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In 1924 Emil Forrer announced that he had discovered references to the Mycenaean Greeks in the Hittite texts. Since then scholars have debated the issue of whether the Ahhiyawans of the Hittite documents were in fact the Mycenaean Greeks of the Bronze Age. This thesis will examine the evidence for contact, trade or otherwise, between the Hittites and the Mycenaean Greeks and will discuss whether the Hittites were aware of the Mycenaean Greeks. It will also examine the evidence for the Mycenaean Greek’s settling areas of western Anatolia, which caused frustrations for the Hittites evident in the Hittite texts, and the reasons why there is limited evidence for contact by the Mycenaean Greeks with inland Anatolia and the heart of the Hittite Empire. Finally, it will explore the writings of later time periods to gather evidence for the relationship between the Mycenaean Greeks and the Hittites based on later Greek involvement in Asia Minor. It is necessary to study these later Greek sources as most of the sites the Mycenaean Greeks were settling and trading with in the Bronze Age had continual occupation. These sites were also where the Greeks in later periods settled and with which they traded, as is evident in the writings of Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo and, to some extent, Homer. The reasons the later Greeks settled and traded with these areas were much the same as for the Mycenaeans in the Bronze Age. The later Greeks were seafarers as well and therefore pursued trade and settlement with coastal and fluvial areas as the more logical and easier choice; such was the case with Magna Graecia. In later periods trade also did not regularly occur with inland Asia Minor
as the geographical difficulties inland from the Aegean coastline remained the same as in the Bronze Age. Therefore, the writings of later Greek periods will add some insight into why and how the Mycenaeans were trading and settling the areas examined in this thesis.

Chapter Two entitled “Contact Points” evaluates the likely points where the Mycenaean Greeks made contact with the Anatolian mainland and the surrounding islands, and through which their existence might have become known to the Hittites. For the purposes of this thesis this chapter will examine the archaeological evidence from a few of the main sites on the Anatolian mainland and the surrounding islands, in particular Miletos, Müskebi, Rhodes and Troy (Fig. 1.1). The type of contact will also be investigated in relation to these sites to see if they were merely trading points or Mycenaean settlements. Finally, this chapter will discuss the possible reasons why the Mycenaean Greeks needed these trading points and settlements on the Anatolian mainland and surrounding islands.

Chapter Three “Trade and Exchange” will explore the reasons why there is so much archaeological evidence for Mycenaean contact with the Anatolian coastline, but only limited evidence for contact with inland Anatolia and the heart of the Hittite Empire (which is often an argument for the Hittites having limited knowledge of the Mycenaean Greeks). These reasons include the Mycenaeans as a ‘seafaring people’ (therefore trade with coastline or fluvial settlements would be natural), the geographical difficulties involved in penetrating the Anatolian interior from the coast, the evidence that the Mycenaean Greeks had other trade networks with Cyprus, the Levant and Egypt (all
coastal or fluvial areas), and that these trade networks possibly provided the Mycenaeans with all the commodities that they needed. The idea that these trade networks were similar to those prevailing in later periods will also be considered, as well as the suggestion that the palaces were not in control of these trade routes directly.
Lastly, Chapter Four “Textual Evidence” will examine any evidence for contact between the Hittites and the Mycenaean Greeks through analysis of the Linear B tablets and the Hittite documents (Fig. 1.2 and Fig. 1.3). This chapter will deal with the controversial Ahhiyawa-Mycenaean Greece correlation proposed by Emil Forrer and the implications of this if accepted. The chapter will also examine the possible locations of Ahhiyawa such as Miletos, Crete, Cyprus, Rhodes or a location on the Greek mainland such as Pylos, Thebes or Mycenae. Furthermore, the equation of Miletos and Millawanda will be discussed, and the possible reasons for why there are Hittite-Mycenaean Greek hostilities in the Hittite documents will be explored.
Fig. 1.3: A Linear B tablet from Knossos

To begin, what evidence of contact by the Mycenaean Greeks on the Anatolian coastline and surrounding islands can be found?
Chapter Two: Contact Points

Introduction

The Aegean Anatolian coastline and adjacent islands have yielded much Mycenaean pottery and architecture. What will be established in this chapter is the extent of the contact between the Mycenaean Greeks (which for the purposes of this chapter describes the inhabitants from the whole of Greece) and the Aegean coastline of Anatolia, and why they needed this contact. Additionally, the type of contact by the Mycenaeans will be examined, whether it was restricted to trade or whether the Mycenaeans themselves settled on the Aegean coastline of Anatolia and the adjacent islands. This chapter will consider these aspects by examining some of the key sites from the Anatolian Aegean coastline and the neighbouring islands, namely Miletus, Müksebi, Rhodes and Troy, respectively. Furthermore, this contact and settlement is important as it is evident that the Hittites were aware of the Mycenaean Greeks and contact occurred between the two, as the Mycenaeans settled on the outer reaches of the Hittite empire.

Since 1876, when Heinrich Schliemann\(^1\) excavated the shaft graves at Mycenae and uncovered the apparent wealth, in the form of golden death masks, jewellery, seals, and numerous bronze weapons, questions have arisen about how Mycenae, situated in the resource-poor land of Greece, had generated this wealth.\(^2\) (Fig. 2.1 and Fig. 2.2)

---

\(^1\) Schliemann 1877:86ff, Deuel 1977:232ff, Mountjoy 1993:1
Mycenae, or the Peloponnese, may have been a hub for trade and communication, distributing raw materials such as silver, gold, copper and tin, which were obtained outside the Aegean, but which were in great demand in Greece.\(^3\) There have been many sites suggested that the Mycenaean Greeks traded with, such as Egypt, where Mycenaean wares have been found in around 20 sites, or the Levant where more than 60 sites have

\(^3\) Bryce 2006:95-96, Wood 2003:68
yielded Mycenaean wares, or Cyprus as Mycenaean pottery has been unearthed in several sites spanning the length and breadth of the island. These sites, however, give scant evidence that the Mycenaean Greeks themselves were actively visiting and trading their wares in person. Rather, it appears that these places traded with the Mycenaean Greeks indirectly through other agents (see Chapter Three). The probable place that the Mycenaeans traded with was the Anatolian Aegean coastline. The coastline of Anatolia and the surrounding islands provides substantial evidence of contact with the Mycenaean Greeks. This area is also, a little unsurprisingly, where the Greeks of the Iron Age and later periods settled. This later settlement is significant because as a result of the lack of written evidence from the second millennium B.C. I will also explore the writings of later time periods to infer where and why the Mycenaean Greeks settled on and traded with the Anatolian coastline and the adjacent islands. Herodotus says that the Greeks of later periods chose the western coastline of Asia Minor and the nearby islands as an area in which to settle outside of the Greek mainland in The Histories at 1.6, 1.26-28 and 1.141-151, particularly in the following passages,

5 Bryce 2006:98, with the exception of Cyprus and perhaps Ugarit on the Levantine coast.
In terms of climate and weather, there is no fairer region in the whole known world than where these Ionians – the ones to whom the Panionium belongs – have founded their communities. There is no comparison between Ionia and the lands to the north and south, some of which suffer from the cold and rain, while others are oppressively hot and dry.

They do not all speak exactly the same language, but there are four different dialects. Miletus is the southernmost Ionian community, followed by Myous and Priene; these places are located in Caria and speak the same dialect as one another. Then there are the Ionian communities in Lydia – Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedus, Teos, Clazomenae, and Phocaea – that share a dialect which is quite different from the one spoken in the places I have already mentioned. There are three further Ionian communities, two of which are situated on islands (namely, Samos and Chios), while the other, Erythrae, is on the mainland. The Chians and Erythraeans speak the same dialect, but the Samians have a dialect which is peculiar to themselves. So these are the four types of dialect spoken.\[^7\]

\[^7\] Herodotus *Historiae* 1.142, ed. Rosén
\[^8\] Herodotus *The Histories* 1.142 trans. Waterfield. Passage 1.145 is also important here as Herodotus states that the Ionians originally came from the Peloponnese: δυώδεκα δε μοι δικέουσι πόλιας παρασχαθαι αι Ἴωνες και γυμ' ἐθελήσαν πλεύνας εσδέξασθαι τούδε εἴνεκα, οτα και οτε ἐν Πελοπόννησῳ οίκεαν, δυώδεκα ἴν αϊτῶν μέρεα, κατὰ περὶ νῦν Ἀχαιῶν τῶν ἐξελασάντων Ἴωνας δυώδεκα ἐστι μέρεα: Πελλήνη μὲν γε πρῶτῃ πρὸς Σικυώνος... ed. Rosén
The Dorians from the region now known as Five Towns (though it used to be called Six Towns) do much the same… For this offence, the five towns – Lindos, Ialysos, Camirus, Cos and Cnidos – excluded the sixth town, Halicarnassus, from making use of the sanctuary. So that was the penalty imposed by the five towns on the Halicarnassians.9

So much for the Ionian communities. The Aeolian ones are as follows: Cyme (that is, ‘Phriconian’ Cyme), Lerisae, New Walls, Temnus, Cilla, Notium, Aegiroessa, Pitane, Aegaeae, Myrina and Gryneia. These are the eleven original Aeolian communities which remain from the twelve there used to be on the mainland, until one of them, Smyrna, was taken over by Ionians. In actual fact, the land these Aeolians occupy is more fertile than that owned by the Ionians, but it does not have such a good climate.10

9 Herodotus Historiae 1.144, ed. Rosén
10 Herodotus The Histories 1.144 trans. Waterfield
11 Herodotus Historiae 1.149, ed. Rosén
12 Herodotus The Histories 1.149 trans. Waterfield
These passages, therefore, show that the Greeks settled the western coastline of Asia Minor and the surrounding islands in the later periods and this is the same region in the Bronze Age that exhibits Mycenaean settlement and contact.

**Miletus**

Miletus, situated on the south-eastern coastline of Anatolia, lay south of the Meander River on the horn of the Meander Gulf (Fig. 2.3).

The once sea-side city now lies 4 miles or 6.44 kilometres from the sea, and the Bronze Age harbour has vanished owing to thousands of years of silt deposits from the Meander River.

---

**Fig. 2.3: The Promontory of Miletus**

Excavations at Miletus suggest that Minoans settled on the site in the first building phase c.1600 B.C. in the Middle Minoan Period. This first building phase was destroyed by fire, perhaps, as Mountjoy suggests, as a result of an earthquake. In the

---

14 Wood 2003:162, Mee 1978:134
16 Mountjoy 1993:170, Mee 1978:135
second building phase at Miletus Minoan elements such as architecture and pottery were supplanted by distinctly Mycenaean ones. This phase most likely coincided with the rise of the Mycenaean to power in the Aegean, and the collapse of the Minoan “Empire”. It has been argued, however, that on the basis of the pottery evidence there was no sudden transition from Minoan to Mycenaean culture at Miletus but rather a steady rise in the level of Mycenaean activity. The argument is moot as there is insufficient archaeological evidence to determine whether the change in cultural material, and therefore culture, was a gradual process or a sudden event. From the late 14th century B.C. onwards the archaeological record reveals that Miletus was definitely under Mycenaean influence. This period corresponds with the third building phase at Miletus, which has the greatest likelihood of being a Mycenaean settlement because of abundant Mycenaean pottery in the archaeological record. Moreover, a massive fortification wall, that was like Mycenaean walls elsewhere, was erected in this third phase, and Mycenaean chamber tombs were in use.

Mycenaean pottery has been found in profusion at Miletus. Varying quantities have been found spanning from LHIIIA1-LHIIIC Middle; however, sherds from LHIIA have been documented at Miletus as well. Analysis of samples of Mycenaean pottery from Miletus reveals that the pottery was both imported and locally produced. Seven

---

17 Bryce 2006:99. These include “…Mycenaean type domestic architecture and Mycenaean burials.” Bryce 1989:2, Mee 1978:135, 149
18 Bryce 2006:99
20 Mountjoy 1993:170
22 Bryce 2006:99
24 Bryce 2006:99
26 Mee 1998:139, Mountjoy 1993:172
pottery kilns have also been uncovered in the Mycenaean levels of settlement at Miletus, which also indicates that the pottery was made at the site.\textsuperscript{27} The presence of these kilns adds weight to the argument that Miletus was settled by the Mycenaean Greeks. Furthermore, the pottery assemblage from Miletus contains 95\% Mycenaean pottery, including coarse and cooking pots, and only 5\% Anatolian wares.\textsuperscript{28} When this assemblage at Miletus is compared to other sites on the Anatolian Aegean coastline such as Troy, where the Mycenaean pottery only forms 2\% of the total ceramic assemblage, the high percentage of Mycenaean pottery suggests that Miletus became a Mycenaean settlement.\textsuperscript{29} Pottery alone is insufficient evidence to state definitively that Miletus was a Mycenaean settlement, however.

In the late 14\textsuperscript{th}/early 13\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. Miletus was fortified with a large defensive wall that encircled the whole town.\textsuperscript{30} The north side of the wall was the first section to be unearthed during excavations in 1955-57 and in the excavations of 1959, 1963 and 1966 the west, south and east sides of the wall were discovered, although the corners where these walls meet were not found.\textsuperscript{31} The length of the wall has been estimated to be 1100 metres, enclosing an area of 50 000 square metres.\textsuperscript{32} This wall was erected in the early LHIIIB period and can be dated by two Mycenaean vases discovered by the northern rim of the main wall, under a smaller wall that attached to it (Fig. 2.4 and Fig. 2.5).\textsuperscript{33} These are identified as stirrup jars, dating to the LHIIIA2 and LHIIIB periods.\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{thebibliography}
\bibitem{27} Mitchell 1998-1999:153, Mee 1978:136
\bibitem{28} Mee 1998:139, Mitchell 1998-1999:153
\bibitem{30} Mee 1998:139, Wood 2003:162, Mee 1978:133, 135
\bibitem{31} Cook and Blackman 1970-1971:44
\bibitem{32} Wood 2003:162, Mee 1978:135-136
\bibitem{33} Mee 1978:135
\bibitem{34} Huxley 1960:14
\end{thebibliography}
Fig. 2.4: Common Stirrup jars from LHIIIA2

Fig. 2.5: Common Stirrup jars from LHIIIB
This fortification wall was built on a substantial burnt layer, as Miletus was destroyed by fire at the end of LHIIIA2.\textsuperscript{35} This destruction might have prompted the inhabitants of Miletus to build this defensive structure in early LHIIIB. The defensive wall had square bastions 14 metres apart,\textsuperscript{36} an architectural style that has parallels with both Hittite and Mycenaean design, such as the great ‘Cyclopean’ walls at Mycenae and Tiryns, and also the immense defensive walls of Troy and Boghaz Köy/Hattusa (the Hittite Capital) (Fig. 2.6).\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35}Cook and Blackman 1970-1971:44, Mountjoy 1993:174
\textsuperscript{36}Huxley 1960:13-14, Wood 2003:162
\textsuperscript{37}Mee 1998:139, Wood 2003:162
Perhaps the most telling evidence for the presence of Mycenaean settlers at Miletus is a Mycenaean cemetery 1.5 kilometres south-west of the city at Degermentepe. This cemetery, discovered in 1907, had around a dozen Mycenaean-style chamber tombs. These chamber tombs have the same characteristic long dromos with an oval chamber, as the Mycenaean chamber tombs on the Greek mainland (see: Müskebi), and contained Mycenaean grave goods, which included pottery from LHIIIA2, LHIIIB and LHIIIC. Chamber tombs on the Greek mainland became the prevailing way of burying the dead from LHIIIA1-LHIIIC, but LHIIIA2 was the period in which chamber tombs are most frequent on the Greek mainland. This use of chamber tombs at Degermentepe, then, is contemporaneous with the use of chamber tombs by the Mycenaeans on the Greek mainland.

These typically Mycenaean chamber tombs with Mycenaean grave goods indicate that the Mycenaeans settled in Miletus. This cemetery evidence, coupled with the evidence of the huge fortification wall, and the preponderance (95%) of Mycenaean pottery in Miletus provide compelling evidence that Miletus was a Mycenaean settlement, just as it was an important Classical Greek settlement. The presence of imported Mycenaean wares further indicates that trade occurred between Miletus and the Mycenaeans, either from the mainland of Greece or from the surrounding islands such as Rhodes. Before Rhodes is reviewed, however, it is necessary to examine Müskebi.

---

42 Mountjoy 1993:126
43 Mountjoy 1993:126
44 Even though these walls are similar to Hittite walls as well, it would seem, that given the other evidence, there were Mycenaean settlers at Miletus.
45 Mee 1998:140
46 Herodotus *The Histories* 1.15-21, 1.142, ed. Rosén
another site on the southern Halicarnassus Peninsula with possible evidence for contact with or settlement by the Mycenaean Greeks.

Müskebi

Müskebi (or Müsgebi) is situated in the interior of the Halicarnassus Peninsula on the Aegean coastline of Anatolia (Fig. 2.7).\textsuperscript{47} It is a large Mycenaean necropolis discovered in the excavations of 1962-1964 and is the site of 48 Mycenaean chamber tombs.\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig_2.7}
\caption{Map of coastline of Anatolia}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{47} Bryce 2006:99, Mountjoy 1993:172, 174
At Müskebi 24 chamber tombs were in use in LHIIIA2 and in LHIIIB-LHIIIC Early the chamber tomb cemetery was still utilised but it was much smaller.⁴⁹ These chamber tombs were a simpler, smaller version of the elaborate tholos tombs, such as the Treasury of Atreus (Fig. 2.8).

