

KUB XIV 3 AND HITTITE HISTORY

A historical approach to the Tawagalawa-letter

Daan W. Smit

1.0 Problems of interpretation & the historical method

Few Hittite texts have been debated more hotly among historians than KUB XIV 3, commonly called the "Tawagalawa-letter" (hereafter *Taw*)¹. The tablet is the final third part of a letter written by a Hittite Greatking to his colleague, the Greatking of Ahhiyawa.

Since the names of both kings are missing, they will be referred to as "the King" and "the Ahhiyawan" respectively.

The contents of the tablet can be divided into three parts:

1. The King's version of what had happened in the recent past (I 1-II 55, § 1-7). He recalls a subject of earlier correspondence, on which the Ahhiyawan presently is "misinformed" (I 27, I 32-34, II 51-52), i.e. his march into Lukka-territory, which eventually led him to cross the border into Ahhiyawan-controlled Milawanda. The King gives his comment on various persons, all well-known to the Ahhiyawan, who played a part in this.

2. The King's request for the return of his former subject Piyamaradu, one of the persons mentioned earlier (II 56-IV 15, § 8-12). This part is concluded by suggesting to the Ahhiyawan three alternative ways of dealing with Piyamaradu (III 63-IV 7) and by calling Piyamaradu the direct cause of the King's presence in Milawanda (IV 11-15).

3. A summary of frictions between the two kings in the past and a plea for peaceful relations from now on (IV 16-57, § 13-15). These frictions include a war about Wilusa², an old insult made by the King (IV 32-44) and a recent insult made by the Ahhiyawan (IV 44-57).

¹ Published in 1926 by A. Goetze. Roman numbers will refer to this document if not stated otherwise.

² See below section 1.3.

This article is focussed on three problems of interpretation :

1. The dating of the letter
2. The acts of persons other than the two kings
3. The status of Ahhiyawa and the "Wilusa-war"

These items are, to a large degree, interconnected, so each will be treated in outline first before being discussed separately. Many hypotheses have been offered to solve either of the problems. The text-material is often poly-interpretable in details due to its quantity and the state of its preservation, so the method of selecting and testing various working-hypotheses will be applied throughout³.

The historical method has been discredited in the recent past. The discussion of the "Ahhiyawa-problem" in particular was bedevilled by a vast amount of possibilities drawn from Greek Epic, causing some to re-interpret historical data provided by Hittite texts, or even regard them as false. More in general, the redating in the 1960-ies of some of the "Tuthaliya & Arnuwanda"-texts from ca. 1220-1190 to ca. 1420-1390⁴ proved some eloquent reconstructions to be premature. On the other hand, linguistic features, in so far as they did not establish a historio-chronological thesis beyond reasonable doubt, have sometimes been raised by linguists to the doubtful level of a "Ruling Theory"⁵. Conclusions to be drawn from the historical method are limited. The reliability of a thesis depends on the nature and the preservation of the text-material on which it is founded :

1. *Unbiased accounts of events*, the acts of persons, the relations between countries etc.;
2. *Statements*, allowing alternative interpretation;
3. *Attestations*, or mentions in otherwise unclear context;
4. *Possible attestations*, e.g. a man's name Pi-[yamaradu?].

There are also restrictions on the proper application of the method. When a conclusion should not be in conflict with reliable information provided by any document whatsoever, it should be verified or falsified by regarding all related evidence. Without such a test, a conclusion is limited to a preference for a particular possibility, likely to be contradicted by any new evidence of the first category. Such new historical evidence is provided by the Bronze Tablet found in 1986⁶.

³ Cf. I. Rouse, *Migrations in Prehistory* (Yale 1986) 2-3.

⁴ The present chronology sets the start of the reign of Ramses II in 1279 BC. A comparative time-table is offered in D.F. Easton, "Has the Trojan War been found?", *Antiquity* LIX (1985) 193.

⁵ Terminology after Rouse (n. 3 above) 3f.

⁶ Transcription (hereafter *BT*) by H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy*, StBoT Beiheft 1, Wiesbaden 1988 (= Otten 1988).

1.1 Suggested datings

The first transcription of KUB XIV 3 was offered by E.O. Forrer⁷ who held the Hittite king to be Mursili II (ca. 1321-1296). This view was supported until 1979⁸.

In the second full transcription, published by F. Sommer in 1932⁹, sufficient linguistic arguments were presented for a possible redating of the text to the reign of one of Mursili's sons, either Muwatalli (1296-1272) or Hattusili III (1265-1240)¹⁰. A case for the authorship of Muwatalli was first presented by E. Cavaignac in 1933¹¹, most recently defended by A. Ünal¹², S. Heinhold-Krahmer¹³ and O.R. Gurney¹⁴. But in the 1980-ies most linguists tended to follow H.G. Güterbock's case for Hattusili which he first presented in 1936¹⁵. Of these studies, that offer some refinements to Sommer, but also return to Forrer's readings on some major points, those of Heinhold-Krahmer¹⁶, Güterbock¹⁷, I. Singer¹⁸, M. Popko¹⁹ and F. Schachermeyr²⁰ will be discussed below.

While the linguistic and historical case for Mursili is presently too meager to consider Mursili as a working-hypothesis²¹, the choice between Muwatalli and Hattusili is still relatively open²², although in most recent historical studies preference is shown for Hattusili including those by former adherents of Mursili or Muwatalli²³. Little purely

⁷ *Forschungen I* (Berlin 1926): 95-105 (dating), 106-119 (transcription and translation), 120-206 (comment).

⁸ J.G. Macqueen, *AS* 18 (1968) 169-85; O. Carruba, *SMEA* XIV (1971) 75-94; F. Cornelius, *Geschichte der Hethiter* (Darmstadt 1973) 218; J. Lehmann, *The Hittites* (London 1977) 233; T.R. Bryce, *OR* 48 (1979) 91-6.

⁹ *Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden* (Munich 1932), hereafter *AU*. On KUB XIV 3 see 2-19 (transcription and translation), 20-191 (comment), 191-4 (summary).

¹⁰ *AU* 36 n. 1.

¹¹ "La lettre Tavagalava", *RHA* 3 (1933), 100-4; *Les Hittites* (Paris 1950) 38.

¹² *TdH* 3 52-4.

¹³ *TdH* 8 175-8.

¹⁴ *The Hittites* (Penguin 1980³) 52.

¹⁵ "Neue Ahhijawa-texte", *ZA NF* 9 (1936) 326-7.

¹⁶ "Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu", Teil 1, *OR* 52 (1983) 81-97 (= *Unt. I*); Teil 2, *OR* 55 (1986) 47-62 (= *Unt. 2*).

¹⁷ "The Ahhiyawa-problem Reconsidered", *AJA* 87 (1983) 133-8 (= *ApR*).

¹⁸ "Western Anatolia in the 13th Century B.C. according to Hittite Sources", *AS* 33 (1983) 205-17 (= *Singer*).

¹⁹ "Zur datierung des Tawagalawas-briefes", *AoF* 11 (1984) 199-203 (= *Popko*).

²⁰ *Mykene und das Hethiterreich* (Vienna 1986).

²¹ *Unt. I* 86-8; Popko 199. No new arguments are presented by Macqueen in his recent plea for the Mursili-thesis in *The Hittites and their contemporaries in Asia Minor* (London 1986²) 48 n. 39.

²² *Unt. I* 97; *ApR* 135; Easton (1985) 194.

²³ E.g. Gurney, *The Hittites* (1990⁴) 41; Bryce, "Ahhiyawans and Mycenaean—An Anatolian Viewpoint", *Oxford Journal of Archeology* 8(3) (1989) 301.

linguistic evidence has been put forward by those scholars who have recently advocated the Hattusili-thesis. The paleography of the letter, showing late forms, does not favour Muwatalli²⁴. However, Popko argues that *Taw* probably is a very late copy, showing some older forms as well. According to him, the date of the original cannot be established yet²⁵.

I will first suggest a historical optimum within the present chronology for either thesis, before considering the historical arguments in support of each below. Both optima are based on the age of the *tuhkanti* (crown-prince)²⁶, who must have been quite young in either thesis. On the other hand, he was unlikely sent out on his diplomatic mission before he was 18 years old²⁷. The action of the King's son excludes that the King could have been Urhi-Tesub, who would have been too young for a grown son even in 1265.

Hattusili married his queen Puduhepa only after Kadesh, in ca. 1273. No earlier marriage of his is known and although he had sons by *I.SAR.TU*-wives, no other than a son of Puduhepa would have been his *tuhkanti*. Thus the year 1255 is a terminus post quem in the Hattusili-thesis²⁸.

As Muwatalli was unlikely born before ca. 1318²⁹ he would not have sent out a son before ca. 1280. As for a lower limit, this thesis puts the letter before the temporary transfer of the Hittite capital to Tarhuntassa³⁰. Therefore the period 1280-1277 is the historical optimum in the Muwatalli-thesis.

²⁴ Singer 209 n. 19. But as Singer admits, the writing of *-li* (100% late forms) supports neither candidate. The opposite view is defended by Easton (1985) 194 for *sar*, *du*, *KU* and *URU*.

²⁵ Popko 199-200.

²⁶ *Taw* I 7. On his identity with the *TAR.TE.NU* (I 9-11, I 67, II 4, where he is the King's son) see Gurney, *AS* 33 (1983) 97-101.

²⁷ The 12-year old *tuhkanti* Tuthaliya IV (K.K. Riemschneider, *JCS* 16 (1962) 117-9, cf. *BT* II 31-48) must have been an exception.

²⁸ An Egyptian, but no Hittite crown-prince was mentioned in a text related to the peace-treaty of 1258 (Goetze, *CAH* III Vol. II/2 259).

²⁹ Muwatalli was not the eldest son. His father Mursili was called a *DUMU* ("boy") without any military experience at his accession. On the other hand the historical introduction of the Manapa-³⁰*U*-treaty shows that Mursili was involved in politics before he became king. Cf. J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-reiches* I (MVAG 34/1, 1930), nr. 4, §1 A 9-18.

³⁰ Cf. Easton (1985) 192.

1.2 *Dramatis personae*

It is subject of discussion who is meant in the first part when no personal name is written. These persons are indicated as N1, N2 etc. in the list of those appearing on the tablet below:

- N1³¹, who destroyed the city of Atarima³².
 Tawagalawa, the Ahhiyawan's brother³³ who came to help the Lukka-people (I 4-5), and who once came out of Milawanda to meet the King (I 71-72)³⁴.
 N2, who when the King set out to march requested to become his vassal (I 6-22; II 3-7).
 The *tuhkanti*, sent out to bring N2 before the King (I 7-15, 67-70, II 4-7).
 N3, the enemy who confronted the King at three points in Iyalanda (I 22-5).
 N4, brother of the following.
 Lahurzi, who opposed the King near Iyalanda (I 26)³⁵.
 N5, who kept his word and did not show himself near Iyalanda (I 27-31)³⁶.
 Piyamaradu, who, when the letter was written, resided in some country belonging to the Ahhiyawan (III 61)³⁷.
 N6, who did not inform the Ahhiyawan properly on Piyamaradu (I 49-52).
 dLAMA-as, who once came to meet the Ahhiyawan (I 73-74)³⁸.
 Atpa, subject of the Ahhiyawan in Milawanda and son-in-law of Pijamaradu (I 63; II 20-55).
 Awayana, another son-in-law of Piyamaradu (I 63).

