

TROY AND THE TROJAN WAR

A SYMPOSIUM HELD AT BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
OCTOBER 1984

Papers by
J. LAWRENCE ANGEL, HANS G. GÜTERBOCK,
MANFRED KORFMANN, JEROME SPERLING,
EMILY D.T. VERMEULE AND CALVERT WATKINS

Edited by
MACHTELD J. MELLINK



BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PA.
1986

IV

TROY IN HITTITE TEXTS? WILUSA, AHHIYAWA, AND HITTITE HISTORY

Hans G. Güterbock

Among the Hittite tablets excavated in 1906-1907 at Hattusa, the Hittite capital at Boğazköy in central Turkey, there is a vassal treaty concluded between the Hittite Great King Muwatallis and Alaksandus, ruler of Wilusa. Already in 1924, Paul Kretschmer had pointed to the similarity between Alaksandus, king of Wilusa, and Alexandros, prince of (W)Ilios. In addition, he mentioned the note of Stephanus Byzantius according to which a certain Motylos, founder of the city of Samylia in Caria, was host to Paris and Helen (presumably on their way from Sparta to Troy); he took Motylos as an echo of Muwatallis, the name of the overlord of Alaksandus. In a postscript Kretschmer commented on Emil Forrer's equation of the place name Taruisas with Troy, which he accepted.¹

It must be because of these names that you have invited a Hittitologist to participate in this discussion of the Trojan War. In a wider sense, the Trojan War, whatever its date, is so close to the time of the Hittites and the Mycenaeans that it is legitimate to ask whether the so-called Ahhiyawa problem — the question of whether the name Ahhiyawa of the Hittite documents refers to the land of the Achaians — has a bearing on the historical background of the Trojan War.

The Ahhiyawa problem is still a matter of faith: there is no strict proof possible either pro or contra. In recent years I have publicly stated why I belong to the believers, and have offered new interpretations of a few passages in support of my opinion. In a paper read before the

1. Paul Kretschmer, "Alakšanduš, König von Viluša," *Glotta* 13 (1924) 205-213, an article based on a mere mention of the text by F. Hrozný, *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research* 6 (1922) 67. Kretschmer wrote before the appearance of E. Forrer's much discussed article on "Vorhomerische Griechen in den Keilschrifttexten von Boghazköi," *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 63 (1924) 1-22, which he could only cite in a postscript. D.D. Luckenbill had noticed the similarity of Alaksandus with Alexandros as early as 1911: "A Possible Occurrence of the name Alexander in the Boghaz-keui Tablets," *Classical Philology* 6 (1911) 85-86.

Archaeological Institute of America² and repeated, with the relevant documents, in a seminar at Bryn Mawr College, I left out the Alaksandus issue because it has no direct bearing on the Ahhiyawa problem. In a later paper, read before the American Philosophical Society,³ I briefly mentioned it without taking a stand. Here now is the occasion to face this question.

I shall discuss the various aspects of the problem in the following sections:

1. The names Alaksandus and Kukkunnis;
2. The date of Alaksandus;
3. The names Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa;
4. The history of Wilusa (which will be the longest section);
5. The relation of Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa to one another;
6. The location of Wilusa;
7. The gods of Wilusa.

1. *The names Alaksandus and Kukkunnis.* In the onomastic of the Hittite period the name Alaksandus is rather isolated; it has no recognizable meaning in Hittite or Luvian and no similarity to other names. Therefore it is conceivable that it is foreign. On the Greek side, Ferdinand Sommer's objection to the antiquity of the name Alexandros — on the grounds that older compounds with the word for "man" used the form *enōr* — is now removed by the occurrence of the name Alexandra (*a-re-ka-sa-da-ra*) in a tablet found at Mycenae.⁴ Thus, Alaksandus *may* be the Greek name Alexandros. But here we must immediately add that Alaksandus is nowhere characterized as an Ahhiyawa man. He is called one of the four kings in the Arzawa countries.

