

Oriental

ANATOLIAN STUDIES

Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara

VOL. XXXIII

1983

Special Number

in honour of the seventy-fifth birthday of

DR. RICHARD BARNETT

23rd January, 1984

Published annually by
THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AT ANKARA
c/o The British Academy, 20-21 Cornwall Terrace, NW1 4QP

WESTERN ANATOLIA IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY B.C.
ACCORDING TO THE HITTITE SOURCES*

By ITAMAR SINGER

The redating of certain Hittite texts – notably the Indictment of Madduwatta and the annals of Tudhaliya and Arnuwanda – from the end of the thirteenth century to the turn of the fifteenth has been one of the most discussed Hittitological subjects in recent years.¹ The sudden availability of sources covering a previously poorly known period in Hittite history has naturally brought about an intense preoccupation with the Early Hittite Empire, largely overshadowing the less “fortunate” side of the redating, the “deprivation” of the main body of sources relating to western Anatolia in the second half of the thirteenth century. The situation is aptly demonstrated in the most recent comprehensive study on Arzawa,² where the chapter dealing with the period after Muwatalli to the end of the Hittite Empire barely covers 16 pages, in contrast to the far more abundant documentation on the fourteenth century.

The small number of texts from this period relating to western Anatolia may in itself be regarded as *argumentum e silentio* for circumstances prevailing in that region. It seems to me however, that the scarcity of documents is not as drastic as it appears at first view, or at least not for the entire period. It is rather the exceedingly fragmentary nature of the material which is in part responsible for that impression. Moreover, I believe that there is cumulative evidence which suggests a lowering of the traditional dating of two of the most important documents, namely, the so-called “Tawagalawa” and “Milawata” letters (to the reigns of Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV respectively). Recently, this source material has greatly benefited from two important contributions, which also stimulate a reassessment of the subject. H. Hoffner discovered a join to the “Milawata letter” and the augmented text provides new insights the importance of which can hardly be overestimated.³ H. G. Güterbock reexamined the main Ahhiyawa texts suggesting new text interpretations for some crucial passages.⁴

The following attempt to reconstruct a plausible historical picture from these fragmentary and problematical data is partly motivated by awareness of the importance of this region for the history of the ancient Near East in this particular period. In his comprehensive study on the “Sea Peoples”⁵ Dr. R. D. Barnett has duly emphasized the strong western and southern Anatolian connexions of some of these peoples, a view which has since found growing confirmation and support.⁶

*This paper has been presented in a lecture to the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara on the 24th May 1983. I wish to thank Professor Gurney and Mr. David Hawkins for reading the manuscript and offering valuable remarks.

¹ See S. Heinhold-Krahmer in *Texte der Hethiter*, Heft 9(1979), Chap. I, and review by O. R. Gurney, *OLZ* 77(1982), 560 ff.

² Susanne Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa (TdH 8, 1977)*, Ch. VI. Cf. critical review by T. R. Bryce, *BiOr* 36 (1979), 60 ff. See also Elizabeth Jewell, *The Archaeology and History of Western Anatolia During the Second Millenium, B.C.* (University Microfilms 1974), Ch. XIV.

³ *AfO Beiheft* 19(1982), 130 ff. (henceforth *Mil.*).

⁴ *AJA* 87(1983), 133 ff. For a summary of the archaeological evidence, applied to the Ahhiyawa=Achaians theory, see M. Mellink, *id.* 138 ff.

⁵ *CAH II*³, Ch. XXVIII (fasc. 68, 1969).

⁶ See particularly J. Mellaart, *Mélanges Mansel I*(1974), 493 ff.; *idem*, *The Archaeology of Ancient Turkey*(1978), 70 ff.

Muršili's final conquest of Arzawa in his third year marks the end of the separate existence of that kingdom,⁷ once a major power in Anatolia. The royal family of Arzawa fled from the capital Apaša, on the Aegean coast, first to an island,⁸ and then to Ahhiyawa, where they found refuge. The territory of the kingdom, which always formed the nucleus of the Arzawan confederacy, was probably annexed to other Arzawan lands – Mira-Kuwaliya lying to its east and the Šeha River Land with Appawiya to its north. As correctly maintained by Heinhold-Krahmer, later occurrences of the name Arzawa are either in a general geographical sense referring to the Arzawan lands in central and north-western Anatolia, or in an ethnic-cultural one.

The incorporation of the four Arzawan kingdoms – the Šeha River Land and Wiluša on the coast, Mira and Hapalla inland – into the Hittite imperial system was regulated by a series of treaties between each land and Hattuša and between themselves. The two more important kingdoms of Mira and the Šeha River Land were further tied to the Hittite court by marriage alliances with Hittite princesses. Needless to say, these measures were not in themselves sufficient to obtain a lasting stability in the Arzawa lands, which were often seduced by Ahhiyawa (the Mycenaean Greeks)^{8a} to throw off Hittite rule. The intervention of the Hittite overlord was almost always needed in one or the other kingdom to assert his supremacy.

The only evidence which indicates that Muwatalli was involved in a military campaign to the west derives from §6 of the treaty with Alakšandu, king of Wiluša. It seems to imply that the Hittite king stepped in to help against an enemy, possibly the Land of Maša, and another land whose name is broken off. The same events may perhaps be alluded to in the Manapa-Tarhunda letter, where the arrival of a Hittite contingent and an attack on Wiluša are reported (*KUB* XIX 5, 3 ff.).