Chamber tombs had long dromoi that were cut through the rock with stomia (doorways) that were closed by stones that were moved for each successive burial (Fig. 2.9 and Fig

⁴⁹ Mountjoy 1993:172, 174, 175
At the end of the *dromos* and *stomion* there was an oval chamber where the deceased was placed on the floor with grave offerings of weapons, jewellery and pottery.\(^{51}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Mountjoy 1993:126

\(^{51}\) Mountjoy 1993:126
The 48 chamber tombs at Müskebi have typical characteristics of short, steep *dromoi* and narrow *stromia* and the oval chambers had dimensions ranging from 0.49-9.08 square metres.\(^{52}\) At Müskebi inhumation was the common method of burial, although at least three cremations have been found.\(^{53}\) Cremation was an Anatolian custom that was also employed intermittently on Rhodes and Cos in the LHIIIC period.\(^{54}\) Excavations at Channia near Mycenae have also uncovered cremation burials, showing that this method of burial was also being used on the Greek mainland in the LHIIIC Late phase.\(^{55}\)

The grave offerings at Müskebi are characteristically Mycenaean. They include bronzes, jewellery (some with semi-precious stones) and pottery.\(^{56}\) All the pottery sherds from the chamber tombs at Müskebi are Mycenaean.\(^{57}\) The pottery ranges from LHIIIA1-LHIIIC Early, although the majority of the pottery is from the LHIIIA2-LHIIIB periods.\(^{58}\) Some of the pottery seems to have been imported from the Argolid and Rhodes.\(^{59}\) The pottery types recovered from the chamber tombs at Müskebi include deep *kylikes*, stirrup jars, straight-sided *pyxides*, three-handled jars and low one-handled cups (Fig. 2.11).\(^{60}\)

\(^{52}\) Mee 1998:138  
\(^{54}\) Mountjoy 1993:25, Bryce 2002:179, explains Hittite funerary practices: “But the bodies of kings and queens were, it seems, invariably consigned to the pyre. This in contrast to their counterparts in the Mycenaean world and Egypt. Here royalty and nobility were interred with their bodies intact, as evidenced by the Mycenaean shaft graves and tholos tombs, and the Egyptian New Kingdom cliff tombs in the Theban Valley of the Dead. The Land of Hatti had no funerary architecture on this scale.”  
\(^{55}\) Mountjoy 1993:26, 27  
\(^{57}\) Cook and Blackman 1970-1971:48  
\(^{59}\) Mountjoy 1993:174  
\(^{60}\) Cook and Blackman 1970-1971:48
The archaeological evidence indicates that Müskebi was inhabited by Mycenaean settlers, or at least that this was the place that the Mycenaeans who had settled on the Halicarnassus Peninsula buried their dead.\(^6\) The Mycenaean grave goods and Mycenaean

pottery, and the most frequent use of the chamber tombs occurring in LHIIIA2,\footnote{Which coincides with the height of the use of Chamber tombs on the Greek mainland.} corroborates that Müskebi was a Mycenaean burial ground. Moreover, chamber tombs, which are a distinctly Mycenaean form of burial, were being used at Müskebi, and inhumation was more frequent here than the Anatolian rite of cremation.\footnote{Mee 1982:87} This use of cremation suggests that these were Mycenaeans who were buried at Müskebi and who lived around this area.\footnote{Mee 1982:87} These chamber tombs are much like the ones used at the proposed Mycenaean settlement at Miletus to the north and the chamber tombs used on the island of Rhodes to the south, to which I turn now.

**Rhodes**

The island of Rhodes is located off the south-west coast of modern day Turkey. The Mycenaeans were active on Rhodes, especially in the LHIII phase, and therefore Rhodes is rich in Mycenaean material. Certainly Rhodes was one of the most important centres outside of the Greek mainland during the LHIIIA1 and onwards.\footnote{Mountjoy 1993:171} Two of the key Mycenaean sites are the Bronze Age town of Trianda and the Mycenaean chamber tomb cemetery of Ialysos (Fig. 2.12). Sir Alfred Biliotti excavated at Ialysos in 1868-1871 and uncovered 41 Mycenaean chamber tombs.\footnote{Mountjoy 1993:1, Mee 1982:8, Jones and Mee 1978:462} Between 1914 and 1928 Maiuri and Jacopi excavated Ialysos further and unearthed 60 and 28 chamber tombs respectively.\footnote{Mee 1982:1, 8, Jones and Mee 1978:462} Trianda was excavated by Monaco in 1935-1936.\footnote{Mee 1982:1}
Like Miletus, Trianda on the northern coast of Rhodes began as a Minoan settlement.⁶⁹ Evidence of Mycenaean contact can be detected as early as LHIIB since Mycenaean pottery dating to this period has been found alongside Minoan ceramics in the Minoan settlement at Trianda.⁷⁰ During the LHIIIA1 period Trianda was abandoned and Minoan activity came to an end on Rhodes.⁷¹ The succeeding Mycenaean settlement has not been found, although the chamber tombs at Ialysos were still being utilised until
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⁶⁹ Mountjoy 1993:169, Mellink 1983:139
⁷⁰ Mountjoy 1993:169
⁷¹ Mountjoy 1993:169
the LHIIIC Middle period. In LHIIIA1, however, the Mycenaean pottery imports at Trianda and also an increase in the number of chamber tombs in use at Ialysos. A small number of LHIIA sherds have been found at Trianda in stratum IIB, along with two LHIIB sherds and 24 LHIIIA1 sherds. The 24 LHIIIA1 sherds are from goblets, cups and piriform jars. On the basis of this evidence we can say that the Mycenaeans began to settle on Rhodes by LHIIA1. At the site of Ialysos LHIIB-IIIA1 Mycenaean pottery was also present, the majority of which was imported from the Argolid. This importation of pottery further suggests that the settlers on Rhodes were from Mycenaean Greece. In the LHIIIA2 period the settlement pattern changed on Rhodes. Whereas the Mycenaeans previously had only settled on the north-western coast at sites such as Trianda and Ialysos, they were now settling on the west and south of the island as well, bringing with them vast amounts of LHIIIA2 pottery. Mee reports that 23 LHIIIA2 sites have been discovered, which is incontestably more than the six sites in LHIIIA1. Much of the pottery imported from the Argolid was of a high standard, and clay analysis conducted on the pottery from this and the later phases of LHIIB and LHIIIC confirms that the pottery was imported from the Argolid. However, the clay analysis evidence from Ialysos indicates that Mycenaean potters themselves were also established on
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72 Mountjoy 1993:169, 170, Jones and Mee 1978:462, 463
73 Mountjoy 1993:169
74 Mountjoy 1993:169
76 Mee 1982:6
77 Mee 1982:6, Mountjoy 1993:169
78 Mee 1982:6, Jones and Mee 1978:462
79 Mee 1982:6, Huxley 1960:26
80 Mee 1982:83
82 Mee 1982:83
83 Mountjoy 1993:169, Jones and Mee 1978:468-470
Rhodes.\(^{84}\) Of the pottery found from this period were many \textit{kylikes} decorated with Octopi (clearly a favourite design) and another \textit{kylix} was decorated with birds (Fig. 2.13).\(^{85}\) Large piriform jars were also popular containers on Rhodes (Fig. 2.14).\(^{86}\) These \textit{kylikes} were produced or imported as luxury items, whereas the large jars were used to store and transport other commodities such as wine, perfumed oils and, probably, olive oil.\(^{87}\)
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\(^{84}\) Mee 1982:83  
\(^{85}\) Mountjoy 1993:171  
\(^{86}\) Mountjoy 1993:171  
\(^{87}\) Vermeule 1972:255, Mountjoy 1993:163, Cadogan 1993:93, more on pottery styles and there uses in Chapter Three.
The LHIIIB period seems to indicate less pottery importation, possibly because there were fewer tombs in use at Ialysos. This decrease in importation gives the sense that this was a period of decline, especially in the north of Rhodes, but it is hard to establish definitively whether this was the case. This is because the tombs were often cleared for later burials (in LHIIIC), which destroyed evidence of earlier use. Of the pottery found, much was still imported, partly from the Argolid, but also from Boeotia and Attica as well. In the south of Rhodes, at sites such as the chamber tomb cemeteries of Vati and Apollakia, a great quantity of LHIIIB pottery has been unearthed.

By the beginning of LHIIIC it seems that most of the pottery was locally made on Rhodes by the Mycenaeans, although a small proportion of pottery from the Argolid, decorated in the Close style, was still imported. Clay analysis undertaken on the pottery from this period confirms that the majority of the pottery was made on Rhodes, presumably by the Mycenaeans. An example of pottery locally made on Rhodes is this stirrup jar from the LHIIIC Middle period, which is decorated with the popular Octopus motif (Fig. 2.15).
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88 Mountjoy 1993:173
89 Mee 1982:1
90 Mee 1982:29
91 Mountjoy 1993:173, Jones and Mee 1978:469, possibly Knossos as well.
92 Mountjoy 1993:173
93 Mountjoy 1993:174, 175, in the context of the phases LHIIIC Early and LHIIIC Middle. Jones and Mee 1978:461, 469
94 Mountjoy 1993:23, Jones and Mee 1978:469, 470
95 Mountjoy 1993:101
The fact that the majority of the pottery was made on Rhodes in LHIIIC, indicates that settlers from the Peloponnese had established themselves at a number of sites in the fertile north of Rhodes.\textsuperscript{96} However, the prosperous situation on Rhodes declined late in the LHIIIC period.\textsuperscript{97}

As previously discussed, the settlement at Trianda was abandoned in LHIIIA1, and no succeeding Mycenaean settlement has been found there.\textsuperscript{98} The lack of settlement sites is common on Rhodes as many Mycenaean cemeteries, such as Paradisi-Asprovilo, Tolo, Kalvarda, Lelos and Pilona (to name just a few) have been found without any Mycenaean settlements to accompany these cemeteries.\textsuperscript{99} Chamber tombs became the fashion of burial on Cos and Rhodes in the LHIIB/LHIIIA1 periods, and one of the larger chamber tomb sites on Rhodes is that of Ialysos.\textsuperscript{100} Ialysos, situated on the lower slopes of Phileremos, is a site made up of two hills, Moschou Vunara, on which 90 chamber
tombs were discovered, and Macra Vunara, which has 39 excavated chamber tombs. Biliotti excavated 41 tombs on Moschou Vunara, Maiuri unearthed 60 tombs in total (21 on Moschou and 39 on Macra Vunara) and Jacopi excavated 28 chamber tombs on Moschou Vunara. The cemetery at Ialysos was first in use in LHIIIB. Six tombs can be dated exclusively to LHIIIB-LHIIIA1 from the pottery found within them. Mee states that in this short time period (LHIIIB-LHIIIA1) 18 tombs were in use and that they were developed at random on both of the two hills, Moschou and Macra Vunara. By contrast, in the LHIIIA2 period 57 tombs were in use and once again they were scattered over both Moschou and Macra Vunara. This increase in the number of tombs in use at Ialysos gives the impression that the Mycenaens were numerous on Rhodes in the LHIIIA2 phase, and certainly as we have already seen that this was precisely when the Mycenaens were settling in a number of sites on Rhodes and elsewhere in the eastern Aegean. In the LHIIIB period there seem to have been fewer tombs in use at Ialysos and therefore there is less Mycenaean material evidence. This dearth of material may be a false impression because the tombs might have been cleared and reused for later burials in the LHIIIC period. In LHIIIC, of the 39 tombs on Macra Vunara, only six were in use. On Moschou Vunara, of the 49 tombs left 17 were robbed and therefore
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101 Mee 1982:8
102 Of these three were empty most probably due to grave robbers.
103 Mee 1982:8, dates for these excavations are mentioned above.
104 Mee 1982:1, 8, Mountjoy 1993:169
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106 Mee 1982:8
107 Mee 1982:11, 83
109 Mountjoy 1993:173
110 Mee 1982:29
111 Mee 1982:29
cannot be dated, which leaves 32 tombs.\textsuperscript{112} Of these 32 tombs 28 (scattered all over Moschou Vunara) were in use in LHIIIC, and from these 28 tombs 15 were exclusively LHIIIC from the pottery evidence, ten tombs had pottery from LHIIIA and LHIIIC; and three had pottery dating from LHIIIB and LHIIIC.\textsuperscript{113} Cremations were found in only six tombs from this time period, but in these six there were also between two and ten inhumations in each, which shows that the Mycenaean custom of burial was favoured over the Anatolian custom of cremation.\textsuperscript{114} The scattering of chamber tombs in use in the later periods suggests that perhaps more tombs were in use in these phases but that they were cleared and reused for later burials (as stated above in the case of LHIIIB).\textsuperscript{115}

From the archaeological evidence, such as the enormous quantities of Mycenaean pottery and the presence of a large number of chamber tombs, we can safely conclude that the Mycenaean settlers on the island of Rhodes and probably on the other islands in the Dodecanese, such as Cos.\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, on Rhodes this evidence is found from the south to the north of the island, which suggests widespread settlement of and trade with the Mycenaean.\textsuperscript{117} Bryce, however, takes a more conservative approach and suggests that while there were Mycenaean settlements on Rhodes, these could have been no more than enclaves of merchants living within a native population to arrange the transshipment of goods to Cyprus and the Levant.\textsuperscript{118} It is more likely, however, that the Mycenaean settlers in large numbers on Rhodes because the evidence for

\textsuperscript{112} Unfortunately as Mountjoy adds looting occurs at most cemetery sites. Mountjoy 1993:170-171. As these 17 tombs can not be dated one can speculate that some or all of these could have been in use in the LHIIIB period, which is another reason why we should not be too hasty to announce that this was a period of decline on Rhodes for the Mycenaean.

\textsuperscript{113} Mee 1982:29

\textsuperscript{114} Mee 1982:27,28

\textsuperscript{115} Mee 1982:29

\textsuperscript{116} Huxley 1960:27, Cook 1962:18, Mountjoy 1993:171

\textsuperscript{117} Mountjoy 1993:171

\textsuperscript{118} Bryce 2006:98, this could explain the lack of purely Mycenaean settlements found on Rhodes.
Mycenaean settlement is so widespread. The Mycenaeans also took advantage of the situation and position of Rhodes for their expanding trade with the eastern Mediterranean and vice versa, as it is obvious that Rhodes was another stepping stone on the trade routes to the East.119

**Troy**

Unlike the other sites discussed thus far, Troy was not a Mycenaean settlement. It does, however, appear to have been a place of contact with the Mycenaean Greeks for the purposes of trade, as Mycenaean pottery has been found at the site. Troy seems to be a trading point, as opposed to a Mycenaean settlement, as it has closer links with other inland Anatolian sites, as evidenced by the ceramic assemblage, urban construction and size, and defensive fortifications. Troy was situated on an important trade route that meant that goods from farther east travelled through it, and therefore can be likened to other important trading emporia, such as Ugarit. Troy is important for the discussion as this is probably where the Mycenaeans acquired some of their wealth from, such as gold, which is evident at sites like Mycenae.

The site of Hisarlik in the north-west of modern day Turkey has been identified as ancient Troy since the excavations of Heinrich Schliemann in 1871-1873 (Fig. 2.16 and Fig. 2.18).120 Wilhelm Dörpfeld continued excavations at Hisarlik in 1893-1894 and Carl Blegen excavated in the 1930s.121 The late Manfred Korfmann began the most recent
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119 Mee 1982:1, 82
120 Deuel 1977:187, Mountjoy 1993:23, Schliemann 1884:52-174, Schliemann believed that the Troy of Homer’s description was the second civilisation layer as he unearthed many gold artifacts that to him indicated the wealth of Priam’s Troy.
121 Blegen 1963:164, Mountjoy 1993:23
excavations at Troy in 1988 and they have been ongoing since then (Fig. 2.18).\textsuperscript{122} Troy was situated on an important trade route which extended through to the Black Sea area and we know that the Mycenaean Greeks traded with Troy. However, it does not seem that the Mycenaean Greeks settled in large numbers at Troy as the site bears similarities to other sites in inland Anatolia. There are ten layers of occupation that span over 3000 years of human settlement at Hisarlik, starting from the early Bronze Age to the Byzantine Empire (Fig. 2.17).\textsuperscript{123} The most important layers of occupation, for the purposes of this thesis, are those of Troy VI\textit{h} and of Troy VII\textit{a/Vi}.  

\begin{figure}[h]  
\centering  
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig216.jpg}  
\caption{The Troad from the Spaceshuttle (NASA)}  
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{122} Korfmann 2003:19  
\textsuperscript{123} Korfmann 2003:19, the first seven layers of settlement are the Bronze Age settlements, layer eight is the Greek settlement, layer nine is the Roman settlement and layer ten is the Byzantine settlement.
Fig. 2.17: Chronological Table as of 2000
Fig. 2.18: Excavation cycles, 1865 to 2003

The pottery found at the site of Troy suggests links to Anatolia. While Mycenaean pottery has been found in the assemblages from Troy it is only 1-2% of the total pottery found.\textsuperscript{124} This small percentage has led scholars to believe that this Mycenaean pottery was therefore imported.\textsuperscript{125} Whatever the case may be, the Mycenaean pottery can be regarded as foreign to the site as the vast majority of the pottery found is Grey Minyan ware, which consists of functional vessels constructed of grey clay that were manufactured locally (Fig. 2.19).\textsuperscript{126} In 1992 Easton concluded that the Grey Minyan ware was modelled after Anatolian pottery on the basis of similar patterns and technique of production, and that this had been the case since Troy V.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{124} Latacz 2004:39, Mee 1998:144
\textsuperscript{125} Latacz 2004:39, Mountjoy 1993:23, Mee 1998:144
\textsuperscript{126} Mountjoy 1993:23, Latacz 2004:39
\textsuperscript{127} Latacz 2004:39
at Troy was renamed ‘Anatolian grey pottery’ after 1995, as Korfmann’s excavations confirmed Easton’s conclusion.\textsuperscript{128}

Fig. 2.19: Mycenaean pottery and Anatolian Grey pottery from Troy VI. The two drinking cups at the top and the two pots in the centre are Mycenaean. The two lower pots are Anatolian Grey ware modelled after Mycenaean designs.