According to the treaty, a predecessor of Alaksandus, contemporary with Muwatallis' grandfather Suppiluliumas (ca. 1352-1322), bears the name Kukkunnis, which may well be Anatolian, since it resembles such names as Kukulis, Pupullis, Zuzullis, etc. Kretschmer compared it with the name Kyknos (Κύκνος) of a hero somehow connected with Troy, but he thought that Kyknos was a "Gräzisierung" (Hellenization) of a foreign, i.e., Anatolian name, since he felt that the reasons given in the Greek tradition for a hero being called "Swan" were rather artificial.

It seems to me that for both names, Alaksandus and Kukkunnis, the

2. H.G. Güterbock, "Hittites and the Aegean World: Part I. The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered," *American Journal of Archaeology* 87 (1983) 133-138.
3. H.G. Güterbock, "Hittites and Akhaeans: A New Look," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 128 (1984) 114-122.
4. J. Chadwick, *The Mycenae Tablets III* (*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 52.7, 1962) 64-65, No. V 659. For Sommer's objection see *infra*, n. 5.

same two explanations are possible: Either they are Anatolian, and the Greek names — if indeed their similarity is not purely accidental — are Greek interpretations of foreign names; this was Sommer's view.⁵ Or these names are actually Greek, Alexandros and Kyknos, respectively, and the forms we read in the cuneiform text are Hittitizations.

2. *The date of Alaksandus.* Hittitologists have given reasons for dating the installation of Alaksandus as king of Wilusa to that part of Muwatallis' reign which falls before the war with Egypt that culminated in the battle of Qadesh. According to the newest view on the chronology of the Egyptian New Kingdom,⁶ the battle occurred in 1275, which gives an approximate date of ca. 1280 for the Alaksandus treaty. How this date of Alaksandus compares with the date or dates proposed for the Trojan War I hope to learn from the other symposiasts.

3. *The names Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa.* Sommer, with all due disclaimers that this was not his opinion but only a possible "way out" for those who insist on the equation of Wilusa with Ilios, suggested that in addition to the initial digamma one might assume a form *Wiluwa "without the -s- suffix": *Wiluas > Wilios.⁷

As for Wilusiya, the additional -iya is no obstacle to the identification with Wilusa, since there are other Anatolian place names that occur with and without this augment.

Forrer's claim that *Ta-ru(-ú)-i-sa* was "Troy" was discussed by Kretschmer⁸ and Sommer,⁹ both admitting that the equation could be accepted on the assumption that the first syllable was only the graphic device in cuneiform for writing the cluster *tr* and that the name had a secondary form without the -s-. So one might posit Truisa > Truiya > Troiē.

The relationship among the three places will be discussed later.

4. *The history of Wilusa.* The Alaksandus treaty, like many others, contains a preamble outlining the events that led to the conclusion of the treaty. Unfortunately most of this introduction is very poorly preserved. Since Friedrich's edition of 1930 some additional material has turned up,

5. Sommer, AU 370. C. Watkins (*infra*, 48-49) takes Alaksandus as Greek, Kukkunnis as Anatolian.
6. E.F. Wente and C.C. Van Siclen, III, "A Chronology of the New Kingdom," in *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes* (*Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations* 39, Chicago 1976) 217-261, esp. 218.
7. AU 370-371, n. 1, comparing such pairs as Karkisa/Karkiya, Himussa/Himuwa (the last two places are, however, not identical).
8. Kretschmer (*supra* n. 1) 213. For Forrer, see *supra* n. 1.
9. AU 364.

but not enough to fill all the gaps.¹⁰ The first few lines can now be rendered as follows:

After my forefather Labarnas had, long ago, subjugated all the lands of Arzawa [and] the land of Wilusa, Arzawa began hostilities, but Wilusa defected from Hatti — since the matter is long past I do not know from which king. (But even) when Wilusa had [defec]ted from Hatti, they (its people) were at peace with Hatti and kept sending [messengers]. But when Tudhaliyas came to Arzawa he did not enter Wilusa: [it was] at peace and kept sending [messengers].