The participation of contingents from Maša, Karkiša, Lukka and *Drdny* on the Hittite side in the battle of Qadeš obviously does not prove a Hittite control over these countries or ethnic groups.⁹ In fact, the opposite is indicated in the somewhat earlier Alakšandu treaty, in which Karkiša, Maša, Lukka and Waršiyalla are regarded as potential enemies (§14). These groups could well have fought as mercenaries, in the same way as the Šerdana fought alongside the Egyptians. They can perhaps be regarded as foreshadowing the activities of Carian and Ionian mercenaries of later times. More evidence can be gathered, I believe, for the existence of such western units in the Hittite army.

The turbulent events connected with the dynastic dispute between Urhi-Tešub and Hattušili have left their mark upon western Anatolia as well. Two of the local rulers reacted in opposite ways over the issue.

Kupanta-DKAL, the aging king of Mira, supported the legitimate heir to the throne and even attempted to intervene on behalf of Urhi-Tešub at the Egyptian court. Whether he was punished by Hattušili after his seizure of the throne is not known, but having ruled since Muršili's 12th year he could hardly have survived for long the Hittite-Egyptian peace treaty (1258 B.C.). He appears in several fragments which also mention Piyamaradu, to which we shall return later on. Another fragment mentions his sons (*KBo* XIX 80,9').

⁷ See the detailed argumentation in Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 136 ff.

^{8a} For a recent assessment of the Ahhiyawa = Achaeans theory, with which I fully agree, see H. G. Güterbock, *AJA* 87, 133 ff. (especially p. 138).

⁸ For *gursauwananza* "to the islands" see F. Starke, *KZ* 95(1981), 132 ff.

⁹ See T. R. Bryce, *BiOr* 36(1979), 63; *Or* 48(1979), 96²⁰.

The land of Mira, which after Muršili's conquests was the most important Arzawan state, gradually disappears from the texts after Hattušili's reign. The so-called "Tarkondemos seal", which belonged to a king of Mira probably named Targašnamuwa,¹⁰ shows that this kingdom did not cease to exist altogether, but it must have lost in importance, apparently to the benefit of its western neighbour, the Šeha River Land.

Mašturi, the king of this strategically positioned land, threw in his lot with the winning party, for which he may have been rewarded by Hattušili. In any case, later documents indicate that the Hittites attempted to turn the Šeha River Land into their main bulwark in the west against the rival influence of Ahhiyawa.

That this was not an easy task is shown by *KUB* XXIII 13, a text often quoted in studies on western Anatolia and on Ahhiyawa. It may be conveniently titled "the offences of the Šeha River Land". A Hittite king records the historical background for his own punitive campaign to this country. After an opening sentence stating that the Šeha River Land has committed for a second time an offence, the people of the land are apparently quoted as arguing as follows:¹¹ "The grandfather of His Majesty did not conquer [us] by armed force. [When the father of His Majesty] defeated the Arzawa lands [he did not defeat] us by armed force. [...] we 'repented (our) sins(?)' to him."¹² If the last sentence can be rendered as suggested above, it can satisfactorily be related to the episode reported in Muršili's annals and in the Manapa-Tarhunda treaty, when a delegation of old men and women from the Šeha River Land came to beg for Muršili's mercy. The father of His Majesty who defeated the Arzawa lands, is no doubt Muršili, and the author of the text could be either Muwatalli or Hattušili.¹³ The latter seems a better choice to me, if not for other reasons, then simply because similar annalistic fragments can positively be attributed to him.

The text then goes on to describe the recent events. The hostilities started by someone, probably Tarhunaradu, are mentioned in connexion with the king of Ahhiyawa. The verb following after the king of Ahhiyawa (*appa epta*) has traditionally been translated as "retreated", and the sentence has been quoted as evidence for the presence of the king of Ahhiyawa in Anatolia. Güterbock has now suggested¹⁴ that a rendering "he relied upon (the king of A.)" provides here a far superior sense. As many times in the past, Ahhiyawa instigated an anti-Hittite rebellion in one of the western countries. The Šeha River Land bordered in the south on the Ahhiyawan dependency of Milawata. The temptation to throw off Hittite control, encouraged by Ahhiyawa, was thus more decisive than the treaty ties with distant Hattuša. The expected Ahhiyawan support, either

¹⁰ H. Nowicki, *Festschrift G. Neumann*(1982), 227 ff.

¹¹ F. Sommer, *Die Ahhijawā-Urkunden*(1932), 314 f.; J. Garstang-O. R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*(1959), 120 f.; The following restoration of l. 3 f. was suggested by D. Easton in a paper read at the Fifth International Colloquium on Aegean Prehistory, Sheffield 1980.

¹² For *wašdazza*, a Luwian acc. pl. for "offence, guilt" see E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la Langue Louvite*(1959), 109; F. Starke, *Or* 50(1981), 470 f. For *išhunahh*- "geringschätzig behandeln" see N. Oettinger, *MSS* 35(1976), 94. Literally translated *nu=wa=ši wašdazza išhunahhuen* would be "(for) him we looked down on the sins". Could the conjectural rendering suggested above, which provides a sensible meaning in this context, be included in the semantic range of *išhunahh*-?

¹³ Thus against the traditional dating to Tudhaliya IV. D. Easton, op. cit. suggested a Muwatalli dating, whereas H. G. Güterbock, *AJA* 87(1983), 137²⁶ a Hattušili III dating.

¹⁴ Op. cit. 138.

did not come, or was insufficient, for the Hittite king managed to suppress the rebellion and deported Tarhunaradu to Arinna, together with many prisoners and 500 (teams) of horses.