\textsuperscript{128} Latacz 2004:39, Korfmann 1997
Mycenaean pottery has been found at Troy dating as early as LHIIA, while LHIIB sherds and a small number of LHIIIA1 sherds have been found as well. Mycenaean pottery dating from LHIIIA2 to LHIIB, has also been uncovered in the numerous sub-levels of Troy VI. As of 1998/1999 Mountjoy dated the end of Troy VIh to LHIIIA2 as there were vast amounts of this style of pottery in the destruction stratum of this occupation level. This pottery might indicate trade between the Mycenaean Greeks and Troy, or at least close contact. There is no exact date for the destruction of Troy VIh, but the pottery evidence suggests that the event happened sometime within the first 70 years of the 13th century B.C. According to Bryce this is when the activity of the people of Ahhiyawa, the disputed name for the Mycenaean Greeks in the Hittites documents (see Chapter Four), was “most intense” on the Anatolian mainland.

The other layer of occupation which is important is that of Troy VIIa. For the most part, after Blegen, Troy VIIa was thought of as being “markedly inferior to its immediate predecessor” (Troy VIh). Yet on this point it seems that the argument is flawed as the recent excavations concur with what Dörpfeld and Blegen believed, namely that the level of VIIa should be equated culturally to level VI, and level VIh in particular. Level VIIa then should really be renamed level VIi, but as this would create
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129 Mountjoy 1993:168
130 Mountjoy 1993:169, 170
131 Mountjoy 1993:23, 170, 172
132 Bryce 1999:397
133 Mountjoy 1999, Mountjoy explains the few sherds of LHIIB pottery found in this layer are later intrusions.
135 Bryce 1999:399
136 Bryce 1999:399
137 Bryce 1999:398
confusion, as a result of the long-established labelling of Schliemann, the level shall be referred to here as Troy VIa/VIi.\textsuperscript{139} This new labelling is based on the pottery evidence that has been found in layer Troy VIa/VIi. Troy VIh was destroyed during LHIIIA2.\textsuperscript{140} In Troy VIa/VIi a few sherds of LHIIIA pottery have been found, but the majority of the pottery remnants have been from LHIIB and early LHIIC.\textsuperscript{141} Therefore Mycenaean pottery was still being imported during Troy VIa/VIi.\textsuperscript{142} By the time of Troy VIIb Mycenaean pottery was no longer imported, but local imitations were still being made.\textsuperscript{143} The site of Troy was not completely abandoned until level VIIb.\textsuperscript{144} Troy VIIb was destroyed around the same time as or just after the destruction and collapse of the main Bronze Age civilisations in the Near East and in Greece, possibly by marauders at the end of the Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{145} The evidence for the time period of the collapse can be found at Troy in layer VIIb, where only a few sherds of LHIIC pottery have been found.\textsuperscript{146} This evidence shows the downfall of the Mycenaean civilisation, as no more LHIIC pottery was imported by Troy after this period.\textsuperscript{147}

One of the greatest finds of the Korfmann excavations at Troy (level VIh) was the discovery of a lower town which stretches in an ‘elliptical shape’ south of the citadel.\textsuperscript{148} The extent of the town was established through geomagnetic readings.\textsuperscript{149} These ultimately found a ditch in 1992-1993 that was 3 metres wide and between 1.5 and 2
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metres deep, which showed indications of two gates in the southern part of the circuit (quadrants z29, A29, C29) (Fig. 2.20 and Fig. 2.21). The ditch was followed for 350 metres in the excavations of 1993. It must have been used to hinder the approach of Bronze Age ‘war chariots’ just as the ditch surrounding the Achaean camp in the *Iliad* did.

Fig. 2.20: Troia VI – Ditch in the bedrock, Lower City
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151 Becker and Jansen 1994
152 Mannsperger 1995, Homer *The Iliad* 7.336-343 and 7.433-441
Excavations in 1995 uncovered a gate in the southern part of the city in the ‘course’ of the Troy VIh ditch (quadrants y28 and y29).\textsuperscript{153} This gate interrupts the ditch for a length of 10 metres and has evidence of a rock cutting, which supported a palisade, as well as of two postholes (Fig. 2.22).\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{153} Korfmann 1996, Jablonka 1996

\textsuperscript{154} Jablonka 1996, Korfmann 1996
This discovery substantiates the idea that the ditch was part of the fortifications of the Lower Town and that the defensive wall, which lay behind the ditch, must have encircled the whole of the Lower Town. Korfmann and his team first estimated the size of the city of Troy to be 200 000 square metres, perhaps with a total population size of between 5 000 and 6 000 people, which would have been roughly comparable to Mycenaean towns at this time on the Argolid. But, since the excavations of the summer of 2003, Korfmann has now calculated the size of Troy VIh to be around 350 000 square metres (Fig. 2.23). Troy VIh, then, was a rather large city, comparable to the city of Ugarit, which covered an area of around 200 000 square metres and had an estimated population size of 7600. However, when compared with the cities of the advanced civilisations, such as Babylon, Uruk, Assur, and Hattusa of the Near and Middle East Troy was somewhat of a small place. However, it still appears from Troy VIh’s location on an important trade route and its size, that it was an important Anatolian Kingdom, possibly one of the regional capitals.
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155 Korfmann 1996, Korfmann 1997
157 Korfmann 2003:29
158 Korfmann 2003:29
159 Korfmann 2003:49
160 Wood 2005:298. The Hittite documents suggest that the site of Troy (probably the place named Wilusa in the texts) was a Hittite vassal state that seemed to be of some importance. More on the Hittite documents in Chapter Four.
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Fig. 2.23: The Troia Lower City, as it was in the 2nd millennium B.C.E.

The archaeological evidence, of pottery (95% of the assemblage being Anatolian) and the extent of the lower town, suggests strong links between the site of Hisarlik and the Hittites from Anatolia. Latacz argues that because Troy VIh, VIIa/VIi had not only a citadel but also a large lower town, it should be reclassified as an “old near-eastern royal seat and trading centre”.\(^\text{161}\) The fortifications of the citadel and the lower town support this link to Anatolia as they bear stronger resemblance to Anatolian urban construction of the second millennium B.C.E. than to that of Mycenae.\(^\text{162}\) One such resemblance is the defensive ditches at Troy, which were not a part of the composition of Mycenaean towns but were part of the defense of Anatolian urban sites such as Boğazköy,

\(^{161}\) Latacz 2004:37
\(^{162}\) Latacz 2004:37
Karkemis/Jerablus and Tell Halaf.\textsuperscript{163} Also in Anatolia, during the Hittite period, towers were an essential part of the perimeter walls of the towns. This is clearly evidenced in the period of Troy VI where the towers are a very prominent part of the citadel wall.\textsuperscript{164} (Fig. 2.24, Fig. 2.25 and Fig. 2.26)

\textsuperscript{163} Latacz 2004:37
\textsuperscript{164} Latacz 2004:38
Excavations have yielded more archaeological evidence for links to Anatolia. For example in 1995 a bronze effigy of an Anatolian deity was found in a house from Troy VIIa/VIIi, in the Lower Town residential quarter southwest of the citadel mound. This find suggests that at this time of around 1200 B.C.E. at least one person or household at Troy worshipped Anatolian deities. Another artefact found at Troy, through Korfmann’s excavations, which suggests links with Anatolia is a small round, biconvex-bronze seal with Luwian hieroglyphs inscribed on it. This seal, found in 1995 in a house inside the citadel wall (Blegen’s house 761 in the western end) from the early Troy VIIb2 level (Fig. 2.27), is the first confirmed prehistoric or pre-classical inscription from Troy. Luwian was a language that was spoken in the south and west of the Hittite empire and which was used by the Hittites mainly in seals and monumental inscriptions.

Fig. 2.27: Hieroglyphic Luwian seal (Troia VIIb).

165 Korfmann 1996, Latacz 2004:40
166 Latacz 2004:40
167 Korfmann 2003:38, Latacz 2004:49
169 Hawkins and Easton 1996, Latacz 2004:49
In spite of these possible links to Anatolia the ceramic evidence suggests that there was trade between Troy and the Mycenaean Greeks. The recent excavations at Troy confirm that Mycenaean imports from the Argolid were present among the ceramic assemblage, as analysis of the sherds’ chemical and isotopic compositions proved their origin. There was also a Minoan trade route to Troy, that possibly extended through to the Black Sea area, which the Mycenaeans would have taken control of when they expanded and absorbed the Minoan empire, as evidenced by their gradual dominance over sites such as Trianda and Ialysos on Rhodes and Miletus. Troy would have been an important trading post as it is situated on the Hellespont and the Dardanelles at the entrance to the Black Sea. This location, therefore, suggests that many tradable items passed through Troy, such as copper and gold from the Balkans and the Caucasus, as well as tin, amber and perishable items such as horses, textiles, salt, wood, fish and probably slaves. There is evidence for the slave trade or slave raids in the Linear B tablets from Pylos, where many tablets refer to female slaves whose ethnicity seems to be of Asian origin (See Chapter Four for more on the Linear B tablets and the mention of female slaves in them). Other artefacts such as weapons and breastplates of Near Eastern origin also reached the Troad, which again shows that the route for trade must have gone through Troy.

Troy was in all likelihood a “forced port of call”, as the narrow straits through the Dardanelles made sailing very difficult. Prevailing north-easterly winds required
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171 Knacke-Loy, Satlr and Pernicka 1995
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176 Latacz 2001:7, Mee 1998:144. This is because when an ancient mariner and his ship sailed through to the Black Sea, he was sailing almost straight into the prevailing north-easterly winds and against the strong
trading ships to shelter in Beşik Bay, which lies 8 kilometres to the south-west of the
citadel of Troy and acted as Troy’s harbour. Troy, consequently, was a major trading
centre and entrepôt much like Ugarit, and this would have made it an ideal trading city
for the Mycenaean Greeks.

Why this contact?

The question now arises: Why did the Mycenaean Greeks need these trading
points such as Troy and these overseas settlements such as Miletus and Rhodes? It could
have been to expand their territory in a warlike or piratical nature, as Bryce speculates.
However, it seems more likely, as Bryce continues that their intention was to produce
wealth through commerce, and to establish trade routes with access to land overseas, so
as to procure resources that were otherwise scarce on the Greek mainland. Examples
are gold, tin and copper or arable farmland or perhaps resources that leave little or no
trace in the archaeological record such as slaves. All these trade goods could readily be
supplied from Anatolia or the trade route through Troy to the Black Sea. Therefore this
evidence indicates why the coastline of Anatolia was invaluable to the Mycenaean
Greeks. Moreover, there are more sites along the Anatolian coastline that have yielded
Mycenaean wares than those discussed above, such as Clazomenae, Panaztepe,
Colophon, Ephesus and Cos. These sites add further weight to the notion of Mycenaean Greeks actively trading with the Anatolian coastline in the Bronze Age.

Conclusion

We return then to the original question of how the Mycenaean Greeks, and in particular Mycenae itself situated in the resource-poor Greece, generated their apparent wealth. The most likely answer is their extensive trade and contact with the Anatolian coastline and the surrounding islands. Troy was undoubtedly an important trading contact for the Mycenaean Greeks as a great deal of the resources that they desired, such as gold, came through Troy from the Black Sea region and beyond. The Mycenaean Greeks were noticeably active along the Anatolian coastline as the archaeolgical evidence, such as the Mycenaean-style chamber tombs and the Mycenaean pottery sherds, confirms the settlement of Mycenaean Greeks at Miletus, Müskibi and the island of Rhodes. These might have been enclaves of merchants within a native population, but more likely were Mycenaean settlements. What is clear is that the Hittites must have been aware of the Mycenaean Greeks trading and settling on the western border of their empire, much as the Persians were aware of the Greeks in Classical antiquity.

The questions that arise out of this and which will be discussed in the following chapter are, what type of Mycenaeans were trading with the Anatolian coastline? Were they individual opportunistic merchants or were the palaces in control? And since we have this evidence for trade and contact by the Mycenaean Greeks on the coastline of
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Anatolia, then how is it that there is little evidence for contact with inland Anatolia and therefore direct contact or trade with the Hittites?
Chapter Three:  
Trade and Exchange

It is clear from Chapter Two that there are numerous sites on the western coastline of Anatolia from which Mycenaean pottery has been recovered. The question still pending is why is there little to no evidence for trade with the heart of the Hittite Empire, that of central Anatolia? There are many factors that could have caused this lack of trade or evidence for lack of trade, such as geological or geographical problems, the idea that the Mycenaean Greeks were a seafaring people and therefore trade with the coastline of Anatolia would have been much more achievable, and the fact that the Mycenaean Greeks had other trade networks to places such as Cyprus, Egypt and the Levant that could have supplied them with everything they needed or desired. It could also have been that the Greek palaces did not exclusively control these trade routes and individual Greek merchants or enclaves of Greek merchants were in control of them.

The majority of the sites where evidence for trade with the Mycenaean Greeks can be found are clearly coastal emporia and some important river networks, such as Egypt (Fig. 3.2, Fig. 3.12 and Fig. 3.13).\(^1\) Even at Miletos and Ras Shamra (Ugarit), where there is evidence for permanent Mycenaean settlement, the evidence for trade does not seem to permeate more than a decent distance beyond Levantine and Anatolian coastlines.\(^2\) In the case of the Anatolia this is because the coastline was more accessible.
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\(^1\) Vermeule 1972:255  
\(^2\) Vermeule 1972:255
than inland areas for the Greeks and therefore easier to trade with than the landlocked Hittite seat of power. The whole of the Anatolian coastline is essentially cut off from the interior by large mountain ranges. Miletos, for example, tended to look outwards towards the Aegean for trade as this was much more straightforward, with the great harbour that Miletos had, than overland trade with inland Anatolia. This is because the Latmus Mountain region at the mouth of the Meander River is a natural barrier for trade between Miletos and inland Anatolia. The way in which Miletos could trade with inland Anatolia was for the merchant to re-board his ship and travel across the Bay to the mouth of the Meander River, thereafter to unload the goods and to send them via land up the river valley (Fig. 3.1 and Fig. 3.2).

Fig. 3.1: Map of the South Aegean Islands and Miletos with the Bay
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3 Bryce *The Major Historical Texts of Early Hittite History*:1
4 Cook 1962:61
5 Bryce 2006:84
6 Cook 1962:51
This inland trade route can be shown to be unpopular, as even in the 6th and 7th centuries B.C. Miletos looked outwards to the Aegean for trade, establishing colonies on the surrounding islands and further afield in the Black Sea region but not in inland Asia Minor. This access to eastern Aegean trade, therefore, would have been why Miletos was an ideal location in Anatolia for the Mycenaens to establish themselves. The mountain ranges along the western Anatolian coastline also made coastal communication difficult, as they run out in long headlands, such as that where Miletos is situated. As a result of these headlands, the islands along the Anatolian coastline, such as Rhodes and Cos, were important for coastal trade and communication because they acted as a bridge for these activities to occur (Fig. 3.1 and Fig. 3.2).

Fig. 3.2: Trade Routes in the Bronze Age
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8 Cook 1962:17-18
9 Cook 1962:17-18
It seems that Mycenaean wares were rarely transported to inland areas; however, there are some depictions of this occurring (Fig. 3.3).\(^{10}\) Where the occasional finds of Mycenaean material in inland Anatolia have occurred at Fraktin and the Lake Burdur region, these have usually been jars (stirrup jars) or oil containers.\(^{11}\) These would have gone up the caravan routes possibly passing through the hands of several merchants.\(^{12}\)

Mycenaean trade occurred in coastal and fluvial areas because the Mycenaeans were a seafaring people, as was discussed in the previous chapter.\(^{13}\) This capability is also outlined in Thucydides, a 5\(^{\text{th}}\)-century view on the early Bronze Age, where he explains the origins of seamanship in Greece in his work *The Peloponnesian War*,

\[\text{Δίνως γὰρ παλαίτατος ὃν ὀκνή ἵσμεν ναυτικὸν ἑκτήσατο καὶ τῆς νῦν Ἐλληνικῆς βαλάσσης ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐκράτησε καὶ τῶν Κυκλάδων νήσων ἦρξε τε καὶ οἰκιστής πρώτος τῶν πλείστων ἐγένετο, Κάρας ἕξελάσας καὶ τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ}\]

\(^{10}\) Mountjoy 1993:167
\(^{11}\) Vermeule 1972:255
\(^{12}\) Vermeule 1972:255
Minos, according to tradition, was the first person to organise a navy. He
controlled the greater part of what is now called the Hellenic Sea; he ruled over
the Cyclades, in most of which he founded the first colonies, putting his sons in
as governors after having driven out the Carians. And it is reasonable to suppose
that he did his best to put down piracy in order to secure his own revenues.  

For in these early times, as communication by sea became easier, so piracy
became a common profession both among the Hellenes and among the
barbarians who lived on the coast and in the islands. The leading pirates were
powerful men, acting both out of self-interest and in order to support the weak
among their own people.  

The Greeks’ affinity with the sea was also apparent in later time periods. Athens’ port,
the Peiraeus, which was a booming commercial centre in the 5th and 4th centuries B.C., is
only the best known example of such a harbour with far-flung connections. Once again

Thucydides provides us with some evidence for continuing Greek seamanship:
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14 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.4.1, eds. Page, Capps and Rouse
15 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.4.1 trans. Warner
16 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.5.1, eds. Page, Capps and Rouse
17 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.5.1 trans. Warner
18 Casson 1991:99-101
The old form of government was hereditary monarchy with established rights and limitations; but as Hellas became more powerful and as the importance of acquiring money became more and more evident, tyrannies were established in nearly all the cities, revenues increased, shipbuilding flourished, and ambition turned towards sea-power.  

Later the Ionians were a great naval power. This was in the time of Cyrus, the first King of the Persians, and of his son Cambyses. Indeed, when they were fighting against Cyrus, they were for some time masters of all the sea in their region. Then Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos, made himself powerful by means of his navy. He conquered a number of the islands, among which was Rhenea, which he dedicated to the Delian Apollo.

These extracts show that the Greeks were a seafaring people in later periods and therefore suggest the possibility that the Greeks of the Bronze Age too were seafarers. However, our knowledge of Bronze Age freighters or cargo ships is lacking as we are ignorant about the number of crew needed to man the ships and the size of the storage
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19 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.13.1, eds. Page, Capps and Rouse
20 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.13.1 trans. Warner
21 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.13.6, eds. Page, Capps and Rouse
22 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.13.6 trans. Warner
The slow-moving cargo ships were propelled by the typical Bronze Age square-rigged sail and oars as the surviving depictions have shown (Fig. 3.4).

