

## DEFINING BOUNDARIES OF A STATE: THE MYCENAEANS AND THEIR ANATOLIAN FRONTIER \*

Traces of a possible Mycenaean presence in Anatolia have been well tracked for some time <sup>1</sup>. Among the different categories of artefacts used as trace elements, pottery identified as Mycenaean ranks highest on the list in terms of frequency of finds and potential significance. Architecture (including tombs) also figures prominently. In addition, texts contribute relevant information, notably about Ahhiyawa (in Hittite documents) and about the Achaean war against the Trojans (in later Greek literature).

Despite much discussion, the picture drawn by these disparate pieces of information is unclear. The Mycenaean presence in the area is poorly understood. Were these Mycenaean settlements, colonies, or sporadic trading missions? Was this area in fact part of the Mycenaean cultural sphere? Or were the objects used by other ethnic groups? <sup>2</sup> Indeed, what were the boundaries of the Mycenaean cultural sphere -- or the Mycenaean state -- and how can they be determined?

In order to define the boundaries of Mycenaean culture in Anatolia, we must determine, first, where Mycenaeans were in Anatolia, and, second, what the nature of

---

\* I would like to thank Robert Laffineur and Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier for organizing this stimulating conference. Thanks also to various participants for helpful questions and comments, some of which I have addressed here in this written version. In addition to the standard abbreviations, I shall use:

*Bronze Age Migrations* = R. CROSSLAND and A. BIRCHALL eds, *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean* (1973);

*Festschrift Nimet Özgüç* = M. MELLINK, E. PORADA, and T. ÖZGÜÇ eds, *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç* (1993);

*Greek Colonists and Native Populations* = J.-P. DESCŒUDRES ed, *Greek Colonists and Native Populations. Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in honour of Emeritus Professor A.D. Trendall. Sydney 9-14 July 1985* (1990);

*KBo* = *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (1916-);

*KUB* = *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* (1921-);

*Milet 1899-1980* = W. MÜLLER-WIENER ed, *Milet 1899-1980. Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung. Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980* (1986);

*Traffici micenei* = M. MARAZZI, S. TUSA, and L. VAGNETTI eds, *Traffici micenei nel Mediterraneo. Atti del convegno di Palermo (11-12 maggio e 3-6 dicembre 1984)* (1986).

1 Recent treatments include C. MEE, "Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C.", *Anatolian Studies* 28 (1978), 121-156; C. ÖZGÜNEL, "Batı Anadolu ve İçerlerinde Miken Etkinlikleri", *Belleten* 47 (1983), 697-743; and L. RE, "Presenze micenee in Anatolia", *Traffici micenei*, 343-364.

2 These questions were succinctly posed by Elizabeth French in 1973: E. FRENCH, "Who were the Mycenaeans in Anatolia?", *Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Ankara-Izmir 23-30/IX/1973* (1978), 165-170. French called attention to an earlier discussion of these issues by M. MELLINK, in a review of F. CASSOLA, *La Ionia nel mondo miceneo* (1957), in *AJA* 63 (1959), 294-295. For a thoughtful discussion of the problems of correlating pottery with ethnic groups, using as its focus Habur ware of Middle Bronze Northern Mesopotamia, see C. KRAMER, "Pots and Peoples", *Mountains and Lowlands: Essays in the Archaeology of Greater Mesopotamia. Bibliotheca Mesopotamica* 7 (1977), 91-112.

their presence was. Then, lastly, we can assess how this presence, or different types of presences, coalesced into a definable geographical area<sup>3</sup>.

In this search for Mycenaean in Anatolia, let us first examine the archaeological evidence and look for finds of Mycenaean objects, or Mycenaean-like objects. Non-Mycenaean objects cannot easily serve as indicators of Mycenaean presence, because, in the absence of supplementary information, there is no way of telling whether or not Mycenaeans handled them. And let us begin with pottery. The importance of pottery as an indicator of ethnic presence and cultural change in the Aegean Bronze Age can hardly be overestimated<sup>4</sup>. Mycenaean pottery has been well studied, at least the decorated wares, so when it has been found in Anatolia, it has been quickly identified and publicized.

Despite this ceramic expertise, Mycenaean pottery cannot serve as the cultural divining rod we all might wish. Problems are several:

1) Mycenaean pottery need not automatically indicate the presence of Mycenaeans. Non-Mycenaeans could just as well be responsible for those sherds getting to that final resting place<sup>5</sup>. The general rule, that pottery need not correspond with ethnic groups, pertains also to the next problem.

2) Imports vs local manufacture must be defined. Local manufacture need not rule out Mycenaeans; it could be Mycenaeans living in West Anatolia making their own pottery on the spot, in the styles used on the west shores of the Aegean. Or, again, it could be non-Mycenaeans living in West Anatolia who are making pottery that imitates West Aegean types.

3) The finds of Mycenaean pottery must be evaluated in relation to finds of non-Mycenaean pottery. Interpretation of the Mycenaean pottery may well be influenced by the ratio between Mycenaean and non-Mycenaean pottery<sup>6</sup>.