Tarhunaradu is not known from elsewhere. It is logical to assume that he was the king of the Šeha River Land, or at least a claimant to the throne. His relation to his predecessor Mašturi is also unknown, but an interesting episode concerning Mašturi's Hittite wife may be brought into consideration. Matanazi (= DINGIRMEŠ-IR), a sister of Hattušili, is the subject of a Ramses letter reconstructed and published by E. Edel.¹⁵ Hattušili had asked the Egyptian monarch to send a physician who could prepare a medicine that would enable her to bear a child. Egyptian doctors were highly esteemed in Hatti. But alas, even an Egyptian doctor could not work miracles! Ramses ironically responds, that he knows the woman and she cannot be fifty years of age, as he was informed, but she must be at least sixty. No medicine would help her have a child. He nevertheless sends a physician and suggests that she pins her faith on the gods. We may quite safely assume that Matanazi did not produce an heir to the throne of the Šeha River Land, a situation which even in less unstable countries invokes unrest and disorder. These circumstances may perhaps be connected with Tarhunaradu's actions, but this remains conjectural.

Subsequent developments in the Šeha River Land and its neighbours will be followed up later on, but first Hattušili's activities in the southwest will be evaluated.

The fragments *KUB XXI 6* and *6a* (*CTH 82*), which according to the edition may belong to the same tablet, are written by Hattušili and deal with campaigns to the Lukka Lands. They have been correctly attributed to an annalistic composition of this king. "Lukka lands" is a loose geographical designation for southwestern Anatolia, used for a group of ethnically and culturally related communities and clans.¹⁶

In *KUB XXI 6a* a borderline is described delineated by Zallara, the Lower Land and Harziuna. This is indeed the traditional westward extent of the Hittite land, somewhere in the Konya region. The Ilgin inscription, the westernmost inscription of a Hittite king, may indicate the approximate line beyond which the Hittite control in the southwest was very tenuous. As pointed out by Bryce in his studies on Lukka,¹⁷ these regions had a basically different socio-political character to the Arzawan kingdoms in the west and northwest. The latter had clearly defined political organizations and could be as such incorporated into the Hittite Empire through treaties of vassalhood. The Lukka, and perhaps other similar groups, like Karki(š)a and Maša, apparently lived under semi-nomadic tribal conditions. These "Habiru of western Anatolia" were never organized as a political entity and were therefore extremely difficult to control.

There are several more fragments containing indications for a Hattušili dating, in which Piyamaradu, the well-known raider from the "Tawagalawa letter", is mentioned.

KUB XLVIII 80 (Bo 6447), which mentions Ištar of Šamuha (obv. 11'), Hattušili's protective goddess, was already evaluated by Güterbock in 1936. The general situation emerging from this fragment seems to be similar to that

described in the "Tawagalawa letter" and therefore Güterbock suggested that Hattušili was the author of the latter document¹⁸, rather than Muṣili or Muwatalli.

KUB XIX 78 is a very small, but rather suggestive fragment. The "brother of His Majesty" in l. 5' could only be Muwatalli, mentioned by Hattušili. The latter's seizure of the throne may perhaps be referred to in l. 7': "I have sat [on the throne(?)]". Thus Piyamaradu (ll. 6', 8') seems to appear in a context related to both kings, a conclusion that will be substantiated later. The mention of [Kupanta]-^dKAL, king of the land of Mira (l. 4'), perhaps in connexion with his stance in the dynastic dispute in Hattuša (l. 3'), is also in accordance with these observations.

In *KBo XXVII 4*, again a fragment mentioning both [Kup]anda-^dKAL (l. 4') and [Piyama]radu (see also *KBo XXVII 3*), the latter appears next to a country the name of which begins with Iya[- (l. 7'), most probably Iyalanda. This is precisely the town where the Hittite king came under attack according to the "Tawagalawa letter". The city of Nerik mentioned in l. 3' has close associations with the person of Hattušili.

In view of this evidence, the name beginning with P[i- in line 4' of the annalistic fragment *KUB XXI 6* could very well be that of Piyamaradu, especially since a few lines later (9') we read: "I sent him the man". This could perhaps refer to his alleged request for vassalhood in the "Tawagalawa letter" (see below).

This brings us to the so-called "Tawagalawa letter" (*KUB XIV 3*). The beginning of this text, which has figured prominently in Ahhiyawan studies, records the campaign of a Hittite king to the Lukka lands. It is *a priori* more reasonable to ascribe this letter to Hattušili, whom we know to have campaigned in this region, than to Muwatalli, whose only known western campaign is to Wiluša in the far northwest.

The same conclusion may be reached however from internal evidence of the letter. The palaeography is late. E.g. the sign *li*, which occurs about twenty times, is invariably written with the new form.¹⁹ The orthography and the vocabulary also exhibit late features,²⁰ which find their best parallels in Puduhepa's letter to Ramses (*KUB XXI 38*).

As for prosopography, the least one could say is that it allows for both a Muwatalli or a Hattušili dating,²¹ but in fact, it is more compatible with the latter. Šahurunuwa, whose son is apparently mentioned as a precedent case in the extradition matter (III 41 ff.), could theoretically be either the king of Karkamiš under Muwatalli, or the "chief herdsman, chief of the scribes-on-wood and chief of the UKUŠ-troops" from the Šahurunuwa Deed and the Ulmi-Tešub treaty. In both cases Šahurunuwa's son would have lived under Hattušili. ^dKAL, who is said to have been a powerful king (I 73 f.), could not possibly be the

¹⁸ ZA 43(1936), 326 f. *AJA* 87(1983), 135. Also D. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (1959), 32⁴³; Houwink ten Cate *apud* R. A. Crossland and Ann Birchall, *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean* (1974), 150 f.; E. Jewell, loc. cit., 328. S. Košak, *Linguistica* 20 (1980), 41. Sommer, *AU* 36¹ also considered this dating possibility.

¹⁹ A. Archi, *OrAnt* 14(1975), 321 ff., who examined the various copies of the Alakšandu treaty and the Prayer to the *pihaššašši* Storm-god, has found that in texts of Muwatalli the old and the new forms still alternate frequently, as in texts dated to Muṣili II. A more distinct transition only occurs under Hattušili, though obviously it is by no means absolute. See also A. Kammenhuber a. o., *TdH* 9(1979), 95 ff. and H. Hoffner, *Mil.*, 136²⁷.