Because the Bronze Age ships were designed with the square-rigged sail they were predominantly designed to sail with the wind. The art of tacking against the wind was at this time underdeveloped because the square-rigged sail made the process difficult; it could be done but, as Casson points out, inefficiently. This square-rigged sail and the sailing techniques that went with it were in use from the Bronze Age until the 6th century B.C., when the foremast was invented. Owing to the square-rigged sail and the inefficiency of tacking against the wind the captain of a Bronze-Age ship would have
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23 Mountjoy 1993:163
26 Latacz 2004:41, Casson 1971:273-274. Casson states that the Bronze Age ships “…could probably point no closer to the wind than seven points,” and that (Casson 1971:274 footnote 16) “Square-riggers as late as the 19th century could get no closer than six—i.e., if headed north, they could aim no better than WNW on one leg, ENE in the other.”
27 Casson 1971:70
found it easier to sail between islands, or stay closer to the shore, within visible distance to land, sailing from one landfall to the next. Hara Georgiou, on the other hand, disagrees with this view, stating that staying closer to land would have been more treacherous for the Bronze Age sailor because of the possibility of crashing into land due to storms. There is, however, evidence for the preference of sailing from one landfall to the next in Homer’s *Odyssey*, where Nestor, sailing home from Troy, island-hopped from Tenedos to Lesbos and then held a consultation with his captains to plan the next leg of their journey homewards. With reservations Nestor decided to set out straight across the open sea instead of sailing from one island to the next, and then landed safely on the southern tip of Euboea, where he sacrificed to Poseidon “...because we had passed that great stretch of sea.”

28 Casson 1991:40
29 Georgiou 1993:360-361
30 Casson 1991:40
31 Casson 1991:40
32 Homer *Odyssey* 3.179 trans. Shewring
While half of the people still held back, keeping on shore with their shepherd Agamemnon, the other half of us went aboard and began our voyage; the ships sailed fast, for the god had now smoothed the sea with its underworld of waters. We came to Tenedos and offered sacrifice to the gods, longing to be home; but return so soon was not the design of Zeus; unpityingly, he brought disastrous dissension on us a second time. Some of us turned their vessels Troyward again; these were the comrades of King Odysseus the subtle-witted, and now once more they fell in with the wishes of Agamemnon.

I myself fled homewards with all the ships that had come with me, because I was sure that the god intended evil. Brave Diomedes
likewise fled and urged his comrades to make for home. Then, somewhat later, King Menelaus came to join us; he overtook our ships at Lesbos as we pondered over the long sea-journey that remained – should we sail north of craggy Chios and close to Psyra, keeping that island on our left, or south of Chios, past gusty Mimas? We were asking the god to show us some sign, and this he did, counselling a mid-ocean passage towards Euboea to escape disaster as soon as might be. Then a fair wind came whistling over us; our vessels raced through the teeming sea-paths, and during the night reached harbour at Geraestus; then we laid on Poseidon’s altar the thighbones of many bulls, because we had passed that great stretch of sea. It was the fourth day when the comrades of Diomedes moored their ships off the coast of Argos; but I myself held on for Pylos, and the fair wind never slackened, from the hour when the god sent it forth to blow.\footnote{Homer \textit{Odyssey} 3.155-183 trans. Shewring}

Admittedly Homer wrote in the 8\textsuperscript{th} or 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries, but what he describes of the ships in the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} fits in well with what is known of both the ships of his time and the ships of the Bronze Age Aegean.\footnote{Casson 1971:43} He even omits from his descriptions the ram, which was a prominent feature of ships in his time, and the triaconter, a 30 oared vessel, which was also in use in Homer’s day.\footnote{Casson 1971:44-45, 49}

More evidence to suggest that sailing between landfalls was the norm for the Bronze Age sailor is that in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century the Greeks still employed the same sailing technique. Thucydides describes how, early in the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians
sided with the Corcyraeans over the Corinthians as their island lay on the route from Greece to Italy and Sicily. This meant that the captain of a ship navigated the shortest distance of open water between the Greek mainland and Italy and once there could sail down the coast of Italy to Sicily.

The general belief was that, whatever happened, war with the Peloponnese was bound to come. Athens had no wish to see the strong navy of Corcyra pass into the hands of Corinth. At the same time she was not adverse from letting the two Powers weaken each other by fighting together; since in this way, if war did come, Athens herself would be stronger in relation to Corinth and to the other naval Powers. Then, too, it was the fact that Corcyra lay very conveniently on the coastal route to Italy and Sicily.

The discoveries of two Bronze-Age shipwrecks by George Bass off the coast of south-western Turkey have greatly increased the understanding of Bronze-Age ships and the widespread trade that took place in this time period. The first ship was found off Cape Gelidonya and excavations began in 1960 (Fig 3.2). It was a small ship 8-9 metres in length and was perhaps Syrian or Cypriot in origin. The ship, which has been dated
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37 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.44.2, eds. Page, Capps and Rouse
38 Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.44.2 trans. Warner
40 Casson 1991:26
to c.1200 B.C. on the basis of the artefacts it was carrying, was sailing west from Cyprus
or the Levant carrying copper ingots and bronze tools (Fig. 3.5). 42

Fig. 3.5: Copper ingots from the Cape Gelidonya shipwreck

The second shipwreck that was discovered in 1982, west of the previous
shipwreck, was much larger. 43 The ship of Ulu Burun was found 8 kilometres offshore
from Kaş and at the time it sank was sailing from east to west (Fig. 3.2). 44 Owing to the
nature of its cargo Ulu Burun has been likened to a royal consignment. 45 The ship was
transporting 10 tons of copper ingots, which equates to some 500 ingots, and this was the
main component of the cargo. 46 There was also one ton of tin, which amounts to the
correct ratio to mix copper and tin together to make bronze. 47 The second largest
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42 Vermeule 1972:229, Bryce 2006:123
43 Casson 1991:26
45 Casson 1991:26
these copper ingots were “…carefully stowed in rows deep in the hull.”
component of the cargo, after the copper ingots, was terebinth resin (used to make perfume), which was found packed into amphoras (Fig. 3.6). \[48\]

Other items included fragments of gold and silver, a solid gold cup, raw ivory, hippo teeth, ingots of raw glass, logs of African ebony, and a consignment of Cypriot ceramics (which were 18 pieces in total packed with care in a huge clay jar). \[49\] The cargo of the Ulu Burun wreck displays how geographically widespread the Bronze Age trade networks were (Fig. 3.7). \[50\] The copper and pottery would have come from Cyprus, the resin and glass form the Near East and the ebony and hippo teeth from Egypt. \[51\] There were also other objects such as Near Eastern cylinder seals, Egyptian scarabs, a
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\[48\] Casson 1991:26-27  
\[50\] Korfmann 2003:46, Casson 1991:27  
Mycenaean seal, and pieces of Mycenaean pottery. On the basis of these artefacts the Ulu Burun wreck has been dated to c.1300 B.C. It is likely that there was at least one Mycenaean passenger or trader on board as is evidenced by the Mycenaean seal and a Mycenaean style globed pin that were also found amongst the wreckage.

Fig. 3.7: Provenance of the cargo of the Uluburun shipwreck

These shipwrecks illustrate the types of commodities exported and imported by the Bronze Age cities and settlements. On the Greek mainland there is a stark imbalance
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54 Bass 1986:296, Pulak 1988:37, most probably a Mycenaean trader because of the nature of the ship.
between the visible imports and the exports found around the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{55} The Mycenaean exports were primarily the Mycenaean pots,\textsuperscript{56} in particular closed shapes such as stirrup jars and piriform jars in various sizes, which were used to hold wine, perfumed oils and probably olive oil (Fig. 3.8).\textsuperscript{57} Alabastra and amphoriskoi were used to hold honey and possibly spices such as mint, coriander, and cumin (Fig 3.8).\textsuperscript{58} The settled enclaves of Mycenaean merchants overseas, at places such as Miletus or Rhodes, produced the more fragile pottery, such as drinking cups and vases, and the pots with pictorial decoration, such as the amphoroid and the stemmed and ring-based kraters, were imported as luxury items (Fig. 3.8).\textsuperscript{59} Other Mycenaean exports included forged bronze weapons and, in addition to the archaeologically untraceable items mentioned above (wine and olive oil) there were probably textiles, timber and mercenary soldiers.\textsuperscript{60} The imports, as has been demonstrated by the shipwrecks above, were most probably raw materials that were worked by Mycenaean craftsmen. These raw materials, attested from the archaeological remains, included bronze and tin from Canaan; bronze from Cypriot mines; silver and gold from Troy; ivory and spices from the Levantine coast; and faïence, alabaster, and gold from Egypt.\textsuperscript{61}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Vermeule 1972:255
\item Presumably this was not only for the pots but the contents inside them as well.
\item Vermeule 1972:255, Mountjoy 1993:163, Cadogan 1993:93
\item Mountjoy 1993:163
\item Mountjoy 1993:163, Vermeule 1972:255
\item Vermeule 1972:255
\item Vermeule 1972:255-257
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Fig 3.8: Vessels utilised in Exchange and Trade

The extent of the widespread trade networks in the Bronze Age is apparent, as many sites other than those mentioned in Chapter Two have yielded Mycenaean wares. These trade routes to places such as Cyprus, the Levant and Egypt, all of which appear to have supplied the Mycenaean Greeks with the commodities they needed and desired, were routes that the Minoans used before the Mycenaeans, and they are similar to the trade routes the Greeks had in later time periods. Casson explains that in the 5th and 4th centuries Athens imported items such as wine, figs, nuts and slaves from Asia Minor, papyrus and flax from Egypt, preserved fish from the Black Sea, dates, incense and wine.
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62 Casson 1991:100-103
from Syria and furniture from Miletos. Mycenaean wares have been found at Cyprus, along the Levant and in Egypt to varying degrees. These wares bear witness to both extensive trade and settlement.

Cyprus

![Fig. 3.9: Cyprus](image)

Much Mycenaean pottery has been found in Cyprus, but none dating before the LHIIA period. In this period the Mycenaean pottery has been found at Ayia Irini (Fig. 3.9), while in LHIIB Mycenaean wares have been uncovered in Cyprus at Enkomi (Fig. 3.9). Mycenaean pottery in the LHIIIA1 phase is rather more common in sites around the Mediterranean and it is found in several sites on Cyprus, these being Enkomi, Maroni, Kalavassos, Milea, Katydata, Hala Sultan Tekke, and Kourion (Fig. 3.9).

The LHIIIA2 period saw the exportation of Mycenaean wares increase and, therefore, Mycenaean trade expanded to a great extent on Cyprus. A large volume of
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LHIIIA2 pottery has been uncovered on Cyprus with the most popular shapes being stirrup jars, piriform jars, straight-sided alabastra, amphoroid kraters (Fig. 3.10), jugs and flasks.\textsuperscript{68} Owing to the amount of pottery found on Cyprus in the LHIIIA2 period it is natural to assume that there were Mycenaean settlers there at this time;\textsuperscript{69} however, clay analysis has proven that the pottery was imported, obviously in abundance.\textsuperscript{70} Moreover, the burial style and architectural elements on Cyprus still exhibited the local techniques and there is minimal Mycenaean unpainted every-day pottery that usually denotes Mycenaean settlement.\textsuperscript{71}

Fig. 3.10: Amphoroid Krater from Enkomi and a Straight-sided Alabastron

In the LHIIIB phase more Mycenaean pottery has been recovered than from the previous LHIIIA2 phase.\textsuperscript{72} This contrasts with the decrease in the amount of pottery found on Rhodes in the LHIIIB phase compared to the LHIIIA2 period.\textsuperscript{73} Once again the

\textsuperscript{68} Cadogan 1993:93, Mountjoy 1993:171
\textsuperscript{69} As there appear to be on Rhodes in this time period, see Chapter Two.
\textsuperscript{70} Mountjoy 1993:171-172
\textsuperscript{71} Mountjoy 1993:171-172, Cadogan 1993:94
\textsuperscript{72} Mountjoy 1993:174, Stubbings 1951:37
\textsuperscript{73} Mountjoy 1993:173, Mee 1982:1. See Chapter Two as the LHIIIB phase may not necessarily be one of decline on Rhodes.
popular shapes were piriform jars, stirrup jars and amphoroid kraters, but deep bowls and ring-based kraters join the list. The majority of pottery dating to this phase has been found at such sites as Enkomi, Kourion, Hala Sultan Tekke and Kition (Fig. 3.9); however, there is still no evidence for Mycenaean settlement on Cyprus, and the majority of the pottery comes from Cypriot burial contexts. Another piece of evidence to suggest that Mycenaens were not settling on Cyprus at this time (at least in large numbers) is that some of the pottery found on Cyprus includes shapes uncommon on the mainland, which suggests these styles of pottery were being produced exclusively for export to Cyprus. These uncommon shapes include shallow bowls, chalices, and ring-based kraters adorned in the Pictorial Style, (Fig.3.11).

Fig. 3.11: A Shallow Bowl and a Ring-based Krater with stags from Enkomi

The LHIIIC Early period indicates the arrival of Mycenaean settlers as most of the Mycenaean pottery is at this time locally made. Mycenaean pottery has been found at sites such as Enkomi, Kiton, and Sinda as well as central sites and western coastal
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76 Mountjoy 1993:174. It seems, for this pottery to be buried with Cypriots.
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sites (Fig. 3.9). More evidence to indicate that Mycenaeans and Mycenaean craftsmen were now settling on Cyprus is that bronze greaves, oxhide ingots and ivory carvings with a Mycenaean influence have been found, along with the Naue II sword (a common Mycenaean sword of this time period). In comparison to the LHIIIC Early period, the Mycenaean pottery of the LHIIIC Middle phase is not common around the Mediterranean, but it was still locally produced on Cyprus by the Mycenaean settlers. In the LHIIIC Late period on Cyprus a new style of pottery appears that was labelled the Proto-White Painted ware. It is an amalgamation of local Cypriot and local Mycenaean decoration and shapes.

From the evidence presented above it is clear that the Mycenaean Greeks were trading extensively with Cyprus. It is also apparent, from the local production of Mycenaean pottery, that by LHIIIC Early the Mycenaeans were settling on Cyprus. However, unlike sites such as Rhodes and Miletus, these settlers were fewer in number and established themselves in the native population, as is evident from the Cypriot architectural features, such as burial style, and the pottery, and because minimal Mycenaean unpainted every-day pottery has been found. This pattern of extensive trade but sparse settlement by the Mycenaean Greeks is similar in the Levant, which I will examine now.
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Levant

Mycenaean wares have been found in around 60 sites along the Levantine coast, at places such as Ras Shamra (Ugarit), Minet el Beida (port of Ugarit), Byblos and Tell Abu Hawam, to name only a few (Fig. 3.12 and Fig. 3.13).

Fig. 3.12: The Levant/Near East and Cyprus

LHIIA is the earliest phase of Mycenaean pottery to appear in the Levant, and was found at Lachish, Tell el Ajul and Byblos (Fig 3.12 and Fig. 3.13). As there is only a
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small quantity of this pottery Vronwy Hankey suggests that it was a result of trade, but most likely not a product of regular trade.\textsuperscript{87} It is a similar case in LHIIB, where pottery from this period is found at Amman in the Near East (Fig 3.12 and Fig 3.13).\textsuperscript{88} It was not until the LHIIIA1 phase when Mycenaean pottery became more extensive along the Levant.\textsuperscript{89} LHIIIA1 pottery has been found at Gezer, Tell Kazel, Tell es Salihiyeh, El Jib and Hazor (Fig. 3.12 and Fig. 3.13).\textsuperscript{90}

This progressive abundance of Mycenaean pottery increased in the LHIIIA2 phase.\textsuperscript{91} In Syria there was only a small amount of LHIIIA2 pottery because this area came under Hittite control at the end of the LHIIIA1 period; however, on the coast of the Mediterranean the site of Ras Shamra (Ugarit) continued to import large quantities of LHIIIA2 pottery (Fig. 3.12 and Fig. 3.13).\textsuperscript{92} Some of this Mycenaean pottery reached Tell Atchana (further north and inland of Ras Shamra) and much reached Jordan and Israel (Fig. 3.12).\textsuperscript{93} The inland site of Beth Shan has also yielded Mycenaean LHIIIA2 pottery, and Tell Abu Hawam has a similar amount of pottery as Ras Shamra (Ugarit) (Fig. 3.12 and Fig. 3.13).\textsuperscript{94} The popular shapes of Mycenaean pottery in the Near East in the LHIIIA2 period were much the same as for Cyprus in the same time period: piriform jars, stirrup jars, flasks, and straight-sided alabastra (Fig. 3.10).\textsuperscript{95} Another favourite was

\textsuperscript{85} Hankey 1993a:103, Mountjoy 1993:168
\textsuperscript{86} Mountjoy 1993:168
\textsuperscript{87} Hankey 1993a:103
\textsuperscript{88} Mountjoy 1993:169
\textsuperscript{89} Hankey 1993a:103, Mountjoy 1993:170
\textsuperscript{90} Mountjoy 1993:170
\textsuperscript{91} Mountjoy 1993:172
\textsuperscript{92} Mountjoy 1993:172. See Chapter Four for evidence of the Hittite control of this area.
\textsuperscript{93} Mountjoy 1993:172
\textsuperscript{94} Mountjoy 1993:172
\textsuperscript{95} Mountjoy 1993:172
the amphoroid krater decorated in the Pictorial Style (Fig. 3.10). This correlation with popular styles or shapes on Cyprus suggests that in this time period, LHIIIA2, the abundance of Mycenaean ware is a product of trade with Cyprus and the Mycenaean Greeks.