Apart from unnamed messengers etc., the rest of the letter mentions as

³¹ *Taw* I 1 [*nam-ma*]-as ("Furthermore he"); Unt. 2 59 rather than a personal name [dLAMA]-as (Forrer) or [Gulla]-as (Sommer). This makes the first sentence a direct continuation of the lost second tablet of the letter.

³² For references, uncommon geographical names are spelled as in G.F. Delmonte & J. Tischler, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen in hethitischen Texte*, RGTC 6 (Wiesbaden 1978).

³³ ApR 136 on *Taw* II 61.

³⁴ After Singer 212. See sections 2.1 & 4.2 below.

³⁵ In Sommer's translation Lahurzi had fled, but "he set up an ambush" or "he took a defensive position" is also possible. The King would have been opposed by Lahurzi's mere presence.

³⁶ The end of I 27 is broken. Sommer restored L[ahurzi] (AU 67 "der Situation nach zu erwarten"), but T[a- or P[i- is possible.

³⁷ Probably not, as is sometimes held, in Ahhiyawa proper, because the Ahhiyawan had to write to Piyamaradu (III 63f).

³⁸ Cf. n. 34, above.

a contemporary only Dabala-^dÚ, who was sent out as a hostage for Piyamaradu (II 57-77). It has to be explained to the Ahhiyawan who he is, but his brother Tawagalawa “knows him well” (II 61-62)³⁹.

The names of Tawagalawa, Lahurzi, Awayana and Dabala^dÚ are not attested in other texts⁴⁰. N2 was identified as Tawagalawa by Forrer, Sommer, Güterbock, Schachermeyr and others, but Heinhold-Krahmer and Singer⁴¹ have recently plead for Piyamaradu. A sudden change of subject goes with both views. Nothing in itself suggests why the “he” of I 6 should not be the aforementioned Tawagalawa; on the other hand it is unclear why the King ends a section dealing with the crimes of Piyamaradu by repeating his’ sending the *TAR.TE.NU* to meet N2 (I 67-70)⁴². N2 and N5 can be regarded identical on internal evidence. N2 is ordered to stay away from Iyalanda if he really wants the King’s overlordship (I 17-21); N5 does so in contrast to N3 and Lahurzi. N4 cannot be Tawagalawa, as in that case Lahurzi would have been a brother of the Ahhiyawan as well, which he is not⁴³. For further discussion see below, section 3.

1.3 Ahhiyawa and Wilusa

Forrer, who had identified Ahhiyawa as the mainland of Greece as early as 1924, resumed his theory as follows in 1929:

1. Ahhiyawa is a major power;
2. It cannot be situated within Anatolia;
3. For a location outside of Anatolia, the Greek mainland is the likeliest candidate⁴⁴.

Although Forrer was severely criticized by Sommer and others, the newly defended readings “Greatking” in *Taw*⁴⁵ confirm the first two of Forrer’s arguments. Other locations of Ahhiyawa outside of Anatolia

³⁹ Cf. J.T. Hooker, *Mycenaean Greece* (London 1980²) 124. On “stepping on a chariot” see n. 180 below.

⁴⁰ On two fragments mentioning a brother of “My Brother, the king of Ahh[iyawa]” (= Tawagalawa?) see section 3.1 below.

⁴¹ Unt.2 *passim*; Singer 211f.

⁴² Cavaignac (1933) 103 suggested that the Ahhiyawan knew that *both* Tawagalawa and Piyamaradu had fled. This would explain why the King changed subjects so easily.

⁴³ First argued by Forrer (1926) 131.

⁴⁴ *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* (1929) 253; “(würde ich)..in dem A. genannten Land eine Großmacht sehen müssen....für die selbst aber kein Platz in Kleinasien ist und die daher über See zu suchen ist, wofür Griechenland in erster Linie in Betracht kommt”.

⁴⁵ ApR 135-6, on II 13; Singer 212, on I 73.

have been suggested as well, but the Greek mainland as yet presents the likeliest hypothesis⁴⁶. The problem of Ahhiyawa's location may no longer be discussed as vividly as it was some 20 years ago. I will therefore turn to the question of the extent of Ahhiyawa's power. The diversity of opinion on the "tone" of the letter⁴⁷ justifies an inquiry of the relations between Hatti and Ahhiyawa in general and for the period of ca. 1320-1255 in particular. From those willing to identify the Ahhiyawans as Mycenaean Greeks, most postulated a Mycenaean control of the seas against a Hittite "landlockedness"⁴⁸. Thus *Taw* would reflect a normal situation, in which the two kings, having different interests, had little to fear from one another. Others did not make this assumption⁴⁹, or argued that Ahhiyawa, regardless of its geographical position, was not a significant power throughout Hittite history and consequently *Taw* would represent an exceptional situation.

The country mentioned in IV 8 was the issue of the only attested official state of war between the Hittites and Ahhiyawa⁵⁰. Forrer had read *Wi-lu-sa*⁵¹, which was reluctantly followed by Sommer. The reading was rejected by others⁵², but recently Güterbock has confirmed Forrer⁵³.

This "Wilusa-war" had ended not long before *Taw* was written. Piyamaradu apparently still relied on the enmity between the two kings in his own interest and he may even have claimed to be unaware of the change officially:

⁴⁶ Ahhiyawa is unlikely situated on any island as the son of Uhha-zitis went *out of the sea* (i.e. *from an island*) to Ahhiyawa (D.W. Smit, *Talanta* XVIII (1986) 54 n. 37). J. Mellaart's suggestion to locate it in Thrace (*AS* 18 (1968), 187-202) depends on Macqueen's defense of a northern location for Lukka, Milawanda and other countries (Macqueen 1968: 172); cf. section 2.2.2 below.

⁴⁷ In some views the King was cautious, conciliatory, respectful or just friendly, e.g. G.L. Huxley, *Achaean and Hittites* (Oxford 1960) 16; ApR 136; Gurney (1990) 40. Macqueen (1968: 182) calls him "soft-hearted". Others argued for a more dualistic approach, e.g. D.L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad*, Berkeley & Los Angeles (1959) 12; Cornelius (1973) 221; F.H. Stubbings, *CAH* III Vol. II/2 187; Hooker (1980²) 124; Singer 213-4.

⁴⁸ Page (1959) 37 n. 57; recently Gurney (1990) 38, 42; Lord William Taylour, *The Mycenaeans* (London 1990²) 158-9.

⁴⁹ E.g. M.P. Nilsson, *Homer & Mycenae* (New York 1968, reprint of 1933) 99, 104.

⁵⁰ *Taw* IV 7-10; 19-20. Arzawa, not Ahhiya(wa), was an enemy (*kurur*) in a treaty from the late 15th century even after some fighting against Ahhiya(wa); KUB XIV 1 § 6 Obv. 30-32 (transcription by Goetze, *Madduwattas*, MVAG 32 (1927) = *Madd.*). Nor was Ahhiyawa *kurur* when its ships were denied access to the Assyrian enemy in the later 13th century (Sausgamuwa-treaty Rev. IV 12-18, cf. C. Kühne and H. Otten, *StBoT* 16 (1971) (= *Sausg.*).

⁵¹ Forrer (1926) 117.

⁵² TdH 8 176; Singer 213-4.

⁵³ Quoted from a letter by Güterbock to Schachermeyr (1986) 207/8; 246 n. 47.

IV 7. "....."The king of Hatti, and I

8. as for the matter of Wilusa, on this

9. we were enemies. Now he has changed my mind,⁵⁴

10. and we have been at peace (since), and for us a war is not
right!"⁵⁵

11. "[Write] th[is] (to) him (= Piyamaradu)!"

2.0 The chronological problem

Both the King's earlier insult (IV 32-44) and *any* war against a Greatking of Ahhiyawa uneasily fit in either chronological thesis. Hattusili came to the throne when he was at least 47, so the King's apology for his insult in IV 34 "(then) I was young" necessarily refers, within this thesis, to the period before he was Greatking. Schachermeyr has suggested to restore the broken lines IV 33-34 in this way⁵⁶, but no mention of Ahhiyawa is made in Hattusili's own account of his youth, which recalls several activities carried out in the reign of his brother Muwatalli⁵⁷. Other texts from his reign attest only friendly contacts with Ahhiyawa, the ruler of which is never styled a Greatking⁵⁸.

In the Muwatalli-thesis the insult roughly coincides with KUB V 6 (ca. 1300), which suggests friendly relations. The war needs even more explanation if the reading *Wi-lu-sa* in IV 8 is correct. In the treaty concluded between Muwatalli and Alaksandu of Wilusa Ahhiyawa is not mentioned among the Greatkingdoms, nor is it called a past or possible enemy. While this treaty (hereafter *AL*, commonly dated ca. 1295-1285)⁵⁹, offers a *terminus post quem* for a "Wilusa-war" in the reign of Muwatalli, it restricts the rise of Ahhiyawa's status and the hostilities to a period of a few years only. In defense of the Muwatalli-thesis one may ascribe the Manapa-^dÚ-letter (hereafter *Man*) to his reign⁶⁰. If so, the reconstruction of a short period of Hittite history out of three major texts

⁵⁴ Lit. "He has made me bow".

⁵⁵ Alternatively, "a-war is not right!" (AU).

⁵⁶ Schachermeyr (1986) 211, 246, 271.

⁵⁷ Hattusili's Apology §§ 5-9; cf. Otten, *StrBoT* 24 (1981).

⁵⁸ Cf. section 4.1 below.

⁵⁹ Transcription by Friedrich (1930) 42-102. For additions based on the excavator's notes see Otten, *MIO* 5 (1957) 26-30; TdH 8 161-3.

⁶⁰ Alternatively, it may belong to the later years of Mursili II. The remains of the letter consist of KUB XIX 5, translated by Forrer (1926) 90-3 and KBo XIX 79, a join proposed by E. Laroche in 1972 (CTH 191). A combined transcription of both documents is offered by P.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, "Sidelights to the Ahhiyawa question", *JEOL* 28 (1983-4) 33-64 (= *SAQ*).

becomes an attractive possibility, which is one of the reasons why preference will be given to the Muwatalli-thesis below.