²⁰ See Kammenhuber a. o., op. cit. 255 ff.; Hoffner, *ib.*

²¹ See Sommer, *AU*, 34 ff. and especially 36¹.

¹⁵ *Ägyptische Ärzte und ägyptische Medizin am hethitischen Königshof* (1976), 31 ff., 53 ff., 67 ff.

¹⁶ Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *The Records of the Early Hittite Empire* (1970), 73¹⁰⁵; E. Laroche, *Revue Archéologique* 1976, 15 ff.

¹⁷ *JNES* 33(1974), 395 ff.; *Antichthon* 13(1979), 1 ff.

general attested in Muršili's 9th year. He could very well be Kurunta,²² who was made king of Tarhuntašša by Hattušili.

A word must be said on what seems to have been the main reason for a Muršili or Muwatalli dating of the "Tawagalawa letter", namely, the occurrence of Piyamaradu and Atpa in the Manapa-Tarhunda letter as well. I see no compelling grounds for the almost automatic assumption that therefore both letters must be almost contemporary.²³ That Manapa-Tarhunda, the king of the Šeha River Land is trying to drum up Hittite aid against Piyamaradu and Atpa is obvious, but it does not necessarily mean that the Hittite king, in all probability Muwatalli (note the intervention in Wiluša mentioned above), was able or willing to provide it immediately. The insurrectionist activities of Piyamaradu must have stretched over quite a long period to leave such a vivid memory in Hittite documentation. One need merely recall another western freebooter, Madduwatta, who was active throughout the reigns of two Hittite kings.

Thus cumulative evidence in the letter itself, and the historical fragments mentioning Piyamaradu, strongly suggest Hattušili as the author of the "Tawagalawa letter".²⁴

We may now turn to the contents of the letter. Most recently, Güterbock has come to grips again with the text and has reaffirmed two of Forrer's original conclusions, which are of cardinal importance for the Ahhiyawa problem. First, the king of Ahhiyawa is clearly called Great King, My Brother and My Equal.²⁵ Second, Tawagalawa is the brother of the king of Ahhiyawa.

A major problem in the interpretation of the first column, which also engaged Güterbock in his article, has always been the definition of Tawagalawa's activities compared to those of Piyamaradu. I would like to put forward a suggestion which may, I believe, solve this problem.

Let us first delineate the problem. The main subject of the third, and the only preserved, tablet of the letter, is Piyamaradu, a freebooter who was carrying out raids on the Lukka lands and other territories. Throughout the letter the Hittite king takes great pains trying to convince the king of Ahhiyawa to extradite Piyamaradu, or at least to curtail his activities effectively.

The interpretation is complicated however by the fact that the first column of the tablet apparently deals with another person, Tawagalawa, whose activities are in part similar to Piyamaradu's. The people of Lukka have been attacked by some unknown enemy and they have approached first Tawagalawa, later the Hittite king, requesting help. While on his way to the rescue, the king received a message from Tawagalawa (according to the traditional interpretation) who was asking for a Hittite vassalhood. When however a Hittite high official²⁶ came to escort him to Hatti, he refused to do so with various pretexts. The tantalizing question is, in Güterbock's words (p. 136), "why should a high ranking

²² Houwink ten Cate, op. cit., 150 f.; for Kurunta see also Edel, *Ärzte*, 82 ff.

²³ E. Forrer, *Forschungen* I/2(1926), 90 ff.; Sommer, *AU*, 36; E. Cavaignac, *RHA* II/11(1933), 101 f.; G. L. Huxley, *Achaean and Hittites*(1960), 2; J. G. Macqueen, *AnSt* 18(1968), 176¹⁰⁴. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 176; T. R. Bryce, *Or* 48(1979), 63.

²⁴ Incidentally, this authorship of the letter provides a nice combination between the allusion to Hattušili's youth, when he learned riding on a chariot from Dabala-Tarhunda the charioteer (II 61 f.), and his autobiographical note that as a youngster he served as a groom (KUŠKA.TAB.ANŠU Hatt. I 12).

²⁵ Col. II 9–20 (*AJA* 87, 135 f.). The same applies, in my view, to I 73 (see below) and perhaps IV 55 f.

²⁶ For the equation of the *TARTĒNU* and the *tuhkanti* see now O. R. Gurney in this volume.

Ahhiyawan, actually, as just demonstrated, the king's brother, seek the overlordship of the Hittite king?"

I think that the answer is astonishingly simple. The person who is discussed throughout the first column is not Tawagalawa at all, but Piyamaradu. How is this possible? Let us reexamine the beginning of the column. Someone is said to have destroyed the city of Attarimma (l. 1 f.). Thereafter we are told that the men of Lukka approached Tawagalawa and the Hittite king (ll. 3–5). Then the text goes on saying that when the king arrived at Šallapa he sent a man asking for Hittite vassalhood (ll. 6 ff.). It was always assumed, according to sound grammatical logic, that "he" must refer to Tawagalawa who was just mentioned before. A sudden switch of the subject is indeed quite unusual. Sometimes, however, grammar can be misleading in text interpretation and reason is to be preferred. A whole tablet, no less than 275 lines, deals with the person of Piyamaradu. He must have been the predominant subject of the first two lost tablets as well. Now, in such a context there is really no need to constantly remind your correspondent whom you have in mind when you say "he", especially if you repeat time and again the same story about his misdeeds. The king of Ahhiyawa must have had by now a pretty good idea of Piyamaradu's acts and his pretended appeal to the Hittite king. He could not possibly have mistaken this to refer to his own brother Tawagalawa.