In the LHIIIB Mycenaean pottery imports to the Levant increased, as is the case on Cyprus as well. Once again, with the majority of the sites in the Levant this was probably due to intensive trade. The exceptions to these are the sites of Ras Shamra (Ugarit) and Minet el Beida, the harbour of Ras Shamra, which lay opposite Cyprus, where LHIIIB Mycenaean pottery is found in abundance, along with many Mycenaean cult figurines (Fig 3.12 and Fig. 3.13). Mountjoy proposes that there was growth in trade in the Levant because of the political stability of the time. She states that after the Battle of Qadesh Rameses II made a treaty with the Hittites, the outcome of which was that trade could flow freely within this area. The political stability once again allowed LHIIIB pottery to permeate through Syria reaching to the north at Tell Atchana (Fig 3.12). Once more there is much LHIIIB pottery at Tell Abu Hawam, and the pottery is found inland at Megiddo and Beth Shan (Fig 3.12 and Fig. 3.13). The popular shapes of the LHIIIB phase were stirrup jars and kylikes.

The LHIIIC Early period differs markedly from the previous LHIIIB period in that only a small volume of pottery from the LHIIIC Early phase has been found along
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the Levantine coast. \(^{106}\) LHIIIC pottery imports have been found at Tell Sukas in Syria, at Beth Shan, Ashdod and Sarepta (Fig 3.12 and Fig. 3.13). \(^{107}\) LHIIIC Early pottery has also been found at Tyre and Byblos but here it is possibly locally made as opposed to imported (Fig 3.12 and Fig. 3.13). \(^{108}\) This pottery volume in the Levant contrasts markedly with the same time period on Cyprus. As has been discussed above, LHIIIC Early was a time of greater expansion of Mycenaean pottery on Cyprus. \(^{109}\)

The LHIIIC Middle period saw a mixture of a few Mycenaean imports in the Levant, either from the Greek mainland or Cyprus, and local imitations. \(^{110}\) The pottery could also have been made in the Levant by Mycenaean settlers established there. \(^{111}\) The scant imports have been found at Tell Keisan and Beth Shan (Fig 3.12 and Fig. 3.13). \(^{112}\) The local copies were manufactured at Ashdod, Ekron and Akko (Fig 3.12 and Fig. 3.13). \(^{113}\) At Byblos there were also vases that were either locally made or imported. \(^{114}\) In LHIIIC Middle there was a hybrid ware that was locally made as well. \(^{115}\) This hybrid ware has been labelled Philistine Ware and it mixed the local style of red and black paint with Mycenaean LHIIIC designs, such as fish or birds. \(^{116}\) In the LHIIIC Late period no Mycenaean pottery has been found on the Levantine coast or in Egypt. \(^{117}\)

Like Cyprus, the Levant traded in abundance with the Mycenaean Greeks and at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) the Mycenaean Greeks settled. The Mycenaean pottery found at
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sites along the Levant suggests that the trade occurred with the Mycenaean Greeks on Cyprus (or at least it occurred with them through Cyprus) as there is a correlation of popular styles and shapes with Cyprus and the Levant. In Egypt, however, it appears that the Mycenaean pottery found there was a result of trade rather than settlement.

**Egypt**

In Egypt, Mycenaean wares have been discovered in around 20 sites (Fig. 3.13).\(^{118}\) The earliest Mycenaean pottery in Egypt dates to the LHIIIA phase\(^{119}\) and has been found at Saqqara and Thebes (Fig. 3.13).\(^{120}\) Some LHIIIB pottery has also been found at sites such as Kahun, Thebes and Gurob (Fig. 3.13).\(^{121}\) Much Mycenaean pottery was imported in Egypt in the LHIIIA2 period.\(^{122}\) In LHIIIA2 the Pharaoh Amenophis IV or Akhenaten moved his palace and the capital of Egypt to Tell el Amarna and LHIIIA2 pottery has been found in great profusion there (Fig. 3.13).\(^{123}\) The LHIIIA2 pottery finds at Tell el Amarna have been unearthed in numerous contexts from the palace complex itself, to the temples, to the poorer houses.\(^{124}\) LHIIIA2 pottery has additionally been located at Qantir, Tell el-Muqdam, Saqqara, Memphis, Gurob and Thebes (Fig. 3.13).\(^{125}\) Popular closed shapes of LHIIIA2 pottery in Egypt were piriform jars and flasks (Fig. 3.14).\(^{126}\) Other shapes included were shallow cups and shallow bowls and *kylikes*.\(^{127}\)

---

\(^{118}\) Bryce 2006:98  
\(^{119}\) This correlates with Cyprus and the Levant.  
\(^{120}\) Mountjoy 1993:168, Hankey 1993b:112, 113, 114  
\(^{121}\) Mountjoy 1993:169, Hankey 1993b:113, 114  
\(^{122}\) Hankey 1993b:112, Mountjoy 1993:172  
\(^{123}\) Mountjoy 1993:172, Hankey 1993b:111  
\(^{124}\) Hankey 1993b:111  
\(^{125}\) Hankey 1993b:113, 114, Mountjoy 1993:172  
\(^{126}\) Mountjoy 1993:172  
\(^{127}\) Hankey 1993b:112
Fig 3.13: A map of the Levant and Egypt to illustrate trade in the Bronze Age
Fig. 3.14: LHIIIA2 piriform jar from the bridge connecting the Great Palace with the King’s House, Tell el Amarna, and a LHIIIA2 flask from the Rubbish Heaps, Tell el Amarna

Pottery from the LHIIIB period is not found in quantity in Egypt; however, the stirrup jar was still used and imported.\textsuperscript{128} No pottery from the LHIIIC phase has been uncovered thus far in Egypt; therefore it is reasonable to assume that trade between the Mycenaean Greeks and Egypt or at least the importation of Mycenaean wares to Egypt ceased sometime in LHIIIB.\textsuperscript{129}

In the case of Cyprus and Ras Shamra (Ugarit) there appears to be a steady increase of trade with the Mycenaens from the LHIIA period onwards, which led to eventual colonisation by Mycenaean merchants and craftsmen. The rest of the Levant region produces much in the way of Mycenaean wares but this is only slight evidence of the Mycenaens themselves living in this area.\textsuperscript{130} In Egypt the Mycenaean pottery finds, which are widespread and abundant, were a by-product of trade, although it is uncertain whether the Mycenaens themselves were trading with this area or whether trade

\textsuperscript{128} Mountjoy 1993:174
\textsuperscript{129} Hankey 1993b:112, Mountjoy 1993:175, 176
\textsuperscript{130} Bryce 2006:98
occurred through an intermediary.\textsuperscript{131} In comparison there is evidence that the Minoans traded directly with Egypt.\textsuperscript{132} This can be seen in tomb paintings at Thebes, such as the one below were a Minoan man, dressed in Minoan style, is carrying a bull rhyton (Fig. 3.15).\textsuperscript{133}

It does seem, however, that the Egyptians were aware of the Mycenaeans, as a base of a statue at Kom el-Hetan in the temple of the Pharaoh Amenophis III (c.1390-1352 B.C.) has a two-part list inscribed on it that has references to Greek sites.\textsuperscript{134} This inscription is one of five inscriptions that list the important towns and regions that were of political significance and were known to the Egyptians at this time.\textsuperscript{135} On the left-hand side of the inscription is a list of mainland Greek sites, which includes Mycenae, Messenia, Elis, Nauplion and Cythera and a list of Minoan sites, which includes Knossos, with its port Amnisus, and Phaestus (the palace centres) and also a town Cydonia, which Bryce writes is the modern Khania.\textsuperscript{136} On the right-hand side of the inscription are the names Dnj and Kftw (Keftiu).\textsuperscript{137}

Keftiu most probably refers to the Minoans or Cretans and on the left-hand side are the cities that these people come from, such as Cnossos.\textsuperscript{138} Dnj has been equated with the name Danaya, one of the names the Greeks were possibly known by in the Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{139} Homer uses this name in its Greek form Danaoi (Δαναοί) interchangeably with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{131} Bryce 2006:98
\item \textsuperscript{132} Bryce 2006:98
\item \textsuperscript{133} Vermeule 1972:148ff, Bryce 2006:98
\item \textsuperscript{134} Bryce 2006:89-90, Latacz 2004:130
\item \textsuperscript{135} Latacz 2004:130
\item \textsuperscript{136} Bryce 2006:90
\item \textsuperscript{137} Bryce 2006:90
\item \textsuperscript{138} Latacz 2004:130
\item \textsuperscript{139} Bryce 2006:90, Latacz 2004:130
\end{itemize}
Achaians to name the Greeks in *The Iliad*\(^{140}\) and *The Odyssey*.\(^{141}\) This would then mean that the places on the left-hand side are where the Danaya came from, such as Mycenae.\(^{142}\) There is also a reference to Danaya in the annals of Tuthmosis III, where a prince of Danaya sent a drinking set to the pharaoh in the Levant\(^{143}\) comprising four copper beakers with silver handles and a silver flagon in ‘Kafta-work’.\(^{144}\) More evidence, this time from the mainland of Greece, which suggests that the Egyptians were aware of the Mycenaean Greeks and vice versa was the discovery, at Mycenae, of the remains of a faïence door-post that has both the birth name and the pharaonic name of Amenophis III incised on both sides.\(^{145}\) There have also been finds of six to nine faïence plaques at Mycenae, either arriving here through direct trade or through an intermediary.\(^{146}\) Six sites in the Aegean, including Mycenae, have yielded faïence artefacts that have the names of either Amenophis III or his wife Queen Teje inscribed on them.\(^{147}\) These forms of evidence add certain weight that the Mycenaeans were known to the Egyptians even if they were not trading directly with them.\(^{148}\)

---

\(^{140}\) Homer *The Iliad* 1.42, 1.90, eds. Page, Capps, Rouse, Post and Warmington

\(^{141}\) Homer *The Odyssey* 1.350, ed. Goold, Bryce 2006:90

\(^{142}\) Bryce 2006:90

\(^{143}\) Tuthmosis III was in Syria on a campaign, Latacz 2004:132

\(^{144}\) Latacz 2004:132, Kafta-work is described here as Cretan-Minoan Style. Also this is the time when the Mycenaeans occupied Knossos on Crete. Latacz 2004:133

\(^{145}\) Latacz 2004:131, Latacz also describes here the possible uses for the room such as an Egyptian consulate, Egyptian medical practice, the bedroom of an Egyptian or an Egyptian temple.

\(^{146}\) Latacz 2004:132

\(^{147}\) Latacz 2004:132

\(^{148}\) Latacz 2004:132-133
It is apparent, therefore, from the abundance of Mycenaean wares found at a number of sites all over the Aegean, Near East and Egypt, that the Mycenaeans were clearly active in overseas ventures\textsuperscript{149} in the Bronze Age, and particularly in the Late Bronze Age. It has been suggested that the Mycenaeans were not directly trading with the Levant and Egypt, but that the trade was left in the hands of other people, such as the Cypriots or the Syrians who were active traders in the Late Bronze Age,\textsuperscript{150} as the

\textsuperscript{149} Bryce 2006:98
\textsuperscript{150} Bryce 2006:98
shipwreck off Cape Gelidonya attests (Fig. 3.2 and Fig. 3.5).\textsuperscript{151} It is likely, however, that the Mycenaeans were trading directly, given the evidence presented thus far either from the mainland of Greece or from places such as Rhodes or Cyprus.\textsuperscript{152} What is to be determined is to what extent the Mycenaean palaces or royalty were involved in these overseas expeditions. To shed some light on this I will discuss the Linear B tablets in the following chapter.

From the evidence discussed above it is more than likely that the Mycenaeans settled on Cyprus and at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) on the coast of the Levant, and even if they did not settle in Egypt, it is evident that the Egyptians were in fact aware of the Mycenaeans and vice versa. The shipwreck of Ulu Burun shows that these trade routes and contacts supplied the Mycenaeans with all the raw materials and items that they required, such as copper and tin to make bronze.\textsuperscript{153} The Mycenaeans for their part provided functional and decorative pottery, as well as, presumably, what was inside these vessels—wine, perfumed oils and probably olive oil.\textsuperscript{154} Given the existence of these trade routes and the geographical and geological difficulties of trading with inland Anatolia, coupled with the accessibility of the Anatolian coastline and the sea capabilities of the Mycenaeans (discussed above), it is not altogether surprising that Mycenaean objects are rarely found in inland Anatolia. The Mycenaean contacts with Cyprus, the Levant (especially at Ras Shamra), and Egypt would have allowed the Mycenaeans and the Hittites to encounter one another while they were trading at these (Cyprus and Ugarit)

\textsuperscript{151} Bryce 2006:123, Vermeule 1972:230
\textsuperscript{152} Bryce 2006:98
\textsuperscript{153} Bryce 2006:123, Bass, Pulak, Collon, Weinstein 1986:1, Casson 1991:26, along with other commodities such as mercenaries, possibly.
emporia. But what contact did the Hittites have with the Greeks and to what extent were the Hittites aware of the Greeks?
Chapter Four: Textual Evidence

It is evident from the archaeological evidence put forward in Chapters Two and Three that the Mycenaean Greeks were active throughout the Bronze Age around the Aegean, in Egypt, along the Levantine coast and down the length of the western Anatolian coastline. This chapter will examine the textual evidence, which consists of Hittite documents that allegedly expose encounters with the Mycenaean Greeks as well as the Linear B texts, which suggest contact with Anatolia. I will review the on-going debate about the correlation between the Ahhiyawans and the Mycenaean Greeks and I will examine the possible locations of Ahhiyawa, from which the Ahhiyawans staged forays into the Hittite territory. First, though, I will address the evidence from the Linear B tablets of the Mycenaean Greeks for evidence of contact with the Hittite empire.

Linear B

The documents that have been discovered on Crete and at several sites on the Greek mainland are incised on clay tablets in a script that Sir Arthur Evans called Linear B. This script of Linear B superseded Linear A, the previous form of writing on Crete.¹ Linear B was deciphered in 1952 by Michael Ventris who found that it was an early form of the Greek language (Fig.4.1).² The Linear B syllabary consists of around 90 signs (Fig. 4.2 and Fig. 4.3).³

¹ Mountjoy 1993:21, The Linear A script is still un-deciphered.
³ Latacz 2004:146, Mountjoy 1993:21
The content of the surviving Linear B tablets is limited to the administrative activities of the palaces\(^4\) and therefore does not provide direct evidence for contact between the Mycenaean Greeks and the Hittites or any other overseas powers of the Bronze Age. The tablets, however, still provide much evidence for how the palaces were managed and for

\(^4\) Mountjoy 1993:21
culture of the Mycenaean Greeks, such as community structure, occupations and the types of people who filled them, what products were manufactured and where, and whether these products were intended for local markets and consumption or whether they were exported. Indirect evidence for contact with overseas peoples can also be inferred from these tablets.

Fig. 4.2: Chart of eighty-seven Linear B signs, with numeral equivalents and phonetic values
The majority of the tablets from Knossos on Crete were found in the LMIIIA2 destruction layer of the site, and the tablets from the mainland recovered at sites such as Pylos, Mycenae, Tiryns and Thebes were found in the LHIIIIB destruction levels of these sites.\(^5\) The tablets that have survived give us information of a small snapshot of time just

\(^5\) Mountjoy 1993:21
prior to the destructions of these sites. This is because the normal course for the records on clay tablets would have been to inscribe them, to let them dry in the sun and to store the tablets for as long as needed. Thereafter the tablets would have been destroyed or discarded. The tablets that have been discovered, at the sites mentioned above, were baked hard by the fires that destroyed these sites, preserving what was inscribed on them. This has left a more or less lasting inventory of the palaces at the time just before their destruction. It has been suggested that the main records of the palaces might have been written on perishable items such as papyrus or wood before the tablets were discarded and that this explains why no comprehensive documents on a larger time scale have survived. This destruction by fire could also have been the unfortunate case of the documents, if there were any, of correspondence between foreign powers and Greece.

The tablets at Pylos give us the most complete picture of the Late Bronze Age life at this site as over one thousand tablets have been discovered here in what appears to be an archive room of the palace. The location of tablets at Pylos contrasts with sites such as Mycenae, Thebes and Tiryns, where the tablets have been found scattered rather than in one place. The Pylos tablets show that the palace was administered by a king or ‘wanax’, and they also give a clear indication of the types of products produced by the different areas that were administered by the palace. Pylos produced flax-based textiles and linen cloth and also wool from its flocks of sheep. The tablets also give information

---

6 Mountjoy 1993:21
7 Mountjoy 1993:21
8 Mountjoy 1993:21
9 Mountjoy 1993:21
10 Mountjoy 1993:21
11 Mountjoy 1993:21, Chadwick 1967:112
12 Mountjoy 1993:21
on the metal-working industry. They note the supplies of raw material, such as bronze, and what was issued to the smiths as well as the end products of the smiths’ work, such as weapons. The palace also administered the division of land and arranged the pasturage of animals such as sheep, goats, pigs and oxen, and organised the products that came from them. Along with the land and livestock the tablets also explain that the palace managed agricultural products such as wine, figs, olives, honey and oil, and that the production of perfume with an olive oil base was an important industry for Pylos.

Mycenae appears to have produced wool, grain and oil. Nine Linear B tablets from Mycenae found in the house of the sphinxes also list spices such as cumin, pennyroyal, saffron, coriander, fennel, mint, celery seeds and sesame. Sesame would have been imported from the east and therefore suggests contact, if not direct trade with Syria, because the Greek name for sesame is a loan-word from a Semitic language. Other possible contacts with the Near East can be seen in the Linear B tablets as words such as /Aigyptios/, Egyptian, and /Aithiokɔ/s/, Ethiopian, are present in the tablets, along with /Kyprios/, Cyprus.