With these guiding principles in mind, let us examine the nature of Mycenaean settlements in Anatolia. Mycenaean pottery has been discovered in varying amounts in the Aegean and Mediterranean coastal regions of Turkey and in small and sporadically

3 The question was asked after my talk in Heidelberg, "Who were the Mycenaeans?" The question, deceptively simple, was in fact a pertinent one, and it is appropriate to answer it here. The term "Mycenaean" indicates a cultural assemblage consisting of LH pottery and other artifact types that have been associated with it, such as figurines, metal objects, architectural forms and techniques, tomb types, and writing. Its name comes from the site of Mycenae. It has been given a historical, ethnic, and linguistic identity by association with the Achaean side in the Trojan War and other legends of later Greek literature, and by the decipherment of its script, Linear B, as the earliest known form of the Greek language. For a more complex definition, see K. KILIAN, "Il confine settentrionale della civiltà micenea nella tarda età del bronzo", *Traffici micenei*, 283-284; and again K. KILIAN, "Mycenaean Colonization: Norm and Variety", *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, 445-447.

4 Indeed, so important is the role of pottery in Aegean prehistory that Susan Sherratt has rightly spoken of the mystique of the Aegean pottery specialist. S. SHERRATT, review of P. WARREN and V. HANKEY, *Aegean Bronze Age Chronology* (1989), in *Antiquity* 64 (1990), 415.

5 The issue of who transported Mycenaean pottery looms large in discussions of trade and shipping. The affiliation of the ships wrecked off Cape Gelidonya and Ulu Burun, for example, has been debated with passion; see the recent update by George Bass, a key protagonist: G. BASS, "Evidence of Trade from Bronze Age Shipwrecks", *Bronze Age Trade*, 69-82. For a recent synthesis of Aegean Bronze Age trade, see O. DICKINSON, *The Aegean Bronze Age* (1994), 234-256.

6 Incomplete publication of pottery finds from Aegean sites has prevented a meaningful assessment of this ratio. FRENCH (*supra* n. 2), 167-168; and A. ÜNAL, "Two Peoples on Both Sides of the Aegean Sea: Did the Achaeans and the Hittites Know Each Other?", *Essays on Ancient Anatolian and Syrian Studies in the 2nd and 1st Millennium B.C. Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan* 4 (1991), 22-24. Ünal claims that Mycenaean pottery forms perhaps only 5% of the Late Bronze Age pottery at Miletus, 2% at Troy, and 0.6% at Panaztepe. These low percentages startle us, he says, because we know so little about the abundant local pottery, largely ignored on excavations and surveys.

occurring quantities inland. A thorough list was published in 1978 by Christopher Mee<sup>7</sup>; this article still serves as a useful starting point for this issue. I would like to focus on the Aegean coast, and especially on Miletus, the most important site with Mycenaean material known so far. But problems in interpreting the finds from Miletus are certainly encountered at other sites with Mycenaean material.

Miletus is of significance to this issue for two reasons. First, it offers in soundings made in the area of the Temple of Athena three well-attested Late Bronze levels marked by Minoan and then Mycenaean pottery and by architecture<sup>8</sup>. Second, it most probably is the town of Millawanda/Milawata mentioned in Hittite texts. I am accepting that equation<sup>9</sup>; more on Millawanda shortly.

Minoan pottery has been found in association with architecture in the lowest two of the three Late Bronze Age levels<sup>10</sup>. The pottery of the lowest level dates from MM III through, probably, LM IB. The second level contained LM II/IIIA:1 pottery, but in much reduced quantities. This second level, the first settlement with Mycenaean material, was destroyed by fire, of unknown cause, in LH IIIA:2<sup>11</sup>. The succeeding settlement of LH IIIB (/C), the third level, was marked by an impressive fortification wall, ca 1100 m in length, constructed of stone foundations with a mudbrick superstructure, with bastions regularly spaced every 14 m<sup>12</sup>. This wall enclosed an area of five hectares (compared with the two hectares of the inner citadel of Troy VI, and the nearly four hectares of the citadel at Mycenae<sup>13</sup>), with houses, including a residential complex with a court on Stadium Hill, the highest point in this settlement. 1.5 km to the south at Değirmen Tepe is a necropolis of chamber tombs that contained IIIB/IIIC pottery<sup>14</sup>. The town was destroyed during LH IIIC. Subsequent reoccupation is uncertain<sup>15</sup>.

7 MEE (*supra* n. 1).

8 For a summary of finds and list of relevant publications before 1978, see MEE (*supra* n. 1), 133-137. To this list add: ÖZGÜNEL (*supra* n. 1), 729-730; W. SCHIERING, "Zu den Beziehungen zwischen der ältesten Siedlung von Milet und Kreta", *Milet 1899-1980*, 11-15; W. VOIGTLÄNDER, "Milets Beziehungen zur Argolis in späthelladischer Zeit", *Milet 1899-1980*, 17-34; and for a summary of the 2nd millennium B.C. remains within a detailed presentation of Late Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age finds, H. PARZINGER, "Zur frühesten Besiedlung Milets", *IstMitt* 39 (1989), 415-431. Parzinger notes the absence of finds from the first half of the 2nd millennium (before the MM III pottery), and wonders whether the Milesian peninsula was indeed uninhabited at that time (p. 429). For a recent discussion of relations between Crete and Anatolia in the Middle Bronze Age, see J. ARUZ, "Crete and Anatolia in the Middle Bronze Age: Sealings from Phaistos and Karahöyük", *Festschrift Nimet Özgüç*, 35-54.

9 Following, most recently, Ph. Houwink ten Cate, H. Güterbock, and T. Bryce: Ph. HOUWINK TEN CATE, "Anatolian Evidence for Relations with the West in the Late Bronze Age", *Bronze Age Migrations*, 146; H. GÜTERBOCK, "The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 1. The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered", *AJA* 87 (1983), 138; T. BRYCE, "The Nature of Mycenaean Involvement in Western Anatolia", *Historia* 38 (1989), 6; and T. BRYCE, "Ahhiyawans and Mycenaeans - an Anatolian Viewpoint", *OJA* 8 (1989), 306.

