

The West-Anatolian origins of the Que kingdom dynasty

Anna Margherita Jasink – Mauro Marino

Firenze

*A. W(a)rikas, Muksas, Hiyawa (§§1-7)**

1. *Introduction.* The discovery of the Çineköy bilingual¹ has renewed the interest on the problem of the Cilician dynasty that ruled the Neo-Hittite state known from the Assyrian sources as Que. It makes it possible to add a missing link to a series of specific information which have contributed to the reconstruction of the history of this south-eastern area of Anatolia in the Early Iron Age. The mention of the Hieroglyphic name Hiyawa to designate this kingdom in fact leads to the hypothesis of a further connection between the “Mopsos’ dynasty” and the kingdom of Ahhiyawa mentioned in the second millennium Hittite sources, taking this latter as a “Mycenaeanised” kingdom located in the extreme coastal and insular regions of western Anatolia². A comparison of the new data of the Çineköy bilingual with those of the Karatepe bilingual, to be dated to one or two generations later, partly confirms and partly modifies the theses that I have discussed in previous works. The starting point of the present work arises from two observations: the names Urikki³ and Mopsos are attested in both the bilinguals, the first appearing in slightly different forms in the two documents⁴; and the name Adana (and its derivatives) is missing in the Hieroglyphic text in the Çineköy bilingual, substituted by Hiyawa that in the Phoenician text has a counterpart in *DNNYM*. In my opinion these elements are not coincidental but are extremely significant to reconstruct the history of the reign of Que, of its name and of the names of its rulers.

2. *Urikki and Mopsos.* A relation between Urikki and Mopsos was previously known only from the Karatepe bilingual, although with some ambiguity: in fact, Azatiwatas men-

* §§ 1-7 are by A.M.Jasink ; §§ 8-11 are by M. Marino.

¹ R. Tekoğlu – A. Lemaire, “La bilingue royale louvito-phénicienne de Çineköy”, *CRAIBL* 2000, juillet-octobre, pp. 961-1006. References in J.D. Hawkins, “Scripts and Texts”, *The Luwians*, H.C. Melchert ed. Leiden – Boston 2003, p. 148; M. Forlanini, “Un peuple, plusieurs noms : le problème des ethniques au Proche Orient ancien. Cas connus, cas à découvrir”, *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia, Actes de la XLVIII Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 1-4 July 2002*. Leiden 2005, pp. 113-114.

² It is just the relation between Ahhiyawa and the Cilician Hiyawa than can represent a hint in favour of the interpretation recognizing in Ahhiyawa not the Mycenaean Greece as a whole or a city therein (Thebes or Mycenae) but rather a “Mycenaean” state formed on the Anatolian area and/or on the facing islands. A moving of its inhabitants to Cilicia following the uprisings at the end of the Late Bronze Age, without a substantial change of the local culture but with only the appearing of the TE III C pottery particularly at Tarsus, looks quite probable (see in the following and A.M. Jasink, “Presenze micenee e greche nella Cilicia preclassica”, *ΠΟΙΚΙΛΑΜΑ. Studi in onore di Michele R. Cataudella*. La Spezia 2001, p. 608).

³ For convenience the term used by Assyrians will generally be adopted in this paper.

⁴ *wali+rali-i-ka-sá* / *W[R(Y)K]* in Çineköy corresponding to *à-wali+rali-ku-sa* / *WRK* in Karatepe bilingual.

tions the “House of Mopsos” three times, but without an explicit connection to Urikki. I was inclined to believe that this expression had a much wider value, as a symbol not only of the ruling dynasty but also of the kingdom of Que independently of the dynastic changes⁵. The interpretation of Urikki as a name belonging to the Hurrian language⁶ could have been explained by a dynastic change within Que. The new bilingual, from which one argues a direct connection between Urikki and Mopsos⁷, however, seems to favour a western etymology for Urikki as well. The legends about Mopsos, son of Rhakios – whom Pausania defines as “the Cretan”⁸ –, and founder of a kingdom in Cilicia, could actually derive from a reminiscence of historical events.

A linguistic correspondence between Rhakios and Urikki, proposed by Massimo Forlanini⁹ and supported by the hypothesis that in the Karatepe bilingual the starting *a* of the noun (*ā-wa/i+ra/i-ku-sa*)¹⁰ depends on the Anatolian phonetic laws not allowing for a double consonant at the beginning of a word, is further enforced by the reading *wa/i-ra/i-i-ka-sá*¹¹ in the new bilingual, that now likely represents the most ancient attestation of the name Urikki

⁵ A.M. Jasink, “Danuna e Adana: alcune considerazioni sulla Cilicia”, *Mesopotamia* 23 (1988), pp. 100 ff., with the translation of the three passages (notes 30-32).

⁶ A. Goetze, “Cilicians”, *JCS* 16 (1962), p. 53, derives this name from *awar* root. Other names of Que kings have been considered of Hurrian origin as well: I refer to Kate and to his brother Kirri in particular, the first deposed in favour of the second by Salmanassar III in 833, according to the Annals of this Assyrian king. More difficult is to recognize the origin of Cilician princes as Tulli prince of Tanakun (mentioned again in the Annals of Salmanassar for the year 833), Kirua prince of Illubru (Inscription of Sennacherib, 696); a Luwian etymology is more likely for Sanduarri, prince of Kundu and Sizzu (Inscription of Esarhaddon, year 678): see related discussion in P. Desideri – A.M. Jasink, *Cilicia. Dall'età di Kizzuwatna alla conquista macedone*. Firenze 1990, pp. 137-138. Nevertheless, we must remember that we know only the Assyrian translation of these names, that may be based only on assonance.

⁷ Urikki is defined [*mu-ka*]-*sa-sa* INFANS.NEPOS-*si-sa*, “Mopsos’ nephew”, broadly speaking “descendant”, as it is clear in the Phoenician text *’ŠPH MPŠ* “descendance of Mopsos” (for *’ŠPH* as a graphic variant of Phoenician *’ŠPH* see Lemaire in Tekoğlu – Lemaire, *CRAIBL* 2000, p. 996).

⁸ Pausanias IX (*Boeotia*), 33, 2. We remember that Pausanias again, VII (*Achaia*), 3, 1-3, relates the Colophonian tradition about a first colonization by the Cretans, arrived at the Anatolian coasts following Rhakios, their fights against Carians and the arrival in the same region of the Hellenes guided by Mantos. The two, Mantos and Rhakios, after removing their divergences, married and had a son, Mopsos. He, leading Hellenes (the followers of Mantos) together with Ionians (this is the new name for the followers of Rhakios), won again the Carians. It is hard to reject a priori a kind of connection between these legends and the events of the second millennium, that show a first presence of the Minoan component in the western Anatolian coasts, to which the Mycenaean component follows, developing the new Ahhiyawa state, composed not only by Minoan-Mycenaean but also by local elements.

⁹ M. Forlanini, “Awariku, un nom dynastique dans le mythe et l’histoire”, *Hethitica* 13 (1996), pp. 14-15; Id., *Ethnicity*, pp. 113-114.

¹⁰ In the Phoenician version of the same bilingual and in the Phoenician text of Hassan-Beyli (on this inscription see also notes 12 and 34) the *aleph* should be originated by a slavish translation of the term written in Hieroglyphics.

¹¹ *W[R(I)K]* in the Phoenician version. The passage is fragmentary but, in all hypotheses of reconstruction, the initial *aleph* is absent. We find a homonym *WRYK* also a century later, in the Cebel Ires Daği stele (on this personage and his relations with Urikki see in the following).

in Hieroglyphics¹². A reconstruction of the type **Wrik(i)os/Wrik(i)as* is not very far from **Wrakios>Rhakios*¹³. On Mycenaean tablets a personal name *wo-ro-ko-jo* (gen. on PY Sa 763) and the term *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* (PY Er 312.7, Un 718.11), to be probably interpreted as a possessive derived from a man’s name **Wroikiōn*¹⁴, are attested. These evidences are in favour of an “Aegean” reconstruction of the name Urikki.

The identification of W(a)rikas as descendant of Mopsos and king of Hiyawa leads again to a proposed connection with the Muksus¹⁵ mentioned in the Hittite text known as “the Indictment of Madduwattas”. There is not yet any evidence to relate Muksus to Ahhiyawa; however, a new argument could connect this same person and Attarsiya, “man of Ahhiya”, considering the two as personages outside the Anatolian world and coming from the Aegean area. The presence of the name *mo-qo-so* in two Linear B tablets¹⁶, the first from the Knossian archives and probably dating to a period not far from the Hittite quotation, could strengthen the proposal that the name has not an exclusively Anatolian but rather a “Greek”, or at least Indoeuropean, origin¹⁷.