Contact or ties with the eastern Aegean is further suggested by the presence of what appear to be female slaves in the Linear B tablets. The Pylos tablets record some

---

13 Mountjoy 1993:21
14 Mountjoy 1993:21, Chadwick 1967:116
15 Mountjoy 1993:21
16 Mountjoy 1993:21
17 Mountjoy 1993:21, 163, Chadwick 1967:116. The three fragrances of perfume were rose, cyperus and sage.
18 Mountjoy 1993:21
19 Chadwick 1967:120, Mountjoy 1993:21
20 Ventris and Chadwick 1973:135
21 In the Linear B tablets as a₃-ku-pি-ti-jо to be read /Aigyptios/ found in tablet KN Db 1105 where it is a man’s name.
22 a₃-ṭи-jo-qa to be read /Aithiokɔ/s/ found in tablet PY Eb 156 where it is a man’s name.
23 ku-πи-ri-jo to be read /Kyprios/ found in tablet PY Cn 719 where it is a man’s name and also in the G tablets from Knossos which have descriptions of spices.
600 women, together with around the same number of children, who are linked to menial
tasks such as carrying water, spinning, preparing flax and grinding corn, which suggests
that they had a servile status.24 These groups of women appear on the tablets with their
lists of rations, which also suggests that they were slaves, as the palace controlled their
food and supplies.25 It is also clear that most were slaves as the word lawiaiai, ‘booty
women’, appears next to the groups on the tablets.26 Many of the groups on the tablets are
also described with an ethnic adjective that would suggest that their origins were other
than the Greek mainland.27 These place epithets include Lemnos,28 Cnidus,29 Zephyrus,30
Chios,31 Miletos,32 /Krokiai/,33 /Ewripiai/,34 and /Aswiai/.35 The last in the list, /Aswiai/,
occurs in the form /Aswios/ in the tablets at Mycenae and Knossos as well as Pylos.36 It
has been proposed that this is the Linear B form for Asia, or the area known as Assuwa to
the Hittites.37 Assuwa was situated north of the lands of Arzawa, Haballa and Seha and
has also been linked with a place that was later called Assos by the Greeks on the

25 Chadwick 1967:115
26 Wood 2003:159, Chadwick 1967:115
27 Wood 2003:159, Chadwick 1967:115
28 In the Linear B tablets as ra-mi-ni-ja to be read /Lamniai/ found in tablet PY Ab 186
29 In the Linear B tablets as ki-ni-di-ja to be read /Knidiai/ found in tablet PY Aa 792 and elsewhere.
30 In the Linear B tablets as ze-pu-ra to be read /Zephyriai/ found in tablet PY Aa 61. Zephyrus is the
earlier name for Halicarnassus, see Strabo Geography 14.2.16
31 In the Linear B tablets as ki-si-wi-ja to be read /Kswiai/ found in tablet PY Aa 770
32 In the Linear B tablets as mi-ra-ti-ja to be read /Milatiai/ found in tablet PY Aa 798
33 In the Linear B tablets as ko-ro-ki-ja to be read /Krokiai/ found in tablet PY Aa 354. /Krokiai/ in the
Linear B tablets equates to the Hittite name Karkia (spelt ka-ra-ki-sa or ka-ra-ki-ja in the Hittite tablets)
which was a place in western Anatolia. See the extract of the Tawagalawa Letter below (pp.102-103 ) for
reference to Karkija in a Hittite document and also for evidence that it was a western Anatolian place.
34 In the Linear B tablets as e-wi-ri-pi-ja to be read Ewripiai found in tablet PY Aa 60. E-wi-ri-pi-ja or
/Ewripiai/ means ‘straits women’. There were a number of places that had this name but it does bring to
mind the Dardanelles.
35 In the Linear B tablets as a-*64-ja (sign *64 is probably swi) to be read /Aswiai/, found in tablet PY Aa
36 Wood 2003:159. /Aswios/ found in tablets KN Df 1469 and MY Au 653.
37 Garstang and Gurney 1959:107, Wood 2003:159
southern coast of the Troad.\textsuperscript{38} All the places listed in the Linear B tablets suggest contact or ties between the Mycenaeans and the eastern Aegean, and the mention of Miletos, Zephyrus and Aswija in the tablets indicates contact with or ties to the Anatolian mainland and therefore the Hittite area.\textsuperscript{39} As was shown in Chapter Two, it is precisely at Miletos that there was a Mycenaean settlement. The other places listed might also have been colonies or places of trade but more likely were where the Mycenaeans raided and took the women and their children.\textsuperscript{40} The slave women are more likely a result of raids, first because the name lawiaiai, ‘booty women’, clearly suggests this; secondly, the women all appear to be of the same age and are accompanied by their children; and thirdly if these women had been sold at a slave market they would not have been sold in groups according to their place of origin as the slavers would hardly have bothered to do this. One would also expect that if these women were being purchased at a slave market they would have come from all over not just the one geographical region and that Knossos would have also had these women in their records too, which it does not. All this evidence therefore suggests that these women were captured in a ‘great’ raid along the western Anatolian mainland by the Pylians.\textsuperscript{41} If this was also a unique and exciting experience for these men they would have perhaps found the need to list the women in order of geographical locales to record their successful raids.

\textsuperscript{38} Latacz 2004:98, Garstang and Gurney 1959:107. Latacz points out that Assuwa could possibly be associated with Assos rather than Asia as the word Asia emerges relatively late. Phonologically, however, Aswija equating to Assos does not work because in Greek primary *-sw- is dropped (e.g. the word for ‘arrow’ *swios becomes ιόζ) and secondary *-sw- becomes -s- (e.g. the word for ‘equal’ *iswos becomes ιόζ), therefore the -sw- in Aswija could not have become the -ss- in Assos. Also the older ethnicon of Asia is Ασιά which is typical of the straits region, north-west Anatolia (e.g. Lampsakênos, Cyzikênos)

\textsuperscript{39} Chadwick 1967:115

\textsuperscript{40} Ventris and Chadwick 1973:134, Chadwick 1967:115

\textsuperscript{41} Parker 1999:495-502
The presence of slaves in the Linear B tablets is also attested in the Hittite documents. The Manapa-Tarhunda Letter deals with a raid by the Ahhiyawans, to some extent his father-in-law Piyamaradu on Lesbos. Atpa in this raid took some of the Hittite subjects and would not give them back to Manapa-Tarhunda or the Hittite King. Manapa-Tarhunda wrote the following to the Hittite King,

7. After [Piyama]radu had humiliated me, he set Atpa on my
8. [ba]ck. And (the latter) attacked the land of Lazbas.
9. And…whichever SARIPUTU-people belonged to me,
10. they all took part in this. And whichever SARIPUTU-people belonged to My Sun,
11. they all took part in it…
21. but [Piyama]radu sent Si-X-as [to him] and he spoke to him as follows:
22. “Some go[d gav]e them to you! Why should you [give] them back?”
23. Atpa, after he heard the message from Piyamaradu,
24. did not give (them) back…

Bryce explains that Hattusili III complains in the Tawagalawa Letter to one of the kings of Ahhiyawa of the taking of some 7000 of his western Anatolian subjects from the Lukka Lands into Ahhiyawan territory.

9………………………………...Prisoners in large numbers have
departed across the borders of my land, and my Brother has taken
(?) 7 000 prisoners from me.

---

42 Probable Hittite name for the Mycenaean Greeks, see below.
43 For more on Atpa and Piyamaradu see below.
44 Houwink ten Cate P. T. “Letter of Manapa-Tarhunda, KUB XIX 5 + XIX 79,” JaarbExOrLux, XXVIII, 1983
Thus the Linear B tablets and the Hittite documents complement each other by suggesting that the Mycenaens used western Anatolia as a recruiting or raiding ground for labourers for the Mycenaean palaces.\textsuperscript{47} Perhaps the Mycenaean Greeks recruited workforces from here to help build their immense fortification walls at sites such as Tiryns and Mycenae.\textsuperscript{48} Bryce points out that this would fit in with an (admittedly late) attested tradition that the walls of Tiryns were built by Cyclopes, who were giants from Lycia.\textsuperscript{49} This tradition is attributed to Strabo, a 1\textsuperscript{st} century Greek writer.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{quote}
Τῇ μὲν οὖν Τίρυνθι ὄρμηταρ ἀρμασσαί δοκεῖ Προῖτος καὶ τειχισαί διὰ Κυκλώπων, οὓς ἐπτὰ μὲν εἶναι, καλεῖσθαι δὲ γαστερόχειρας, τρεφομένους ἐκ τῆς τέχνης, ἥκειν δὲ μεταπέμπτους ἐκ Λυκίας.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

Now it seems that Tiryns was used as a base of operations by Proetus, and was walled by him through the aid of the Cyclopes, who were seven in number, and were called the “Bellyhands” because they get their food from their handicraft, and they came by invitation from Lycia.\textsuperscript{52}

Bryce also notes that these Lycians were the first millennium descendants of the Bronze Age Lukka people who lived in parts of western and southern Anatolia, which is exactly the region where Hattusili III is concerned about his subjects being taken from by the Ahhiyawans as shown above.\textsuperscript{53}

It is, however, still unclear from this evidence whether the palaces of Mycenaean Greece were indeed in direct control of the trade with overseas people. The Linear B
tablets unfortunately do not give us such exact facts as they are an inventory of the palaces and the surrounding areas. It appears, though, that the administrators of the Mycenaean palaces were very involved and efficient in the day-to-day running of the palaces and this might suggest that they were equally as involved in the trade with other people overseas. But, no direct evidence for contact between Mycenaean Greeks and any Anatolian forces can be observed in the Bronze-Age documents from the mainland of Greece. This is because, as mentioned above, the many Linear B tablets that have been discovered at Pylos do not record official communication between kingdoms or empires. As a result of this one must search the Anatolian or Hittite documents for any reference to contact between Mycenaean Greeks and the inhabitants of Central Anatolia.

**Hittite Documents and the Ahhiyawa Controversy**

The first textual evidence for contact, or more accurately, conflict between the Hittite empire and a possible Mycenaean state is in a well-known document called the ‘Indictment of Madduwwatta’ written in the early 14th century by the Hittite king Arnuwanda I. In this document Arnuwanda I refers to Attarsiya as a “Man of Ahhiya” and describes his military campaigns in western Anatolia which included 100 chariots against the Hittites. This extract of the document, sent by Arnuwanda I to a man named Madduwatta, describes how Madduwatta was helped by the Hittite king in escaping from Attarsiya,

> Subsequently Attarsiya, the Man of Ahhiya, came and sought to kill you, Madduwatta. But when the father of My Sun heard of this, he dispatched Kisnapili, troops, and chariots to do battle against Attarsiya. And you Madduwatta, offered no resistance to

---

54 Bryce 2003:59, Bryce 1999:401-402, Gurney 1990:38  
Attarsiya, and fled before him. (*Indentment §12, obv. 60-2)*

In 1924 Emil Forrer postulated that the Hittite word ‘Ahhiyawa’ and other similar variations found in many Hittite documents, such as ‘Ahhiya,’ were the Hittite forms of writing the Greek ‘Achaiwia.’ ‘Achaiwia’ later became Achaia when the ‘w’ sound was lost in Greek.

This proposal that Ahhiyawa and Achaia refer to the same thing has been debated ever since its suggestion, but most scholars now accept it because of the apparent phonetic similarity between the two words and also because, as has been shown in the previous chapters, there is substantial ceramic evidence to suggest that the Mycenaean Greeks had contact with western Asia Minor. If Mycenaean Greece cannot be equated with Ahhiyawa, then it must be accepted that there were two separate Late Bronze-Age populations that had very similar names and, according to Hittite documentation and archaeological findings, were establishing themselves in the same region of western Asia Minor at the same time. It would also suggest that the Ahhiyawans left no archaeological evidence but were nonetheless documented by the Hittites, while the Mycenaean Greeks left archaeological evidence but no traceable textual evidence.

---

56 Bryce 1999:144
57 According to Gurney, this form Ahhiya is found in only two Hittite texts, the ‘Indictment of Madduwatta’ mentioned above and an oracle text that was probably written around the same time. It is therefore seen as the older form of the name Ahhiyawa. Gurney 1990:38, also see Güterbock 1983:134. This correlation between Ahhiya and Ahhiyawa may not be the case and an absolute connection between the two is hard to prove, however, they both come into contact with the people of Anatolia, both lie on the sea and both carry out plundering raids on western Anatolia.
58 Latacz 2004:121-122, Bryce 1999:59, Bryce 2006:100. The ‘W’ sound, or letter digamma, was used by the Bronze Age Greeks as is evident in the Linear B tablets. Digamma eventually disappeared in Greek as an independent sound. Latacz 2004:160, Bryce 2006:77, Latacz 2001:3-4
59 Latacz 2004:121, 122, Bryce 1989:4
62 Bryce 1999:61, Bryce 2006:100
term Ahhiyawa may not have referred to the whole of Greece but possibly just that part of Greece controlled by a particular Mycenaean state or an island off the Anatolian coastline that was dominated by the Mycenaeans, such as Rhodes. It would seem then that scholars rightly associate Ahhiyawa with the Mycenaean Greeks, but until absolute proof is found this correlation remains circumstantial.

If the argument that the Ahhiyawans are the Mycenaean Greeks is correct, then the Ahhiyawans had to have been situated somewhere. There have been many places that have been suggested such as the Mycenaean settlements on the islands of Crete and Cyprus, or on the western Anatolian coastline. As I will show these locations for Ahhiyawa can be ruled out. The more likely location of the Ahhiyawans was either an island such as Rhodes or the mainland of Greece. In the Annals of Mursilis II Ahhiyawa is mentioned twice; however, in both circumstances the records are severely damaged, which is unfortunate as these documents may have aided in locating Ahhiyawa beyond any doubt. The Annals do, however, suggest that to get to Ahhiyawa one first had to travel to an island off the western Anatolian coastline and from there take a boat to Ahhiyawa. In this section of the Annals of Mursilis II Ulla-Lú-ši, the ruler in Apasa (Classical Ephesos), aligned himself with the Ahhiyawans. This provoked Mursilis II and he marched against Ulla-Lú-ši, whose son tried to put up a resistance. Ulla-Lú-ši escaped to an island off the coast of Apasa with his son.

63 Mee 1998:142, Bryce 1999:60
64 Bryce 2006:100
66 Güterbock 1983:134
67 Güterbock 1933:50-51
68 Güterbock 1933:66-67
69 It is also interesting to note that the Land of Arzawa, at this time, is also allied with the Land of Ahhiyawa. Güterbock 1933:58-59
I defeated Piyama-Inara, son of Uhha-LŪ-iš, together with his infantry and chariotry, and I struck him down. I pursued him again and went across into the Land of Arzawa, and went into Apasa, the city of Uhha-LŪ-iš. Uhha-LŪ-iš offered me no resistance, but fled before me and went across the sea to the islands, and there he remained.\footnote{Bryce 1998:210-211, Götze 1933:50-51}

The Annals later explain that the son of Uhha-LŪ-iš went from the above island to the land of Ahhiyawa by boat.\footnote{Götze 1933:66-67} This information from the Annals, therefore, can rule out any of the islands off the coast near Ephesos, such as Samos, as the Land of Ahhiyawa because a boat is required to take the son of Uhha-LŪ-iš from these islands to Ahhiyawa.

The problem with situating Ahhiyawa on the Anatolian mainland, besides the above evidence from the Annals of Mursilis II, is that it would have to be along the coast because Ahhiyawa is understood to have a large sea-going capacity.\footnote{Bryce 1998:60} This would mean that Ahhiyawa would have to fit into the already crowded geography of the western Anatolian coastline, which includes places such as Wilusa, Assuwa, Arzawa, Seha River land, Lukka Lands and of course Millawanda (Fig. 4.4).\footnote{Gurney 1990:44} Ahhiyawa could not be located at Miletos because Miletos equates to Millawanda\footnote{Gurney 1990:40, Millawanda is also called Milawata in some Hittite texts.} in the Hittite texts as the Tawagalawa Letter, a Hittite document, proves. It is evident from the Tawagalawa Letter that Millawanda is a coastal city because a man named Piyamaradu is described as fleeing Millawanda by ship each time Hattusili III tried to capture him.\footnote{Latacz 2004:123, Gurney 1990:40, Garstang and Gurney 1959:75-76. See below for more details pertaining to the Tawagalawa Letter.}
But when [my brother’s messenger] arrived at my quarters, he brought me no greeting and he brought me no present, but he spoke as follows: “He has written to Atpa (saying) ‘Put Piyamaradu at the disposal of the king of Hatti.’” So I went into Millawanda. But I went firm also in this resolution: “The words which I shall speak to Piyamaradu, the subjects of my Brother also shall hear them.” But Piyamaradu escaped by ship.\textsuperscript{76}

Thus Millawanda is thought to correspond to Miletos even though phonetically it does not correlate.\textsuperscript{77} Miletos would likely be Millawanda as is suggested by the places mentioned in the Tawagalawa Letter that can be identified with other Greek cities running westward from Pessinus to Miletos.\textsuperscript{78} As shown in Chapter Two it is also at Miletos where there is a large amount of archaeological evidence to suggest that there was a Mycenaean settlement, if not a colony.\textsuperscript{79} It is evident from this association that the development of place names, or names for that matter, does not always follow the same rules that are set in place for a particular language.\textsuperscript{80} Latacz explains that names are generally modified by ear to the new language that ‘discovered’ them.\textsuperscript{81} For example, the Italian word Milano is changed to Mailand in the German.\textsuperscript{82} Therefore the Hittites and the Mycenaean Greeks would have taken the place names and harmonised the names to

\textsuperscript{76} Garstang and Gurney 1959:112
\textsuperscript{77} Garstang and Gurney 1959:80, Bryce 1999:60-61, Bryce 1989:6
\textsuperscript{78} Garstang and Gurney 1959:80
\textsuperscript{79} Garstang and Gurney 1959:81, Bryce 1999:60-61
\textsuperscript{80} Garstang and Gurney 1959:81, Latacz 2004:85-86
\textsuperscript{81} Latacz 2004:85
\textsuperscript{82} Latacz 2004:86
fit with their own phonetics, thus Millawanda may be equated to Miletos and Wilusa to Ilios.\textsuperscript{83} In this way Miletos is unlikely to be Ahhiyawa.