10 W. SCHIERING, "Die minoisch-mykenische Siedlung in Milet vor dem Bau der grossen Mauer", *IstMitt* 25 (1975), 9-15; MEE (*supra* n. 1), 134-135; J. DAVIS, "The Earliest Minoans in the South-East Aegean: a Reconsideration of the Evidence", *Anatolian Studies* 32 (1982), 33-41; M. MELLINK, "The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 2. Archaeological Comments on Ahhiyawa-Achaians in Western Anatolia", *AJA* 87 (1983), 139; W. SCHIERING, "The Connections between the Oldest Settlement at Miletus and Crete", *Thalassocracy*, 187-189; and SCHIERING (*supra* n. 8).

11 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 134-135, with references; MELLINK (*supra* n. 10), 139.

12 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 133-136, with references; MELLINK (*supra* n. 10), 140; and PARZINGER (*supra* n. 8), 415 and 429. See also note 25, below.

13 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 135-136, and note 11 (citing C. RENFREW, *The Emergence of Civilisation* [1972], 237).

14 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 133.

15 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 136.



The pottery found in Late Bronze Age Miletus is of great importance. It has only been partly published, unfortunately. So far, we know that the Minoan and then the Mycenaean pottery both coexist with much local pottery<sup>16</sup>. We also know, thanks to analyses of clay carried out by Karen Gödeken, that most of the Minoan and Mycenaean pottery was made at Miletus, alongside coarse kitchen wares and storage jars and so-called "Anatolian wares"<sup>17</sup>. Imports were not fine wares, but coarseware containers for wine, oil, etc.<sup>18</sup>. Gödeken has identified two clay sources exploited for this Late Bronze Age pottery. 25 additional clay sources sampled were not used until Byzantine times<sup>19</sup>.

This locally made Mycenaean-style pottery had a wide distribution. Some of this pottery was found in the tombs at Müsgebi<sup>20</sup>; some was discovered at Iasos<sup>21</sup> and even at Enkomi and Ugarit<sup>22</sup>.

The character of Late Bronze Miletus is strongly Aegean: it includes Minoan and Mycenaean pottery types, chamber tombs, female figurines<sup>23</sup>, and writing suggested by signs found on some locally made containers<sup>24</sup>. And yet indications are that Miletus was not a clone of a mainland Greek site; rather it had an Anatolian flavor, too. The wall recalls the *Kastenmauer* type walls of Hattusha-Boğazköy, the contemporary Hittite capital<sup>25</sup>. Furthermore, there is all the pottery that can't be pinned on the Mycenaeans of mainland Greece<sup>26</sup>. A proper study of this local pottery should help place Miletus in its Anatolian setting.

It has often been proposed that these pottery finds demonstrate a colony of first Minoans, then Mycenaeans, each bringing the models of their distinctive decorated pottery: two waves of foreigners washing against Anatolian shores and encountering unidentified locals<sup>27</sup>. This model depends on the Minoan and Mycenaean pottery being imported, at least initially. It recalls the historical situation in the early Iron Age, when migrants from the Greek mainland settled on the East Aegean islands and coast, marked likewise by finds of pottery types associated with mainland Greece.

16 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 134-136.

17 K. GÖDECKEN, "A Contribution to the Early History of Miletus. The Settlement in Mycenaean Times and its Connections Overseas", *Problems*, 307-318.

18 GÖDECKEN (*supra* n. 17), 312-314. But see VOIGTLÄNDER (*supra* n. 8), for skyphoi and bowls allegedly imported from the Argolid; it is not clear whether or not Gödeken analyzed these pots and found them to be locally manufactured.

19 GÖDECKEN (*supra* n. 17), 315.

20 GÖDECKEN (*supra* n. 17), 310-315.

21 GÖDECKEN (*supra* n. 17), 313-314.

22 G. KLEINER, "Stand der Erforschung von Alt-Milet", *IstMitt* 19/20 (1969/70), 114 and 118; and GÖDECKEN (*supra* n. 17), 313, but without further indication as to which vases these might be.

23 For example, W. SCHIERING, "Die Ausgrabung beim Athena-Tempel in Milet 1957: I. Südabschnitt", *IstMitt* 9/10 (1959/60), 25 and 30, pls 18,1 and 2. For different information, see E. FRENCH, "The Development of Mycenaean Terracotta Figurines", *BSA* 66 (1971), 181 and 186.

24 GÖDECKEN (*supra* n. 17), 314.

25 PARZINGER (*supra* n. 8), 429, although he notes that Bittel, at least, regarded this comparison with some misgiving. Indeed, Naumann claimed that inner cross walls were not found, and consequently this wall was not of true Hittite *Kastenmauer* type, but instead was an Aegean hybrid: R. NAUMANN, *Architektur Kleinasien* (1971), Beilage I. For a summary of the controversy, see MEE (*supra* n. 1), 135.

26 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 134-135.

27 W.-D. NIEMEIER, "The End of the Minoan Thalassocracy", *Thalassocracy*, 207 and 214. The Minoans may have settled on uninhabited land, as Niemeier and Parzinger (PARZINGER, *supra* n. 8, 429) point out. Indeed, Strabo states that Miletus was founded by Cretans: 14.1.6. For Mycenaeans, see also C. MEE, "A Mycenaean Thalassocracy in the Eastern Aegean?", *Problems*, 301-306. For Iasos, the only other coastal site with Bronze Age remains comparable to those from Miletus: C. LAVIOSA, "The Minoan Thalassocracy, Iasos and the Carian Coast", *Thalassocracy*, 183-185; and see below, note 55.