Man attests fighting about Wilusa and it is also directly related to *Taw* because it mentions Piyamaradu and Atpa⁶¹.

2.1 The Hattusili-thesis

Since the Hattusili-thesis is currently preferred, let us first consider the historical arguments in its favour:

1. The style of the letter recalls Hattusili's style⁶².
2. No direct contacts between Muwatalli and Piyamaradu are known⁶³.
3. The *lands* of the Lukka-people (I 3-5) is an unusual plural and may point to Hattusili, whose annals mention "all the Lukka-lands"⁶⁴.
4. Some fragments mentioning Piyamaradu as a contemporary of Kupanta-^dLAMA, vassal-king of Mira, may provide a historical background for the letter⁶⁵. Singer connects these to what is known about Hattusili's military activities in the southwest⁶⁶. Alternatively, Heinhold-Krahmer argues from the fragments and the absence of Kupanta-^dLAMA in *Taw* that the letter was written after the death of this vassal⁶⁷.
5. If ^dLAMA-as was "a mighty king" (I 74), he likely is identical to Muwatalli's youngerson, who's career was later supported by Hattusili⁶⁸.

However, none of these arguments is conclusive:

1. The frequent use of the rhetorical negation may be explained by the wish of the King to be convincing, since his colleague had been told otherwise. *E silentio*, too few of Muwatalli's texts have survived for proper comparison⁶⁹.
2. Muwatalli was at least informed about Pijamaradu by Manapa-^dÚ, provided that *Man* was written ca. 1285 or a little earlier⁷⁰. Moreover, Ünal argued that [Muwa]talli with Piyamaradu on KBo XVI 35 is the required attestation⁷¹.

⁶¹ Cf. Forrer (1926) 190, although he set both *Man* and *Taw* in the reign of Mursili II.

⁶² Unt. 1 95; ApR 136; Singer 209, 214; Popko 202. Cf. KUB XXI 38 I 11f (letter by Puduhepa).

⁶³ Unt. 1 95; Singer 209.

⁶⁴ KUB XXI 6/6a; Singer 208; Popko 202; first argued by Houwink ten Cate, *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (Istanbul 1970), 72-3. For KUR.KUR.^{MES URU} lu -[...] see now also KUB LVII 19 (= Bo 4212), 11'.

⁶⁵ See section 2.2.4 below.

⁶⁶ Singer 208-9.

⁶⁷ Unt. 1 96-7.

⁶⁸ Hattusili's Apology IV 62-4; BT I 6-13.

⁶⁹ TdH 3 48; Unt. 1 95 n. 77.

⁷⁰ Cf. section 2.2.3 below.

⁷¹ TdH 3 52 n. 24.

3. The terminology is not exactly the same⁷². In *Taw* the plural may have distinguished the Lukka-men who asked for help by Tawagalawa from those who requested the King to interfere.

4. After Heinhold-Krahmer, the fragments KBo XIX 78 and KBo XIV 35 likely describe events from Muwatalli's reign⁷³. In view of the extensive contacts between the two courts when *Taw* was written the absence of Kupanta-^dLAMA in this particular document should not be valued too highly.

5. The name ^dLAMA-as is not uncommon⁷⁴. Little is known of Muwatalli's younger son before he became vice-king⁷⁵, but he may have been of age in ca. 1280⁷⁶.

When the Hattusili-thesis is not actually proven, it can be said to be based on indications and therefore preferable to the lack of information about Muwatalli's reign. To falsify it, however, it must be investigated if other information about Hattusili's reign disfavours it. Firstly, the year 1255 BC, defined above as a *terminus post quem* on account of the *tuhkanti*, provides some difficulty regarding the age of the other participants. In the traditional chronology *Man* is dated not after ca. 1277, which makes Atpa at least 40 in 1255.

Then the statement that he was a "DUMU.NITA" in II 30 requires a very unusual interpretation of this Sumerogram. Sommer called his translation "young man" a compromise between "vassal" and "boy"⁷⁷. However, Atpa was not the King's vassal, since the Ahhiyawan had "given him his hand" before the King was asked to do the same. Nor would he have jested at the moment he was asking for a favour from the avengeful King, who knew about his crimes (II 32). With the minimum-ages of Atpa's (and Awayana's) father-in-law Piyamaradu (ca. 65), Hattusili and Dabala-^dÚ (both 58+), and, if he was still alive, Kupanta-^dLAMA (at least 73)⁷⁸, a Hattusili-dating in 1255 or later would imply

⁷²Houwink ten Cate (1970) 73 n. 106; Unt. I 96-7.

⁷³Unt. I 94. See section 2.2.4 below.

⁷⁴Forrer (1926) 98-102, referred to a general ^dLAMA-as in Mursili's age to support his case for Mursili. Another ^dLAMA-as is mentioned in the Milawata-letter (reign of Tuthaliya IV).

⁷⁵Cf. AU 36 n. 1; Easton (1985) 194.

⁷⁶*Taw* I 74 *Ú.UL-as sar-ku-us* LUGAL-as *e-es-ta* "Was he not a mighty king?". It may be inferred from the praeteritum that ^dLAMA-as was not an actual king yet, but had acted like one. A figurative reading "Did he not (behave) most kingly?", would express e.g. Muwatalli's pride in his youngest son. The Bronze Tablet states that ^dLAMA-as was an adult in 1265 (BT I 6-11).

⁷⁷AU 113-6.

⁷⁸Hattusili's mother died in Mursili's 9th year (1313); Kupanta-^dLAMA became vassal-king of Mira in 1310.

an unexpected gathering of old men on a very important stage in Hatti's relations with the west.

Secondly, the King knew Dabala-^dÚ since his own youth and his wife was a member of the queen's family. So if the King was Hattusili, some romantic detail is given about his marriage. Dabala-^dÚ then knew Hattusili long before this king met his future wife, so either he followed his example⁷⁹ and married as a middle-aged man, or he married before Hattusili did and played a part in introducing Hattusili to Puduhepa. No such explanation is needed, however, if not Hattusili were the King, but Muwatalli.

2.2 *The Muwatalli-thesis*

In short, the political situation of *Taw* is attested in documents from the reign of Muwatalli (*AL*) or presumably belonging to his reign (*Man*). Moreover, this political situation started after the reign of Mursili II and is not at all attested for the reign of Hattusili III.

2.2.1 *Wilusa*

According to the prologue of *AL*, an independent Wilusa was friendly or neutral towards Hatti from the Arzawa-campaign of Tuthaliya II (ca. 1420) to that of Mursili II. It was Muwatalli who brought Wilusa within the Empire, giving it the same status as the three "Arzawa"-kingdoms Mira, Seha-riverland and Hapalla, that had been vassals since 1318. After Muwatalli, the only Hittite king for whom any claim on Wilusa is attested was Tuthaliya IV⁸⁰. Since Muwatalli does not mention any Hittite attack on Wilusa in the prologue of *AL*, the attack attested in *Man* is best explained as part of Muwatalli's campaign against Alaksandu's enemies, which is attested in *AL*⁸¹. If so, Alaksandu was temporarily banished from Wilusa⁸²; the pro-Hittite king may not have been very popular with his subjects⁸³. A later date for the fighting in *Man* would imply an unprecedented attack upon a vassal.

2.2.2 *Lukka, Masa and Karkisa*

The countries of Lukka, Masa and Karkisa have much in common in

⁷⁹ E.g. the example set by Alexander the Great to 150 of his companions in marrying a Persian wife?

⁸⁰ As appears in the Milawata-letter and (probably) in KBo XVIII 18 (letter to Mashuitta), cf. TdH 8 307-8; Singer 216.

⁸¹ *AL* § 6 A 43-56 (restoration cf. n. 59 above) and A 71-74.

⁸² Cf. Friedrich's restoration of *AL* § 8 16-19.

⁸³ *AL* considers discontent with his rule among the people of Wilusa (§ 6 A 62-63) and a coup d'état by a member of his own family or anybody else (§ 6-7 A 75-B 10).

Taw. Their inhabitants are called Hittite subjects (I 21 Lukka; III 59 Masa & Karkisa) and all were threatened by Piyamaradu. A political, geographical or sociological connection between them has been defended⁸⁴. When little can be said about Karkisa, on present evidence Lukka and Masa unlikely were situated closely together⁸⁵, nor was their social organisation analogous, with the exception that no indigenous king is known to have ruled either of the three⁸⁶. What remains is a common political status, only stated for the reign of Muwatalli⁸⁷. They have little in common in other periods; e.g. Hattusili's annals mention only Lukka⁸⁸. All three regions were at times hostile or friendly towards Hatti, but they never appear to have been so *as a unit* but for the reign of Muwatalli⁸⁹. Furthermore, only this king had an excellent motive to treat them as a unit, since he may have expected them to provide auxiliary forces⁹⁰ for a planned Egyptian campaign⁹¹. Therefore *Taw* can

⁸⁴ *Political*: J. Garstang & O.R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* (London 1959) 104; *Geographical*: Macqueen (1968) 172; *Sociological*: Singer 208.

⁸⁵ Since Bryce's summary (*JNES* 33 (1974), 395-404) Lukka is more closely associated with the south after BT 61-3. Otten (1988, comment 37-8) identifies the hostile *Parha* across the *Kastaraya* with classical Perge across the Kestros; cf. *Parha* and "all the Lukka-lands" in KUB XXI 6a 4', 6'. A (relatively) northern position of Masa seems likely; cf. Easton, "Hittite History and the Trojan War", *Papers of the First Greenbank Colloquium*, Liverpool 1981 (1984 = *Greenbank*) 25.

⁸⁶ Lukka was a land of many cities (of which Atarima, I 1-2, with its royal citadel and lower city, seems to have been of the familiar type). Masa, ruled by "nobles", may have been more primitive (cf. the cult-text KUB VII 35 in which the "men of Masa" are to fight with inferior weapons; translations in RGTC 6, 226 and Goetze, KA 163). Karkisa was represented by "men" only.

⁸⁷ AL § 14 III 3-9, where Muwatalli considered an offensive action *starting* from either of the three. The treaty also states Alaksandu's military obligations if hostilities should occur either against a king of the same rank as Muwatalli (AL § 14 III 9-12) or in any of the other "Arzawan" vassal-kingdoms, their rulers being Alaksandu's equals (AL § 17 III 31-44). Therefore the geographical connection between Lukka, Masa & Karkisa should be restricted to western Anatolia in a very broad sense.

⁸⁸ KUB XXI 6/6a. The areas mentioned are more likely situated near Tarhuntassa then towards the Aegean. Admittedly, very little has survived from Hattusili's annals.

⁸⁹ On this see appendix 2 below.

⁹⁰ Other campaigns in less civilised areas in order to provide troops: KUB XXIII 11 Obv. 10-2 and Obv. 33-6 (Tuthaliya II) and AM 129-31, 137, 139 (Mursili II).

