Prof. J.G.P. Best for this observation.

<sup>31</sup> XXII 202-204, cf. Leaf's commentary (The Iliad, London/New York 1892).

insertion<sup>32</sup>. It can easily be defended that XX 191-194 is an “older” story<sup>33</sup>, which provoked the rather clumsy “younger” explanation of XX 89-96, on which again the account of the Kupria was based. So it cannot be decided what is “older” or “younger” on internal evidence alone.

When reduced to its essence, the story has four elements:

1. An opponent is driven into a (fortified) town;
2. The town is attacked under divine support;
3. Great booty is made when the town is sacked;
4. The opponent escapes alone.

As will be shown, “divine support” and “booty” are formulas in the description of military actions in the annals of Hittite kings, especially in those of Mursilis II, whose annals have been transmitted more completely than those of any other king. They consist of the “10 year-Annals” (KBo III 4), which is focussed on his personal exploits, and the “Extensive Annals”<sup>34</sup>. Mursilis also composed the “Deeds” (annals) of his father Suppiluliumas I<sup>35</sup>. The annals of other kings have been delivered too fragmentarily for analysis of the present type, with the exception of those of the early Empire. A single escape appears as a Hittite figure of speech not only in KBo III 4, but on at least four other occasions.

#### A) *Divine Support-formulas*

A1) (KBo III 4) *And the Sun-goddess of Arinna, my Lady, the proud Weathergod, my Lord, Mezzullas and all the gods stood by me.*

In the longer formula of the Extensive Annals the Sun-goddess of Arinna takes second place:

A2a) *And the gods stood by me: the proud Weathergod, my Lord, the Sun-goddess of Arinna, my Lady, KAL of Hattusa, the Weathergod of the army-camp, the all-powerful Weathergod.*

<sup>32</sup> Kirk, comm. sub Iliad II 690-691 follows the Kupria by setting Aeneas' escape before the sack.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Webster's arguments for the existence of a short siege-story in Mycenaean poetry (58-61).

<sup>34</sup> Both were translated and commented by A. Goetze, *Die Annalen Mursilis* (MVAG 38 (1933), reprinted Darmstadt 1967, hereafter *AM*).

<sup>35</sup> Translation: H.G. Güterbock, *JCS* 10 (1956), hereafter *DS*.

A2b) The same, with Ishtar-of-the-field and (later years) Yarris.

There is a short formula in two variants:

A3a) *And the gods stood by me.*

A3b) *And the gods stood by him*<sup>36</sup>.

### B) *Booty-formulas*

The standard Hittite booty-formula contains the capture of NAM.RA, GUD (cattle) and UDU (sheep), always written in Sumerograms (hereafter N/G/U-formula). NAM.RA are *civilian* captives, often distinguished from prisoners of war. They were not slaves<sup>37</sup>, but could not leave the area in which they were re-settled. They ran away frequently nevertheless; when the Hittites persecuted them after that no distinction was made between recaptured and freshly-made NAM.RA. A request for the return of run away NAM.RA, when denied, could be a *casus belli*<sup>38</sup>.

GUD and UDU are captured from both lowland and hill-side enemies. No details of the pursuit of live-stock are given as opposed to the frequent details on the fate of the NAM.RA and the occasional references to the burning or confiscating of the foe's crops. Although translated literally below, the archaic GUD & UDU may stand for anything of value apart from NAM.RA.

B1a (peaceably) *And I took it (a geographical name) with NAM.RA, cattle and sheep and brought it to Hattusa.*

B1b (violently) *And I burned (GN), and took it with NAM.RA, cattle and sheep and brought it to Hattusa.*

B2 (larger numbers) *And whatever NAM.RA I took from (GN) to the palace, that amounted to N<sup>39</sup> NAM.RA; but what the Lords and the army took regarding NAM.RA, cattle and sheep, that was beyond counting.*

B1a can also conclude an enemy action. In KUB XIV 17 Rev. 2-4 and 7-9 (AM 95-7) the booty is brought to Hajasa. The summaries of KBo III 4 and the first 10 years of the Extensive Annals in Appendix I below

<sup>36</sup> Thus in DS, but A3b is also used to describe the action of a general or a vassal.