According to this account Wilusa was brought under Hittite overlordship already under Labarnas, probably II, of the Old Kingdom (before 1600), but later became independent again. It is amusing to see that Muwatallis confesses his ignorance regarding the date of this defection. But he then stresses that Wilusa maintained peaceful relations even after it gained independence. The Tudhaliyas mentioned next must be one of the kings of that name who reigned around 1400, most probably Tudhaliyas II. The statement that he did not enter Wilusa because it was at peace is of importance for the discussion of the assumed identity of Wilusiya with Wilusa (to which we shall turn later).

The fragmentary next section deals with the time of Suppiluliumas I, apparently in the same sense that this king fought Arzawa but that Kukkunnis, king of Wilusa, was at peace and kept sending messengers. The section dealing with the next Hittite king, Mursilis II, the father of Muwatallis, is unfortunately very badly damaged. From other sources we know that he defeated Arzawa and concluded vassal treaties with Mira-Kuwaliya, Seha-Appawiya, and Haballa. Just the names of these countries are mentioned in our treaty; the context is lost. Preceding these names there are four beginnings of lines reading:

the land of Wi[lusa . . .]
the king of W[ilusa . . .]
help [. . .]
he attacked [. . .]

Did Mursilis help the king of Wilusa? Was this Kukkunnis? Against whom did he help him? There follows another section which Friedrich restored in the sense that Kukkunnis adopted Alaksandus as son and heir, but this is

10. J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches II* (*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft* [henceforth *MVAeG*] 34.1 [1934]) 50-55, with *KUB XLVIII.95* added to his copy *C₁* = *KUB XXI.2*.



only one possibility; the relationship between the two rulers remains unknown.

Where Muwatallis comes to his own time, the still fragmentary text seems to say that he helped Alaksandus against some aggressors, among them the country of Masa, before concluding the treaty.

What happened to Wilusa after the conclusion of the Alaksandus treaty?

Some time after the treaty an attack on Wilusa by Hittite troops is mentioned in a letter of Manapa-Tarhuntas, king of the Seha River Land, but its reason or significance is not clear.¹¹

Still later is the so-called Tawakalawas letter,¹² which is addressed to an unnamed king of Ahhiyawa by an equally unnamed Hittite king (their names must have been on the first tablet of this long letter, which is not preserved). Most scholars now believe that the writer was Hattusilis III (ca. 1255-1230) rather than Muwatallis. At one point the writer (Hattusilis) asks the addressee (the king of Ahhiyawa) to remind a third person of the fact that the two kings made peace in the matter of Wilusa about which they had been fighting. The name of the town is slightly damaged, and the reading *Wi-lu-ša* has therefore been doubted. But an enlarged photograph, which I owe to the kindness of Mrs. Ehelolf, shows the three signs clearly enough, so that I do not hesitate to accept the reading. I thus take it as fact that a Hittite king (most probably Hattusilis III in the middle of the thirteenth century) and a Great King of Ahhiyawa "were at odds over the matter of Wilusa."¹³ The following clause: "He (the Hittite) persuaded me (the Ahhiyawan) in that matter and we made peace" *may* indicate that it was only a diplomatic confrontation, but the possibility of actual war is not ruled out. Whatever event is meant here, it would be very different from the Trojan War of tradition!

The next text containing information on Wilusa is the so-called Milawata letter.¹⁴ The main part of the tablet is broken in such a way that more than half the length of each line is lost. Nevertheless it was used over the years as one of the principal sources for the Ahhiyawa problem. Recently Harry Hoffner found an adjoining fragment (both pieces are in Berlin and have been physically joined) which completes the last ten lines of the reverse and the five lines of the lower edge.¹⁵ It is in this completed section that Wilusa is mentioned.