⁹¹ A war against Egypt may have been considered unavoidable as early as 1285. Bentesina, king of Amurru, changed sides as a result of the Syrian campaign of Seti I (1299-1279), cf. Goetze, *CAH* III Vol. II/2 252.

be dated between the Alaksandu-treaty and the battle of Kadesh (1274), when all three were Hittite allies⁹².

2.2.3 *Atpa and Piyamaradu's "career"*

The parts played by Piyamaradu and Atpa in *Taw* suggest a short elapse of time between this document and *Man*, the more so because Atpa is not mentioned in any but these two texts⁹³. There even is some similarity in Atpa's behaviour, as he opportunistically changed sides in both. This may show him to have been a shrewd politician, but more likely he was indeed a "beardless youth" (II 30), easily influenced by more experienced men, using his age as an apology for his involvement with Piyamaradu⁹⁴. Those defending the Hattusili-thesis have coped with this in two ways :

1. According to Popko, the spelling of the name Gassu in *Man* is late. So this letter may have been written by a hitherto unknown second king by the name Manapa-^dÚ, a contemporary of Hattusili⁹⁵.

2. We may happen to miss other information on Atpa, but at least Piyamaradu was active for several decades. KBo XIX 78 shows that he survived Hattusili's succession. In Singer's view, Piyamaradu, who's career he compares to that of the long-active free-booter Madduwatta, marked the beginning of the end of Hittite control over western Anatolia⁹⁶.

However, both arguments need reconsidering after the discovery of the Bronze Tablet. Hittite dominance over the west appears to have been still unchallenged as late as the early years of Tuthaliya IV (ca. 1235), when the Bronze Tablet mentions Masturi and Alantalli as vassal-kings of the Seha-riverland and Mira respectively⁹⁷. There are no compelling reasons to insert a second Masturi as well, after a hypothetical second Manapa-^dÚ⁹⁸. The reign of the first, and, as I see it, only Masturi could

⁹² J.H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago 1906) III § 309 ; "...Masa, Kaska, Karkisa, Lukka..". Lukka is mentioned last in a similar list (§ 312), but fails in a third (§ 306).

⁹³ AU 35; Page (1959) 33 (n. 43); Huxley (1960) 2.

⁹⁴ Atpa could have been a minor at the time of *Man*, if his marriage to Piyamaradu's daughter was a political arrangement.

⁹⁵ Popko 199-200.

⁹⁶ Singer 207-9.

⁹⁷ BT IV 32-6; Otten (1988) 26-7. The tablet does not mention other western vassals, but only the kings of these two countries were akin to the Hittite royal family, which is why they appear as witnesses. On Alantalli see KUB VI 47, a fragment mentioning a law-suit (6'), possibly that of Hattusili (7'), who is not the Hittite king, against "his" father (= Kupanta-^dLAMA, father of Alantalli?). See also TdH 3 174.

⁹⁸ Popko argues that *Taw* was copied *because* of an interest in Piyamaradu in the later Empire. Then *Man* may have been copied for the same reason. On the name Gassu see SAQ 41 n. 21-22.

have lasted 40 years⁹⁹. In view of the length of the reign of Kupanta-^dLAMA (1310 -after 1258) this is not unlikely. A temporary interruption of the Manapa-^dU & Masturi-dynasty in the reign of Muwatalli or Hattusili has been argued for, but cannot be proved¹⁰⁰. The evidence of the Bronze Tablet proves that whatever indications we have of growing independence of Hatti's western vassals¹⁰¹ did not lead to structural changes and, moreover, definitely disproves the existence of an independent Arzawa after 1318¹⁰².

This long period of relative stability in the west is not quite the expected background for some decades of hostilities by Piyamaradu. When he was a person of some historical importance to the Hittites, a mention by one of Hattusili's grandsons does nothing to prove that he also was a long-lasting opponent, as Madduwatta is not mentioned by any later king. More precisely, when Madduwatta's mischief in bad times led to a Royal Edict, the re-emergence of Arzawa in the days of Suppiluliuma's father indicates that he did not establish a new dynasty, which caused later kings to lose interest in him as a historical person. Likewise, Piyamaradu may have been remembered as a precedent for the return of a high-ranking fugitive only and his "career" can be reduced to a short period of raids and rebellious activities as mentioned in *Taw*. The King's quotation from a previous letter in I 51-52 is inexplicably ironic if Piyamaradu had been raiding his lands for a number of years before this letter was written:

"Piyamaradu frequently attacks this [country] of mine here, does [My] Brother [know] this, or doesn't he know it?"

⁹⁹ He was installed by Muwatalli (*Sausg.* Obv. II 16-19), likely towards the end of the reign of this king, as his father Manapa-^dU had been a DUMU in 1321. Masturi was a contemporary of Hattusili (*SAQ* 67). His Hittite wife (born ca. 1315) was still alive in ca. 1255. This would limit the reign of "Manapa-^dU II" to a period of ca. 15 years.

¹⁰⁰ KUB XXIII 13 was ascribed to Muwatalli (Easton (1985) 194) or Hattusili (Apr 137 n. 26). It relates a revolt of the Seha-riverland led by one Tarhunradu. Mursili's subjugation of the Seha-riverland is mentioned, but since the text is broken it is impossible to decide whether Mursili was the author's grandfather or father. Only a grandfather is actually mentioned; I therefore follow the traditional view of ascribing this text to Tuthaliya IV.

¹⁰¹ [Mas]turi reports what may have been a border-incident between Seha and Mira in a very fragmentary letter to Hattusa (KUB XXIII 100 11, see *SAQ* 64-7). Hattusili's coup d'état (1265) was supported by Masturi, but Kupanta-^dLAMA supported the legitimate king Urhi-Tesub even after Hattusili had succeeded.

¹⁰² Most recently defended by Mellaart, *Greenbank* 63-80 and Macqueen (n. 21 above). The textual evidence for a 13th century Arzawa was doubted by Heinhold-Krahmer, *TdH* 8 153-4, 243-4.

2.2.4 Historical texts mentioning Piyamaradu

Nothing in the texts in which Piyamaradu is a contemporary of Kupanta-^dLAMA supports the idea of a long period of instability. On the contrary, they suggest a short series of events only. First we have to regard their positions in *Man*. The king of the Seha-riverland complains in it of Piyamaradu, who had “humiliated” him or had caused him a financial loss. Piyamaradu had attacked the country of Lazpa, after which some SA.RI.PU.TI-people were brought to Atpa. These now formally “belonged” (i.e. paid taxes) to Atpa instead of Manapa-^dU and the Hittites. Atpa was influenced by Piyamaradu to “keep” them, thereby opposing the interests of Manapa-^dU, whereas the Hittite interests were looked after by Kupanta-^dLAMA. This makes Piyamaradu the opponent of both vassal-kings, but not necessarily an enemy of the Hittite king as well. It is not known who was in command of Lazpa at the time, so it may have been on the enemy side¹⁰³. If so, Piyamaradu’s attack on it had the approval of the Hittite king, as had the raid on Wilusa, mentioned in the preceding lines 3-4, probably by the Hittite general Gassu¹⁰⁴. Piyamaradu once was a Hittite subject like Gassu¹⁰⁵ and this text may offer no more than an early warning for his *future* unloyalty by his personal enemy Manapa-^dU¹⁰⁶.

This is a minimal approach of the information provided by *Man*, but reconstructing large-scale hostilities from it, even a temporary “take-over” of the Seha-riverland¹⁰⁷, is uncautious in view of its state of preservation.

Three smaller fragments which mention Piyamaradu and (the king of) Mira supply historical data relevant to *Taw* as well. Two of these, KBo XIX 78 (fragment A below) and KBo XVI 35 (B) were transcribed by Heinhold-Krahmer¹⁰⁸ and are only translated here. The third, KBo XXVII 4 (C) was discussed by Singer¹⁰⁹. The personal name [Piyama]radu is incomplete, but it also mentions [Kup]anta-^dLAMA. Not a single full line has been preserved and the upper and lower limits of the tablets are unknown.

¹⁰³ The unfamiliarity of the Hittite court with the gods of Ahhiyawa and Lazpa in ca. 1300 (KUB V 6 II 57-64, cf. AU 275-94) suggests that Lazpa did not belong to Hatti then.

¹⁰⁴ SAQ 41-2.

¹⁰⁵ His former residence (“your land”, III 4) is unknown.

¹⁰⁶ SAQ 50-1 argues for an earlier conflict between Manapa-^dU and Piyamaradu.

¹⁰⁷ Bryce (1989) 303. Cf. n. 100 above.

¹⁰⁸ Unt.1 91f.

¹⁰⁹ Singer 209, 211.

A. KBo XIX 78

----- (new paragraph)

2. ... to(wards) My Majesty [...]
3. ... because of the governance not [...]¹¹⁰
4. ..Kupanta] ⁴LAMA, king of Mir[a...]
5. ... Now My Majesty's brother [...]
6. ..Piyam] aradu (.) mountain [...]
7. ...I] ascended [the throne ...]¹¹¹
8. ... Piyamar[adu...]

B. KBo XVI 35

2. ..N]ow [...]
3. ... Piyamarad[u ...]
4. ... and for me/you/him (a) battle [...]
5. ..Muwa]talli¹¹² above became [...]
6. ...]auwa (they) stepped back [...]
7. ... (he) brought away Piyamaradu [...]
8. ...f]rom Mira (he) took away nothing [...]
9. ... he gave him his home (?)¹¹³
10. ...] -ta

-
11. ..H]attusili, my grandfath[er...]
 12. ..the c]ountry of Pasuna, the country of Ka[...]
 13. ..the c]ountry of Haliunza [...the country of
 14. the] river Seha [...]¹¹⁴

C. KBo XXVII 4, transcription

2. ...]x-an É.^{MES} [...]
 3. ...]-ka/INIM^{URU} ne-r[i...]
-
4. ...]an-da ⁴LAMA-as i(a (?))...
 5. ...] e-ip-ta EGIR [...]
 6. ..EGIR-an] ti-ia-at LUGAL KUR [...]
 7. ...r]a-du-us KUR^{URU} i-i[a...]
 8. ...] ar-ha wa-ar-n[u...]
 9. ...] KUR^{URU} pi-ta[...]
 10. ...] EGIR-SU-ia ku-ru-[ur...]

-
11. ...] URU Ha-at-tu-sa-i [...]
 12. ...] ha-tu-ga-a[s ...]
 13. ...] SED-az [...]

(lines 1 and 14-15 are too fragmentary)

¹¹⁰ [AS.S]UMEN^{UT.TI} Ū.UL x[...; cf. AL § 6 A 62: I].NA KUR^{URU} Wi-lu-sa AS.SUM LUGAL^{UT.TI} Ū.UL k[uinki... (In Wilusa because of the kingship not a[nyone...).