<sup>37</sup> On the social position of NAM.RA compared to that of slaves, see A. Goetze, *Kulturgeschichte Kleinasiens* (1957<sup>2</sup>) (hereafter *KA*), 106-7.

<sup>38</sup> References: K.K. Riemschneider, *JCS* 16 (1962), 111 n. 23.

<sup>39</sup> The numbers range from 3,000 (Azi) to 66,000 (Arzawa).

describe 45 Hittite military actions. 24 of these are introduced by a "divine support"-formula and 23 are concluded by a N/G/U-formula.

In DS the larger "divine support"-formula starts with the Sun-goddess of Arinna, but there is no fixed order after her<sup>40</sup>. The N/G/U-formula is rare<sup>41</sup>. The same appears from the scanty remains of the annals of Tuthalijas II<sup>42</sup>. There are three early examples of a combination of A3a/b and a N/G/U-formula<sup>43</sup>.

The formulas facilitate the reconstruction of broken passages, but few details of actual fighting have been delivered.

### C) *The principal opponent escapes alone*

This figure of speech is used in KBo III 4 to describe the fate of the Arzawan prince Tapalazunaulis<sup>44</sup>. It also occurs in the Extensive Annals<sup>45</sup>. Twice it appears in the Madduwattas-text<sup>46</sup>, in which both Madduwattas (fleeing for Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>KAL of Arzawa) and Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>KAL (fleeing for the Hittites) escaped alone<sup>47</sup>. The Arzawan Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>KAL also escaped alone according to the annals of Arnuwandas and his father Tuthalijas<sup>48</sup>. Because of this Goetze identified the king of the Madduwattas-text and his father with the kings of these annals<sup>49</sup>.

Lastly, in Bo 6455 l.6 a reading <sup>m</sup>*Ma-am-ma-li-is-ma-kán 1-as* S[AG.DU-(*as is-pár-za-as-ta*)] is possible. The last sign was read as

<sup>40</sup> DS fragm. 11, 15, 17, 34, 35, 43, 50.

<sup>41</sup> In DS fragm. 3, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 28, 37, 40, 43, 45, 48 and 50 the enemy "dies in multitude" as an alternative for a booty-formula.

<sup>42</sup> KUB XXIII 11 Obv. II 24-5 and Rev. III 19-20.

<sup>43</sup> KUB XXII 11 Obv. II 31-2 (Tuthalijas II), KUB XXIII 21 Obv. II 28-30 (Arnuwandas I), DS fragm. 28 (Suppiluliumas).

<sup>44</sup> Obv. II 77: [*Ta-pa-la-zu-na-wa-li-is-ma-kán 1-as* SAG.DU-*as is-pár-za-as-ta*].

<sup>45</sup> KBo V 8/KUB XIX 36 Rev. III 31-2.

<sup>46</sup> Translation and comment by A. Goetze, Madduwattas (MVAG 32 [1927], reprinted Darmstadt 1968); see also H. Otten, StBoT 11 (1969) and I. Hoffmann, OR 53 (1984), 34-51. (Hereafter *Madd*).

<sup>47</sup> *Madd* § 8 Obv. 47 (Madduwattas); § 10 Obv. 56-7 (Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>KAL).

<sup>48</sup> KUB XXIII 21 Obv. II 31-2.

<sup>49</sup> I.e. Tuthalijas II and Arnuwandas I (ca. 1420-1380), after P.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (Istanbul 1970), 5, 62. Hoffmann (above, n. 46) and F. Schachermeyr, *Mykene und das Hethiterreich* (Vienna 1986) argue for (unknown) later kings by these names. The father of *Madd* is more aggressive than Schachermeyr holds as he expresses his wish to attack Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>KAL in the treaty with Madduwattas. Moreover, *Madd* § 10 Obv. 56 "<sup>m</sup>*Ku-[pa-an-ta-<sup>d</sup>KAL-ia-as-p]t A-HI-TI-SU a-ra-ah-sa ha-an-da-a-it-ta-ar*" (Goetze) does not say that the Hittite general who saved Madduwattas also defeated Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>KAL and therefore does not conflict with the annals, in which Kupanta-<sup>d</sup>KAL is defeated by the kings personally.

B[A.BAD...]<sup>50</sup>, but the defeated Hittite general Mammalis was more likely the only one to escape than the only one to die.