I have no doubt that it is Piyamaradu who asked for the Hittite king's overlordship, only to defy it later on. He may have been responsible for the attack on Attarimma, whereas his brother Lahurzi was probably responsible for the attack on the Hittite king at Iyalanda (l. 26). Here I would like to draw attention again to the small fragment *KBo* XXVII 4, where Piyamaradu appears next to Iyalanda (l. 7').

The other major obstacle in the correct understanding (in my view) of the first column has been the difficult passage, lines 71 ff. We have just heard that when the Hittite king arrived at Millawanda, Piyamaradu fled by boat, probably with the assistance of his sons-in-law Atpa and Awayana. Then the king repeats (for unknown reasons if the traditional interpretation is followed) how he instructed the *TARTĒNU* to conduct the candidate for vassalhood to Hattuša (ll. 67–70).

His refusal to go to the Hittite king is expected at the beginning of line 71 (as in I 11–13), and indeed, Sommer suggested the restoration [*U-U*] *L me-ma-aš*, which is plausible, though not secure.²⁷ Being convinced that it was Tawagalawa who refused to go, they have taken him as the subject of the sentence: "[No!], he said, i.e. Tawagalawa." This, however, required the beginning of a new sentence after *Tawagalawaš=pát*, and Sommer was forced to emend the following sign into an introductory sentence particle *nu*!. This is most unsatisfactory according to the copy and the photograph. The sign is attached to *-pát-* without any interval and although it is written over an erasure (like most of the line) it can readily be identified as *-kán*. Thus, *Tawagalawaš(=pát=kán)* is obviously the subject of the *next* clause (the predicate of which is *uit*).

If one follows the textual evidence without a preconceived view on the

²⁷ More than half of the line is written over an erasure (*AU* 84), which makes the reading difficult, especially here. A. Götze, *OLZ* 1930, 289 read [*U-U*] *L-ši-ma-aš* ^m*T*. and translated "er (war) sich nicht aber T." Originally I left the damaged beginning of l. 71 unrestored. Professor Gurney has pointed out to me that [*U-U*] *L me-ma-aš* is in fact compatible with the suggested interpretation of column I. Although it is unnecessary, there is enough space for a possible *nu* preceding the *UL*; *na-aš* however would be too long.

identity of the candidate for vassalship, one inevitably comes to the conclusion that a connexion between Tawagalawa in line 71 (see below) and the person referred to in the previous lines is unnecessary, in fact very unlikely. Lines 67 ff., with Piyamaradu's pretended request for vassalship, now gain a fully satisfactory sense, as a quotation of the things the Hittite king made Atpa and Awayana swear to report truthfully to the King of Ahhiyawa.

In line 73 all the interpreters of the text have chosen rather unusual grammatical deviations from the norm, in order to avoid a historically unlikely situation.²⁸ *nu=ta* LUGAL.GAL is an appositional complex, "to you, Great King...", which must refer to the king of Ahhiyawa. Sommer has taken the *-ta* to refer to Tawagalawa, as a "psychological" mistake for "to him" (*nu=ši*), and the LUGAL.GAL to refer to the Hittite king, this being the only exception in the tablet to the rule, that Great King comes with a verb in the 1st person when the Hittite king speaks of himself.

I would tentatively suggest the following interpretation for lines 71 ff., seeking to stick to the regular meaning of the sentences:

- I 71 [(*nu*) *Ú-U*] *L me¹-ma-aš^m Ta-wa-ga-la-wa-aš-pát-kán ku-wa-pí* LUGAL.
 GAL *ú²-[w] a²-nu²-un* (see AU 85)
 72 [*na-aš(?)*]²⁹ *URUMi-el-la-wa-an-da ta-pu-ša ú-it*
 73 [*ka-ru-*]*ú(?) -ma^{mD} KAL-aš ka-a e-eš-ta nu-ut-ta* LUGAL.GAL
 74 [*IGI-aḡ-d*]*a(?) u-un-ni-eš-ta Ú-UL-aš šar-ku-uš* LUGAL-*uš e-eš-ta*
 II 1 *na-aš Ú-UL-ma :za-ar²-š²-ya²* [
 2 *a-pa-a-aš-mu ku-wa-at Ú-UL* x x x x x x x
 I 71 [No!] he said. Even Tawagalawa,³⁰ when (I), the Great King, came,
 72 he came aside to Millawanda.
 73 [Previous] *y(?)^D KAL* was here and to you, Great King,
 74 he drove [in(?)]. Wasn't he a powerful king?
 II 1 And yet, [did] he not [accept(?)] a guarantee?
 2 But that one (i.e. Piyamaradu), why [does/did] he not [] me?

If I understand the meaning of this passage, it seems to quote two precedents aimed to emphasize Piyamaradu's uncivilized and outrageous conduct. It also may point out that he has nothing to fear from the Hittite king, a subject which is lengthily elaborated in the next column. We are ignorant of the historical context of these precedents, but they appear to represent symmetrical cases: Tawagalawa, the Ahhiyawan, came near Millawanda, perhaps to meet(?) the Great King of Hatti, whereas ^DKAL, possibly Kurunta king of Tarhuntašša, came to meet (??) the Great King of Ahhiyawa. Only Piyamaradu, whose status is considerably lower than that of these two persons, ignored the "civilized" codes by refusing to meet the Hittite king.

This interpretation of lines 71 ff., although as far as I can see is in agreement

²⁸ Forrer, *Forsch.*, 144; Sommer, *AU*, 89; Götze, *OLZ* 1930, 289.