11. *KUB XIX.5:3-4*, translated in J. Garstang and O.R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* (London 1959, henceforth Garstang-Gurney) 95.

12. *AU 2-19*; the name Wilusa in col. iv 8 (p. 16) with discussion, pp. 169-170.

13. Thus *CHD III* 20 s.v. *laknu*- 6.

14. *KUB XIX.55*, *AU* 198-205.

15. H.A. Hoffner, "The Milawata Letter Augmented and Reinterpreted," in *28^{ème} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, Vienna 1981 (*Archiv für Orientforschung, Beiheft* 19, 1983) 130-137.

The introduction to this letter consists of a single line of which only the words "Thus (speaks) His Majesty to [. . .]" are preserved. No greeting or blessing follows. This was the way to address subalterns. The use of the mere title "My Majesty" without the name of the king is standard in such cases. In the text the royal writer calls the addressee "my son." Since in the course of the letter he mentions the addressee's own father, it is clear that the addressee is not the king's real son; the term "my son" is rather used to address a vassal in a condescending way; conversely a vassal occasionally addresses his overlord as "my father."¹⁶ This Hittite vassal may or may not have been the ruler of Milawata, but if his realm was not Milawata itself it must have been close to its borders.¹⁷

At the time of the Tawakalawas letter Milawanda/Milawata, which is most probably Miletos, belonged to the king of Ahhiyawa; the Milawata letter obviously presupposes a different situation. Above, we dated the Tawakalawas letter to the reign of Hattusilis III. The unnamed writer of the Milawata letter is probably Hattusilis' son, Tudhaliyas IV. This dating is based on some spellings characteristic of the late thirteenth century and, more specifically, on the mention of a couple of cities otherwise known from a hieroglyphic inscription of Tudhaliyas.

In the completed section of the letter we read:

My son, send Walmus to me! Then I shall install him again in the kingship of Wilusa: just as he was previously king of Wilusa, let him now likewise [be king of Wilusa], and just as he was previously our . . . vassal, let him now be likewise a . . . vassal [of . . .].

In the fragmentary preceding lines, restored only partially by the join, it was apparently told that someone (Walmus?) had fled, following which one reads: "Another lord for them." Apparently there had been what we now call a coup in Wilusa, and this event prompted the Hittite king to reinstate the legitimate vassal, Walmus.

16. See, e.g., H. Klengel, "Zum Brief eines Königs von Hanigalbat," *Orientalia* 32 (1963) 280-282.

17. In the version of this paper read at the Bryn Mawr Symposium, I followed a tentative interpretation offered by Hoffner (supra n. 15) for the verb written on the joining fragment with a rare logogram (DU). It resulted in a translation "When we, My Majesty, and you, my son, took away territory of Milawata." Afterwards I found that a better attested reading of the same sign (as GIN) results in "established/fixed the border of Milawata for ourselves," which amounts to the same as Sommer's free restoration (AU 202-203.47). Another ambiguity is in the subsequent phrase "I did not give you [such and such place] in addition to the territory of Milawata" or "within the borders of Milawata." I now prefer the second alternative in both cases ("established the border" and "within the border"), but even so the addressee may originally have ruled in a neighboring area.

Finally there is a small fragment of a royal letter¹⁸ that dealt with the affairs of Wilusa but is broken in a most tantalizing way. It is addressed by "[. . . , the Great King of Hat]ti, to Mashuittas, king of [. . .]." Instead of Mashuittas one can also read Parhuittas (the name is not attested elsewhere). The next three lines contain the usual statement that all is well with the writer and the wish that it may be the same with the addressee. This indicates that the addressee was a sovereign king, and we would love to know what his country was. The next lines, of which only the ends in decreasing length are preserved, contain the following words or phrases:

[. . .] in that year kingship
[. . .] killed (3d. sg.), but to/for me the land of Wi[lusa]
[. . .] but Wilusa not to/for me
[. . .] was (3d. sg.) [. . .]
[. . .] in that affair
[. . .] at the time of my father the land of x[. . .]
(the sign is not *wi*; it could be *š[a]*)
[. . .] to/for life [. . .].