But the results of the clay analyses that show much of the pottery to be local force us to rethink our concept of the Mycenaean presence in West Anatolia.

Our interest should now center on the identity of those local people who are making pottery in the Mycenaean style, and why they are doing so. Some possibilities are as follows:

1) The Colonization Model -- favored in the literature. First migrating Minoans, then conquering Mycenaeans settle in the areas and make pottery in the styles of their south and west Aegean homelands <sup>28</sup>.

2) The Imitation Model. A local people, neither Minoan nor Mycenaean, is swept up in Aegean cultural trends of the early and later Late Bronze Age -- in the way Carian Mausolus and the Lycian patron of the Nereid Monument utilized Classical Greek art styles <sup>29</sup>. These local inhabitants may be Carians, as E. Melas and others have proposed <sup>30</sup>. This model might be of greater impact if more were known about the non-Minoan/Mycenaean pottery found in coastal sites of Aegean Turkey: ware shapes and fabrics, and percentages in overall assemblages.

3) The Indigenous Eastern Mycenaeans Model. The local population of the entire Late Bronze Age is always Mycenaean, that is, the same culture as exists on mainland Greece. In other words, Mycenaean culture originated in West Anatolia as well as in southern Greece. Like the Mycenaeans of the Shaft Graves, they too are much smitten by Minoan fashions, but eventually give it up and produce their own wares, both decorated (in the Mycenaean style) and plain <sup>31</sup>.

Of these three models, archaeology alone cannot decide which one is correct. Help may come from Hittite texts, however, even if from the confusing world of Hittite geography <sup>32</sup>. Information about Millawanda (Miletus); Ahhiya and Ahhiyawa; Assuwa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa; and Arzawa will be of particular importance, because these are the best candidates for states in West Anatolia that might define the Mycenaeans's

28 See *supra* n. 27. These issues, with some similar models proposed, are discussed by Manolis Melas, but with reference to the Minoans only: M. MELAS, "Minoans Overseas: Alternative Models of Interpretation", *Aegaeum* 2 (1988), 47-70.

29 For the Mausoleum, see A. STEWART, *Greek Sculpture, An Exploration* (1990), 180-182, with additional references on p. 345. For Lycian monuments: W. CHILDS, *The City-Reliefs of Lycia* (1978); and T. BRYCE, "Hellenism in Lycia", *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, 531-541.

30 E. MELAS, "The Dodecanese and W. Anatolia in Prehistory: Interrelationships, Ethnicity and Political Geography", *Anatolian Studies* 38 (1988), 114, with references.

31 For a possible "Greek" preserve in Northwest Anatolia: HOUWINK TEN CATE (*supra* n. 9), 145-146. For Greeks as autochthonous, at least in mainland Greece, and comments on culture process, see D. FRENCH, "Migrations and 'Minyan' Pottery in Western Anatolia and the Aegean", *Bronze Age Migrations*, 53. Any assessment of this model will depend on continuing improvements in the understanding of the archaeology of West Anatolia in the 2nd millennium B.C. See E. JEWELL, *The Archaeology and History of Western Anatolia During the Second Millennium, B.C.* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1974); J. MELLAART, "Anatolian Trade with Europe and Anatolian Geography and Culture Provinces in the Late Bronze Age", *Anatolian Studies* 18 (1968), 187-202; and surveys by David French and Recep Meriç: D. FRENCH, "Prehistoric Sites in Northwest Anatolia, I. The Iznik Area", *Anatolian Studies* 17 (1967), 49-100; D. FRENCH, "Prehistoric Sites in Northwest Anatolia, II. The Balıkesir and Akhisar/Manisa Areas", *Anatolian Studies* 19 (1969), 41-98; and R. MERİÇ, ongoing reports at the annual meeting for the results of archaeological research in Turkey, the latest of which is "1988 Yılı İzmir, Manisa İlleri Arkeolojik Yüzey Araştırması", *VII. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı. Antalya, 18-23 Mayıs 1989* (1990), 361-366.

32 Works on Hittite geography are many. Useful discussions, with additional references, include the articles mentioned in n. 9 *supra*; J. GARSTANG and O. GURNEY, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* (1959); JEWELL (*supra* n. 31); and E. CLINE, *Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea: International Trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean* (1994), 68-125. A recent and (self-confessed) controversial contribution is J. MELLAART, "The Present State of 'Hittite Geography' ", *Festschrift Nimet Özgüç*, 415-422.

Anatolian frontier. Let us take them in reverse order. *Arzawa* is generally thought to be a state located in West Anatolia, a buffer between the Hittites (on the plateau) and the Aegean coast, a sort of Late Bronze Age Lydia<sup>33</sup>. Its capital, Apasa, has been equated with Ephesus<sup>34</sup>. But otherwise it has no certain archaeological tie-in, that is no artifacts, architecture, or settlements have been defined as Arzawan. Such sites of inland West Anatolia as Beycesultan, Aphrodisias, and especially the currently excavated Gavurtepe at Alaşehir (Classical Philadelphia) with its intriguing 15th century megaron are attractive candidates<sup>35</sup>.

Second, *Assuwa*, *Wilusiya* and *Wilusa*, and *Taruisa*. The name 'Assuwa' sounds like Asia, and the final two, member nations of Assuwa according to a text from the reign of Tudhaliya II (third quarter of the 15th century B.C.), sound like Ilios and Troy<sup>36</sup>. In the early 13th century B.C., Wilusa is called an Arzawan land, loyal to the Hittites even when Arzawa proper was not<sup>37</sup>. The texts do not otherwise make their geographical location precise, so the temptation to place this group in the Troad has usually been irresistible<sup>38</sup>.