²⁹ *na-aš* is indicated as a possible restoration by Sommer, *AU*, 86. Forrer, *Forsch.*, 141 restored ZAG KUR; Götze-H. Pedersen, *Murs. Sprachlähm.*, 25 suggested *nu-kán*. The *-kán*, however, which is required by *tapuša*, is already given in l. 71, attached to the first word of the sentence, Tawagalawa.

³⁰ Cf. e.g. KUB XXI 27 II 15 ANA DUMU.NAM.LÚ.UL^{LU}-*pát-kán anda memian kišan memiškanzi*. H. Hoffner, *Festschrift H. Otten*, 113: "even among mankind they are in the habit of speaking a word as follows."

with the textual data, may not be accepted. However, it does *not* affect the suggestion concerning the identity of the person discussed throughout the rest of the first column. It merely demonstrates that it is unnecessary, and most unlikely, to identify him with Tawagalawa in l. 71.

This suggestion immediately resolves the difficulties resulting from the alleged similarity between Tawagalawa and Piyamaradu and the extremely peculiar attitude of a high-ranking Ahhiyawan towards the Hittite king. We can now sort out what belongs to whom and reconstruct their totally different profiles.

Piyamaradu's role remains basically unchanged, only that now a new facet is added to his reckless figure, that of a shrewd tactician. On the one hand he pretends to accept Hittite overlordship, whereas on the other, he and his men do everything to undermine Hittite hold in the west, exactly as Madduwatta had done more than a century earlier.

More significant however is what is left of the figure of Tawagalawa. There is of course no more question of him accepting Hittite overlordship. He is only mentioned three times in the letter. First when he comes to Lukka (I 3 f.); second, in the difficult context just discussed (I 71 f.); and third, in the well-known passage where Dabala-Tarhunda, the charioteer whom the Hittite king proposes to send as hostage to Ahhiyawa, is said to have ridden with him on the same chariot (II 61 f.). These data are more scanty than before, but also much clearer and more intelligible. Tawagalawa is a brother of the Great King of Ahhiyawa, probably stationed in Millawanda from where he operates in Lukka, in competition with the Hittite king. In other words, he appears to be the highest representative of Ahhiyawan interests on Anatolian soil. Whether his mission is temporary or permanent cannot be established. A parallel to the role of Muršili's brother, Piyaššili, the viceroy of Karkamiš, would perhaps be too far-fetched, but could provide a notion about a similar practice in the Hittite imperial administration. It would be helpful to know more about his exact responsibilities and the hierarchy between him and Atpa, who seems to be the actual ruler of Millawanda. However, this cannot be learned from the text.

One would hardly think that the Hittite king was well disposed towards his intervention in Lukka, but any resentment is prudently concealed in the letter where his act is reported to his brother in a purely informative manner. This, of course, is in full accord with the general conciliatory tone of the letter. The Hittite king goes out of his way to maintain an agreeable relationship with the king of Ahhiyawa.

The message he is trying to convey has a most significant historical value for us. The real menace to international *status quo* is not posed by differing interests or occasional clashes between the great powers, but by elements like Piyamaradu who cause instability and who cannot be controlled effectively without the co-operation of the established powers. A few decades later history proved him right.

We may now attempt to sum up the evidence on Hattušili's involvement in western Anatolia. With Egyptian relations normalized and Assyrian pressure not yet critical, he appears to have carried through a relatively successful inner-Anatolian policy, not only against the Kaška tribes in the north, but also in the western regions.

An Ahhiyawan inspired uprising in the Šeha River Land is suppressed and a new king is installed on the throne. There is no mention of Wiluša. The highly

conjectural restoration of the name in the "Tawagalawa letter" (IV 8) would better be left aside. Hapalla and later Mira disappear from the texts, which could indicate relatively peaceful circumstances, or perhaps even a more centralized incorporation within the Hittite lands.

As for the southwest, there is clear evidence for at least one campaign of Hattušili to the Lukka countries, probably in connection with Piyamaradu's activities there. Perhaps the creation of the kingdom of Tarhuntašša, somewhere in western Cilicia, was also connected with these events. It may have served as a buffer-state and as a basis for military operations in the southwest, considerably shortening the supply lines for the Hittite armies. This would be even more probable if ^DKAL in the "Tawagalawa letter" is indeed Kurunta, the king of Tarhuntašša.

The entry into Millawanda, an acknowledged Ahhiyawan dependency, is most significant. It was no doubt intended to be an impressive power demonstration directed towards Ahhiyawa and her partisans in Anatolia. The apologetic and conciliatory wording of the "Tawagalawa letter" should not mislead us, for Hattušili is notorious for his shrewd diplomacy. In fact, there may even be a slight indication that it achieved its purpose, the extradition of Piyamaradu, if the sentence "he brought away Piyamaradu" in a fragment written by a grandson of Hattušili (*KBo* XVI 35, 7') is referring to the latter. The flattering words bestowed upon the king of Ahhiyawa cannot conceal the fact that Millawanda was occupied by the Hittite king, even if for a very short while, without Ahhiyawa being able to do much about it.

This seems however to mark the end of Hittite dominance in the west. The situation changed radically for the worse during the reigns of the last kings of Hatti.

The death of Hattušili was, as always in these circumstances, followed by serious uprisings throughout the west. But this time the rebellious tide seems to have reached much nearer to the Hittite heartland.

In a letter of Tudhaliya to the queen (*KUB* XIX 23), written shortly after his father's death (rev. 15'), a rebellion in Lalanda is reported (16') and even the possibility of a general uprising in the Lower Land is considered. Such an eventuality would be, according to Tudhaliya, hardly possible to contain (19' f.). This alone sufficiently demonstrates the extent to which the Hittite grasp on the west has weakened towards the closing decades of the century.