Booty was captured from the defeated in all six cases. Perhaps the figure of speech is used to indicate that the opponent ceased to be of military importance, although when fleeing he may have been accompanied by a small number of followers.

Tapalazunaulis (KBo III 4) fled to an island with his father and his brother when Apasa, the capital of Arzawa, was captured by Mursilis. By the next spring he returned from the sea to the city of Puranta to fight, but he was defeated in battle and he is not mentioned after his escape. After the fall of Puranta Arzawan resistance was over and the "Pax Hethitica" (Mursilis' creation of Hittite-depending vassal-states) in western Anatolia was not seriously contested for at least 80 years.

### *Historical conclusions*

The Hittite parallels may explain why Achilles needed divine support from Athena and Zeus<sup>51</sup> and why he could not find Aeneas after sacking Lyrnessos. When the activities of Mursilis and Tapalazunaulis are compared to those of Achilles and Aeneas, the parallels are striking:

Mursilis	Tapalazunaulis	Achilles	Aeneas
takes Apasa		takes cattle	
	flees to island goes to Puranta		flees from Ida goes to Lyrnessos
resumes war divine support		resumes fight divine support	
	is defeated escapes alone		- escapes alone
takes family takes booty (Puranta)		- takes women (Lyrnessos)	

If KBo III 4, and the fate of Tapalazunaulis in particular, was a model for the Iliad-passage, a more specific model for transmission to Mycenaean Greece is required.

For a political model I recall the part played by Ahhijawa in Mursilis' Arzawa-campaign. Ahhijawa was involved for its interest in

<sup>50</sup> DS fragm. 20 (Güterbock, JCS 10 [1956], 56, 81).

<sup>51</sup> Both Athena and the Sun-goddess of Arinna were at times venerated as goddess of battle. I see less difficulties in identifying Zeus with the (foremost) Weathergod.

Milawanda, that was captured by the Hittites before the campaign. After the fall of Apasa the Ahhijawans were still considered to be on the side of the enemy. In a letter to the citizens of Puranta Mursilis hoped for their surrender, since they were not to be blamed for their king's siding with Ahhijawa (Goetze's restoration) and when Tapalazunaulis returned to fight, his brother SUM-<sup>d</sup>KAL went *out of the sea* to Ahhijawa. But after he had sacked Puranta, Mursilis had little difficulty in getting SUM-<sup>d</sup>KAL into his hands<sup>52</sup>.

The Hittite viewpoint may have reached Greece somewhat later, when a frequent exchange of letters and messages is attested in KUB XIV 3<sup>53</sup>. In KUB XXVI 91 a Hittite king refers to his great-grandfather to prove his case in a letter to Ahhijawa. So it may be suggested within this model that a Hittite king *after* Mursilis sent a document to the king of Ahhijawa in a diplomatic effort to remind him of the wise if unheroic behaviour of his forefather in Mursilis' age. The circumstances of 1319/8 (AM) and those of KUB XIV 3 are similar. AM restricts the title LUGAL to the Kings of Ahhijawa and Egypt<sup>54</sup>, but has Milawanda captured. KUB XIV 3 calls the king of Ahhijawa LUGAL.GAL (Greatking), but has Milawanda occupied by the Hittite army. In both cases the Ahhijawan is requested to hand over a (potential) trouble-maker.

A theological model of transmission has less time-restrictions. Goetze bitterly opposed Forrer's idea of the observation of a solar-eclipse in Mursilis' 10th year<sup>55</sup>. However, a solar-eclipse would have provided an excellent motive for the pious Mursilis to compose an elaborate account of the first 10 years of his reign, if only to show to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, his personal protective deity, that the king was not to be blamed for the phenomenon. As the Hittites imported Babylonian knowledge on liver-interpretation<sup>56</sup>, it is perhaps not too far-fetched to conjecture the Mycenaean Greeks doing the same on interpreting solar-eclipses. A Hittite interest in Ahhijawan theology is attested by the "gods from Ahhijawa and Lazpa", who were brought to

<sup>52</sup> Goetze's reconstruction of the broken passage on Tapalazunaulis' brother is supported by Güterbock (1983), 135.