3. *Ahhiyawa and Hiyawa*. The derivation of the second term from the first can hardly be doubted. Therefore, a relation between a Mycenaean (or rather “Mycenaeanised”) state located on the south-western coasts of Anatolia in the second half of the second millennium, and a state corresponding in general terms to Cilicia in south-eastern Anatolia during the first half of the first millennium, cannot absolutely be ignored. The problem is then to identify the period when the “transfer” of the dynasty ruling Ahhiyawa (or at least of a prince of that dynasty) and of its subjects from western to eastern Anatolia occurred. This transfer involves, on the one hand, the end of the term Ahhiyawa to denote the state that is well known for the Late Bronze Age – and that in the first millennium will be defined always in the same area with terms likely derived from the same root¹⁸ – and, on the other hand, the beginning of its

¹² The Phoenician inscription from Hassan-Beyli seems in any case paleographically quite close to that of Çineköy and historically could both be dated either to the period when also Ahaz of Judah, a Tiglath-pileser III vassal, asks for his intervention against Israelians and Aramaeans or, more likely in my opinion, to the period of Sargon II, during his intervention against Midas and the Ionians which penetrated into the territory of Que.

¹³ See Forlanini, *Hethitica* 13 (1996), p. 15.

¹⁴ J.T. Killen, “Pylos Tablet Va 482”, *Briakiaka. A tribute to W. C. Brice (Cretan Studies 9)*, Y. Du-houx ed. Amsterdam 2003, p. 73 and n. 25.

¹⁵ It is of interest to note how the ending of Mopsos, in Cuneiform Hittite Muksus but in Hieroglyphic Luwian Muksas, displays the same problems as Awarikus and Warikas: it is likely that these arise from the adjustment in Anatolia of a foreign (Greek?) name in *-os* (for Rhakios/Awarikus/Warikas, see Forlanini, *Ethnicity*, p. 113, n. 13).

¹⁶ KN De 1381.B *mo-qo-so* (it is one of the many tablets referring to ovine livestock, attributed to Hand 117 and coming from the *East-West Corridor*, and one of those datable with more certainty to the period preceding the fire at the end of TM IIIA (c. 1370); PY Sa 774 *mo-qo-so-jo* (the tablet lists a couple of wheels for the chariot of M.).

¹⁷ The Mycenaean term shows that this name presents at its origins the labiovelar *kʷ* which explains the existence of the two forms Mopsos and Moxos.

¹⁸ See in the following.

use in an area more to the east where it will be associated to a dynasty still active at the beginning of the seventh century.

This transfer probably coincides with the great upheavals that involved the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean areas between the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age, characterized in terms of Mycenaean pottery by the transition from LE IIIB to IIIC¹⁹ or, in a less specialized and more imaginative language, the period of the “Sea Peoples” or “the Return of the Heroes” after the war of Troy. It is possible that groups coming from Ahhiyawa instead of confining themselves to trade with the Cilician area, mainly through Cyprus, had established permanent bases in areas at that time free from Hittite subjection²⁰.

As I have already noted, there was already a relationship during the Late Bronze Age between the people of Ahhiyawa and the area that by then had become an integral part of the Hittite empire and which had previously formed the independent state of Kizzuwatna. I think, however, that these relations were mainly indirect²¹: the ships of Ahhiyawa likely sailed along the southern Anatolian coasts either as far as the area including Ulu Burun and Cape Gelidonya (where the two famous shipwrecks have been found) proceeding from there directly to Cyprus – central island for the clearing of goods coming from east or west – or proceeding along the coast of the reign of Tarhuntašša, founded by Hattusili III as a Hittite vassal state, as far as the “free” port of Ura²² and from there proceeding again to Cyprus. From Cyprus the ships continued to Ugarit, another central clearing place, and from there the goods proceeded either by land toward eastern lands or along the Syro-Palestinian area to Egypt. Therefore Cilicia, in both its mountainous and level parts (beyond the Calycadnos river mouth, near where the port of Ura is thought to have been located), could have profited from Ahhiyawa’s goods arriving either directly or via Cyprus; in either case, being able to take advantage of the Hittite Empire’s apparent indifference to “Mycenaean” products²³.

The presence of two different entities, the Ekweš and the Denen, among the “Sea Peoples” is of interest for our problem. Among many suggested hypotheses I am inclined to ac-

¹⁹ On the historical and archaeological situation of this period in western and southern Anatolia see in the following.

²⁰ From the archaeological point of view see J. Yakar, “Anatolian Civilization following the disintegration of the Hittite Empire: An Archaeological Appraisal”, *Tel Aviv* 20/1 (1993), p. 14, who proposes that, after the destruction of most of the Cilician towns, refugees from Greece – for the scholar Ahhiyawa corresponds to the Mycenaean world (author’s note) – reached Cilicia and joining to people from Cyprus moved up to Porsuk, north of Cilician Gates, and to Cappadocia, to come back only later. This would explain the initial similarities of the pottery of these areas with the Cilician ceramics.

²¹ Jasink, *Studi Cataudella*, pp. 601-605.

²² A.M. Jasink, “Il ruolo di Tarhuntašša da Muwatalli II a Šuppiluliuma II”, *Semitic and Assyriological Studies presented to Pelio Fronzaroli by Pupils and Colleagues*. Wiesbaden 2003, pp. 271-274 (in particular see n. 18).

²³ There are scarce findings of Mycenaean pottery in the Anatolian hinterland, in Hittite areas, with the exception of sites in the valleys of the rivers at whose mouth the Mycenaean presence is attested. For the particular case of Mašat see M.J. Mellink, “Archaeology in Anatolia”, *AJA* 89 (1985), p. 558; M. Benzi, “Problems of the Mycenaean Expansion in the South-Eastern Aegean”, *Atti e Memorie del secondo Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma-Napoli, 14-20 ottobre 1991*. E. De Miro – L. Godart – A. Sacconi eds. Roma 1996, pp. 953-954.

cept the one that recognizes in the former the people of Ahhiyawa (rather than the Mycenaeans tout court) and in the latter the Danuna – a term that, in my opinion, denoted the area and the inhabitants of Kizzuwatna²⁴ in the Akkadian language – and, in particular, those fugitives from the Hittite authority who did not consider themselves Hittite subjects any more. We are dealing therefore with two distinct entities that would, at least in part, gather in a single state ruled by the dynasty of Mopsos²⁵ at the end of a “transitional period” that fully redesigned the map of Greece, Anatolia and northern Syria. Starting from this period, it is likely that slowly and probably over quite a long span of time a more direct route is opened along the southern coasts of Anatolia; this route goes partly by sea but partly along the alternative, and at times almost inaccessible, ways by land that make direct connections between Ionia and Cilicia possible²⁶.

4. *Hiyawa, Adana and Danuna*. It is now appropriate to reconsider the problem of the terms Danuna and Adana and of their possible connection since the data from the Çineköy bilingual, with the inclusion of the term Hiyawa, shed a new light on the problem. In the Karatepe bilingual the Hieroglyphic text reports the terms *adanawa* (place-name), *adana-wani*, *adanawanizi* (ethnic name and adjective), while the Phoenician version reports ‘*dn*’ (place-name) and *dnnym* (ethnic). I have already discussed at length the relation among these terms²⁷. I shall only recall here the conclusion that recognizes in *dnnym* the only long tradition term, adopted in the Phoenician language²⁸ to denote the state called Que by the Assyrians; *dnnym* appears as the Phoenician rendering of the name *da-nu-na*, already in use in the second millennium in the Syrian area and in the Akkadian language²⁹ to indicate either the

²⁴ We shall reconsider this problem in § 4

²⁵ The hypothesis considering the settlement of Ahhiyawa-people in Cilicia during this period has been already suggested by Jasink, *Studi Cataudella*, pp. 608-612.

²⁶ Such so ancient connections can in any case be taken only hypothetically. In fact, in the Cilician area the pottery of Mycenaean leaning defined as “Helladic-Cilician” pottery soon disappears in the Iron Age with no trace left. On the contrary, slowly and beside a ceramics of a strictly Anatolian character, a “Greek” pottery makes sporadically its appearance; however, we have examples datable with certainty only starting from the ninth century.

²⁷ Jasink, *Mesopotamia* 23 (1988), pp. 91-104.

²⁸ A first attestation dates back to the IX century in an inscription of Kilamuwa of Sa’mal, contemporary of Salmanassar III in the second part of his reign, in which the prince asks the Assyrians for help against his neighbouring “king of Dnnym” (for a historical comment to the text see Desideri – Jasink, *Cilicia*, pp. 142-144). To my knowledge the toponym Danuna does not appear in the Neo-Assyrian texts. There is actually a “land of Danuna”, whose cities are conquered likely by Assurnasirpal (according to the so called “White Obelisk”, see A.K. Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*, Vol. 2. Wiesbaden 1976, p. 158) but we are dealing with a completely different place, that can be located in the region of mount Kashiari.