Third, *Ahhiya* and *Ahhiyawa*<sup>39</sup>. The two names would seem to be two versions of the same word, but this is not certain<sup>40</sup>. These words certainly sound like Achaia and the

33 GARSTANG and GURNEY (*supra* n. 32), 83-100; J. MACQUEEN, *The Hittites and their Contemporaries in Asia Minor* (1986), 37-39; and A. BAMMER, "Ephesos in der Bronzezeit", *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 57 - Beiblatt (1986/87), 14-38.

34 GARSTANG and GURNEY (*supra* n. 32), 88; GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9), 138; and MELLINK (*supra* n. 10), 140. Bammer, however, proposes that Apasa was not Ephesus but Ilicatepe, an unexplored site south of Kusadası, with visible fortification walls of Cyclopean masonry. He does not explain why he rejects the equation Apasa = Ephesus. BAMMER (*supra* n. 33), 23-28, including figs. 11 and 12.

35 Beycesultan: S. LLOYD and J. MELLAART, *Beycesultan*, Vol. II. *Middle Bronze Age Architecture and Pottery* (1965); and S. LLOYD, *Beycesultan*, Vol. III, Part I. *Late Bronze Age Architecture* (1972). The Late Bronze Age pottery and miscellaneous finds have yet to be published. Aphrodisias: M. JOUKOWSKY, *Prehistoric Aphrodisias* (1986). Gavurtepe: the latest report is R. MERİÇ, "1991 Yılı Alaşehir Kazısı", *XIV. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı*, II. Ankara, 25-29 Mayıs 1992 (1993), 355-363; see also M. MELLINK, "Archaeology in Anatolia", *AJA* 95 (1991), 138; and M.-H. GATES, "Archaeology in Turkey", *AJA* 98 (1994), 258-259.

36 GARSTANG and GURNEY (*supra* n. 32), 101-108; and H. GÜTERBOCK, "Troy in Hittite Texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, and Hittite History", *Troy and the Trojan War. A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984* (1986), 33-44. For the text, the Annals of Tudhaliya: *KUB* 23.11 and duplicate 12; translated in GARSTANG and GURNEY (*supra* n. 32), 121-122.

37 The Alaksandu Treaty: *KUB* 48.95 and *KUB* 21.2; translated in GARSTANG and GURNEY (*supra* n. 32), 102-103. Discussed by GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 36); he dates the Treaty to ca. 1280 B.C. (p. 35).

38 GARSTANG and GURNEY (*supra* n. 32), 101-108; and GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 36), 41-44. Dissenters include Macqueen, who prefers a location near modern Eskişehir: MACQUEEN (*supra* n. 33), 39.

39 I owe my basic orientation in the controversy over Ahhiyawa and related Hittite geography to a paper written by Patrick Thomas for a graduate course in the Aegean Bronze Age which I taught at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in the fall of 1986. My conclusions differ from his, however, so I must absolve him of any responsibility for opinions expressed here. Recent studies on the location of Ahhiyawa, with references, include: HOUWINK TEN CATE (*supra* n. 9); GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9); MELLINK (*supra* n. 10); M. MARAZZI, "Gli 'Achei' in Anatolia: un problema di metodologia", *Traffici micenei*, 391-403; BRYCE (*supra* n. 9, both articles); ÜNAL (*supra* n. 6), 16-44; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 68-125.

40 HOUWINK TEN CATE (*supra* n. 9), 147. Moreover, they were long thought to have been used at different times, with the name Ahhiya first occurring in the Indictment of Madduwatta, a text dated to 1450-1430 B.C. (*KUB* 14.1 + *KBo* 19.38 sec. 12; GÜTERBOCK [*supra* n. 9], 133-134 and 138; and BRYCE [*supra* n. 9, 1989b], 298-299; and CLINE [*supra* n. 32], 121, giving a date of c. 1400 B.C.), and with Ahhiyawa appearing only later, beginning with texts of the reign of Murshili II, ca 1330-1300 B.C. (GÜTERBOCK [*supra* n. 9], 134-135; BRYCE [*supra* n. 9, 1989b], 299-300; and CLINE [*supra* n. 32], 122). But Ahmet Ünal has recently redated fragments *KUB* 23.13, which mention the King of Ahhiyawa, from the reign of Hattushili III or Tudhaliya IV (second quarter - mid 13th century B.C.) to the Annals of



Achaean, but are they really the same place as the Achaian heartland on the Greek mainland <sup>41</sup>? For Ahhiyawa, the texts do give some hints about its geographical setting. *First*, it can't be too far from the Hittites, for a god of Ahhiyawa and a god of Lazpa were brought to Hattusha to help cure the Hittite King Murshili II <sup>42</sup>; Murshili's mother perhaps was later banished to the country of the city of Ahhiyawa <sup>43</sup>; and in a fragmentary list of boundaries probably from the reign of Muwatalli II (early 13th century B.C.), Ahhiyawa is listed together with the city of Tarhuntassa and the land of Mira, places attested in Anatolia <sup>44</sup>. *Second*, it has a seacoast <sup>45</sup>, and it has ships <sup>46</sup>. *In sum*, the location is not definite, but it would seem to be in Anatolia, on the seacoast <sup>47</sup>.