It is further understood from the Tawagalawa Letter that the Ahhiyawan king is the overlord of Millawanda, but that he is located far away and therefore needs the agents, Atpa and Tawagalawa, to rule there.\textsuperscript{84} Interestingly the Tawagalawa Letter makes it known that Tawagalawa was the brother of the Ahhiyawan king which suggests closer ties with Millawanda to Ahhiyawa.\textsuperscript{85} This situation of brothers being in power both in their native land and in an overseas territory can be compared to a similar situation in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century. On the death of Pisistratus (the leader of Athens) his son Hippias came to power in Athens while his brother Hegesistratus ruled in Sigeum Athens’ overseas territory in Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{86} The Tawagalawa Letter, along with the information from the Annals of Mursilis II discussed above and the evidence of a ship being required to bring back a Prince to the Hittite kingdom and to Mursilis II in the fourth year of his Annals, suggests that Ahhiyawa cannot be located on the Anatolian mainland.\textsuperscript{87} Güterbock on this basis states that there is no evidence for Ahhiyawa being located on Anatolia and that the information from the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries points to the location being overseas.\textsuperscript{88} Ahhiyawa, therefore, can not be located on the mainland of Anatolia and the same applies for Cyprus.

\textsuperscript{83} Latacz 2001:5 \\
\textsuperscript{84} Garstang and Gurney 1959:81 \\
\textsuperscript{85} Güterbock 1990:158, Parker 1999:61-83 \\
\textsuperscript{86} Herodotus \textit{The Histories} 5.94 \\
\textsuperscript{87} Güterbock 1983:135 \\
\textsuperscript{88} Güterbock 1983:138
Fig. 4.4: The geography of the Hittite Empire according to Garstang and Gurney

The island of Cyprus, the finds of which were discussed in Chapter Three, has yielded much Mycenaean pottery, and had possible Mycenaean settlement in LHIII C.\textsuperscript{89} Despite this evidence, Cyprus can not be the location of Ahhiyawa as it is known as ‘Alasiya’ in the Hittite, Egyptian and Near Eastern documents.\textsuperscript{90} In fact the Hittite document the ‘Indictment of Madduwatta’, discussed above, explains also that Madduwatta and Attarsiya, the same ‘man of Ahhiya’ who tried to kill Madduwatta, joined in an attack or raid on Alasiya, which was held by the Hittites at this time,\textsuperscript{91} which suggests that Cyprus could not be the location of Ahhiyawa. This extract from the

\textsuperscript{89} Mountjoy 1993:174-175
Indictment, beginning with the Hittite King Arnuwanda’s reproach, shows the aftermath of the event and provides further evidence that Cyprus did indeed belong to the Hittites,

Since Alasiya belongs to My Majesty, [why did you attack it?]

Madduwatta replied:

When Attarsiya and the man of Piggaya made raids on Alasiya, I also made raids. Neither the father of Your Majesty nor Your Majesty ever advised me (saying): ‘Alasiya is mine! Recognise it as such!’ Now, if Your Majesty wants captives of Alasiya to be returned, I shall return them to him.

(To this, the king replied:)

Since Attarsiya and the man of Piggaya are independent of My Majesty, while you, Madduwatta, are a subject of My Majesty, why did you join them?"92

There are two other documents that confirm that Cyprus was part of the Hittite territory as a vassal state. The first is a Hittite tablet containing an inscription of Suppiluliuma II.93 This text deals with two separate wars where the Hittites are victorious over the Cypriots.94 The first war was conducted by Suppiluliuma’s father Tudhaliya IV.95

Col. I (top broken) (1-2)……

(3) [PN (or: The king of Alasiya)] with his wives, his children, [and his…] I seized;

all the goods, [with silver, gold, and all the captured people I [re]moved and [brought]

them home to Hattusa. The country of Alasiya, however, I [enslaved] and made tributary

---

92 Güterbock 1983:134, Güterbock also explains that “We do not know on what grounds Arnuwanda could claim Cyprus for himself or who “the man of Piggaya” may be…The text does not speak of conquest, and raids cannot be expected to leave tangible traces.”
93 Güterbock 1967:73
94 Güterbock 1967:73-74. Güterbock explains that the text has been discussed by scholars at length. This is because it was believed that the text described the same war twice but upon further study it is now realised that the text describes two separate campaigns against Cyprus.
95 Güterbock 1967:74, 75
The second war was lead by Suppilulima II which he won as well.  

Col. III (1) My father [………] I mobilised and I, Suppilulima, the Great King,  
immediately [crossed/reached(?)] the sea.  
(5) The ships of Alasiya met me in the sea three times for battle, and I smote them;  
and I seized the ships and set fire to them in the sea.\(^98\)

The second text that confirms that Cyprus was a Hittite vassal territory is a letter sent from the King of Ugarit to the King of Cyprus. The tone of this letter and that the king of Ugarit uses the title “my father” when he addresses the king of Cyprus makes it clear that Ugarit is a vassal state of Cyprus.\(^99\)

1. To the King of Cyprus,  
2. my father, speak!  
3. Thus (speaks) the King of Ugarit,  
4. your son:  
5. I fell down at the feet of my father!  
6. May prosperity be before my father!  
7. For your houses, your wives, your troops,  
8. for everything which (belongs)  
9. to the King of Cyprus,  
10. my father, (may there be) in the highest measure  
11. prosperity!\(^{100}\)

\(^{96}\) Güterbock 1967:77  
\(^{97}\) Güterbock 1967:75  
\(^{98}\) Güterbock 1967:78  
\(^{99}\) The title “my father” was used by vassals when they were addressing their overlords, whereas the title “my brother” was used to address kings of equal status.  
\(^{100}\) Ras Shamra 20.238 (Letter of the King of Ugarit to the King of Cyprus), English translation given to me by V. Parker.
In this letter the king of Ugarit explains to the king of Cyprus that an enemy is about to attack Ugarit and that he has no defences as his troops are in the land of Hatti and his ships are in the “land of Lukka”. The fact that the troops of Ugarit are in the land of the Hittites indicates that Cyprus was a vassal state to the Hittites by allowing its own vassal state to supply the Hittites with troops. Cyprus, therefore, much like the Anatolian mainland could not have been the location of Ahhiyawa as the Hittite documents discussed above clearly rule it out. A Linear B document can also eliminate Crete as a potential location for Ahhiyawa.

Ahhiyawa is also unlikely to be the island of Crete because a Linear B tablet has been found on Crete mentioning a place called a-ka-wi-ja-de (Fig. 4.5). This tablet refers to livestock at Knossos, not in the form of tribute, as is usually the case with sheep, but as an allotment or a gift that is being sent to this destination by the palace. The tablet reads,

Fig. 4.5: Tablet C(2) 914

102 Ventris and Chadwick 1973:208-209
a-ka-wi-ja-de / pa-ra-ti-jo Rams 50
pa-ro He-Goats 50

To Achaiwija: with Pallantios, fifty rams, fifty he-goats.103

The –de suffix indicates that a-ka-wi-ja is a place, and that fifty rams and fifty male goats are intended for this place.104 A-ka-wi-ja could be the name for a Cretan town ‘Ἀχαιώια, but the exact location of this town is unknown105 and this name of a-ka-wi-ja is not mentioned on other tablets.106 It is more likely that this is Ahhiyawa because the spelling fits the Greek original form ‘Ἀχαιώια.107 McArthur is more cautious about this suggestion and believes that the palace might not have sent livestock overseas, but Ventris and Chadwick see no reason why livestock would not be sent overseas, just as other commodities were.108 Even so, this tablet does not give a precise location of Ahhiyawa/a-ka-wi-ja, but if Crete is ruled out only somewhere in the Cyclades, Rhodes and the Greek mainland remain as the potential locations.109

It has been argued that Rhodes could not have been what the Hittites meant as the land of Ahhiyawa because the island was too small and did not have sufficient resources in land and population to be an international great power.110 It is known that the

---

103 Ventris and Chadwick 1973:209
104 McArthur 1993:127
105 There is also no evidence that this town existed on Crete in the 13th century.
109 If the above hypothesis of a-ka-wi-ja equating to Ahhiyawa is taken into account.
110 Latacz 2004:242
Ahhiyawans were able to cause problems for the Hittites on the western coastline of the Anatolian mainland and that they had a substantial seafaring capacity, much like the Mycenaean Greeks.\textsuperscript{111} Rhodes is definitely so close to the Anatolian coastline that the Ahhiyawans could have staged raids on the Anatolian mainland from here,\textsuperscript{112} and Rhodes has yielded considerable evidence that it was a Mycenaean settlement. As for the large seafaring capacity, there is no reason why Rhodes could not have had a fleet sufficient for the purpose of raiding. Certainly Vermeule believes that the Ahhiyawans were eastern Mycenaeans whose main centre was possibly Rhodes.\textsuperscript{113} Although it was almost a millennium later Rhodes in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. was in possession of a great naval fleet and was a wealthy nation as Diodorus Siculus states in his work \textit{The Library of History},

\begin{quote}

Τοῦ δ’ ἐναυσίου χρόνου διεληλυθότος Ἀθήναις μὲν ἤρχεν Εὐξένιππος, ἐν ᾿Ῥώμῃ δ’ ὑπῆρχον ὑπατοὶ Λευκίος Ποστόμιος καὶ Τιβέριος Μινώκιος. ἔπὶ δὲ τούτων ᾿Ῥοδίων ἐνέστη πόλεμος πρὸς ᾿Αντίγονον διὰ ταῖαντας τινὰς αἰτίας. ἡ πόλις ἢ τῶν ᾿Ῥοδίων ἰσχύοισσα ναυτικαὶ δυνάμεις καὶ πολιτευμένη κάλλιστα τῶν ᾿Ελλήνων περιμάχητος τοῖς δυνάσταις καὶ βασιλεύσαν ἤν, ἐκάστου σπεύδωστος εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλίαν προσλαμβάνεσθαι. προορμένη δὲ πάρρωθεν τὸ συμφέρον καὶ πρὸς ἁπάντας κατὰ ὑδαίν συντιθεμένη τὴν φιλίαν τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοῖς δυνάσταις πόλεμον σοὶ μετείχεν. διὸ πέρε συνεβαινεν αὐτὴν τιμᾶσθαι μὲν ψφ’ ἐκάστου βασιλικαίας δορεαίς, ἄγοσαν δὲ πολὺν χρόνον εἰρήνην μεγάλην ἐπίδοσιν λαβεῖν πρὸς αὐξησιν’ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γὰρ προεληλύθει δυνάμεως ὡσθ’ ὑπέρ μὲν τῶν ᾿Ελλήνων ἰδιὰ τὸν πρὸς τοὺς πειραταίς πόλεμον ἐπαναστῆσαν καὶ καθαραὶ παρέχεσθαι τῶν κακούργων τὴν θάλασσαν, τὸν δὲ πλείστον ἰσχύσαντα τῶν μνημονευμένων ᾿Αλέξανδρον προτιμῆσαν’ αὐτὴν μᾶλλον τῶν πόλεων καὶ τὴν ὑπέρ ὅλης τῆς βασιλείας διαθήκην ἐκεῖ

\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{111}] Bryce 1998:60
\item[\textsuperscript{112}] Gurney 1990:45
\item[\textsuperscript{113}] Vermeule 1972:272
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotes}
When this year had passed, Euxenippus became archon in Athens, and in Rome Lucius Postumius and Tiberius Minucius were consuls. While these held office war arose between the Rhodians and Antigonus for some such reasons as these. The city of the Rhodians, which was strong in sea power and was the best governed city of the Greeks, was a prize eagerly sought after by the dynasts and kings, each of them striving to add her to his alliance. Seeing far in advance what was advantageous and establishing friendship with each of the dynasts separately, Rhodes took no part in their wars with each other. As a result she was honoured by each of them with regal gifts and, while enjoying peace for a long time, made great steps forward. In fact she advanced to such strength that in behalf of the Greeks she by herself undertook her war against the pirates and purged the seas of these evil-doers; and Alexander, the most powerful of men known to memory, honouring Rhodes above all cities, both deposited there the testament disposing of his whole realm and in other ways showed admiration for her and promoted her to a commanding position. At any rate, the Rhodians, having established pacts of friendship with all the rulers, carefully avoided giving legitimate grounds for complaint; but in displaying goodwill they inclined chiefly toward Ptolemy, for it happened that most of their revenues were due to the merchants who sailed to Egypt, and that in general the city drew its food supply from that kingdom.
This later naval capacity suggests that Rhodes in the Bronze Age could have acquired a large fleet and wealth, much as it did in the 4th century, sufficient to have an impact on the Anatolian coastline and the Hittites.\footnote{Diodorus Siculus The Library of History 20.82-100, here Diodorus also explains that the Rhodians were powerful and competent enough to withstand a year long siege in 305/4 B.C. from Demetrius Poliorcetes. Once again Rhodes in the Bronze Age could have had this power and ability.}

Another island in a later time period to the Bronze Age became a powerful place, this provides more evidence that Ahhiyawa could be one of the islands adjacent to the Anatolian mainland. Polycrates the tyrant of Samos had a great naval strength and wealth, as Herodotus writes in 5th century B.C.,

\begin{quote}
\textit{en xro/νω δὲ ὀλίγω αὐτίκα τοῦ Πολυκράτεως τὰ πρήγματα ηδέζετο καὶ ἦν βεβομένον ἀνὰ τῇ την Ἰωνίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα—ὅκου γὰρ ἰδίωσε στρατευόμενη, πάντα οἱ ἐξώρες εὐπλείως, ἐκέπτητο δὲ πεντηκοντάροις τε ἑκατόν καὶ χίλιοις τοξόταις. ἔφερε δὲ καὶ ἦγε πάντας διακρίνοις συνενθηκή, τὸ γὰρ φίλω ἡπίο χαριεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἀποδίδους, τὰ ἐλαβε, ἢ ἀρχὴν μηδὲ λαβών. συχνάς μὲν δὴ τῶν νήσων αἰρῆκεν, πολλά δὲ καὶ τὴν ἥπειρον ἀστεῖο.\footnote{Herodotus Historiae 3.39, ed. Rosén. See also Thucydides The Peloponnesian War 1.13.6, eds. Page, Capps and Rouse}
\end{quote}

Before long Polycrates’ affairs were prospering and became the subject of conversation throughout the whole of Greece, not just Ionia, because every military campaign he directed was completely successful. He acquired a fleet of a hundred penteconters and an army of a thousand archers, and raided everyone indiscriminately—even friends, because he claimed that he would be doing a friend more of a favour if he returned what he had taken than if he had not taken it in the first place. He conquered a great many of the Aegean islands, and a number of communities on the mainland too.\footnote{Herodotus The Histories 3.39 trans. Waterfield}
Ahhiyawa, therefore, could quite possibly be an island off the coast of western Anatolia, such as Rhodes, or even in the Cyclades, for example Naxos, since in later time periods these islands were capable of establishing themselves as powerful and wealthy places. On the other hand, it has been argued that the seat of the King of Ahhiyawa, who is referred to as having independent status to the Hittite King in the Tawagalawa Letter, cannot be an island but would logically be a larger land, or situated in a larger land. Such a place would be the Greek mainland or a town situated on the Greek mainland.

On the mainland of Greece Ahhiyawa could have been any one of the main centres of the Bronze Age. Mycenae is a good candidate, since in the Iliad Homer refers to Agamemnon, the King of Mycenae, as the leader of the army against Troy, and it is here where much wealth has been found. It has also been suggested that Ahhiyawa was Pylos because of the records of foreign slaves of Anatolian origin discussed above, and the name Eteoclews (Eteocles in the Greek) has been found, which is probably identical to the Hittite name Tawagalawa. But Pylos could not be the location of Ahhiyawa because the slaves were likely acquired through slave raids and they appear exotic to the Pylians because they listed them by their place of origin. Moreover, according to the evidence of the Linear B tablets, Pylos does not seem to have held any overseas territory in Anatolia, and it is also apparent from these tablets that they did not

---

119 Due to the archaeological evidence discussed in Chapter Two
120 See Tawagalawa Letter below.
have territory in Anatolia as they raided the coastline of Anatolia and the surrounding islands.\footnote{125} Latacz has argued that Thebes was the seat of Ahhiyawa because Thebes was one of the larger kingdoms in the 13th century and controlled at least southern Boeotia and central and southern Euboea.\footnote{126} In support of this Latacz cites the first known cuneiform letter written in Hittite from the King of Ahhiyawa to Hattusa and the Hittite Great King, whereas previously all the known correspondence between Ahhiyawa and the Hittites had been from the Hittites to the Ahhiyawans.\footnote{127} The letter has been dated to the 13th century B.C. from palaeographic evidence.\footnote{128} This letter also reveals that there was previous correspondence and relations between the King of the Hittites and the King of Ahhiyawa because the Ahhiyawan King refers to a previous letter from the King of the Hittites.\footnote{129} Latacz explains that the letter deals with the issue of some islands that initially belonged to Assuwa.\footnote{130} The Hittite King must have alleged in his letter that the islands were part of his kingdom, and the Ahhiyawan King objected to this in his response.\footnote{131} The Ahhiyawan King states that an ancestor of his acquired the islands when his ancestor married his daughter to the King of Assuwa.\footnote{132} According to Latacz this ancestor is

\footnote{125}{The Pylians could have made this raid while Mycenaean Greeks were living on the Anatolian coastline or they could have raided the area when the Hittites regained control. The Hittites regained control of the Anatolian coastline from the Ahhiyawans in the reign of Tudhaliya IV as the \textit{Annals of Tudhaliya IV}, KUBXXIII 13, Recto 1-12 describes, found in Sommer 1932:314-315.}
\footnote{126}{Latacz 2004:242}
\footnote{127}{Latacz 2004:243. Unfortunately this evidence was given at a press conference in August 2003 by Frank Starke and therefore I have not been able to find the information directly from Frank Starke (and perhaps he has more information about the text or has found a text join), however the letter is in Ferdinand Sommer’s work \textit{Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden} 1932:268 Kapitel IX: Bo 1485, Text Vs. 1-20. This letter on closer inspection probably does come from the Ahhiyawan King to the Hittite King, it does deal with the issue of some islands and it does reveal that previous correspondence had been happening between the two.}
\footnote{128}{Latacz 2004:243}
\footnote{129}{Latacz 2004:243}
\footnote{130}{Latacz 2004:243}
\footnote{131}{Latacz 2004:243-244}
\footnote{132}{Latacz 2004:244}
named by the Ahhiyawan King in the letter as Cadmos, whose name is synonymous with the foundation of Thebes.133

Any of these sites on the Greek mainland could have been the location of Ahhiyawa despite their small size.134 For example Athens in the 5th century was not necessarily the biggest city-state but it had one of the most powerful fleets and was in control of the Delian League, which included many islands and Ionia in Asia Minor. Thucydides describes the rise of Athenian power and its dominance over these places and sea capabilities in *History of the Peloponnesian War* 1.89-118. The Athenians’ power is evident from their later defeat of the Persians in Pamphylia, as Thucydides describes,

> Εγένετο δὲ μετὰ ταύτα καὶ ἡ ἐπ᾿ Εὐρυμέδοντι ποταμῷ ἐν Πομφυλίᾳ πεζομαχία καὶ ναυμαχία Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς Μῆδους, καὶ ἕνικων τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὁμφότερα Ἀθηναίοι Κιμωνός τοῦ Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦντος, καὶ ἔλαβον τριήρεις Φοινικῶν καὶ διέφθειραν τὰς πάσας ἐς διακοσίας.135

Next came the battles of the river Eurymedon in Pamphylia, fought on land and on sea by the Athenians and their allies against the Persians. In both battles the Athenians won the victory on the same day under the command of Cimon, the son of Miltiades, and they captured or destroyed the entire Phoenician fleet of 200 triremes.136

In sum, the most plausible location of Ahhiyawa in the Hittite texts would be an island off the mainland of Anatolia, such as Rhodes, or a site on the mainland of Greece, such as Thebes or Mycenae. But other evidence of contact and relations between the Ahhiyawans and the Hittites can be found in the Hittite documents. These relations in the

---

133 Latacz 2004:244
134 Bryce 1989:5-6
135 Thucydides *The Peloponnesian War* 1.100.1, eds. Page, Capps and Rouse
136 Thucydides *The Peloponnesian War* 1.100.1 trans. Warner
texts demonstrate Hittite awareness of the Mycenaean Greeks even if there is little in the way of tangible evidence for contact in central Anatolia where the Hittite capital was located. The previous passages from Diodorus Siculus, Herodotus and Thucydides are evidence that the Greeks on the islands in the eastern Aegean and mainland Greek city-states were known to overseas peoples such as the Greeks of western Asia Minor, the Egyptians and the Persians, who controlled much of Asia Minor. It would therefore be probable that the Hittites would have been aware of the Mycenaean Greeks, which the archaeological finds suggest were settling on the western coastline of Anatolia and the surrounding islands-the fringes of the Hittite empire.