²⁹ I refer in particular to the famous letter EA 151 from the El Amarna archive (=LA 125 in M. Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna I. Le lettere dei “Piccoli Re”*. Brescia 1998, pp. 157-158) in which mention is found of events concerning Kinahna, to be identified with the “land of Canaan” that in the XIV century denoted the Syro-Palestinian area in general (see Desideri – Jasink, *Cilicia*, p. 104); but also to the fragmentary letter KBo XXVIII 25, included in the correspondence between Hattusili III and Ramses II, in which Danuna is mentioned (r. 7’) in an obscure context likely with reference to

country or the inhabitants of the southern Anatolian area defined by the Hittites as Kizzuwatna. I still believe that it was a political-ideological operation by Azatiwatas, prince of Que during the first half of the VII century³⁰, to use as a name of his reign and of its people the place-name Adana and its derivatives as a reminiscence of a millenary tradition – in a Hittite text of the half of the second millennium we have the first attestation of the “land of Adaniya” (KUR ^{uru}Adaniya)³¹, as a territory that at the time of the Hittite king Ammuna rebelled against the power of Hatti (the first event of a process that was going to lead to the foundation of the independent reign of Kizzuwatna). Before Azatiwatas, this expression, intended to denote the state of Que/Danuna as a whole, did not exist. The Çineköy bilingual confirms, in my opinion, this hypothesis: in fact, in this bilingual as a counterpart of the Phoenician expression *Dnny* one reads always and only the Hieroglyphic Luwian expression *Hiyawa*³². From this one can argue that the “indigenous” name of the reign of Que was still just Hiyawa. The bilingual, in which the protagonist is Urikki, has been dated to the second half of the eighth century, in the period between the first appearance of Urikki as tributary of Tiglath-pileser (739 B.C.) and the attestation of an Assyrian governor, Aššur-šarru-usur, beside him, at the time of Sargon II (715[?])³³; I am inclined to assign the bilingual to a period preceding this latter event, when the relations between Urikki and the Assyrians look already very strained³⁴.

possible refuge places of Urhi-Tesub. We in fact agree with the reconstruction by E. Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache, I-II*. Opladen 1994, I p. 85, II pp. 138-139, who recognizes a correspondence between Danuna and Kizzuwatna also in this text (for both quotations and for the connected problems see Desideri – Jasink, *Cilicia*, pp. 101-104). A different position is taken by Forlanini, *Ethnicity*, pp. 111-112 and nn. 6-7, who, resuming his previous hypothesis of 1988 (“La regione del Tauro nei testi hittiti”, *VO* 7, pp. 142-143) connects Danuna with the Homeric term Danaoi and considers it as the Semitic denomination of the Mycenaean.

³⁰ On the various hypotheses of historical and chronological collocation of this personage see Desideri – Jasink, *Cilicia*, pp. 135 ff.; J. D. Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin - New York 2000, pp. 44-45.

³¹ Edict of Telipinu (CTH 19) II 2 (=KUB XI 5 Ro 143).

³² Phoenician text, r. 9 WDNMYM W'ŠRYM “et les Danouniens et les Assyriens”; Hieroglyphic text, §VII *hi-ia-wa/i-sa-ha-wa/i*(URBS) *su+ra/i-ia-sa-ha*(URBS) “et Hiyawa et Assyrie” (transcription and translation by Teğoklu - Lemaire, *La bilingue de Çineköy*, pp. 968. 964). Unfortunately the other passages of interest are mutilated in the Phoenician inscription; in any case in the Hieroglyphic inscription we read: § I [EGO-mi] *wali+ra/i-[ka-s]á**hi-ia-wa/i[-ni]-sá*[URBS] *REX-ti-sa*, § III *hi-ia-wa/i-za*(URBS) *TERRA+LA+LA-za* (transcription Teğoklu - Lemaire, *La bilingue de Çineköy*, p. 968). The second expression corresponds exactly to *á-ta-na-wa/i-za*(URBS) *TERRA+LA+LA-za* (in the Phoenician text we read ‘mq’dn) of the Karatepe bilingual (§ XXXVII, Hawkins, *Corpus*, p. 53).

³³ I am inclined to accept this early date for the taking up of the Assyrian governor in Que, considering this measure as an action of the Assyrian king against Urikki and his anti-Assyrian relations with both Mita of Muški and Urartu (G.B. Lanfranchi, “Sargon’s Letter to Aššur-šarru-usur: an Interpretation”, *SAAB* II (1988), pp. 59-64; Desideri – Jasink, *Cilicia*, pp. 122-123).

³⁴ Also the brief Phoenician inscription of Hassan-Beyli - mentioned above for the name ‘WRK’ -, in which an hypothetical reading *MLK DN* “king of Dn” (r. 3) is proposed by A. Lemaire, “L’inscription phénicienne de Hassan-Beyli reconsidérée”, *RSF* 11 (1983), p. 11, dates to this same period.

5. *Mopsos of Hiyawa and the kingdom of Que*. The new expression of Hiyawa to denote the reign of Que and the identification of its founder in Mopsos bring to light two further topics of discussion.

The first consists in the possibility of recognizing in Que the Assyrian translation of Hiyawa, by that time an “indigenous” term. In fact, while a passage Ahhiyawa > Que would have been unthinkable or, at least, too complicated, more than a simple assonance between Hiyawa and Que is undoubted. In addition it should be considered that the more ancient Assyrian form, dating back to the time of Salmanassar, the first Neo-Assyrian king to come in contact with this Neo-Hittite kingdom, is represented by *Qa-a-ù-e*, that is later substituted with the more frequent *Qu-ù-e*³⁵.

The second element consists in the possibility of ruling out an interpretation connecting the legendary presence of Mopsos in Cilicia with the alleged arrival of the Greeks in this area to fight at side of local peoples commanded by Kirua of Illubru against Sennacherib (676 B.C.). As I wrote elsewhere³⁶, I believe that Greeks, meaning in particular the Ionians – we will come back to the significance of this term in the following – were not yet present by this time with trade settlements in Cilicia plain, and that they were fighting at side of local peoples coming either from the sea or from the coasts beyond the Calycadnos river. In any case, even if a date prior to the event described in the *Chronika* by Eusebius is accepted for the presence of Greek settlers in Cilicia, it would be hard to go back in time before the eighth century. Therefore, we are in all cases dealing with a later and distinct presence than that of the peoples of Ahhiyawa/Hiyawa and impossible to be related with the legends of Mopsos in Cilicia.

The tradition concerning the foundation of Mopsouhestia³⁷ has links with this question: the tradition of a dynastic founder by the name of Mopsos during the twelfth century could be a sign that in Cilicia the reminiscence of an occupation from the west, to be taken as “Greek”, exactly starting from the name of Mopsos, had never been completely lost. This first tradition would have merged with the much later legends that see always the hero Mopsos (who has extremely varying characters both in his personal history and in his genealogy, as a consequence of the merging of differently originated histories) as founder of numerous

³⁵ A. Goetze, “Cilicians”, *JCS* 16 (1962), p. 51, and S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms*. Kevelaer-Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970, pp. 288-289, quote the different forms provided by the Assyrian texts. Of interest, as noted by Goetze, since it represents a period of lack in the Assyrian sources, is the attestation of the Aramaic inscription of Zakir of Hamath, at the beginning of the eighth century, where the king of Qaweh/Que (*w[m]lk qwh*) is mentioned among the hostile kings gathered against him by the king of Aram (*KAI*, n° 202, see H. S. Sader, *Les états araméens de Syrie depuis leur fondation jusqu’à leur transformation en provinces assyriennes*. Beirut 1987, pp. 207-208). The other Aramaic attestation of *Qwh* (1 *Kings* 10:28 = 2 *Chron.* 1:16, on the horse trade between Salomon and Que), that could represent the first mention of this state, is a result of supposition. Goetze, p. 52, believes that *Qa-we* is composed by an initial *Qa-(a)-*, a Hurrian personal name (see Nuzi and Alalah) that could indicate the eponymous hero, and *-we*, a Hurrian genitive suffix. Obviously we do not agree with this hypothesis

³⁶ A.M. Jasink, “I Greci in Cilicia nel periodo neo-assiro”, *Mesopotamia* 24 (1989), p. 125.

³⁷ Theopompus (first half of the fourth century B.C.) is the first historian to quote Mopsouhestia and to relate it to Mopsos.

towns in southern Anatolia. There are two evidences that are convincing me to support this hypothesis.