¹¹¹ For e]-es-ha-ha-at = "(I) ascended (the throne)" see Unt.1 92; Singer 209.

¹¹² Restoration after Ūnal, TdH 3 52 n. 24.

¹¹³ On purut "part of the house", cf. AU 196.

¹¹⁴ Pasuna and Haliunza do not occur in other texts. Ka.. is not likely to be read as Karkisa, which is more frequently spelled Kar- than Ka-; cf. RGTC 6 160.

C. Translation of lines 2-12

2. ...] temples (?) [...¹¹⁵
3. ...] matter (?) (of the) city of Ner[ik...
-
4. ..Kup] anta-^dLAMA [...
5. ...] he took again (?) [...¹¹⁶
6. ..side (?)] took [, but] the king of [...¹¹⁷
7. ..Piyamar]adu (.) the country of Iya[...
8. ...] (was) burn[ed] down completely [...
9. ...] the country of Pita[...
10. ...] (he) became hostile again [...
-
11. ...] to/in Hattusa [...
12. ...] horrible (?) [...

These fragments cannot be linked to *Taw* unbiasedly. Due to the state of their preservation it would be rather risky to conclude anything from them, unless they can be synchronized. In that case we may expect in all three of them a clearly segregated section¹¹⁸ as well as the rendering of events in these sections in the same order, although we need not expect all texts to tell exactly the same. All three fragments show a section which is separated by both an upper and a lower limit indeed and fortunately they can all be dated with some accuracy.

Fragment A starts with events of the present Hittite king's own era (2'-3'). Next comes an intermission which describes acts of the king's brother in which Piyamaradu played a part (5'-6'). The king ascending the throne (7') can be no other than Hattusili, recording events from the reign of his brother Muwatalli. Whereas Kupanta-^dLAMA (4') seems to be a present issue, Piyamaradu, a contemporary of the king's succession (7'-8'), is only connected to events from the (recent) past.

B was written by one of Hattusili's grandsons. Hattusili's name and his relation to the author mark the start of a new paragraph (11'), so the events mentioned previously likely refer to the period before his accession, i.e. the reign of his brother [Muwa]talli (5'). The name of the country that "stepped back" in 6' is broken, but [Ahhiy]auwa is the most likely restoration. The country of [Arz]a(u)wa has been suggested here also, but by this time Arzawa no longer existed as a separate political

¹¹⁵ Or "houses", if -an is part of the previous word.

¹¹⁶ If EGIR is not a postposition this line is best left untranslated.

¹¹⁷ For the omission of -nu, cf. the Manapa-^dU-treaty § 3 31-2 nu-za A.N/A ⁿU-uh-ha-LU LU-KUR-IA EGIR-an t/i-ia-it ⁿUTU-SI-ma[...]; "and you joined [Uhha]zitis, my enemy, but My Majesty you [...]"

¹¹⁸ Unt.1 94 segregates A 2-6 and B 1-10 (Muwatalli) from A 7-8 and B 11-14 (Hattusili).

entity¹¹⁹. Ahhiyawa is attested with Mira¹²⁰, and known to have “stepped back” at other occasions as well¹²¹. These events may have been introduced by the start of a new sentence (2', *nu-us-si*).

C likely refers to the reigns of both Muwatalli and Hattusili as well. The matter (?) of the city of Nerik does not quite prove a Hattusili-dating¹²², but may refer to an activity of Muwatalli¹²³. However, as no other document states that Piyamaradu (7') was hostile *again* (10') when Muwatalli still lived, I take Hattusili to be the author of this text. The paragraph-divisions after lines 3 and 10 mark out the section.

In the synchronization below enmity between Piyamaradu and Kupanta-^dLAMA has been assumed. This assumption is based on *Man*, in which both took opposite sides.

A	B	C
2/3. Hattusili's era	?	3. Nerik-matter
4. Kupanta-dLAMA, king of Mira	(see line 8)	4. Kupanta- ^d LAMA
	3. Piyamaradu 4. and a battle	
5. The king's brother	5. The king's brother 6. [Ahhiy]auwa (pl) stepped back	5. (he) took (?)
		6. the king of [...] 7. Piyamaradu, city of Iya(landa ?)
6. Piyamaradu mountain	7. (x) brought away P. 8. (y) took nothing from Mira	8. completely burned 9. Piyamarada, city of Pita (...)
7. [Hatt.] ascended (the throne)	11f. Hattusili's era	
8. Piyamaradu		10. (he) became hostile again

2.3 Intermediary conclusions

So far it appears that Piyamaradu confronted the Hittites twice, once in the reign of Muwatalli and once in that of Hattusili¹²⁴. It is more likely that he spent the intervening years elsewhere in banishment than that he

¹¹⁹ Cf. section 2.2.3 above.

¹²⁰ KUB XXXI 29 & 30.

¹²¹ See section 4.1 below.

¹²² As held by Singer 209; Popko 202.

¹²³ KUB XXI 20 mentions Muwatalli (1') and Nerik (2').

¹²⁴ Cf. Unt.1 93-5.

was an active enemy throughout the period. It is to be preferred on internal evidence that *Taw*, although it does not mention Kupanta-LAMA, belongs to the first, rather than the second confrontation¹²⁵. Moreover, since Güterbock's confirmation of Forrer's reading of Wilusa in *Taw* IV 8, this text can be dated *a priori* to the reign of Muwatalli.

3.0 Unidentified persons and other related fragments

Before comparing the scheme of 2.2.4 with other historical texts I will return to the problem of the actual contents of the first part of the Tawagalawa-letter. This involves Tawagalawa, Piyamaradu and, if not identical to either of these two, the persons indicated as N1, N2 etc. in section 1.2 above.

3.1 Possible attestations of Tawagalawa

Tawagalawa's name is not known from other texts. However, in two fragments a (physical) brother of a ruler of the same rank as the Hittite king ("My Brother") is mentioned. As far as they can be interpreted, both fragments share much of their subject-matter with *Taw*. Sommer ranked KUB XXIII 98 among the Ahhiyawa-documents¹²⁶, as the geographical name in 8', "My Brother, the King of A[h...]" (SES.IA LUGAL KUR a[h...]) can hardly be restored in any other way. The Hittite king informs after the opinion of the addressee as in *Taw* 6', *nu-mu me-mi-an s[a (?) - ku-wa-as-sar...]*¹²⁷ ("now to me the matter a[s it is...]") recalls *Taw* I 66-7 *nu-ut-ta me-mi-an sa-ku-wa-sar me-ma-an-du* ("and they must tell you the matter as it is"). *Tak-su-la-x-x* (9') is perhaps not the noun "peace" but a form of *taksulai-* "to be at peace; to be friendly". (Compare *nu-wa tak-su-la-u-en* "and we have been at peace (since)", *Taw* IV 10). Sommer's comment on the brother of the addressee (11') rules out that the preceeding */x-x-as-kan* can be restored as Tawagalawa(+*kan*), but we need not expect a personal name here.

Forrer's large restoration of KUB XXIII 107¹²⁸ was rejected by Sommer¹²⁹. The fragment mentions Piyamaradu (5') and the brother of the addressee (4', 10', 21'). Apart from these, ships and, again, an inquiry for the opinion of the addressee connect the fragment to *Taw*:

¹²⁵ Cf. section 2.2.2 above.

¹²⁶ Transcription and translation AU 266-7.

¹²⁷ Restoration by Sommer.

¹²⁸ Forrer (1926) 206-9.

¹²⁹ AU 195-6.

- 15] then ships [...
 16] That, My Brother, write to me ! [...
 17] Now my ship [...
 18] Do you allow x x x [...

For whatever reason Tawagalawa was in Anatolia, and whatever his relation was to Piyamaradu, these lines indicate that a separate “Tawagalawa-matter” existed apart from a “Piyamaradu-matter”¹³⁰. The exchange of letters and opinions does not suggest a state of war at this time. Both fragments might be part of *Taw*’s missing first or second tablet, or alternatively belong to other correspondence which *Taw* mentions. They have been labelled too uninformative to be regarded as evidence¹³¹. If they are to be assigned to any other period, however, we may expect some other document to mention the acts of any other brother of a king of equal rank or to associate Piyamaradu with any other such king. Since this is not the case, KUB XXIII 98 and 107 can be dated in the same period as *Taw*¹³².

3.2 *The crimes of Piyamaradu*

The role of Piyamaradu, undoubtedly the main figure of the second part of the remaining tablet, has been upgraded recently in order to explain why N2 should not be the aforementioned Tawagalawa. Singer suggests that Piyamaradu had prevailed in the lost part of the letter as well¹³³. Heinhold-Krahmer identifies him with all the unknown persons of the first part¹³⁴. The minimum of certainty here is that if Lahurzi was *his* brother (I 26) Piyamaradu must at least have been mentioned before. The need for any further mention of Piyamaradu in *Taw* was doubted by Sommer in his rejection of Forrer’s proposal to transfer KUB XXIII 107 to its missing part¹³⁵.

Piyamaradu had held a high rank indeed, but his alleged request for a vassal-kingdom meets with a technical difficulty¹³⁶, since he already

¹³⁰ Unt. 2 55, 60 argues that Tawagalawa was already dead when *Taw* was written, but does not take these fragments into account.

¹³¹ AU 195-6, 267.

¹³² This does not apply to the fragment KUB XXIII 95, which mentions [Ah]-hiya(u)wa (5’), earlier correspondence in 4’ and 17/18’, the request to hand over a person (19/20’) and (the wish for) brotherly relations between the Hittite king and the addressee in 22’. Although the subject-matter of this text is compatible with *Taw*, because it does not mention Piyamaradu or any other direct link with *Taw*, it cannot be dated by the historical information it provides.

¹³³ Singer 211.

¹³⁴ Unt. 2 60.

¹³⁵ AU 75-6; 195-6.

¹³⁶ After Schachermeyr (1986) 227.

was the servant (IR) of the King; III 66 says he should be reconciled with his lord (EN). But N2 *wishes to become* the King's servant (IR) in I 6-8; he longs for a (vassal-)kingdom (LUGAL^{UT.TU}). It is he (= N5) who is told in I 17-21 not to appear in Iyalanda, if he really *wants* the King *to become* his overlord (EN^{UT.TU}). The Hittite scribes seldom overlooked this sort of distinction.

What basis of power is left attested for Piyamaradu? His offenses are restricted to the illegal transport of subordinated people, for which he needed a fleet in *Taw* as well as in *Man*¹³⁷. But his land-forces may have been small¹³⁸ and his objectives may not have exceeded a mere desire for wealth. His raids were made and planned against territories which the King considered to be within his sphere of influence. Nevertheless Piyamaradu, unlike Madduwatta, is never accused of intending to occupy these lands in order to rule them as if he were a king, which is why his alleged kingly aspirations are surprising. He immediately took to the sea when the King came to Milawanda (I 61-62).