Fig. 4.6: The Tawagalawa Letter
As discussed above the Tawagalawa Letter demonstrates conflict between Ahhiyawa and the Hittites in western Asia Minor (Fig. 4.6). This letter was written by the Hittite King Hattusili III to the King of Ahhiyawa, whose name cannot be read. The Letter in its entirety covered three tablets; however, of these three tablets only the third tablet and a fragment of either the first or the second tablet remains. The King of Ahhiyawa is formally addressed by the Hittite King as ‘my brother’, which accords him independent status from the Hittite King. Such recognition suggests that at this time the Ahhiyawans were a force to be reckoned with. This letter is a request from the Hittite king to the Ahhiyawan King to give up a man named Piyamaradu, who had been causing trouble in western Asia-Minor including an attack on Wilusa, known from another letter from the Hittite vassal ruler Manapa-Tarhunda of Seha (c.1300 B.C.E). In the Tawagalawa Letter Piyamaradu is being protected by Atpa (the son-in-law of Piyamaradu and one of the representatives of the king of Ahhiyawa) in Millawanda and escapes by ship to Ahhiyawa whenever Hattusili III tries to capture him.

Further, look here! [it is reported], that he is saying: ‘I wish to cross over from here into the land of Masa or the land of Karkija, but leave the prisoners, my wife, my children, and my household here!’

According to this rumour, while he leaves his wife, his children, and his household in the land of my brother, your land is granting him protection! But he is causing constant trouble in my land! And every time I stand in his way he returns to your
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land! Are you, my brother, well disposed towards his behaviour?

[If not] then, my brother, at least write to him as follows:

‘Arise and go forth into the land of Hatti. Your master has set aside his quarrel with you! Otherwise come into the land of Ahhiyawa, and wherever I choose to settle you, [there must you remain!] Arise [with your prisoners,] your wives and your children [and] settle in another place! As long as you live in enmity with the King of Hatti, exercise your hostilities from [some] other land! From my land shall you exercise no hostilities! If your heart lies in the land of Masa or the land of Karkija, go there! The King of Hatti has persuaded me, in the matter of Wilusa (?), over which we quarrelled, and he and I have become friends. [...] a war would not be good for us.’

A further Hittite text from the annals of either Arnuwanda III or Suppilulima II explains that Hattusili III did successfully capture Piyamaradu.

The attacks on the Hittite vassal state of Wilusa, probably by the Ahhiyawans or at least supported by the Ahhiyawans, in the reign of Hattusili III or Tudhaliya IV (c.1240-1215 B.C.E) resulted in the overthrow of the Wilusan king Walmu. This information is taken from the Hittite text of the Millawanda Letter, where it states that since the Hittites once again had control of western Anatolia and Millawanda because they ousted the Ahhiyawans, Walmu could once again be reinstated as king in Wilusa.

(36")...(highly fragmentary; part omitted) he fled [...], (37") and [they adopted] another man. [...] I (the majesty) have not recognised him. (38") However, Kulanazidi has held ready the documents which were [prepared] for Walmu (by me/by somebody else). (39") He will deliver (?) them (to you), my son. Look
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at them! (…End of 39-40 omitted), (41") Therefore, my son, send me Walmu (who is in exile with you), so that I can restore him in the land of Wilusa (42") to the throne. Just as he was previously king of the land of Wilusa, so shall he be again! (43") Just as he was previously our vassal (and) soldier, so shall he again be our (44") vassal (and) soldier!151

One reason for these conflicts could have been the ever increasing encroachment by the Mycenaean Greeks on the Hittite area of western Anatolia. The evidence for this can be found in such Anatolian texts as the Tawagalawa Letter, the Arnuwanda I document (‘Indictment of Madduwatta’), the Annals of Mursilis II, the Manapa-Tarhunda Letter, as well as the Millawanda Letter. This encroachment of the Mycenaens is also evident, as has been explained, from the ceramic remains found in many Bronze Age coastal Anatolian cities such as Miletos, and the Mycenaen burial grounds at Müskеби.152 This evidence indicates trade153 between Greece and western Anatolia, and in the case of Miletos, probable settlement of the Mycenaens on the western Anatolian coastline. Perhaps this was also a reason for the conflicts that are outlined in the above Hittite documents.

Mycenaean traders and products were well known to many in the Bronze Age.154 The evidence suggests that Mycenaen trade connections extended the length of the western Anatolian coastline as well as along the Levantine coastline down into Egypt.155 However, what is known of the relationship between Mycenaen Greeks and the Hittites
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155 Bennet 1997:518 Bennet also writes that the Mycenaen trade network extended west to South-Italy, Sicily and Sardinia as well.
comes from fragmentary texts from records at Hattusa, which mention Ahhiyawa. These texts refer to gift exchange, possible location of territorial boundaries and the gift of a cult idol from the Ahhiyawan king to heal the Hittite king Mursilis II. Evidence for trade can clearly be seen, or rather found, in coastal Anatolia but not in inland Anatolia, which was where the main centres of Hittite power were located, including the capital Hattusa. But one cannot assume that the lack of evidence of Mycenaean objects in inland Anatolia means that no trade took place between the two empires. Goods may not have been imported regularly by the Hittites and Mycenaean Greeks, or maybe the lack of evidence is due to the general destruction and looting at the end of the Bronze Age, or perhaps the evidence has not been found yet. It has been suggested that the lack of evidence for trade is due to the Hittite imposition of a trade prohibition on the Mycenaean Greeks. Such an argument suggests that the Mycenaean Greeks were seen as a significant political and commercial threat to the Hittites and that there were ongoing hostilities between the two empires, which can be seen in the above Hittite texts. Bryce, on the other hand, suggests that perhaps there was no direct trade contact between the two empires because no suitable trade routes existed. This was because the Hittite ‘homeland’ was landlocked and had no sea capabilities, and so would have required a
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land route in order to reach one of the sea ports under its sphere of governance.\textsuperscript{163} He suggests perhaps a route north along the Black Sea with Troy as the dispatch point, but this was a dangerous course as it was outside the sphere of Hittite influence.\textsuperscript{164} Therefore trade between the Mycenaean Greeks and Hittites in inland Anatolia could have taken place indirectly through the coastal towns and cities such as Millawanda/Miletos, as evidenced by the pottery remains.\textsuperscript{165} On the other hand trade between the Hittites and the Mycenaean Greeks could have occurred on Cyprus or at sites in the Levant such as the trading emporium at Ugarit where there is much archaeological, and in the case of the Hittites textual evidence for the presence of these two Bronze Age powers.

In conclusion, the Linear B tablets of the Mycenaean Greeks give some indirect evidence of contact between the Mycenaean Greeks, Anatolia and the Near East in the form of commodities such as spices (sesame) and slaves listed as imported from these areas. The tablets do not specifically refer to the Hittites or any overseas powers of the Bronze Age because the purpose of the tablets was not foreign correspondence but rather palace inventory and economics. The Hittite documents carry the evidence of direct contact between the Mycenaean Greeks and the Hittites, but this evidence requires that one accept Ahhiyawans as referring to Mycenaean Greeks. This correlation seems to be quite likely because Ahhiyawa seems to be a remote land that is located overseas and the Ahhiyawan King appears to be more of a distant overlord of Millawanda/Miletos requiring Atpa and his brother Tawagalawa as his representatives there. It is also at Millawanda/Miletos where a vast amount of archaeological material attested the presence of a Mycenaean Greek settlement or colony. The absolute evidential proof for the
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association of the Ahhiyawans with the Mycenaean Greeks remains uncertain and therefore the correlation is still circumstantial, however plausible it may be. The probable location of Ahhiyawa, if the Ahhiyawan-Mycenaean Greek association is accepted, is either an island in the Aegean, or somewhere on the Greek mainland itself, such as Thebes, or Mycenae.

The Hittite-‘Indictment of Madduwatta’, Manapa-Tarhunda Letter, Tawagalawa Letter, the Annals of Mursilis II and the Millawanda Letter attest to conflict between the Ahhiyawans and the Hittite empire; however, other documents, such as the conferral from the Ahhiyawan king of a cult idol to heal the Hittite king Mursilis II, demonstrate that other more friendly relations also occurred between the two kings. The conflict, though, seems to be the prevalent theme which was most probably due to the expansion of the Mycenaean Greeks into the Hittite vassal territory of western Anatolia and the surrounding islands. It is clear from the evidence of these documents that the Hittites were aware of both the Mycenaean Greeks settling on the fringes of their empire and the Mycenaean Greeks that had their base overseas from them. This is much the same as in later periods when the Persians were aware of the Greeks both in Asia Minor and in Greece.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

Some time in the Middle LHIIIC period the Mycenaean influence over western Anatolia and the surrounding islands ceased. The end of LHIIIB saw the destruction of the palace sites on mainland Greece. Other sites around the Aegean, Anatolia, Near East and Egypt were attacked and destroyed by the so-called sea peoples at the end of the LHIIIC phase. During the LHIIIA period the Mycenaean Greeks expanded their empire to include sites in the eastern Aegean and they were active in many overseas ventures throughout this time. The volume and spread of their wares are evidence of this expansion. This Thesis has shown the evidence for contact between the Hittites and the Mycenaean Greeks and that the Hittites were aware of the Mycenaean Greeks. It has also examined the evidence for the Mycenaean Greek’s settling areas of western Anatolia and the reasons why there is limited evidence for contact by the Mycenaean Greeks with inland Anatolia and the heart of the Hittite Empire. Finally, it explored the writings of later time periods to gather evidence of the relationship between the Mycenaean Greeks and the Hittites based on later Greek involvement with Asia Minor.

It is evident that the Mycenaean Greeks were settling and trading with the western Anatolian coastline and the surrounding islands. The abundance of Mycenaean pottery found at these places suggests close trading relations. At sites north of the Meander River, such as Troy, it appears that the Mycenaean Greeks were trading as opposed to settling these areas (at least in great numbers). As I have shown the majority of pottery at
Troy is the local Grey Minyan ware, with only 1-2% of the total ceramic assemblage being Mycenaean. South of the Meander River, however, is an entirely different story. Miletos seems to have been a Mycenaean Greek settlement as 95% of the pottery, which includes coarse and cooking pots, is Mycenaean. This pottery was both imported and locally made. The presence of Mycenaean architecture, pottery kilns, and a Mycenaean cemetery 1.5 kilometres south-west of Miletus (Degirmentepe) all support the argument that Miletos was a Mycenaean settlement. The site of Müskebi was a large chamber tomb and Mycenaean burial ground which would suggest that there were Mycenaean settlers around this area as well. Rhodes appears to have had widespread settlement of Mycenaean Greeks as the archaeological evidence of pottery and Mycenaean style chamber tombs indicate their presence over the entire island. The reason the Mycenaean Greeks would have needed these sites as trading posts and settlements was to establish trade networks with overseas peoples and to expand into new places in order to acquire resources that were otherwise scarce on the Greek mainland. The Mycenaeans traded for raw materials and perishable items that leave little or no trace in the archaeological record.

This evidence, therefore, on the western coastline of Anatolia would indicate that the Hittites were aware of the Mycenaean Greeks settling and trading on the fringes of their empire, but there is little evidence that the Mycenaeans were directly trading with the Hittites in inland Anatolia. This situation is due to many factors. One of these factors was the geographical difficulty of establishing suitable land routes into the centre of the Hittite empire. This is especially the case with the mountains directly inland from the coastline of western Anatolia. Another factor was that the Mycenaean Greeks, like the
later Greeks, had extensive sea capabilities and therefore pursued trade with coastal and fluvial areas as the more logical and easier choice. This pattern of trade is evident from the fact that the majority of Mycenaean wares are found along the coastlines of Anatolia and the Levant, on islands such as Rhodes and Cyprus, and at sites along the Nile in Egypt. There simply seems to have been no need for the Mycenaean Greeks to trade directly with inland Anatolia and the heart of the Hittite empire, as they could procure all the commodities that they needed through the coastal and fluvial emporia of the Bronze Age, such as Ras Shamra (Ugarit). There is evidence of trade and settlement of the Mycenaeans on Cyprus as well as Ugarit on the Levantine coast. Surely the Hittites and Mycenaeans would have come into contact at these places, if for some reason they had not done so on the Anatolian coastline. Contact would have occurred at these places as the Hittites traded at Ugarit as well and Cyprus features in the Hittite documents, such as the ‘Indictment of Madduwatta’, the text of Suppilulima II and the letter sent from the King of Ugarit to the King of Cyprus.

The palaces of the Mycenaean Greeks may not have had exclusive control over these trade routes to Cyprus, the Levant and Egypt. Indeed trade with overseas areas most likely started with opportunistic Mycenaean merchants, and grew into more intensive trade and eventual settlement overseas by the Mycenaeans. The Ulu Burun wreck is important as it demonstrates just how widespread these trade connections must have been, and it also gives some evidence for at least one Mycenaean merchant trading abroad.

The Linear B tablets do not give direct evidence of Mycenaeans trading overseas, but foreign slaves from places on western Anatolian mentioned in these tablets do
suggest that such overseas trade occurred. This evidence ties in with the late tradition of Strabo that the walls of Tiryns were built by Cyclopes, who were giants from Lycia in Asia Minor. The Linear B tablets, though, do not give a definitive answer to the question of whether the Hittites were aware of the Mycenaean Greeks. For the answer to this question the Hittite documents were analysed and the Ahhiyawa-Mycenaean Greece equation was discussed. This equation remains circumstantial but it is most likely accurate. The evidence suggests that the Mycenaean involvement in western Anatolia increased in LHIII which coincided with the Ahhiyawans featuring in the Hittite documents. The Ahhiyawan-Mycenaean Greek correlation also appears more likely to be accurate when Millawanda is equated to Miletos which, as we have seen through the archaeological evidence, was a Mycenaean settlement. This Millawanda was under the influence of the Ahhiyawans in the Hittite texts and therefore Mycenaean Greeks as well.

I do believe that Attarsiya the “Man of Ahhiya” with his 100 chariots from the Hittite text the ‘Indictment of Madduwatta’ was most likely a Mycenaean Greek from one of the settlements on the Anatolian coastline and not from mainland Greece. However, the later references to the Ahhiyawans were the Mycenaean Greeks either from an Aegean island such as Rhodes or, perhaps more likely, from a centre such as Thebes or Mycenae on the Greek mainland. The Hittite documents display a range of relations between the Ahhiyawans/Mycenaean Greeks and the Hittites, from openly hostile (Indictment of Madduwatta) to diplomatic (Tawagalawa Letter) to the appearance of friendly relations (the text concerning the conferral of a cult idol from the Ahhiyawan king to heal the Hittite king Mursilis II).
Ultimately it would seem, given the archaeological and textual evidence discussed in this thesis, that the Hittites were aware of the Mycenaean Greeks and vice versa. Common sense must prevail even if there is little evidence of contact between the two parties in inland Anatolia, and the heart of the Hittite empire, the Hittites, nevertheless, must have known of the foreign Mycenaeans settling and trading with their vassal states of western Anatolia. The Hittite documents attest to this as the conflict between the Ahhiyawans and the Hittites is linked to the encroachment of these Ahhiyawans on the Hittite territory. The Hittites would have encountered the Mycenaeans at other trading emporia such as Ugarit but also on the borders of their own territory, which has yielded much in the way of Mycenaean wares and evidence of settlement. These contacts between the Mycenaean Greeks and the Hittites appear to have been extensive, just as those between Greeks from the later time periods and the peoples and empires of western Asia Minor were.
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