It is clear that there was trouble in Wilusa. Was it the same as that just mentioned? According to the handwriting, the tablet seems to belong in the thirteenth century, but I cannot date it more precisely or determine its chronological relation to the Milawata letter.

This is what we can glean of the history of Wilusa. Is that Troy?

5. *The relation of Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa to one another.* So far we have looked at the occurrences of the name Wilusa. The other two, Wilusiya and Taruisa, occur together in the annals of Tudhaliyas,¹⁹ one of the texts that have recently been redated, on linguistic grounds, to Tudhaliyas II of ca. 1400 B.C. Both these names occur only here.

In the first section of this text which is at least partially preserved Tudhaliyas mentions, among other countries, Arzawa, the land of the river Seha, and Haballa, i.e., those parts of western Anatolia later referred to as the Arzawa lands. After he had returned to Hattusa, he continues: "the following countries started hostilities: [. . .]ukka, Kispuwa," etc. This is the beginning of a list of which about twenty names are preserved while a few additional ones are lost. The last preserved items in this list are "land of Wi-lu-ši-ya, land of Ta-ru(-ú)-i-ša" (the additional *ú* sign is in the duplicate). The text then says that all these countries combined their troops

18. KBo XVIII.18.

19. KUB XXIII.11, and duplicate 12, translated in Garstang-Gurney, 121-122; O. Carruba, "Beiträge zur Mittelhethitischen Geschichte, I: Die Tuthalijas und die Arnuwandas," *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 18 (1977) 137-174, esp. 158-161.

against the Hittite king but that he defeated this whole army. He adds that he went into every single one of the countries that had formed the coalition and deported their inhabitants. He then sums up the whole action with the words "When I had destroyed the land of Assuwa."

This has been interpreted in the following way: The twenty-odd countries are called "the Assuwa coalition." The name Assuwa has been taken as the root of the later term Asia which refers to Lydia in its earliest attestations but was soon extended to include most of western Anatolia.²⁰ The list is supposed to be arranged geographically, although there is no evidence for the assumption. The first name, broken [. . .]ukka, was restored to [L]ukka by some, but not by all scholars. Since Lukka is supposed to be Lycia or Lycaonia the list was interpreted as running from south to north, so that Wilusiya and Taruisa became the northernmost countries in the west, which beautifully fitted the Troad!

I guess this listing of all the assumptions suffices to show how shaky the whole argument is. In addition there is the contrast between what Tudhaliyas says about Wilusiya in his own annals and what Muwatallis mentions in the historical part of his treaty. There we read that Tudhaliyas went into Arzawa but not into Wilusa because it was at peace; but in his own annals Tudhaliyas reports that Wilusiya was part of the coalition and that he went into every one of the member countries, even deported their people.²¹

Furthermore, Wilusiya and Taruisa are listed side by side, both as countries. How does that fit the assumed equations Wilusiya = (W)Ilios and Taruisa = Troia? It is generally accepted that for the Greeks Troia was the name of the area, while the city was called Ilios. In the Tudhaliyas annals they are both called "country." Of course one could argue that the scribe who compiled the list had no real knowledge of all the place names and mechanically put the logogram KUR, "country," in front of every one. Or, in order to save the Greek distinction, one could take KUR "Taruisa" as apposition to the preceding name and translate "the land of Wilusiya, a region of Taruisa." But that would be an *ad hoc* interpretation and therefore not acceptable.