The range of mountains (Misis Dağları) dominating the mound of Misis, where the Hellenistic and Seleucid town of Mopsouhestia was discovered, was called Παργικὰ ὄρη in classical age. The expression has been related to the “royal town” of Pahri³⁸, that Salmanassar III destroyed likely in 837 – in 834 he destroyed also the new capital Timur – and that is again mentioned in the Karatepe bilingual as Pahar in the expression “I filled up the granaries of Pahar”³⁹. I have proposed to recognize exactly in this town once more the capital of the reign of Que⁴⁰, that later may have taken the name of Mopsouhestia just because of its importance and of the traditions that relate the state of which it was the capital to the hero Mopsos⁴¹.

In my opinion we should not rule out the old hypothesis by Bossert⁴² that the term Mopsouhestia could imitate the Phoenician expression *bt Mps* “the house of Mopsos” recurring in the Karatepe bilingual, even though in this expression we must recognize a much different valence than of a simple place-name. In fact “house of” in Phoenician/Aramaic languages denoted “dynasty / lineage /, people of ...”, as it is evident from the names of various Aramaic states (Bit Adini, Bit Agusi, etc.). But this does not rule out that Greeks, just remembering this expression, may have derived a toponym from it. Among the other towns taking the name of the founder heroes no one, to my knowledge, is called “house of...”.

6. *Hiyawa and Ypachaioi: Rough Cilicia, Cilician Plain, Pamphylia.* The Çineköy bilingual brings up again for discussion the statement by Herodotos (VII 91) that the inhabitants of Cilicia “were once called ‘Υπαχαιοί’⁴³ before than Cilicians. Above we already ruled out that it was the case of Greek-Cypriots that reached Rough Cilicia in the VIII century⁴⁴; now a reference to Ahhiyawa/Hiyawa and to Mopsos and his descendants is even more likely. We could even venture further to suppose a rise to power by Mopsos in all the south-eastern area of Anatolia to the east of Calycadnos river (Rough Cilicia and Cilician

Plain) that later was distinguished in the two states of Hilakku and Que, with only this latter maintaining the name of Hiyawa with the Mopsos’ dynasty in power.

We should likely connect with this expansion from the west – I would not speak of Proto-Greeks/Mycenaeans but rather of people from Ahhiyawa, bearing an Anatolian connotation – also some evidences coming from Pamphylia. These evidences date to a later period but enlighten a relation never interrupted between the two southern areas of Cilicia and Pamphylia, a relation that is not only the one of the late Greek penetration but is rather bound to the Luwian character of the two areas. Here we shall confine to the town of Aspendos, according to the Greek tradition a foundation by the Argives in the twelfth century (Strabo 14, 4, 2), whose first historical mention dates to the famous battle of the Eurymedon in 470/69 B.C.⁴⁵. The ethnic ΕΣΤΦΕΔΙΙΥΣ is attested on the most ancient coins that we have, dating also to the fifth century⁴⁶; for this term the correspondence has already been proposed – through the reconstructable toponym *Εστφεδύς – with Azatiwataya, the site known from the Karatepe bilingual, that bears the name of the founder Azatiwatas⁴⁷. Maybe it is not by chance that just from the oriental boundary of Pamphylia comes the Phoenician inscription of Cebel Ires Dağı, dated on palaeographic grounds at the end of VII century, that confirms the coming of Phoenicians from the east to the west and also a relation with the Cilician Plain / Que kingdom, with the recurrence of strictly Luwian terms to indicate local personages, and in particular with the mention of *kw* and *wryk* (the latter preceded by the designation of “king”), terms that it is difficult not to associate to Que and Urikki.

7. *Achaeans and Ionians.* The last problem to discuss is concerned with differences and similarities between the two terms of Achaeans and Ionians. Rather than to Achaeans I refer more precisely to the toponym Ahhiyawa>Hiyawa, as a term that can be referred initially to a region included in the eastern Aegean area but that later transforms to indicate a territory located in south-eastern Anatolia, ruled by a dynasty that exhibits, in the same way as its subjects, the Luwian linguistic element as predominating and that has no relation anymore with the Mycenaean/Greek world, apart from some traditions. As Ionians I mean the Greek name initially indicating the inhabitants of large part of the western Anatolian coasts as a consequence of the so called Ionian colonization occurred since the second part of the eleventh century⁴⁸. These Ionians start expanding in the first millennium in the southern Anatolia both by land and, mainly, by sea and are for the first time recognized in the Assyrian sources of late eighth / beginning of seventh century as Iamani. It is just these Iamani that seem to travel again the routes of the merchant-ships of Ahhiyawa⁴⁹ but, since our only sources dat-

³⁸ H.Th. Bossert, “Reisen in Kilikien”, *Orientalia NS* 19 (1949), pp. 123; Id., “Die phönizisch-hethitischen Bilinguen vom Karatepe. 3. Fortsetzung”, *JKF* 1 (1950-51), pp. 290-294; Id., “Misis”, *AfO* 18 (1957-58), pp. 186-189.

³⁹ Hieroglyphic text: § VII 38-40 (Hawkins, *Corpus*, p. 49); Phoenician text: Phu/A I 6; Pho/B 4'; PhSt/C I 10 (H. Çambel, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume II. Karatepe-Aslantaş*, Berlin - New York 1999, pp. 51-52, 54-55, 62-63).

⁴⁰ Jasink, *Mesopotamia* 23 (1988), p. 100.

⁴¹ Archaeological findings before the Hellenistic age show for the mound of Misis a human presence starting from the Chalcolithic period and continuing without interruption until the Byzantine age. Unfortunately the surface findings for Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age (M.V. Seton-Williams, “Cilician Survey”, *AnSt* IV (1954), pp. 164-165) do not allow further considerations.

⁴² Bossert, *Orientalia NF* 19 (1949), p. 123. Cfr. G. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas. Their Early Colonies and Trade*, London 1999⁴, p. 36; contra J. Vanschoonwinkel, *L'Égée et la Méditerranée Orientale à la fin du IIe Millénaire. Témoignages archéologiques et sources écrites*, Louvain-la-Neuve 1991, pp. 318-319.

⁴³ For a comment on this term see Desideri – Jasink, *Cilicia*, p. 141, n. 92.

⁴⁴ This hypothesis was supported by M.C. Astour, *Hellenosemitica. An ethnic and cultural study in West Semitic impact on Mycenaean Greece*, Leiden 1967, pp. 67-69.

⁴⁵ See „Aspendos“, *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Band 2, H. Cancik and H. Schneider eds. Stuttgart-Weimer 1997, p. 108.

⁴⁶ G.F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lycia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia*, Bologna 1964, pp. LXXII-LXXIV, 93-101.

⁴⁷ See Vanschoonwinkel, *L'Égée et la Méditerranée*, p. 317 (in n. 208 bibliography on coins).

⁴⁸ D. Musti, *Storia greca. Linee di sviluppo dall'età micenea all'età romana*, Bari 1989, pp. 80-84.

⁴⁹ The historic-political situation in the areas of arrival of Ionians is very different compared to the end of the Bronze Age, but some features recur. On the southern coasts of Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age three different situations succeed: in the first the Hittite empire controls the whole area, divided between the vassal state of Tarhuntašša in the west and the Hittite district of Kizzuwatna in the east; in

ing mostly to the first half of the I millennium are Assyrian, they are seen as enemies attempting to undermine the Assyrian empire from its western offshoots⁵⁰. On the contrary, it is possible that just along the coasts of Pamphylia and Cilicia, where a tradition of preceding “migrations” from the same western areas, i.e. from the south-western Anatolian coasts, is likely still alive in the memory, in a later period legends of foundation originate that mix up a first Mycenaean and a second Ionian settlement, both felt as “Greek” but enriched by a series of details that are strictly Anatolian.

In this problem we should include the linguistic reconstruction proposed since a long time by Carruba⁵¹ that recognizes in the name of the ethnics Αιοελλέες and Ἰάονες the Greek rendering of second millennium local names, the Hittite(-Lydian) **Ahhijawāles* and the Luwian *(*Ahh*)*ijawanes*, both derived from the place-name *Ahhiyawa*. According to Carruba⁵² also the name of the Aegean sea - Αἰγαῖος (πόντος) - is a derivation of *Ahhijā*, that originally designed all the regions around the Aegean.