<sup>53</sup> The Tawagalawas-letter, which was held by some to date from Mursilis' reign, but recent objections to this are conclusive (cf. S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu I*, OR 52 (1983), 86-90).

<sup>54</sup> KUB XIV 15 Obv. I 24 (*Ah-hi-ú-[wa-a]*), KUB XIX 31 Obv. 10, 12 (*Mi-iz-ri*).

<sup>55</sup> See discussion in *Kleinasiatische Forschungen I* (1930), 273-85 (Forrer); 401-13 (Goetze).

<sup>56</sup> Goetze, KA 149.

the aid of an ill Hittite king, preferably Mursilis, but possibly Muwatallis<sup>57</sup>.

It is unnecessary to assume that the Mycenaeans understood cuneiform Hittite in either model as a copy in Akkadian would have done just as well.

Material contacts between Hittites and Greeks have been argued on account of e.g. the building-technique of the walls of Miletos. Cultural contacts, however, are on present evidence restricted to what can be reconstructed from those more or less distorted scraps of information that survived by means of Oral History.

#### Appendix: *Summary of Mursilis' Annals (Years 1-10)*

##### *KBo III 4*

Yr	AM	Location <sup>58</sup>	A	B
2	23	Turmita, Halila, Tutuska (Gasga)	-	B1b
	23	Other Gasga	A1	tr
	25/7	Ishupita, [Hu]misina	-	B1b+tr
	27/9	Tipija, Kathaituwa	-	B1b
	31	Ishupita	-	-
	33/5	Kamana	A1	B1b
4	3/5	Ishupita, Palhuisa, Pishuru	A1	bu
	51	Arzawa (river Astarpa)	A1	-
	55/7	Arzawa (siege of Mt Arinanta)	A1	B2
4	63	Arzawa (battle of Puranta)	A1	-
	63/5	Arzawa (siege of Puranta)	A1	B2
	75/7	Arzawa (summary)	A1	B2+tr
5	77/9	Asharpaja	A1	em
	79	Arawana	A1	B2
6	81	Ziharija, Mt Tarikarimu	A1	bu+em
7	87/95	Tipija, Istitina	A1	bu
9	123	Azi (Kanuwara)	-	-
	127/31	Ijahrisa	A1	bu
	id.	Pikainarisa	-	B1b
10	131/7	Azi (Aripsa, Tukama)	A1	B2

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Güterbock (1983), 134 n. 2.

<sup>58</sup> For writing-variants and notes on geography see G.F. Delmonte & J. Tischler, RGTC 6 (Wiesbaden 1978).

*Extensive Annals*

Yr	AM	Location	A	B
2	25	(Humi)sina	-	B1b
	29/31	Kathaituwa	A2a	B1b
	31/3	Ishupita	A2a	B1b
	33/5	Palhuisa	A3a	B1b
3	37/9	Milawanda (by generals)	-	B1a
	39	Mira (by vassal)	A3b	-
	41	...]-sa	-	B1b
	43	Palhuisa	-	bu
	43/5	Kuzastarina, Anzalija	A2b	tr
	55/7	Arzawa (Mt Arinanta)	-	B2
4	59	Arzawa (Puranta)	?	?
5	77/9	Mt Asharpaja	?	?
7	85	Nuhasi (by general)	-	-
	87/95	Tipija, Istitina	A3a	B1b
	95	...]-zanda, Tenti (by brother)	A3b	B1a
8	101	?	A2b	B1ba
9	107	Wasumana (by generals)	A3b	B1b
	109	Nuhasi (by general)	-	-
	109	Azi/Hajasa (by general)	-	-
	121/3	Azi (Kanuwara, by general)	-	-
	127/9	Ijahrisa, Pikainarisa	<sup>59</sup>	B1b
	129/31	Taptina, Hursama, Pikurza	-	tr
	131	Haisihla, Kantisisa	-	bu
10	133/5	Azi (Aripsa)	A2b	B1b
	135/9	Azi (Tukama)	-	tr

Note: the following non-formulaic details have been abbreviated:

bu The land of the enemy is burned (without booty)

em The land of the enemy is "made empty"

tr The enemy surrenders and supplies troops to the Hittite army

An"?" Indicates a broken passage

<sup>59</sup> Divine support is given in a special way to enable a nightly attack.