It is more prudent to conclude that it was *Tawagalawa* who asked to become a vassal. The young crown-prince was more likely sent out to meet the brother of the Greatking of Ahhiyawa who was at peace again than to meet a still aggressive rebel, either risking captivity or frustrating negotiations by bringing a large army. Piyamaradu's role in *Taw*, regardless of his other activities, is then reduced to an incident in the relations between Hatti and Ahhiyawa.

3.3 Other missing names

The data offered by the letter and the related fragments are insufficient to interpret every detail unbiassedly. Unless new documents are found, it cannot be proved who destroyed Atarima (N1) or who the enemy in Iyalanda was (N3). Not much weight needs to be given to this, as the destruction of Atarima was only the *direct* cause for the Lukka to ask for intervention. Since N1 is unlikely identical to Tawagalawa, a Hittite¹³⁹ or Piyamaradu¹⁴⁰, N1 and N3 might both be identified as "the enemy from Iyalanda".

¹³⁷ The *SA.RI.PU.TI*-people which he took from Lazpa say to have come from overseas.

¹³⁸ The King does not fear his attacks on Masa or Karkisa (III 60). I see no point in arguing for a considerable army recruited from the 7,000 NAM.RA Piyamaradu had captured (AU 192; Schachermeyr (1986) 223) since NAM.RA were of little military value.

¹³⁹ Cf. AU 20.

¹⁴⁰ In III 51 the Lukka are said to be willing to join him.

Likewise in order to avoid having two enemies operating at the same time I suggest that Piyamaradu instigated the people of Iyalanda to revolt¹⁴¹, but left it to his brother Lahurzi to support them (= N3) openly. Then the King's wish to convince the Ahhiyawan of Piyamaradu's indirect involvement in the uprising was the basis for his impressive oath of I 32-34¹⁴².

N6 may have been Atpa, who received a letter from the Ahhiyawan with instructions on Piyamaradu (I 55), but perhaps the blame was put on Tawagalawa, who was superior in rank.

3.4 Intermediary conclusions (2)

We may now compare the scheme of 2.2.4 to the texts from the reign of Muwatalli (AL and, presumably, Man) and to KUB XIV 3 (Taw) for Piyamaradu's first confrontation and to what is known from texts describing events from Hattusili's reign for his second hostility.

1. Piyamaradu, possibly still as a Hittite subject, confronted Kupanta-^aLAMA of Mira (Man), Hatti's most important vassal in the west (Al).
2. At the same time he instigated Atpa, ruler of Milawanda and his son-in-law in Taw, to oppose Manapa-^aU (Man).
3. After his defection Piyamaradu, acting on his own account, was supported by the king of Ahhiyawa, now Atpa's overlord (Taw).
4. A battle was fought (B 4'), preferably in Mira¹⁴³. Taw I 51 mentions Piyamaradu's raids on Hittite territory.
5. The country of [Ahhiy]a(u)wa (B 6') stepped back. The end of the *kurur*-status in Taw IV 10 is compatible.
6. C 6-8' may refer to Piyamaradu's anti-Hittite behaviour in the matter of the city of Iya[landa] which was burned down by the Hittites. Taw mentions the King's attack on Iyalanda, which he destroyed (I 36, 41). When Piyamaradu took away civilians the King would have captured (*I 45; III 9-17), he was no longer acting under the protection of Ahhiyawa.
7. Piyamaradu was taken away (B 7'), to a mountain (A 6'). From the parallels for Pita- in C 9' we may exclude Pitassa, which is infamous

¹⁴¹ It is tempting to restore KBo XXVII 4 (fragment C above) 7' [*namma* "Piyama]-ra-du-us KUR URU I-i[alanda-an harnamni]at].

¹⁴² Even the paragraph-dividers are arranged to convince the addressee; the oath is set in a small paragraph of its own.

¹⁴³ The fragment KUB VI 50 (cf. *TdH* 8 310-1) mentions more fighting in Mira (12'), involving Manapa-^aU (7'), Kupanta-^aLAMA (10') and the usual booty of NAMRA, GUD & UDU (13').

for its various insurrections throughout Hittite history and therefore an unlikely place of banishment. The other two, Pitalahsa/i and Pitakala(i)sa, are both situated in the mountainous north, not too far from Nerik (C 3')¹⁴⁴.

8. Peace was restored in Mira (B 8')¹⁴⁵.
9. Hattusili succeeded his brother (A 5', B 5') to the throne (A 7')¹⁴⁶.
10. After this, Piyamaradu (A 8') became hostile again (C 10' ?).
11. According to the fragment KUB XLVIII 80 Hattusili was able to apprehend Piyamaradu for the second time, for which he had to invade an unnamed country¹⁴⁷.
12. The Kaska-campaign mentioned after this was held to minimize the importance of Hattusili's action, but seems compatible to the "Nerik-affair" of KBo XXVII 4 (C 3').
13. Later still, Piyamaradu was remembered not only for having been an opponent to Hittite interests in western Anatolia¹⁴⁸, but also because he was once extradited after having caused a confrontation between two Greatkings (B 2'-10')¹⁴⁹.

It remains to be explained, in verification of the thesis, how the king of Ahhiyawa, who was not a Greatking or a possible enemy in regard to Wilusa in *Al*, could reappear as a Greatking after a war about Wilusa only a few years later.

4.0 *The status of Ahhiyawa*

4.1 *Ahhiyawa-conflicts*

In the recent historical studies by Güterbock¹⁵⁰, Bryce¹⁵¹ and Gurney¹⁵², all provisionally accepting Ahhiyawa's location in Greece, the relations between Hatti and Ahhiyawa have been summarized chronologically. This line of approach shows about seven acts of aggression by the

¹⁴⁴ RGTC 6 318-9.

¹⁴⁵ No other hostilities are actually reported from these regions before the reign of Tuthaliya IV; cf. above, n. 100/101).

¹⁴⁶ All texts bypass the intermediary reign of Urhi-Tesub, as usual.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Güterbock (n. 15 above) 326-7. This fragment attests Piyamaradu (2') and Ishtar of Samuha, Hattusili's protective deity.

¹⁴⁸ In the Milawata-letter Piyamaradu figures among ill deeds ascribed to the addressee's father.

¹⁴⁹ Additionally, KUB XXVI 76 possibly attests Piya[maradu] with Ahhiyawa and Egypt; cf. Unt. 1 86 n. 22.

¹⁵⁰ ApR *passim*.

¹⁵¹ Bryce (1989) 289-304.

¹⁵² Gurney (1990-4) 38-45.

Ahhiyawans in ca. 200 years, interrupted by long periods of friendly relations, and hardly ever followed by Hittite retaliation. This would support the idea of an Ahhiyawan "empire" free to interfere in Anatolian politics, impregnable for Hittite counter-measures on account of its control of the seas. However, as will be shown below, a diachronical approach, comparing several instances of Ahhiyawan aggression and Hittite reaction to them, may lead to a different historical interpretation of the relations between the two countries.

If Ahhiyawa is to be found on the mainland of Greece, texts in Mycenaean Greek¹⁵³ and Late Helladic (LH) archaeological material may offer indications on the interpretation of Ahhiyawa's power. The Mycenaean Greeks were situated on the fringe of the civilized world¹⁵⁴, which should warn against attributing a technological advantage to them in military affairs, especially in naval warfare. Nevertheless a list of cities with the heading "Ka-f-tu & Ta-na-ja" at least proves that Greece was not unknown in Egypt during the reign of Amenophis III (c. 1347)¹⁵⁵. The sea voyage from Rhodes to Egypt is relatively easy¹⁵⁶, so LH-pottery found at El Amarna and in Syro-Palestine settlements may have been brought there by the Mycenaean themselves¹⁵⁷. The Mycenaeans can be credited with the means to provide a military threat when the opportunity was right. The tablets list a modest number of rowers and "coastal guards" for Pylos¹⁵⁸, but a significant number of chariots for both Pylos and Knossos¹⁵⁹. Neither the Peloponnese nor Crete provide a suitable terrain for chariot-warfare¹⁶⁰. So, if Attarsiya's 100 chariots fighting in Anatolia are in need of explanation, the Mycenaean chariots could be interpreted as a "strategic reserve"; they may have been intended for use overseas. As for the transportation of the horses, one should not underes-

¹⁵³ M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (London 1972²), hereafter *Docs*.

¹⁵⁴ E.g., no use of bullion or any other standard of exchange is attested (*Docs*. 198).

¹⁵⁵ Cf. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden 1962); P. Faure, *Kadmos* 7 (1968) 138-49.

¹⁵⁶ F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, Vol. II (London 1981⁴) 104 accepts this route as one of the few direct ones across open sea, "known from the Hellenistic period".

¹⁵⁷ Alternatively, Alasiya/Cyprus acted as an intermediary. Cf. Hooker's cautious conclusions on the extent of Mycenaean trade and shipping (1980²: 113-6).

¹⁵⁸ *Docs*. 183-94; cf. Page (1959) 193-6.

¹⁵⁹ The texts mention 160 pairs of wheels for Pylos and more than 400 chariots for Knossos. Only 120 of the latter were fully assembled (*Docs*. 265).

¹⁶⁰ On the construction of Mycenaean chariots see H.-E. Giesecke, "Der Mykenische Wagen", *Talanta* XX-XXI (1988-89) 17-39.

timate Bronze Age ship-building¹⁶¹. Moreover, it has recently been argued that chariots were first introduced into Greece by the sea at the start of the Late Bronze Age¹⁶². Ventris & Chadwick do not reject the transportation of 100 animals from Crete to an overseas *A-ka-wi-ja-de*¹⁶³.

However, even if the Mycenaeans are given the benefit of the doubt, as above, it should be noticed that their striking capacity did not lead to the control of major areas in Anatolia at any period. The quantity of LH-material in western Anatolia is insufficient to infer anything but *local development*¹⁶⁴, apart from the small area of Miletus, Iasus and the Múskebi-graves, where mixed Mycenaean and local Anatolian settlements allow *immigration*. The existence of Mycenaean Greek colonies (*population movement*) is most unlikely¹⁶⁵. As for north-western Anatolia, all historical conclusions based upon the material from Hissarlik will have to be postponed until the results of the recently started excavations have been published¹⁶⁶. All in all, the postulation of an Ahhiyawan sea-borne empire finds little support from circumstantial evidence.