If this is the actual situation, the circle is closed between the “man of Ahhiya”, mentioned for the first time in the Hittite documents of the Middle Reign, and the “Iamani caught as fishes” by the Neo-Assyrian king Sargon II.

the second the same area revolts, at least partially, to the Hittite empire both at the high levels (Tarchuntašša against Hatti during the reign of Šuppiluliuma II) and the low levels (fugitives’ phenomenon), in the third, after the fall of the Hittite empire, the area becomes open to every kind of penetration. In the first situation (but generally also in the second) Ahhiyawa’s ships sail “undisturbed” along the Anatolian coasts, landing to the harbour of Ura, then proceeding to Cyprus/Alasiya – both places being, at least partially, autonomous, despite what Hittite texts relate – and, finally, arrive at the harbour of Ugarit. Probably during the third situation Mopsos of Ahhiyawa/Hiyawa reaches the area formerly under Hittite complete control, Kizzuwatna, and establishes a new dynasty there. During the Iron Age the texts confirm the existence of the Neo-Hittite state of Que/Danuna/Hiyawa. In this same period the Ionian merchants, following the same course of their Ahhiyawean predecessors, bring their goods as far as to Syria. Neo-Hittite, Aramaean and Phoenician people are surely interested to this trade exchange; the Assyrians, on the contrary, recognize enemies in Ionians, because of their help to the recurring local revolts against the Assyrian empire. When this empire falls, Greeks are able to establish a series of settlements in Anatolia, at least west of Hume (<Que).

⁵⁰ For the *Iamani* mentioned in Sargon’s and Sennacherib’s inscriptions see Jasink, *Mesopotamia* 24 (1989), pp. 117-128.

⁵¹ From 1964 (O. Carruba, “Ahhijawa e altri nomi di popoli e di paesi dell’Anatolia occidentale”, *Athenaeum* NS (1964), pp. 269-298) to 2002 (O. Carruba, “The Relations between Greece and Egypt in the 2nd Millennium B.C.”, *A Tribute to Excellence. Studies offered in Honor of Ernő Gaál*, Ulrich Luft, László Török. T.A. Bács ed. Budapest 2002, pp. 139-154, with bibliography).

⁵² O. Carruba, “Ahhija e Ahhiyawa, la Grecia e l’Egeo”, *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Th.P.J. van den Hout – J. de Roos eds. Istanbul 1995, p. 14.

B – Historical and archaeological data on Western Anatolia (Ahhiyawa) and Cilicia (Hiyawa) (§§ 8-11)

8. *Introduction*. The reference to Attarš(š)iya in the Indictment of Madduwatta represents the first written evidence of the presence on Anatolian ground of the country of Ahhiya, better known from later sources as Ahhiyawa, as well as of its existence more in general⁵³.

In this study, which has the main aim to demonstrate a possible connection between the country of Ahhiyawa of the Bronze Age and that of Hiyawa/Que of the Iron Age, I will renounce to give a detailed and close examination of the textual materials we have on the Ahhiyawa Land, postponing the matter to a future publication. Here, I shall limit the analysis to the archaeological records of the area, where the territory of the “Great King” of Ahhiyawa is rightly and almost unanimously located, or at least of that more directly in contact with Hatti, namely the strip of islands and certain coastal centres of western Anatolia, that takes the name of Aegean-Anatolian area.

9. *Relations between Crete and Miletus (MM III-LM IB)*. According to the Hittite sources, that are the only witnesses of the existence of the country of Ahhiyawa – excluding the reference to the *’āqajawasa/Eqweš* in Meremtah’s inscriptions relative to the victory of the Pharaoh against a coalition of people allied with the Libyans –, the only centre ascribable to that reality and recognizable by us with a high degree of probability is Milla-wanda/Milawata, well-known as Miletus beginning from the actual Greek Age. The excavations on this site revealed a Minoan presence since MM III⁵⁴ (namely, between approximately 1700 and 1600 B.C. according to traditional chronology): the typology of the recov-

⁵³ Many hypotheses have been advanced on this state entity, which have led to somehow different conclusions. As known, the charm of the whole matter derives from the onomastic similarity of the term Ahhiya(-wa) with Αἰαία, that has induced, and induces still today, to emphasize the multiple references of Hittite sources regarding the sea and/or the islands related to this country, recognizing therein historical references to Achaeans celebrated by Homer. In brief, a diatribe exists between those who identify the country of Ahhiyawa with continental Greece, with capital in one of the major Mycenaean centres (Thebes or Mycenae), and those who, in one way or another, deny such analogy, considering Ahhiyawa either as one of the various Anatolian political entities, which Hatti occasionally had to confront with in the attempt to subdue the West, therefore completely disjointed from any connection with the Mycenaean world, or, even if partly accepting the cultural belonging to this world, as a politically autonomous from any Greek-Mycenaean palaces country.

⁵⁴ C. Mee, “Anatolia and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age”, *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium. Proceedings of the 50th Anniversary Symposium. Cincinnati, 18-20 April 1997*. E.H. Cline – D. Harris-Cline eds. Université de Liège 1998 (= *Aegaeum* 18), p. 137; W.D. Niemeier, “Mycenaeans and Hittites in War in Western Anatolia”, *Polemos. Le contexte guerrier en Égée à l’âge du Bronze. Actes de la 7^e Rencontre égéenne internationale. Université de Liège, 14-17 avril 1998*. R. Laffineur ed. 1999 (= *Aegaeum* 19), pp. 147-148; A. Raimond, “Importing culture at Miletus: Minoans and Anatolians at Middle Bronze Age Miletus”, *Emporia. Aegeans in the Central and Eastern Mediterranean. Proceedings of the 10th International Aegean Conference. Athens, Italian School of Archaeology, 14-18 April 2004*. R. Laffineur – E. Greco eds. Belgium 2005 (= *Aegaeum* 25), pp. 185-191.

ered materials – domestic pottery produced *in loco*, evidences of religious and administrative practices, and undoubtedly imported products as well – would appear as being an evidence of a more intense relationship between Miletus III and Crete than expected on the basis of occasional commercial trades. As claimed by Niemeier, even if it is not possible to speak about a Minoan Miletus in this period, considering that the local Anatolian exceeds the foreigner pottery, it can be assumed that there was an authentic “colony” of people from Crete, presumably in order to directly manage and ease the merchant trades⁵⁵. A similar situation to that detectable in Miletus is apparent on the islands and some eastern Aegean centres (i.e. Kasos, Karpathos, Kos, Samos, Iasos and Knidos), probably an indication of a maritime route consisting of many ports of call, similar to the Assyrian *karum*, that connected Crete with Anatolia and were oriented to the import of metals⁵⁶.

A rather different picture is offered by Miletus IV, corresponding to the first palatial phase of the city (LM IA-IB, 1600/1580-1425 B.C.): the very high percentage of Minoan pottery (approximately 85-90% of total, among which many conical cups typical of the Cretan society, and domestic use manufactures), the architectural techniques, the evidences of cultural activity, as well as the fragments of frescos of Minoan type, and even the remains of five locally produced pots with linear A inscriptions, demonstrate, in my opinion indisputably, the existence of a Minoan settlement in Miletus, so deeply rooted to constitute the cultural reality dominating the city, at least on the basis of the excavations carried out so far, according to which the actual Anatolian element would virtually seem absent⁵⁷. In different degrees it is also possible to note a coeval Minoan influence in other sites of the same area: especially Ialysos/Trianda in Rhodes seems to offer the most considerable traces of the presence of Minoan settlements, but common domestic use pottery has been found in other places, from Samos to Telos to Teichoussa; obviously, however, the interpretation of these data depends on the relevance given to these findings⁵⁸.

The Minoan presence in the south-eastern Aegean, most probably due to the considerable migration of people from Crete, is important from at least two points of view. The first is that, without any doubt, it constituted the ethnic substratum of the future(?) Ahhiyawa Land: the reference to Attarš(š)iya, Man of Ahhiya, in the Indictment of Madduwatta refers to the kingdom of Tudhaliya I/II (approximately 1390-1370 B.C., according to the chronology suggested by Gurney⁵⁹), just shortly following the level of destruction of Miletus IV, but nothing allows to exclude that the country of Ahhiya(wa) already existed before that sovereign and that the Hittite sources had not referred to this only because the two countries had never come in contact before (we recall that, in spite of little information we have regarding

⁵⁵ Niemeier, *Aegaeum* 19, p. 148. W.D. Niemeier, “The Minoans and Mycenaeans in Western Asia Minor”, *Aegaeum* 25, pp. 200-201.

⁵⁶ Niemeier, *ibid.*

⁵⁷ Niemeier, *Aegaeum* 25, pp. 201-202; Niemeier, “The Mycenaeans in Western Anatolia and the problem of the origins of the Sea Peoples”, *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition. Studies in Honor of Professor Trude Dothan*. Jerusalem 1998, pp. 23-24.

⁵⁸ P.A. Mountjoy, “The East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycaeneans and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa”, *AnSt* 48 (1998), p. 33; Niemeier, *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition*, pp. 28-30.