One scholar proposed to take Taruisa as the royal citadel and Wilusiya as the region surrounding it, thus reversing the distinction made by the Greeks, and added that this was the land of Ahhiyawa, and that Troy VI

20. D.J. Georgakas, "The Name Asia for the Continent: its History and Origin," *Names* 17 (1969) 1-90, esp. 22ff.

21. One could try to avoid the contradiction by assuming that the two texts refer to two different kings Tudhaliyas, both of the Middle Hittite period. But this would be an *ad hoc* interpretation. As long as we know so little about those kings, it is more natural to ascribe these western campaigns to one ruler.

was the royal citadel of that country. This proposal was immediately refuted.²² I only cite it as an example of a divergent view. What is certain is that Wilusa in almost all its occurrences is clearly the name of a country, in contrast to the Greek use of Ilios. The writing without the sign KUR, "land," in the Tawakalawas letter (as reconstructed by Sommer, preceded by the logogram INIM, "the affair of") does not necessarily mean that it was only the city about which the two kings quarreled. Omission of KUR after another logogram is frequent. On the other hand, the normal writing KUR "Wilusa" may, but need not, imply the existence of a city of that name.²³

6. *Location of Wilusa.* Garstang and Gurney,²⁴ followed by Heinhold-Krahmer,²⁵ argued that the reason why Wilusa was able to stay out of the conflict between Arzawa and Hatti was its distance from both countries. That Manapa-Tarhuntas, the king of the land of the river Seha, mentions an attack on Wilusa in his above-mentioned letter has been taken as indication that Wilusa was not too far from his own country. As for the Seha River itself, the importance given in the same letter to an attack on Lazpa — assuming that it is indeed Lesbos — has been interpreted as showing that the Seha is one of the more northerly rivers, either the Kaikos, the river of Pergamon (thus Garstang), or the Hermos, which has a more impressive plain. If then Wilusa was farther than the land of the river Seha from Arzawa with its capital Apasa = Ephesos, it may well have been north of the river Seha, which would fit its position in the Troad.

I cannot discuss here all the reasons given by various scholars for putting Wilusa in the Troad, or those given by others for putting it elsewhere. Suffice it to say that the localization in the Troad seems to me the most likely one, although — as with most of Hittite geography — no strict proof is possible.²⁶ The fact that a king of Wilusa, according to the Milawata letter, took refuge with the ruler of Milawata/Miletos or of a country near it does not necessarily disprove the northerly localization of Wilusa.

22. T.R. Bryce, "Ahhiyawa and Troy—a Case of Mistaken Identity?," *Historia* 26 (1977) 24-32, against J.D. Muhly, "Hittites and Achaeans: Ahhiyawā redomitus," *Historia* 23 (1974) 135; cf. J.G. Macqueen, "Geography and History in Western Asia Minor in the Second Millennium," *Anatolian Studies* 18 (1968) 169-185, esp. 184-185.

23. A. Götze, *Madduwattā's* (MVAeG 32.1 [1928]) 50-53.

24. Garstang-Gurney, 101-105.

25. S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa: Untersuchungen zu seiner Geschichte nach den hethitischen Quellen* (Texte der Hethiter 8, Heidelberg 1977) 350-352; cf. her chapter on Wiluša, 157-178.

26. Cf. also S. Košak, "Western Neighbours of the Hittites," *Eretz-Israel* 15 (1981) 12*-16*, and I. Singer, "Western Anatolia in the Thirteenth Century B.C. according to the Hittite Sources," *Anatolian Studies* 33 (1983) 205-217, esp. 215-216.