Such an empire is not attested in any Hittite document whatsoever. The main text in support of the idea is the Sausgamuwa-treaty, mentioning Ahhiyawan ships sailing to Amurru, their traders supplying hostile Assyria¹⁶⁷. These commercial activities may have displeased Tuthaliya IV, but Hittite control over the seas near Alasiya is stated for his reign and that of Suppiluliuma, who gives the earliest account of a naval battle in the Mediterranean, which ended in a Hittite victory¹⁶⁸. The same situation applies to the early 14th century¹⁶⁹, when Attarsiya of Ahhiya

¹⁶¹ Cf. Taylour (1990) 152-3 and fig. 149; a vase-painting of Middle Helladic warships. F.C. Woudhuizen kindly drew my attention to an LM II-seal from Knossos, depicting a horse on a ship with rowers and a mast; Fr. Hançar, *Das Pferd in prähistorischer und früher historischer Zeit* (Vienna 1956) Tafel XXVII f.

¹⁶² R. Drews, *The Coming of the Greeks* (Princeton 1986) 158ff.

¹⁶³ *Docs.* 78.

¹⁶⁴ Terminology after Rouse (1986) 13.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. C.B. Mee, *AS* 28 (1978) 121-56; idem, "The Mycenaeans and Troy", *Greenbank* 45-57; R. Hope-Simpson, *Mycenaean Greece* (New Jersey 1981) 204-10 (Map O); M.J. Mellink, *AJA* 87 (1983) 139-40.

¹⁶⁶ Professor Korfmann kindly showed me the extent of the lower city when I visited the excavations in August 1988. For his provisional reports on Hissarlik's harbour see *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1984 (165-76); 1985 (157-72); 1986 (303-29). Review by J. Latacz, *Gymnasium* 95, Heft 5 (1988) 385-413; especially 410-1 on new-found evidence for a sea-trade via Hissarlik between the Aegean and Georgia, correcting Mee's negative conclusions (*Greenbank* 82).

¹⁶⁷ *Sausg.* Rev. IV 23.

¹⁶⁸ KBo XII 38 III 5'; Cf. Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 73-81.

¹⁶⁹ *Madd.* § 36 Rev. 86-88.

attacked Alasiya, already then at least nominally a Hittite vassal-state¹⁷⁰. For the intermediary period even an Ahhiyawan domination of the Aegean is unlikely. Sailing to and from Ahhiyawa is attested in several texts, but none of these mention any Ahhiyawan ships, let alone their interference with Anatolian shipping. Ahhiyawan control over some islands¹⁷¹, due to the plural form to be situated in the Aegean, is debated in KUB XXVI 91. These or other islands appear to be part of a "neutral zone" at the time of Mursili's war against Arzawa¹⁷², when the Arzawan royal family took refuge on them.

When common sense may be added to the evidence of the texts, without transgressing into the realm of mere fantasy, one might perhaps abandon the idea of Hatti's "landlockedness" altogether. As has been observed by experts in maritime history, e.g. A.T. Mahan¹⁷³, any major power controlling a Mediterranean coast-line would need a substantial fleet in order to uphold its status. A well-known example of a "land-locked" power temporarily transferring itself into a sea-power when it became necessary to do so is provided by the Roman Republic in its struggle against Carthage; in order to defeat this well-established sea-power large fleets were rapidly constructed and the development of new techniques in naval warfare, after initial set-backs, led to a Roman victory in the First Punic War. The strategic need for a major fleet would have been pressing for the Hittites after Suppiluliuma's conquest of Syria¹⁷⁴ in order to meet future threats of reconquest by Egypt. The north-Syrian coastal area had been occupied by Tuthmosis III not too long before this after a naval surprise-attack, by which means this king had bypassed a well-fortified line of defense more to the south¹⁷⁵. Building and maintaining a number of warships would have been very effective to withhold the Egyptians from marching towards Syria, disturbing their lines of supply and communication from the start or restricting these to

¹⁷⁰ Admittedly, Madduwatta claimed never to have heard of Hittite suzerainty over Alasiya; *Madd.* § 36 Rev. 87-9.

¹⁷¹ After F. Starke, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 95 (1981) 141-57.

¹⁷² The idea of a neutral zone is defended by Schachermeyr (1986) 265 (map), who includes part of the coastal area.

¹⁷³ *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783* (London 1918³). The first edition of this book, which appeared in 1890, had great influence on the naval strategy of the U.S.A. and other nations.

¹⁷⁴ According to Braudel (1981⁴: 136) the Ottoman Turks were in need of a major fleet after their conquest of Syria and Egypt in 1516/17.

¹⁷⁵ M.S. Drower, *CAH* III Vol. II/1 453-4. Tuthmosis' ships were not merely transports; some of them were able to capture two merchantmen on their return.

the long and uneasy land-route¹⁷⁶. The yearly costs of a strategic fleet would have been little compared to the alternative of providing southern Syria with a number of garrisoned fortresses. As the strategic insights of Suppiluliuma and his son Mursili II are praised in most historical studies, both kings can be credited with the ability of enlarging an existing Hittite fleet¹⁷⁷ and those of Hittite dependencies, e.g. Kizzuwatna and Ugarit, at their convenience. When Egyptian pressure was not urgent, they would be able to send a force well beyond the scope of Mycenaean Greece into the Aegean for a few weeks¹⁷⁸.

It may then safely be inferred that *Taw*, calling the Ahhiyawan a Greatking and recognizing his control over Milawanda, reflects an exceptional situation. A closer look at the "tone" of the letter may show that it was likely, however polite the King's words were chosen, that the Ahhiyawan was left with the impression of having been treated as an ignorant upstart. In view of the many other messages and letters which according to *Taw* were exchanged on the subject¹⁷⁹, it is surprising that the Greatking of Ahhiyawa was thought to be unfamiliar with standard procedures in relations between major powers. The King informed his colleague about what was "fitting" for political fugitives (III 41-50). This historical example about a son of one Sahurunuwa, who was sent back to the Hittites by another Greatking, may have served to point out to the Ahhiyawan that he was more or less "obliged" to return Piyamaradu, *now that he was a Greatking himself*. Furthermore the King told the Ahhiyawan how the relation between a Greatking and his vassal should be (II 37-55), what was meant by a guarantee (II 63-4) and explained in detail what was "right" among the Hittites (I 11-2, II 8, II 74-5). Apparently, these explanations were not made in fear of being misunderstood. The Ahhiyawan court was expected to be familiar with figurative

¹⁷⁶ A relatively modern parallel for the difficulties the Egyptians would have met is provided by Texas' war of independence against Mexico. In 1836 a superior Mexican army, separated from its bases by a deserted area, was cut off from supplies by only a few Texan men-of-war and failed to crush the revolt; cf. J.D. Hill, *The Texas Navy* (New York 1962, originally published 1937) 24, 45f.

¹⁷⁷ For a directly-controlled outlet to the Mediterranean see D.W. Smit, "The Hittite Corridor" (elsewhere in this volume).

¹⁷⁸ The Hittite sack of Milawanda, carried out unopposed by either Ahhiyawa or Arzawa early in Mursili's third year (cf. below), when the Arzawan land-forces were still confronting the Hittites a long way inland, becomes less of a mystery when explained as a naval surprise-action.

¹⁷⁹ Letters and messages by the King: I 16f., I 48, I 49f., IV 35 (in the past); by the Ahhiyawan: I 53f., I 55 (= II 21f.), IV 32 (in the past). The King asks his colleague to write two further letters (III 63 = IV 11 and IV 18).

speech such as "take someone by the hand" and "let someone step on one's chariot (frequently)"¹⁸⁰.

The King left no doubt who held the trump-cards :

1. The city of Milawanda, nominally Ahhiyawan territory, was occupied by the Hittite army.
2. The King felt free to grant his support to his colleague's subject Atpa, merely promising to "inform" the Ahhiyawan.
3. The insult made by the King was only apologized for (IV 32-44), but some Ahhiyawan messenger was to be sent to Hatti to answer for an insult made by his lord at the risk of losing his life.
4. Although the King's proposal for the fate of the fugitives (III 9-17) is very reasonable, even democratic¹⁸¹, the request for their return, probably repeated in the broken § 14 (IV 27-31), was a serious matter; a denial was commonly interpreted as a *casus belli*.

A short confrontation between Hatti and Ahhiyawa is not unlikely. In fact, the events from the Arzawa-campaign of Mursili II are rather similar to those of *Taw*:

1. Mursili politely called the Ahhiyawan LUGAL, a title elsewhere in his annals restricted to the king of Egypt.
2. A good opportunity for Ahhiyawan involvement in Anatolia was provided by the difficulties Mursili met at his accession, when Ahhiyawa supported the aspirations of the king of Arzawa.
3. On Arzawan instigation Milawanda "took the side of the king of Ahhiyawa"¹⁸².
4. The city was subsequently captured by the Hittites, but no counter-measure by Ahhiyawa has been recorded.
5. Further troubles, involving Atarima, led to a major war against Arzawa, but not against Ahhiyawa.
6. Immediately after Mursili's victory over Arzawa Ahhiyawa was

¹⁸⁰ *Taking by the hand*: I 12, I 69, II 6, II 30-34. *Stepping on a chariot*: I 9-10, I 69-70, II 60-62 (frequently). I hesitate to accept the wide-spread idea of chariot-instruction, but suggest to translate "show one's benevolence to someone" and "know someone (very) well", respectively. A more fitting, if anachronistic and isolated parallel is offered in 2 Kings 10:15. Jehu, who has just killed some enemies, meets one Jonadab, speaks words of peace and then *takes him by the hand and lets him step on his chariot*.

¹⁸¹ A Hittite envoy was to witness the Ahhiyawans questioning the spokesmen of the NAM.RA. Those that had followed Piyamaradu voluntarily could stay in Ahhiyawa; those that had been forced to do so should be allowed to return to Hatti.

¹⁸² Restoration by Goetze (AM 37; Comm. 235-6), supported by Güterbock (ApR 135-6).

requested to hand over a refugee, a potential trouble-maker. *It did so without delay.*

When all of this took little more than three years, some other confrontations between Hatti and Ahhiyawa throughout the history of the Empire-period follow the same pattern:

- A. *Madd.* § 12 Obv. 63-65, relating the retreat of an Ahhiyan army after a short fight, which caused the only two attested casualties, one on each side, resulting from Ahhiya(wa)n belligerence.
- B. KUB XXIII 13, in which a rebel “relied upon” the king of Ahhiyawa, but did so in vain.
- C. The Sausgamuwa-treaty, in which Tuthaliya IV did not bother to insert a paragraph on what had to be done if any hostile reaction would result from his embargo on Ahhiyawan shipping.