Another text which can now be ascribed to Tudhaliya, probably in a more advanced stage of his reign, is the so-called "Milawata letter". The lower part of the reverse has recently been augmented by a large join, discovered by Hoffner, which greatly improves our understanding of this important text (*KBo* XIX 55+*KUB* XLVIII 90).³¹

The Hittite king addresses an unknown vassal in the west. The obverse is in very bad condition. "[I have] treated you as a brother" (*nu-ud-du-za ŠEŠ-ah-h[u-un]*) in l. 10 is noteworthy. Most of the obverse seems to deal with events connected with the addressee's father, who also received letters from the Hittite king (l. 34). The beginning of the reverse deals with the extradition of a fugitive named Agapurušiya. Piyamaradu is mentioned, probably as a precedent. Agapurušiya may thus be another of those "wild westerners".

³¹ Hoffner's historical interpretation of the text considerably differs from the interpretation put forward here.

After a large gap we arrive, at last, at almost complete lines (38 ff.), due to Hoffner's join. His translation reads (p. 132): "And when his/its lord [. . . -ed] the wor[d . . . , . . .] fled. [And they made(?)] for themselves another lord. I did not recognize [. . . , . . .] the wicked one(?). But the document[ts] which [I/they(?) made] for Walmu Kuwalana-ziti kept. Now behold he is bringing them to (you,) My Son; examine them! Now, My Son, as long as you protect the welfare of My Majesty, I, My Majesty, will trust your good will. So, My Son, send me Walmu, and I will install him again in Wiluša as king. As he was previously the king of Wiluša, so now [let] him [be] (again)! As [he] w[as] previously our *kulawaniš*-vassal, so let him (again) be a *k*-vassal!"

"As we carried off(?) for ourselves the border of the land of Milawata, My Majesty and (you,) My Son, [so] you [must not] omit/neglect(?) your [. . .]. And My Majesty [will trust] your good will with a true spirit."

The two recovered paragraphs are of utmost importance for western Anatolian matters. First, Milawata.³² Since the days of Forrer and Sommer it was always assumed that the letter was addressed to a king of Milawata³³ and the sentence about its borders was restored as follows: "When we, My Majesty and (you) My Son [set] the boundaries of Milawata." The resulting historical conclusion was, that after a period of Ahhiyawan supremacy (attested in the "Tawagalawa letter") Milawata became a Hittite vassal. It now becomes clear that the territory of Milawata was merely the object for the joint raids, in the past, of the Hittite king and the real addressee of the letter. As far as we can tell from the Hittite texts, Milawata was never ruled by the Hittites.

Not less important is the new insight gained on Wiluša. The events may be reconstructed as follows. There has been an uprising in the kingdom of Wiluša. The ruler apparently fled the country and the people of Wiluša appointed another king, who, however, did not obtain the recognition of the Hittite suzerain. A previous king of Wiluša, named Walmu, probably the runaway ruler just mentioned, had apparently found refuge at the court of the addressee. Documents, probably a new treaty, were prepared for Walmu, and one Kuwalana-ziti³⁴ is about to bring them over to the addressee. He is to examine them, i.e. to ratify them, and then send Walmu to Hattuša where he would be reinstated as king.

It is quite obvious that the addressee of the letter is in a key position having at his disposal the Hittite nominee to the throne of Wiluša. No wonder that the Hittite king, whose only hope to regain control over Wiluša, is in the hands of his correspondent, writes in a very restrained tone to his vassal and acknowledges what appears to be a situation of joint overlordship over Wiluša.

Before continuing to the last paragraphs of the letter, we may now attempt to discover the identity of the addressee.³⁵ His land adjoins both Wiluša (probably in the Troad) and Milawata (probably Miletos).³⁶ The only candidates I can think of would be the Šeha River Land or Mira, but in view of what has been

³² Hoffner, *Mil.*, 133; Güterbock, *AJA* 87, 137.

³³ Note however E. Cavaignac, *RHA* II/11(1933), 103, who already saw that the sentence concerning the borders of Milawata does not necessarily mean that this is the country of the addressee. It only means that his country borders on Milawata.

³⁴ See Güterbock *apud* Hoffner, *Mil.*, 137¹⁶, with the possible identification with one of the beneficiaries of the Šahurunuwa Decree, written in the reign of Tudhaliya IV. For the reading *Kuwalana* instead of *Kuwatna* see M. Poetto, *Kadmos* 21(1982), 101 f. See also D. Hawkins, *RLA* 6, 308.

³⁵ Hoffner, *Mil.*, 133 suggests that Milawata is the land of the addressee.

³⁶ I still consider Garstang – Gurney's localizations as very plausible (*Geography*, 105 and 81, respectively; see also *The Hittites*(1981), 58 ff.).

said above on the apparent degradation of the latter, the Šeha River Land seems to me the obvious choice. The fact that the sea is mentioned in the obverse (l. 13) would also fit better this alternative.

It is very tempting to associate the mischievous father of the addressee, described as "one who desires the misfortune of His Majesty" (lower edge l. 1) and "who boasted(?) the city of Arinna" (l. 3; whatever that means) with Tarhunaradu, who according to the text on "the offences of the Šeha River Land" was deposed and was brought to Arinna. This remains however entirely conjectural.

The unprecedented situation in which a Hittite king is willing to accept a semi-autonomous status of his main western vassal, with a joint condominium over a third country, clearly shows that he is no longer able to impose his rule with force and is reduced to accept a less effective solution which would at least maintain some of the remaining Hittite hegemony in this region. What we may be witnessing here is a revival of a comparatively strong western kingdom, a heir to Arzawa, which Tudhaliya's predecessors so fiercely fought to abolish.