7. *The gods of Wilusa.* At the end of the Alaksandus treaty the gods of Hatti and of Wilusa are invoked as witnesses. While the names of the gods of the Hittites fill twenty-six lines, the enumeration of the gods of Wilusa consists of only the following names: "The Stormgod of the Army, [one name lost, *[-x-ap-pa-li-u-na-aš]*, the male and female gods, mountains, rivers, [springs] and the subterranean river(?) of Wilusa."²⁷ Despite the break it is not likely that there were many signs lost before *ap*,²⁸ and the context demands a divine name. It is therefore quite probable that we have here a god called Appaliunas. This was equated by Forrer²⁹ with Apollo, in an old form **Apeljōn* reconstructed from Cypriote *Apeilōn* and Doric *Apellōn*. The double writing *ap-pa* is the normal Hittite way of rendering voiceless /p/; Hittite *a* corresponds to epsilon also in Apasa/Ephesos, Lazpa/Lesbos, Tawakalawa/Etewokelewes. The equation was, of course, rejected by Sommer.³⁰ It is true that the evidence is not sufficient for proof; but neither is there any reason why the equation could not be true. The origin of Apollo, both of the god himself and of his name, is by no means clear and has been sought outside Greece by many commentators. In the *Iliad* Apollōn is on the side of the Trojans. If Wilusa were Ilios and had Apaliunas/Apollōn as one of its three named deities it would make good sense, especially since this god need not have been "Greek" Apollo. It is in conjunction with the other names here discussed that the hypothesis Apaliunas/Apollōn gains importance.

Summing up, we found the following:
 Wilusa was a country, perhaps, but not certainly, with a capital city of the same name.
 The localization of Wilusa in the Troad is possible, even likely, but not

27. KUB XXI.1 iv 27-29; Friedrich (supra n. 10) 80 with additions after an old copy by Hugo Winckler; H. Otten, "Zusätzliche Lesungen zum Alaksandus-Vertrag," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientalforschung* 5 (1957) 29.

28. F. Sommer, "Apollon von Ilios?," *Indogermanische Forschungen* 55 (1937) 181, found that a photograph showed a trace before the *ap* which could best be a "broken vertical" as found at the end of the signs *a*, *za*, *ya*, and *kar*. The choice of *a* may be begging the question, but since spelling *a-ap* in initial position is normal in Hittite, it remains the most likely restoration. Sommer (178-179) expects a mention of the main goddess in this line. Her name would easily fit into the lacuna. (Should we venture a restoration **[ISTAR-li-iš]* as *interpretatio Hethitica* of Aphrodite?)

29. E. Forrer, "Apollon," *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 1.5 (1931) 141-144; cf. P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 24 (1936) 250-251; E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* (Paris 1947) 80.

30. Sommer (supra n. 28) 176-182.

strictly provable, and the suspicion remains that it was influenced by the thought that Troy was meant.

There is nothing in the glimpses we get of Wilusa's history that has any similarity to the Trojan War.

The name Wilusa can be combined with Ilios, but only if a number of morphological and phonetic changes are accepted.

The relation of Wilusa to Wilusiya and T(a)ruisa remains unclear.

Alaksandus is ruler of Wilusa as Hittite vassal, while Alexandros is a son of the independent king Priam.

Muwatallis was a Hittite Great King, while Motylos, founder of a city on the Carian coast, had no comparable position.

The identity of []appaliunas with **Apeliōn*/Apollōn is possible—some would even say probable—but cannot be considered proven.

Neither can any of the four equations, Kukunnis = Kyknos, Alaksandus = Alexandros, Muwatallis = Motylos, and Wilusa = (W)ilios, be proven; there are even some counterindications, as we have seen.