Fourth, *Millawanda/Milawata*. This city or country is also on the seacoast, or on a river, because, according to the Tawagalawa Letter, Piyamaradu, a rebel against the Hittites, escapes from Millawanda by boat, headed apparently for Ahhiyawa, before the Hittite king enters the city in search of him <sup>48</sup>.

The relation between Millawanda and Ahhiyawa is obscure, but for us remains of the highest interest. The Tawagalawa Letter indicates that connections, geographical and political, are close. Ahhiyawan subjects appear in Millawanda; and Piyamaradu seems to move easily from one to the other. But the political situation of Millawanda is not clear. Its rulers are not identified, its governmental structure not mentioned. We might wonder

---

Tudhaliya III (misprint for 'II?'). This text thus becomes the earliest appearance of Ahhiyawa, and attests the contemporaneous use of both Ahhiyawa and Ahhiya in the later 15th century B.C. ÜNAL (*supra* n. 6), 18 (no. 1) and 28; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 121, with references to earlier discussions.

- 41 Virtually all who write on this subject agree that a linguistic equation cannot be proved; included in this group of proposed equations are Milawata/Miletus, Wiliusa/Ilios, Taruisa/Troy, and Apasa/Ephesus. Because proof is lacking, some have refused to entertain any likelihood that they might be true: first and foremost F. SOMMER, *Die Ahhijava-Urkunden* (1932); and most recently, ÜNAL (*supra* n. 6); MELLAART (*supra* n. 32), 415-416; and DICKINSON (*supra* n. 5), 253: "unproved and unlikely." Others, however, have found the similarities too numerous to dismiss as mere coincidence; indeed, on the balance, the equations cohere with indications from historical and archaeological sources. I am following this approach here. This position received eloquent expression at the Plenary Session of the General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, December, 1981: GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9), MELLINK (*supra* n. 10), and E. VERMEULE, "Response to Hans Güterbock", *AJA* 87 (1983), 141-143.
- 42 KUB 5.6 ii 57,60; GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9), 134; MELLINK (*supra* n. 10), 140; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 122.
- 43 KUB 14.2; GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9), 134; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 122.
- 44 KUB 31.29; BRYCE (*supra* n. 9, 1989b), 302; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 123.
- 45 According to the Ten-Year Annals of Murshili II and the Tawagalawa Letter. The Ten-Year Annals of Murshili II: KBo 3.4 ii 28-32, iii 3-5; GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9), 135; BRYCE (*supra* n. 9, 1989b), 299-300; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 122. The Tawagalawa Letter: KUB 14.3; GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9), 135-137; MELLINK (*supra* n. 10), 140; BRYCE (*supra* n. 9, 1989b), 300-301, giving a date during the reign of Hattushili III; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 123-124.
- 46 As indicated in the Sausgamuwa Treaty, a treaty between Tudhaliya IV and Sausgamuwa, king of Amurru (a vassal state in Syria): KUB 23.1; GÜTERBOCK (*supra* n. 9), 136; MELLINK (*supra* n. 10), 140-141; BRYCE (*supra* n. 9, 1989b), 304-305; and CLINE (*supra* n. 32), 124.
- 47 As I state below, I think this is the Aegean coast. Some, however, prefer the Sea of Marmara: ÜNAL (*supra* n. 6), 27-28 (SW end and S shore); MACQUEEN (*supra* n. 33), 39-41 (Thracian shore); and MELLAART (*supra* n. 32), 416 (also in Thrace).
- 48 The adventures of Piyamaradu occupy a significant place in the Tawagalawa Letter, but this document is also extremely important for its mentions of Ahhiyawa and Millawanda; see *supra* n. 44. For additional comments on the location of Millawanda/ Milawata, see *supra* n. 9; GARSTANG and GURNEY (*supra* n. 32), 80-81 and *passim*. Dissenters from the orthodox identification of Milawata as Miletus include JEWELL (*supra* n. 31), 394-399, who placed it near the present mouth of the Gediz River, Northwest of Izmir -- might she today select Panaztepe, under excavation only after she wrote?; and MACQUEEN (*supra* n. 33), 39-41, who located it on the south coast of the Sea of Marmara.

whether it ever was an independent city state, or, as Trevor Bryce has proposed, was in different periods a vassal of, variously, the Hittites and Ahhiyawa<sup>49</sup>.

This nebulous information allows much scope for the imagination. For now, let us place Wilusa in northwest Anatolia, Arzawa in the central west, and Millawanda at Miletus in the southwest. The enigmatic Ahhiyawa can lie in the Aegean coastal zone, comprising all settlements with Mycenaean type pottery and other artifacts. If we leave out Troy, a special case<sup>50</sup>, such sites stretch from Panaztepe, north of Izmir, with small tholoi and other Mycenaean remains<sup>51</sup>; to Limantepe, the Bronze Age settlement of Clazomenae<sup>52</sup>; through Colophon, South of Izmir, with small tholoi<sup>53</sup>; to Ephesus (=Apasa?)<sup>54</sup>, Iasos<sup>55</sup>, and Müsgebi in the Bodrum peninsula<sup>56</sup>. Millawanda/Miletus would surely be part of this group, and so would the important offshore islands of Chios, Samos, Kos, and Rhodes<sup>57</sup>.

How does this definition of Ahhiyawa relate to the larger question of the Eastern, Anatolian frontier of the Mycenaean world? Let us first note four important contradictions in our basic understanding of the Mycenaean state and of Mycenaeans in Anatolia.

1) Homer has conditioned us to think of a Mycenaean world as divided into small local polities. But the Hittites speak of a King of Ahhiyawa<sup>58</sup>.