⁵⁹ O.R. Gurney, *The Hittite*. Harmondsworth 1991.

the immediate predecessors of Tudhaliya I/II, the picture perceived is of their relative difficulty to maintain order in the land of Hatti itself and of inefficiency to exert any kind of authority in western Anatolia⁶⁰). The second aspect is that such a presence would appear to recall the myth of Colophon's foundation⁶¹, carried out by Cretan colonists led by Rhakios (= Warikas?), moreover father of Mopsos (and in this perspective it is rather a curious coincidence that a Muksu is cited in the Indictment ...).

10. *The Mycenaean presence in Western Anatolia (LH IIIA-IIIIB)*. Pausania's tale continues by telling that Rhakios' men, taking the name of Ionians, found themselves, in a circumstance subsequent to their settlement, to fight against the Hellenics, who came from Greece under the leadership of Manto. Such an onomastic and cultural difference between Hellenes and Ionians may correspond to that between Achaeans (if intended as Mycenaean Greeks) and Ahhiya, in contrast to those theories that conceive the two terms in connection to one another and lead to suggest that the “centre” of the Ahhiyawa kingdom was actually in Greece.

Already from a linguistic point of view, Carruba noted how the similarity between the names Ahhiyawa and 'Αχαια/'Αχαιοί is only seeming and not supported by any phonetic rule that leads to a direct connection. According to him, in fact, the term Ahhiya(-wa) – where -wa should be considered as the typical Anatolian suffix to designate the collective, i.e. the territory around the city – cannot be considered, as claimed by some, the Hittite translation of the name 'Αχαια/'Αχαιοί⁶². The similarity between the two toponyms would instead be the result of the common origin from the Indo-European *ak^wa = water and both would indicate autonomously, through local linguistic developments, a specific geographical area very near to the sea, i.e. the Aegean islands, the name of which would have had the same etymological origin⁶³.

Not even the archaeological evidences show such a close connection between the south-eastern Aegean area and the Greek continent. The V and VI levels of Miletus are contemporary to the diffusion of the Mycenaean material culture in Greece and on the Aegean islands⁶⁴; Miletus was involved in this phenomenon: especially the second palatial phase (1425-1318 B.C. approximately) shows large amounts of imported and locally made Mycenaean pottery belonging to the LH IIIA-IIIIB, decorated and directed to domestic use. The architecture offers, instead, a rather ambiguous picture to anyone who would like to believe that a Mycenaean settlement existed on the site: the only two houses, the plan of which

⁶⁰ S. de Martino, *L'Anatolia occidentale nel Medio Regno Ittita*. Firenze 1996, pp. 7-11.

⁶¹ See § 2 and n. 8.

⁶² In this case the Mycenaean occlusive velar aspirate -χ- would have resulted in Hittite with the corresponding voiceless -kk- – the sources would therefore have testified the country of Akkiyawa –, nor can the contrary be claimed, since the Mycenaean language would not appear to preserve laryngeals, which could correspond to the Hittite -hh- (Carruba, *Studio Historiae Ardens*, pp. 10-11).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 17 ff. Also see Carruba, *A tribute to Excellence*, pp. 139 ff.

⁶⁴ The Mycenaean influence in the eastern Aegean area, however, is already documented in the previous period, contemporary to the diffusion of the Minoan culture, as proved by locally produced pottery found in Miletus, Troy and Psara (LH IIA) and the first chamber tombs from Rhodes (LH IIB): Mountjoy, *AnSt* 48 (1998), p. 34.

may be examined, in fact, seem to have indeed a Mycenaean typology, but also have analogies with structures discovered on the Anatolian continent. It is therefore difficult to claim with certainty which model they derive from⁶⁵. The same applies to the several dug furnaces, some of which are however comparable only to examples coming from Crete⁶⁶; moreover, the wall constructed in the typical Anatolian (or perhaps better said, Hittite) technique “Kastenmauer” belongs to the third palatial phase (1318-1190 B.C. approximately). Whereas Miletus IV would therefore appear to have had a close connection with Minoan Crete, Miletus V-VI seems, from the available data, more autonomous from a single cultural centre, but more susceptible to the influxes deriving from both the Anatolian and the Aegean world.

A similar stylistic heterogeneity is found in other sites of the south-eastern Aegean, among which the most evident cases are, without any doubt, Rhodes and Kos, which represent an almost exact synthesis of Minoan, Mycenaean and Anatolian forms and decorations⁶⁷ in the LH IIIA and IIIB, with their abundant ceramic production widespread on a large scale roughly on the whole area considered here. The result is a material culture that defines itself gradually more autonomously from an undoubtedly Mycenaean basis, but also considers the local substrates, achieving ceramic forms without precise equivalents on the Greek continent, reaching in the LH IIIC what Mountjoy defines the East-Aegean *koiné*⁶⁸.

The data arising from the necropolises allow to formulate other considerations. Since the typical Anatolian Late Bronze Age funerary practices, as far as we know, include especially the burial or the individual cremation in urns, in pithoi or in pits, all the other typologies possibly represent intrusions⁶⁹. Moreover it is also certain that the information deducible from these traditions have greater significance, as the ethnic identification of a people is concerned, than those obtained from pottery, in so far as they are usually more conserved and less subject to the influences of “foreign fashions”, as they are not a commercial product but the expression of the customs and the culture of a society⁷⁰. Mycenaean type chamber and/or tholos tombs have been found, often next to typically Anatolian burials, in Panaztepe⁷¹, Bakla Tepe, Colophon, Ephesos, Samos, Degirmentepe, Leros, Kalymnos, Müsgebi, Kos, Astypaleia and in many sites on the island of Rhodes (at least 25⁷²), among which Trianda/Ialysos. The cultural variety, previously observed in relation to the ceramic production, may also be perceived in the grave-goods: indeed, apart from Müsgebi, where the forty-eight

chamber tombs exclusively preserve mostly locally produced objects of Mycenaean origin⁷³, the other sites show a less homogeneous situation, with a mixture of Mycenaean and Anatolian objects⁷⁴. Recently Sylvie Müller Celka⁷⁵ analyzed the typology of some of these intrusive burials in Anatolia, in the attempt to identify the people responsible for its appearance on the continent: as pointed rightly out by this scholar, the tholos tombs found in Colophon where unlikely built by colonists coming from Greece, since this model was scarcely used on the Helladic continent after the beginning of LH IIIA, whereas the burials of Colophon belong to LH IIIB or IIIC. Very similar coeval examples are instead widespread in eastern Crete, where their origin should most likely be sought. As far as the chamber tombs are concerned, which are traditionally related to the Greek-Mycenaean world, Müller Celka points out that they are indeed present in various necropolises of the Ionian coast and of the Dodecanesum, but are instead very rare in other Aegean islands, “qui n’ont pas donc pu servir de relais à la propagation du type”⁷⁶. Here as well, the nearest model is identifiable in Crete, in the necropolis of Zapher Papoura, near Knossos, with which there are further analogies in the building features and funerary practices⁷⁷.

From the brief archaeological analysis suggested so far, the absence of indisputable archaeological evidences, confirming a cultural dependence of the south-eastern Aegean area from Greece, can therefore be deduced. Accordingly, in my opinion, it is also not possible to talk about political dependence: the models coming from the continent are often reinterpreted in an autonomous language, permeable to the local substrate and to the influences coming from the Minoan world. In contrast, the contacts that linked this area to Crete seem worthy of note. These were crucial, I believe, not only for the foundation of the kingdom of Ahhiyawa itself, as the important findings relative to MM III and particularly LM IA-IB demonstrate, but also as a potential ethnic element, complementary to the indigenous one, in the period during which the Hittite sources document the country of Ahhiyawa, if one accepts to confer such relevance to data deriving from the necropolises. Therefore, the distinction between Ahhiyawa and Homeric Achaeans remains valid, if by these one intends the Mycenaeans of the Hellenic peninsula. It could perhaps correspond to that cited by Pausania between Ionians led by Rhakios, coming from Crete, and the Hellenes of Manto, also considering the linguistic reconstruction suggested by Carruba, according to which the term Ionians would actually derive from Ahhiyawa⁷⁸.

11. *Cilicia at the end of Bronze Age and beginning of Iron Age (LH IIIB-IIIC)*. As already pointed out in the first part of this paper, various Greek traditions ascribe to Mopsos the foundation of a kingdom in Cilicia. Pausania presents Mopsos as son of Rhakios: if one accepts to assign historical value to this part of the myth as well, as supported by the discus-

⁶⁵ Niemeier, *Studies Dothan*, pp. 30-31.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

⁶⁷ Mountjoy, *AnSt* 48 (1998), pp. 37-45.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-60.

⁶⁹ J.G. Macqueen, “The Hittites and their contemporaries”, *Asia Minor* 1986, pp. 132-135.