Yet the five similarities remain very suggestive, and there will be some who argue that the combination of these five cannot be accidental. For the sake of argument let us suppose that the similarity can be trusted and, in addition, that Alexandros was the original name of the man called Alaksandus by the Hittites. We would then have a man with a Greek name ruling over Ilios, a city and country which, apart from the remote past under Labarnas, had been independent of the Hittites until he, Alexandros, became a Hittite vassal ca. 1280. After him the area seems to have remained under Hittite rule. That the epic tradition remembered just the existence of a royal personage of that name (and of Kyknos) and incorporated these men somehow into the story of the Trojan War would not be surprising. That the Hittite text never says anything about their ethnic background despite their Greek names is not surprising either, since the designation as rulers of Wilusa was sufficient. We said that Alaksandus is never called an Ahhiyawan, and that is as it should be. I have argued that the Great King of Ahhiyawa, equal in rank to the Great King of Hatti and, by implication, to those of Egypt and Babylonia, can only be a ruler of the rank of an Agamemnon.³¹ We heard that after the Alaksandus treaty he and Hattusilis quarreled about Wilusa. This shows that the city was not considered part of Ahhiyawa by the Hittites. All this would, of course, fit the picture of Troy as a local kingdom, quite distinct from the Greeks who fought against it. If

31. See my articles cited supra, nn. 2-3.

our two Wilusian friends really have Greek names, they are not different from those Trojans in the epic who carry such names. I hope to learn more about the significance of this phenomenon.³²

I said "let us suppose for the sake of argument." Having spun out this nice hypothesis I must repeat that it is no more than just that: a hypothesis. We cannot claim with any certainty that Wilusa is Ilios or that Alaksandus is Alexandros. It would be nice if we could say that the bards remembered the name of a historical ruler, but what they made of him has about as much relevance for the historical Alaksandus as the role of kings Etzel and Dietrich von Bern in the Nibelungen Lied has for Attila or Theodoric.³³

The Oriental Institute
University of Chicago
1155 East 58th Street
Chicago, IL 60637-1569

32. On Greek and non-Greek names at Troy see the contribution by C. Watkins, pp. 53-55.

33. Postscript: L. Foxhall and J.K. Davies, eds., *The Trojan War, Its Historicity and Context: Papers of the First Greenbank Colloquium, Liverpool 1981* (Bristol 1984), has just appeared; D.F. Easton, "Hittite History and the Trojan War," pp. 23-44, has a different approach and does not mention the "five names," while placing Wilusa outside the Troad.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE TROJANS

Calvert Watkins

I have been asked as a linguist, an Indo-Europeanist, to address the question of "the language, or the languages, of the Trojans."¹ Speaking at the Fifth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies in Salamanca in 1970, the French Hittitologist Emmanuel Laroche said: "The Anatolian Northwest, comprising the future lands of Bithynia, Mysia, Lydia, and the Troad, forms a uniform blank on the linguistic atlas of the second millennium. There is not the slightest indication which would permit us to imagine what population group the people who formed the background of the Homeric lay belonged to."² I shall return to these lines presently; but they are a salutary point of departure.

The linguistic situation in general in Anatolia in the second millennium may be briefly sketched as follows. I limit myself to central and western Anatolia. The Old Hittite Laws (sixteenth century) recognize three regions of Anatolia: Hatti, Pāla, and Luiya. Hatti is the Hittite kingdom proper, the northern Anatolian region of the great bend of the Halys river (Kızıl Irmak), and extends south approximately to a line running east from the southern end of the Salt Lake (Tuzgölü). The Hittite language was native here, already at the beginning of the second millennium. The Hittite language is still called *nešumnili* "in Nesian," after the city *Nešaš* = *Kaneš*.

To the northwest across the Halys lay Pāla, in classical Paphlagonia. (That Pāla and [reduplicated] *Paphla-* are connected seems plausible to me, though I cannot recall having seen it stated.) The language was Palaic (Hitt. *palaumnili*); we have enough material (from Boğazköy, not Pāla itself, which is archaeological terra incognita) to classify it as an independent branch of Indo-European Anatolian, with closest affinities to Hittite.

In a language with considerable geographic spread it should not surprise us to find dialect differences. The Hittite texts of Boğazköy are

1. For comments, suggestions and criticisms I am deeply indebted to Anna Morpurgo Davies, Hans Gustav Güterbock, and John Koch.

2. E. Laroche, "Linguistique asianique," *Minos* 11 (1970, pub. 1972) 112-135, quotation on 126.