2) The modern division of the Aegean into Greek and Turkish sections has conditioned us to separate the Eastern Aegean shore, that is, the Turkish shore, from the

49 BRYCE (*supra* n. 9, 1989a), 19-20: Ahhiyawan "perhaps by the early 13th century". Also HOUWINK TEN CATE (*supra* n. 9), 146.

50 The extensive writings about Troy by Greek authors, from Homer on, affect any interpretation of Mycenaean remains at Troy. See the publications of two symposia: L. FOXHALL and J. DAVIES eds, *The Trojan War, its Historicity and Context. Papers of the First Greenbank Colloquium, Liverpool, 1981* (1984); and M. MELLINK ed, *Troy and the Trojan War. A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984* (1986). For results from the current excavations at Troy, see the series *Studia Troica* (1991-).

51 The latest annual report on the current excavations at Panaztepe: A. ERKANAL, "1991 Panaztepe Kazısı Sonuçları", *XIV. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı, I. Ankara, 25-29 Mayıs 1992* (1993), 495-502. See also E. FRENCH, "Mycenaean Greece and the Mediterranean World in the LH III", *Traffici micenei*, 278-279; Y. ERSOY, "Finds from Menemen/Panaztepe in the Manisa Museum", *BSA* 83 (1988), 55-82; and M.-H. GATES (*supra* n. 35), 259.

52 Excavations resumed in 1992 under the direction of Hayat Erkanal. See M.-H. GATES (*supra* n. 35), 258; and for finds before 1979, MEE (*supra* n. 1), 125.

53 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 125-126.

54 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 127; BAMMER (*supra* n. 33), 14-38; and M. MELLINK, "Archaeology in Anatolia", *AJA* 96 (1992), 135-136.

55 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 129-130; LAVIOSA (*supra* n. 27); M. BENZI, "I Micenei a Iasos", *Studi su Iasos di Caria. Bollettino d'Arte, Supplemento al N. 31-32* (1985), 29-34; and, for a summary of Iasos in all periods, F. BERTI, "Iasos di Caria", *Arslantepe, Hierapolis, Iasos, Kyme. Scavi archeologici italiani in Turchia* (1993), 188-247 [Turkish translation in an accompanying volume: "Karia Iasos'u", pp. 119-142].

56 MEE (*supra* n. 1), 137-142. See also C. ÖZGÜNEL, "Selçuk Arkeoloji Müzesinde Saklanan Miken Pyxisi ve Düşündürdükleri", *Belleten* 51 (1987), 535-547; in this presentation of a LH IIIA:2 pyxis from the region of Tire, Özgünel comments extensively on the finds from Müsgebi, and to a lesser extent on Panaztepe, Beşiktepe, and surveys in Western Anatolia.

57 Most recently, with references: J. DAVIS, "Review of Aegean Prehistory I: The Islands of the Aegean", *AJA* 96 (1992), 699-756, especially 725-726 and 743-752.

58 C. THOMAS, "The Nature of Mycenaean Kingship", *SMEA* 17 (1976), 93-116, especially p. 116 on a possible Hittite view of Mycenaean kingship, assuming that Ahhiyawa = the Mycenaean world; and BRYCE (*supra* n. 9, 1989a), 5-6. But see V. DESBOROUGH, *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors* (1964), 218-219 (Ahhiyawa = the entire Mycenaean world, which was ruled by a single ruler, based at Mycenae).



sea and the Greek mainland. But through most of its recorded history the Aegean has been a unified cultural area <sup>59</sup>.

3) The splendid ruins of Mycenae, Tiryns, and Pylos and their Homeric leaders have conditioned us to place the Mycenaean heartland on today's mainland Greece. But Miletus and Ephesus continued to be great cities in later Greek and Roman times; their urban development surely hid or destroyed much of their Late Bronze Age components, causing us to underestimate the East Aegean sector of the Mycenaean world <sup>60</sup>.

4) The Mycenaean pottery of the East Aegean was long thought to be imported, yet now analyses of the clay from especially Miletus and Rhodes show that much was locally made <sup>61</sup>.

The implications of these contradictions upon the evidence provided by archaeology and texts are as follows: The Aegean basin, its west and east shores and the islands in between, must be considered as a unified region in the Mycenaean period, with the east shore being an integral part of the Mycenaean world, not a thin coastline of transients from the West Aegean <sup>62</sup>. Mycenaeans may indeed have existed on these central and southern East Aegean shores from the Middle Bronze Age, as on mainland Greece, equal partners in the development of the Late Bronze culture of the region.

Archaeology defines the Anatolian frontier of the Mycenaeans as the coastal cities of what would later be called Ionia, Caria, and Doris <sup>63</sup>. The Hittite texts give us the states that lie just inland, Wilusa to the north, Arzawa to the immediate east, Lukka to the southwest. The Hittite texts also give us Ahhiyawa. This Ahhiyawa, in Hittite eyes ruled by a king, may well be the unified Aegean world of the later 15th, 14th, and 13th centuries B.C., stretching from the East Aegean shores which the Hittites would naturally know best, across the islands to the great settlements of Central and Southern Greece.

When considered separately, archaeological and textual evidence present lacunae and much uncertainty. Combining them, one might think, should only further muddy the waters. Yet they both exist, and they must have a relationship. We must do our best to understand that relationship, admitting uncertainties, but being ready to modify our views when better evidence becomes available. The Mycenaean frontier in Anatolia is still a porous boundary; future research should allow us to fill in the holes.