⁷⁰ W. Cavanagh and C. Mee, *A private place: Death in prehistoric Greece*. SIMA 125. Jonsered 1998, p. 135.

⁷¹ In this necropolis there are pithos and cist tombs, cremation urns and small “tholos”, all most likely due to the development of a local tradition: Mee, *Aegaeum* 18, p. 140; S. Müller Celka, “Evaluation de l’élément mycénien en Asie Mineure à travers les données funéraires”, *Aegaeum* 25, p. 249 and pp. 253-254.

⁷² M. Benzi, “Anatolia and the Eastern Aegean at the time of the Trojan War”, *Omero – Tremila Anni Dopo. Atti del congresso di Genova 6 – 8 Luglio 2000*. F. Montanari ed. Roma 2002, pp. 375-376 and notes.

⁷³ Mee, *Aegaeum* 18, p. 139; Müller Celka, *Aegaeum* 25, p. 252.

⁷⁴ Exemplary is the case of Degirmentepe (with its 11 chamber tombs), where, among four swords discovered, only one is of Aegean type, the others being of Anatolian origin: Niemeier, *Studies Dothan*, pp. 39-40.

⁷⁵ Müller Celka, *Aegaeum* 25 (2005), pp. 247-258.

⁷⁶ Müller Celka, *Aegaeum* 25 (2005), p. 255.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

⁷⁸ Carruba, *Studio Historiae Ardens*, 1995, p. 16.

sion of the Çineköy inscription reported above, Mopsos would have led a colony coming from what the Hittites called Ahhiyawa Land, i.e. the south-eastern Aegean area. If this is the case, the historical period of such migration of people from West to East remains to be defined. The excavations carried out so far in Cilicia allow to rule out that such a phenomenon took place in the period of the Hittite domination, since there is no material evidence for the whole of the LH IIIA and IIIB that may lead to suggest the settlement of new people coming from the West. The situation is modified instead in the LH IIIC, i.e. during the time of important changes in the Mediterranean which led to the end, among others, of the country of Hatti. Just in this period we can find a large amount of pottery resembling to Cypriot or eastern-Aegean prototypes in the ceramic assemblage.

One of the last references of Hittite sources to Ahhiyawa is included in a passage of the treaty between Tudhaliya IV and Šaušgamuwa of Amurru, concerning a commercial embargo that the Hittite sovereign attempted to lay on Assyria. This is one of the last demonstrations of the power of the kingdom of Hatti, still capable here of exerting a somewhat prominent role in the foreign politics: indeed, already at Tudhaliya IV's time, the situation definitely started to change in his disfavour, with a series of chain insurrections that concerned regions of Anatolia previously under the Hittite control, like the lands of Lukka⁷⁹, Wilusa⁸⁰, the country of the river Seha⁸¹ and Tarhuntašša, with its sovereign, Kurunta, getting as far as to proclaim himself Great King⁸². The crisis will get even more serious with Šuppiluliuma II, also busy putting down a rebellion in southern Anatolia⁸³ and most of all

⁷⁹ See the inscription of Yalburt: M. Poetto, *L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di Yalburt. Nuove acquisizioni relative alla geografia dell'Anatolia sud-occidentale*, *Studia Mediterranea* 8. Pavia 1993.

⁸⁰ As testified by the Letter of Milawata (KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90, J. Garstang e O.R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*. The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. London 1959, pp. 114-115; H.A. Hoffner Jr., "The Milawata Letter Augmented and Reinterpreted", *AfO Beiheft* 19, 1982, pp. 130-137), the country of Wilusa was involved in an internal rebellion that caused the deposition and exile of the legitimate sovereign Walmu. Tudhaliya IV appears from the text not to be able to intervene in person and, to solve the matter, he asks for the collaboration of his correspondent, perhaps the king of Mira (J.D. Hawkins, "Tarkasnawa King of Mira – 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy sealings and Karabel", *AnSt* 48 (1998), p. 20), acknowledging his *partnership* in the hegemony on the country of Wilusa, as well as on the frontiers of Milawata. This is, in my opinion, an indication of weakness by the Hittite sovereign, unable by this time to exert a direct control on western Anatolia and therefore forced to come to terms, offering important accords, with a country since a long time vassal of Hatti.

⁸¹ It is the rebellion of Tarhundaradu, documented by the text "The sins of the country of the river Seha" (KUB 23.13, H.G. Güterbock, "A new look at one Ahhiyawa text", *Hittite and other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in honour of Sedat Alp*. Ankara 1992, pp. 235-243) and moreover fomented by the country of Ahhiyawa.

⁸² Inscription of Hatip, see Jasink, *Studies Fronzaroli*, pp. 276 ff.

⁸³ J.D. Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. Wiesbaden 1995. Although the inscription celebrates a success by the Hittite sovereign, perhaps against Hartapu (Hawkins, *AnSt* 48 (1998), p. 20 and note 106; A.M. Jasink, "Šuppiluliuma and Hartapu: two 'Great Kings', in Conflict", *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999* (= *StBoT* 45). Wiesbaden 2001, pp. 235-240; Id., *Studies Fronzaroli*, pp. 278 f.), it expresses a far more serious situation than that previously perceived by Tudhaliya IV. Whereas, indeed, with the inscription of Yalburt the latter was able to still leave a sign of his

confronting himself with the Sea People⁸⁴. The last evidence we have on the existence of the kingdom of Hatti comes from a letter of Ammurapi, king of Ugarit, to an anonymous king of Alašiya⁸⁵, in which reference is made to assaults of people coming from the sea and to a concentration of military forces under the control of the Hittite sovereign, in the attempt perhaps to organize a common coalition in the eastern Mediterranean to contrast the advance of these people. Such a measure notoriously failed: the inscriptions and the reliefs of Medinet Habu testimony the victory of the Pharaoh Ramses III on a coalition of people coming from the sea, previously responsible – according to these sources – for the invasion and destruction of all the territories belonging to the Hittite empire, i.e. Hatti itself, Arzawa, Kizzuwatna (in the text, Qode), Alašiya and Karkemiš.

The fall of the Hittite empire was accompanied or led to great mutations in the regions previously subject to its authority, with two main consequences: the first is the phenomenon of the *splitting-off* of communities poorly integrated in the Hittite palatial system. These ones took advantage of such a weakening to become autonomous (see e.g. the so-called rebel provinces, whose evidence goes back to Tudhaliya IV's time⁸⁶); the second is the entry of new people, who filled the power vacuum in the areas struck by the Sea People.

The Cilicia Plain was involved in both these phenomena. Known by the name of Kizzuwatna since the time of Telipinu, it was directly enclosed to Hatti under Šuppiluliuma I, as far as we know, it was not characterized by distinctive rebellions for the entire time of the empire. With the decline of the Hittite power, though, some people from this region

deeds on a construction located on the same boundaries of the lands inhabited by the defeated people, as a warning, therefore, of the persistent power of Hatti and of its possibility to intervene in these regions, the inscription of Šudburg found a place in Hattusa and was directed almost exclusively to an internal public, in an attitude that could be regarded as self-celebratory, and that would demonstrate the inability of the country to exert at this time any kind of control over the only just subjected lands, perhaps because already involved in the raids of the Sea People.

⁸⁴ The presence of the Sea People in the Mediterranean may indeed have justified the conquest of Alašiya/Cyprus by Šuppiluliuma II; see also note 49.

⁸⁵ RS (Excavation numbers of the Ras Shamra tablets) 18.147.