There is another letter fragment which may perhaps relate to this same matter. *KBo* XVIII 18 is written by a Hittite king (the end of Hat[ti] is still left in l. 1) to Mašhuitta, the king of a land whose name is broken off. After the titulature there follows a typical courtesy formula (ll. 3–5) of the sort "[to me, to my wives, my sons,] my [army], horses, great ones and within [my land all is well!] May [to you, etc.] your horses, your great ones, [etc., all be well!]" This type of elaborate introduction is usually reserved for letters exchanged between Great Kings.

What is left of the subject matter of the letter deals with the Land of Wiluša, but the context is not clear. One broken sentence (l. 6) which has "in that year [I(?)] insta[lled x] as king" recalls the installment of Walmu in the "Milawata letter". The addressee need not be the king of Wiluša.³⁷ He could very well be the king of the Šeha River Land who had risen to a very prominent status and could therefore be addressed in such a courteous manner. Could Mašhuitta be the addressee of the "Milawata letter" and Tarhunaradu, the deposed ruler of the Šeha River Land, his mischievous father? All this remains conjectural until corroborated by further evidence.

Returning to the "Milawata letter", the last paragraphs (lower and left edges) deal with an exchange of hostages, who appear to have been taken in previous military actions, in the days of the addressee's father. The Hittite king complains that whereas he had already returned the hostages of Awarna and Pina, the addressee did not return the hostages of Utima and Atriya. The significance of this very act of negotiating over an exchange of hostages with a vassal king needs not to be pointed out. It further corroborates what has already been said on the deteriorating situation in the west.

It is worthwhile noting that the towns of Pina and Awarna appear in the block inscription from Emirgazi³⁸ which is dated to Tudhaliya. IV.³⁹ This suggests that the "Milawata letter" was sent by this king.⁴⁰

Tudhaliya's strenuous efforts to maintain some foothold in Wiluša and the Šeha River Land, more by means of diplomatic manoeuvring than by military force, may represent the end of Hittite hegemony over the western and north-western Arzawan countries.

³⁷ As assumed by Heinhold-Krahmer, *Arzawa*, 178.

³⁸ E. Masson, *Journal des Savants* 1979, 36 ff.

³⁹ E. Laroche, *Rev. Arch.* 1976, 17; E. Masson, op. cit., 4.

⁴⁰ E. Masson, op. cit., 37; O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites* (1981), 53; H. G. Güterbock, *AJA* 87(1983), 137. See also n. 34.

From the last kings of Hatti, Arnuwanda III and Šuppiluliuma II, we lack any evidence for western campaigns or for any contacts at all. The only text dealing with the west, which can definitively be dated to one of these kings, is the small fragment *KBo* XVI 35, written by a grandson of Hattušili (l. 11'). It undoubtedly deals with events from the past because it mentions Piyamaradu.

The turbulent southwest has apparently been given up at an even earlier stage. In an instruction text of Tudhaliya IV the Lukka land is listed together with Azzi and Kaška as enemy territory (*KUB* XXVI 12+ II 15'). Lukka also appears in the Ilgin inscription,⁴¹ but the context is not known.

The last that we hear of Lukka is already in the context of the population movements at the end of the thirteenth century. They appear among the so-called "Sea Peoples" (the term is modern), who together with the Libyans raided the western delta of Egypt in Merneptah's 5th year (1207 B.C.).

Contrary to traditional translations such as "the foreign countries made a conspiracy in their islands," the "Sea Peoples" were hardly an organized enemy, nor can the specifications on their origins be taken to indicate more than a general northerly direction.⁴² We know that piratical raids on Cyprus and Egypt were conducted from Anatolian shores as early as the fifteenth century. What changed in the late thirteenth century was merely the scale of the movement and the ability of the established powers to cope with the problem.

The bulk of the Hittite army was at this stage engaged on the eastern front, attempting, not very successfully, to keep back the Assyrians. A severe famine in Anatolia, which had lasted for decades, did not make things easier for them.⁴³ Grain bought in Egypt and Canaan⁴⁴ was shipped to Ugarit and from there to the Hittite port of Ura in western Cilicia. The ships of the "Sea Peoples" operating in the Gulf of Alexandretta⁴⁵ threatened to disrupt these shipments which were so vital for the survival of Hatti. This may partly account, I believe, for the only sea battle recorded in Hittite sources (*KBo* XII 38 III 1'–15').⁴⁶ In a final effort, the last king of Hatti, Šuppiluliuma, managed to defeat an enemy fleet near Cyprus.

His victory however was very short-lived. In a desperate letter to Alašia the king of Ugarit reported that his land was left undefended because his troops are in Hatti and his fleet is in Lukka (*Ugaritica* V no. 24). All that the Hittite viceroy of Karkamiš could offer to his defenceless vassal was moral support (*Ugaritica* V no. 23).

The "Sea Peoples" surged down along the Levant coast, on land and sea, without encountering any serious resistance until reaching the border of the Egyptian Empire in Amurru, in Ramses III's 8th year (1174). Indeed, the Egyptians managed to avoid the fate of the Hittite Empire, and found more efficient ways of coping with the invaders, by recruiting them into their army and settling them in their strongholds in Canaan. But this is another chapter of history.

⁴¹ E. Laroche, op. cit., 17; E. Masson, op. cit., 4².

⁴² W. Helck, *Jahresbericht des Instituts für Vorgeschichte der Universität Frankfurt A. M.* 1976, 7 ff.

⁴³ H. Klengel, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1(1974), 165 ff.

⁴⁴ I. Singer, *Tel Aviv* (1983), (forthcoming).

⁴⁵ Note now *RS* 34.129 (*UF* 10, 1978, 53 ff.; *UF* 11, 1979, 481 ff.), with a first cuneiform attestation of the *Šikila*.

⁴⁶ H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 26(1967), 73 ff.; H. Otten, *Jahresbericht . . . Frankfurt* 1976, 27 f.