From a Hittite point of view, the Ahhiyawans may have been in ill repute, but they tended to yield when sufficiently pressed. In this regard the reign of Hattusili is unique, since no text ascribed to him so far states any Ahhiyawan mischief. The king of Ahhiyawa (not a Greatking) did not support Urhi-Tesub after Hattusili’s coup d’état¹⁸³ and friendly relations appear from other documents¹⁸⁴. It is problematic to provide Hattusili with a motive either to treat Ahhiyawa so harshly or to grant the internationally important title of Greatking to its ruler¹⁸⁵. On the other hand, Muwatalli’s concern for Wilusa and his oncoming confrontation with Egypt provide him with an excellent motive to treat Ahhiyawa as was done in *Taw*.

4.2 *The aftermath of the Wilusa-war*

As has been argued above, Muwatalli is likely to have ended all conflicts with Ahhiyawa peaceably and to have succeeded in his request for the return of Piyamaradu. The diplomatic activities involved with the end of the “Wilusa-war” may have been elucidated by Singer’s new reading of I 71-II 2. According to his interpretation¹⁸⁶, ^dLAMA-as came to meet the king of Ahhiyawa and accepted his guarantee. Afterwards Tawagalawa accepted the King’s guarantee and came out of Milawanda to meet him. As ^dLAMA-as was “here” at the time, we may infer the king of Ahhiyawa to have been “here” as well, i.e. in Anatolia. Naturally, as the Ahhiyawan

¹⁸³ Güterbock (n. 15 above) 321-6.

¹⁸⁴ Unt. 1 96 n. 82-3.

¹⁸⁵ Hattusili bluntly refused to recognize the king of Assyria as a Greatking in a letter to him.

¹⁸⁶ Singer 212.

was not “here” when *Taw* was written, this temporary visit does not influence any view on Ahhiyawa’s geographical position.

If the Mycenaean Greeks were in a state of war with the Hittites over Wilusa in c. 1280 or a few years earlier, it seems inevitable to relate this to the Greek epic of the Trojan War, although neither the adversary nor the result are corresponding. Moreover, the Ahhiyawan control of Milawanda, very probably Miletus, should warn us against over-optimism in reconstructing the past. The city is on the enemy side in the *Iliad*¹⁸⁷; the result of the Greek efforts as related in *Taw* may not have inspired myth-making¹⁸⁸. At best we might connect the historical events with the story of the ill-fated Greek expedition to Mysia¹⁸⁹, unless we are willing to assume that the epic was inspired, among others, by the ambitions of a Mycenaean ruler, who was capable of assembling the greatest force the Mycenaean Greeks had ever seen. While actual fighting was left to others, or was likely restricted to some skirmishings, the positive results were his securing of Milawanda, an uneasy foothold in Anatolia, and his getting recognized as a Greatking internationally.

5.0 *Historical conclusions*

The hostile activities of Piyamaradu against the Hittites and their vassals must have lasted some 30 years, if KUB XIV 3 dates from the reign of either Mursili II or Hattusili III¹⁹⁰.

The data provided by related texts and fragments, however, do not support so long a period of instability in western Anatolia. They rather refer to *two* short periods of anti-Hittite behaviour, the first of which, in the reign of Muwatalli, appears to have been the only serious challenge to Mursili’s “Pax Hethitica” in the west. At its start (c. 1285) Piyamaradu, then possibly still a Hittite subject, opposed two of Hatti’s westernmost vassals. Profiting from family-ties or being able to impose these he succeeded in arranging his son-in-law Atpa, lord of Milawanda, to take the side of the king of Ahhiyawa, providing the latter with the same foothold in Anatolia that his ancestor had held shortly about 40 years before. Both the Ahhiyawan’s eagerness to confront the Hittites, even at

¹⁸⁷ *Iliad* II 868; cf. Stubbings, *CAH* III Vol. II/2 349.

¹⁸⁸ On the identification Tawagalawas = Eteokles the opinion of Nilsson is still valid (1968: 104): “..from a mythological point of view extremely doubtful” as the two persons by that name in Greek myth were “insignificant personages *without any myth of their own*”.

¹⁸⁹ On this see A.T. Murray’s comment on *Iliad* XXIV 765 (Loeb-edition).

¹⁹⁰ Mursili-thesis: before 1297-after 1265 (KBo XIX 78); Hattusili-thesis: c. 1285 (*Man*)-c. 1255.

the risk of war, and his subsequent preference to use the stylo rather than the sword are best explained by the current international political situation, in which a major war between Hatti and Egypt was impending.

KUB XIV 3 states that the King made the Ahhiyawan change his mind on the matter of Wilusa. The related fragments, particularly KBo XIV 35, suggest that Muwatalli was also able to persuade his fresh colleague to extradite Piyamaradu, who, in accordance with the practice of most Hittite kings towards defeated enemies, was not executed, but set to administrate some mountain-district in the north.

The west remained peaceful for some time afterwards. A few years later Muwatalli was able to use much of its fighting potential for his war against Egypt. Alaksandu of Wilusa does not reappear in other texts, but Kupanta-^dLAMA and Masturi remained in office at least until after the successions of Hattusili III and Tuthaliya IV. respectively. If Hittite control over the west had become less effective before this, on which we have no unbiassed account, it is more likely that the vassals had gained more independence¹⁹¹ than that a third party had profited.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Al The Alaksandu-treaty, cf. n. 59 above.
 AM A. Goetze, *Die Annalen des Mursili*. Darmstadt 1967 (reprint of MVAG 38 (1933)).
 ApR H.G. Güterbock, "The Ahhiyawa-problem Reconsidered", *AJA* 87 (1983) 133-8.
 AU F. Sommer, *Die Ahhiyawa-Urkunden*. Munich 1932.
 BT H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy*. StBoT Beiheft 1, Wiesbaden 1988.
 Docs. M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. London 1972, 2nd Edition.
 Easton (1985) D.F. Easton, "Has the Trojan War been found?", *Antiquity* LIX (1985).
 KA A. Goetze, *Kulturgeschichte Kleinasien*. Munich 1957²
 Madd. The Madduwatta-edict, cf. n. 50 above.
 Man The Manapa-^dU-letter, cf. n. 60 above.
 MVAG *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft*.
 Popko "Zur datierung des Tawagalawas-briefes", *AoF* 11 (1984) 199-203,
 RGTC *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cuneiformes*.
 SAQ P.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, "Sidelights to the Ahhiyawa-question", *JEOL* 28 (1983-4) 33-64.
 Sausg. The Sausgamuwa-treaty, cf. n. 50 above.
 Singer "Western Anatolia in the 13th Century B.C. according to Hittite Sources". *AS* 33 (1983) 205-17.
 StBoT *Studien zu den Bogazköy-texte*.

¹⁹¹ Cf. n. 88 & 101 above.

- TdH 3 A. Ünal, *Hattusili III. Teil I*, Band 1. Heidelberg 1974.
 TdH 8 S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*. Heidelberg 1977.
 Unt.1 S. Heinhold-Krahmer, "Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu" (Teil I), *OR* 52 (1983), 81-97.
 Unt.2 Ib. (Teil 2), *OR* 55 (1986) 41-62.

Appendix I: Synchronisation of Hittite kings and some vassals

HATTI	MIRA	SEHA-RIVERLAND	WILUSA
Suppiluliuma (late)	Mashuiluwa (exile)	MUWA.UR.MAH*	Kukkunni*
Mursili II (1318)	idem	Manapa- ^d U	idem
(1310)	Kupanta- ^d LAMA		?
Muwatalli (early)	idem	idem	Alaksandu
(later)		Masturi	
Urhi-Tesup	idem	idem	?
Hattusili III (early)	idem	idem	?
(later)	?	idem (?)	?
Tuthaliya IV (early)	Alantalli	idem	?
(later)	?	Tarhunaradu (rebel)	Walmu (rebels)
(idem)	(Mashuitta)		

* Independent rulers, not vassals.

Appendix II: Hittite relations with Lukka, Masa and Karkisa

	<i>Lukka</i> ¹⁹²	<i>Masa</i>	<i>Karkisa</i> ¹⁹³
Tuthaliya II (1st campaign)	—	—	—
idem (Assuwa-campaign)	hostile ? ¹⁹⁴	—	hostile
Tuth. + Arnuwanda I	—	hostile	—
KUB XIV 1 (Madduwatta)	cities lost	—	? ¹⁹⁵
—			
Suppiluliuma's father ¹⁹⁶	—	hostile	—
—			
Arnuwanda II/Mursili II	—	—	friendly
Mursili II (1321) ¹⁹⁷	rebels	—	—

¹⁹² Always spelled Luqqa.

¹⁹³ Spelled Karkisa, Karakisa, Karkija, Galkija.

¹⁹⁴ The name [Lu]-uq-qa is broken, but the only other candidate Ardu[qqa] is a restoration itself.

¹⁹⁵ Kar(a)kisa is mentioned in *Madd.* Rev. 81, but the context is unclear.

¹⁹⁶ DS fragm. 13. This text supports a northern location for Masa, provided that Kisija is the same country as Kasija.

¹⁹⁷ KUB XXIV 3+II 38f., a list of rebels refusing tribute: Kaska, Arawana, Kalasma, Lukka, Pitassa.

	<i>Lukka</i>	<i>Masa</i>	<i>Karkisa</i>
idem (1319)	NAM.RA ¹⁹⁸	—	—
idem (1319/18, Arzawa-war)	—	—	—
idem (1310) ¹⁹⁹	—	enemy	—
—			
Muwatalli (Al-treaty)	subjected	as Lukka	as Lukka
idem (at Kadesh)	ally	as Lukka	as Lukka
KUB XIV 3 (Taw)	subjected & threatened	as Lukka	as Lukka
—			
Hattusili III	campaign ²⁰⁰	—	—
—			
Tuthaliya IV	enemy ²⁰¹	—	—
—			
(uninformative)			
KBo XI 40 ²⁰²	?	?	—
KUB XV 35+ KBo II 9 ²⁰³	—	?	?
KUB XV 38 ²⁰⁴	—	—	?

¹⁹⁸ NAM.RA had fled from Lukka-cities to Arzawa and the Seha-riverland. It can be inferred that the cities were part of the Empire before this.

¹⁹⁹ The unloyal vassal Mashuiliwa was handed over from Masa after a short campaign.

²⁰⁰ KUB XXI 6/6a, "all the Lukka-lands" are among the enemies or among the countries attacked by an unknown enemy.

²⁰¹ The Lukka were no longer Hittite subjects when Tuthaliya guarded his frontier against them (KUB XXVI 12+XXI 42 II 12-15 and *BT* 61-3, cf. above, n. 83).

²⁰² A list of offerings mentioning Hurri, Arzawa, Masa, Lukka, Kaska and Hatti.

²⁰³ An Ishtar-ritual mentioning Karkija, Masa and Arzawa; transcribed by H.T. Bossert, *Asia* (Istanbul 1946) 34-5.

²⁰⁴ A fragment mentioning Galkija (= Karkisa), Talawa and Jalanti (= Iyalanda); cf. Bossert (1946) 38.