Charles GATES

59 Contemporary politics often color interpretations of the past. Pertinent to our region and period is the recent controversy concerning relations between the Aegean, the Near East, and Egypt raised by M. BERNAL, *Black Athena I* (1987); see discussions by Sarah Morris, Patricia Bikai, J.D. Ray, James Muhly, and Martin Bernal in *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 3 (1990), 53-137.

60 For the effects of erosion, see MACQUEEN (*supra* n. 33), 38.

61 GÖDECKEN (*supra* n. 17); and R. JONES ed., *Greek and Cypriot Pottery. A Review of Scientific Studies* (1986), esp. 281-314 and 501-510.

62 This thesis seems to have been advocated by F. CASSOLA, *La Ionia nel mondo miceneo* (1957), but the book was not available to me; see the review by MELLINK (*supra* n. 2). In this light, it is interesting that Voigtländer has identified Milesian (or vicinity) pottery at Tiryns, from later LH IIIB:2: VOIGTLÄNDER (*supra* n. 8), 17, 20-21, and 24.

63 Mycenaean pottery from the few well-known inland sites is either extremely rare (Beycesultan) or absent (Aphrodisias). Beycesultan: MEE (*supra* n. 1), 124. Aphrodisias: MEE (*supra* n. 1), 124; and JOUKOWSKY (*supra* n. 35), 164. For detailed treatments of LBA finds from the Maeander Valley and North Caria, see the following studies by Ronald Marchese: R. MARCHESE, "Late Mycenaean Ceramic Finds in the Lower Maeander River Valley and a Catalogue of Late Bronze Age Painted Motifs from Aphrodisias", *Archaeological Journal* 135 (1978), 15-31; *The Lower Maeander Flood Plain. A Regional Settlement Study* (1986), 77-94; and *The Historical Archaeology of Northern Caria. A Study in Cultural Adaptations* (1989), 33-37.

## DISCUSSION

**F. Gschnitzer:** Firstly, there is no basis for the equation of Miletus and Millawanda, because we now know that the name of Miletus never had a digamma: not \*Miláwatos, but Milátos (*i.e.* /Milátiai/ in Linear B). Secondly, I sympathise with your idea that the western coast of Asia Minor and the larger islands off the coast were part of the Mycenaean World; that would mean, I think, a part of the Greek-speaking world in Mycenaean times. But there is a great difficulty. There are no traces of pre-Ionic or pre-Aeolic Greek dialects in Asia Minor or on Lesbos or Chios or Samos. There are also no traditions about Greek tribes who should have been in that area before the Ionians and the Aeolians. The inner unity of Ionic dialects is so thorough-going that I cannot believe that this unity was formed in the second millennium. It must be of a more recent origin. All the traditions say that the Ionians and the Aeolians came from the Greek mainland.

**C. Gates:** About Miletus not being Millawanda, yes, the argument which you have made has been made by others, but that seems to be the minority position, as far as I can tell from the outside. People like H. Güterbock and others have decided that on balance it is more likely that they are the same place despite this objection which you have raised. This question I must leave to people like you and Güterbock. I was just adopting the majority position for the purposes of my argument. Secondly, the problem of lack of traces of pre-Ionic dialects in East Greece: you have raised an important point, one that I will have to take into consideration.

**W.-D. Niemeier:** I would like to mention that I am starting this summer a project to study the old material and to carry out new excavations at Miletus, to look for answers exactly to the very questions which Charles Gates has asked today.

**S. Dietz:** C. Gates was talking about a Mycenaean empire with one king. Where was this king? What was the center from which he functioned? As I see it, Mycenaean Greece was not united; it consisted of many states.

**C. Gates:** The Hittite texts mention Ahhijawa. It has to be placed somewhere. The Hittites say that it has a king, but they do not mention its capital city as far as I know; they do not place the king at any particular spot. Now, these are two conflicting views of the Mycenaean world. I do not pretend to have worked out all of the contradictions in these two approaches, but it seemed to me that the Hittites's understanding of the western neighbour could be overlaid on what we know archaeologically and textually about the Aegean region; so they do not blend completely, but they overlay.

**E. Bloedow:** We know from later history that people in large quantities usually move for very good reasons. Have you any idea from where the Mycenaeans were coming and why they were moving?

**C. Gates:** I made two suggestions in the paper. The more reasonable one is that the Mycenaeans are coming into the area from the western Aegean beginning in the later fifteenth century, when the name Ahhijawa is first attested and when the Mycenaean type pottery begins. The second and more speculative suggestion was that they were there earlier, at least from the beginning of the LBA, developing in place like their compatriots on mainland Greece.

**G. Kopcke:** C. Gates has given us various options how to interpret pottery that is found in foreign environments. In this case I think it can be excluded that this is a kind of fashionable imitation by natives. It can also be excluded that the pottery at least around 1200, which is of considerable quality, is imported. K. Gödeken has analysed the pottery and said that much of it is locally produced. Now, the style helps us; and, I think that it quite unambiguously tells us that a settled, very high level, purely Mycenaean style developed there. This is unthinkable, if this had been done by natives. We know the work of natives, we know the way things tend to go when they are repeated for one reason or another in a foreign environment by people who have not grown up in the same tradition. We are dealing around 1200 at Miletus with resident potters of the highest sophistication when it comes to making this Mycenaean pottery.

**W.-D. Niemeier:** Just to add some information: It has been argued by W. Voigtländer in a paper in the volume *Milet 1899 - 1980*, suppl. 31 of *IstMitt* (1986) that there are LH IIIB pottery imports from the Argolid at Miletus. This is now confirmed by new still unpublished clay analyses done by H. Mommsen of the Institute of Nuclear Physics of Bonn University.