⁸⁶ There are actually other examples of subversive activity previous to these events: limiting only to the empire's time, we may recall the moment during which the young Muršili II became king (see his ten-year Annals, KBo 3.4 Vs I §2-§4. A. Götze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*. Leipzig, pp. 15-21 and J.P. Grelis, "Les annales décennales de Mursili II (CTH 61.1)", *Hethitica* IX (1988), pp. 54-55 e pp. 74-75; also see the prayer to the Sun goddess of Arinna, CTH 376, partially translated by R. Lebrun, "Reflexions sur le Lukka et environs au 13ème s. av. J.-C.", *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East, Festschrift E. Lipinski* (OLA 65). Leuven 1995, p. 140 and by T.R. Bryce, *The Luwians*, p. 75); or the crisis that Hattusili III had to face in south-central Anatolia after having deposed his nephew and legitimate sovereign Urhi-Tesub (see Annals of Hattusili III, CTH 87. O.R. Gurney, "The Annals of Hattusili III", *AnSt* 47 (1997), pp. 127-139); or even the rebellions that involved Landa and the Lower Land in the first years of Tudhaliya IV's reign (see the Letter to Puduhepa, KUB 19.23. I. Singer, "Western Anatolia in the Thirteenth Century B.C. According to the Hittite Sources", *AnSt* 33 (1983), p. 214; Jasink, *Studies Fronzaroli*, p. 275). The picture shown is of constant uncertainty by Hittite part in the control of some provinces, which at all times were ready to take advantage of any sign of weakness in order to become autonomous.

rose against the Hittite dominion and became part of the “coalition” of people that contributed to the social and political revolution in the Mediterranean. If the relation of the Tereš⁸⁷ to Tarsus⁸⁸ is not sure, the derivation of Danuna/Denen from Adana can, instead, be considered with confidence⁸⁹. Some centres of Cilicia, beside actively taking part to the events of this particular historical period, suffered the consequences of it as well, e.g. Tarsus, the archaeological evidences of which reveal a level of destruction most likely in relation to this time. The city was rebuilt, even if actually smaller, shortly after on the same site, and shows a relevant novelty, i.e. the considerable presence of a distinctive typology of Mycenaean pottery, previously virtually unknown in this area⁹⁰. On the basis of both the written sources and the archaeological data, it is undeniable that commercial routes already existed connecting the Aegean world to the ports of Syria and of Palestine. The treatise between Tudhaliya IV and Šaušgamuwa of Amurru, for example, represents a textual evidence: omitting in this circumstance the virtually total absence of findings of Mycenaean pottery in the territory that belonged to Assyria – with all the deriving considerations –, this document points out that indeed commercial contacts most likely connected Ahhiyawa with Amurru⁹¹. As it has already been anticipated, it is presumable that such trades followed a route along the coasts of south Anatolia⁹², perhaps even to the port of Ura – on the eastern boundary of the country of Tarhuntašša⁹³ –, descending then, through Cyprus, to Ugarit⁹⁴ and to the other Syro-Palestinian centers⁹⁵. During the time Cilicia was a Hittite province and appears to have remained excluded from this itinerary, probably also because of its population's little predispo-

⁸⁷ Moreover, this people is already present in the list of countries defeated by Meremphah (1213-1204 B.C. approximately) in the fifth year of his reign.

⁸⁸ See e.g. Niemeier, *Studies Dothan*, p. 46; Jasink, *Studi Cataudella*, p. 600 n. 37. The term Tereš, however, has been correlated also with Taruiša/Troy.

⁸⁹ J. Freu, *Géographie historique des provinces méridionales de l'Empire Hittite: Kizzuwatna, Arzawa, Lukka, Milawatta, L.A.M.A., Document n° 6, Tome 2*. Nice 1980, pp. 205-224; J. Vanschoonwinkel, “L'Egée et la Méditerranée orientale à la fin du deuxième millénaire”, *Archaeologia Transatlantica* XI (1991), pp. 326-327; Jasink, *Studi Cataudella*, pp. 599-601; C.J. Moreu, “The Sea Peoples and the Historical Background of the Trojan War”, *Meditarch* 16 (2003), p. 117.

⁹⁰ E. French, “A Reassessment of the Mycenaean Pottery at Tarsus”, *AnSt* 25 (1975), p. 56; E.S. Sherratt e J.H. Crouwel, “Mycenaean Pottery from Cilicia in Oxford”, *OJA* 6 (1987), p. 341; A.M. Jasink, *IIOIKIAMA* 2001, pp. 591-595; E. Jean, “From Bronze to Iron Ages in Cilicia: The Pottery in its Stratigraphic Context”, *Identifying Changes: The Transition from Bronze to Iron Ages in Anatolia and its Neighbouring Regions*. Fischer, Genz, Jeanand Köroglu eds. Istanbul 2002, pp. 86-88.

⁹¹ Niemeier, *Studies Dothan* 1998, p. 25.

⁹² This is what the relicts of ships carrying Mycenaean manufactures found at Ulu Burun and Cape Gelidonya suggest, see R. Payton, “The Ulu Burun Writing-Board Set”, *AnSt* 43 (1993), pp. 99-106; C. Pulak, “The Uluburun Shipwreck”, *Res Maritimae, Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean from Prehistory to Late Antiquity. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium “Cities on the Sea”, Nicosia, Cyprus, October 18-22 1994*. Atlanta, Georgia 1997, pp. 233-262; G. Bass, *Cape Gelidonya: a Bronze Age Shipwreck*. Philadelphia 1967.

⁹³ Jasink, *Studi Cataudella*, pp. 601-605.

⁹⁴ M. Yon, “The Foreign Relations of Ugarit”, *ΠΑΟΕΣ...Sea Routes...Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th-6th c. BC, Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th – October 2nd 2002*. N.Chr. Stampolidis – V. Karageorghis edd. Athens 2003, pp. 42-46.

⁹⁵ See also Jasink, *Studi Cataudella*, pp. 591-595.

sition to maritime activities, as the infrequent traces of coastal settlements belonging to this time would suggest, which although are not justified by physical-geographical factors.

The site that offers the most important evidence of Mycenaean pottery is Tarsus, where a total of 875 Mycenaean sherds was found, but similar findings, although more limited, have been discovered in other sites of the same region as well, e.g. Kazanlı, Mersin, Soli Höyük, Kinet Höyük e Kilise Tepe. All the pottery we can refer to has similar features: it belongs almost totally to the LH IIIC, i.e. to the so-called transition phase contemporary and subsequent to the changes in the eastern Mediterranean; it is often associated within the same contexts with local produced pottery of Anatolian tradition; it also could be locally produced; it shows analogies in the shapes and decoration patterns with the contemporary Cypriot and eastern-Aegean pottery, more than with the Greek continent production⁹⁶. Such elements would lead to suggest the intrusion in this region of a population having a Mycenaean material culture, that would have settled there taking advantage of the power vacuum left by the shattering of the country of Kizzuwatna, and that would have later fused with local people, probably for its reduced number⁹⁷, losing in time its typical features, at least in point of ceramic production (and accordingly perhaps on a dietary level). In this population I tend to recognize a “colony” from the country of Ahhiyawa both for the stylistic analogies, which appear to relate the ceramic findings discovered in this area with those of the eastern Aegean, even through Cyprus⁹⁸, and for the foundation – coeval and following the Mycenaean material demonstrations – of many coastal centres in Cilicia⁹⁹. These foundations could be a cultural result of the people of Ahhiyawa (well used to consider the sea their own territory, in contrast to the indigenous population, which traditionally appears to be less accustomed to maritime practices). In addition, there is the evidence offered by the inscriptions of Meremphah, in which the ‘áqajawasa/Eqweš (= Ahhiyawa?) are presented next to those people (tribes from Libia, Šerden, Šekeleš, Lukka and Tereš) that, towards the end of Late Bronze Age, wandered in the Mediterranean, spreading terror with their raids, in search of new lands to occupy.

The origin of these settlements could also be related to the invasion of Alašiya (Cyprus) by Šuppiluliuma II, interpreting this act, as it has already been done, as an attempt of the sovereign to contrast the Sea People, taking away from them what had become a home base for their raids in the eastern Mediterranean. Among these “pirates”, it is possible that there were precisely people of Ahhiyawa which, after the involvement of the Hittite sovereign, would have moved to the Cilician coasts, taking with them Cypriot stylistic elements, which are evident in the intrusive pottery found in Cilician sites.

In conclusion, it is possible, perhaps, to ascribe the legendary foundation by Mopsos of a reign in Cilicia to this historical time, which may be related to the migrations that followed

⁹⁶ E. French, *AnSt* 25 (1975), pp. 55, 56 (n. 5), 74. Sherratt – Crouwel, *OJA* 6 (1987), pp. 343-344.

⁹⁷ J. Yakar, “Identifying Migrations in the archaeological Records of Anatolia”, *Identifying Changes*, pp. 12-13.

⁹⁸ As well as the demonstrated commercial relations that connected Ahhiyawa and Cyprus, there is the historical fact, testified by the Indictment of Madduwatta, of the acts of piracy committed by Attarš(š)iya, in league with Madduwatta and Piggaya's man, against some centres of Alašiya in the first half of the XIV cent. B.C.

⁹⁹ Sherratt – Crouwel, *OJA* 6 (1987), p. 345.

the shattering of the order previously established in Anatolia by the Hittite empire and that likely led a community coming from the country of Ahhiyawa to settle precisely in that region¹⁰⁰. If it is true that such a community was not very numerous, since it fairly quickly lost some of its characteristic features in favour of local ones, although, according to the inscription of Çineköy, it would appear to have been able to maintain the memory of its identity for several more centuries, founding a reign that reflected the name of its land of origin (Hiyawa = Ahhiyawa) and with dynasts that continued to recall in the onomastics their Cretan origins.

¹⁰⁰ Yakar, *Tel Aviv* 1993, pp. 3 ff. See in particular pp. 14-18.