ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ

STUDIES IN HONOUR OF JAN BOUZEK

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
Univerzita Karlova

Opera Facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis vol. XVIII

PETER PAVÚK – VĚRA KLONTZA-JAKLOVÁ – ANTHONY HARDING (EDS)

This book presents the contributions offered to Professor Jan Bouzek at the conference in honour of his 80th birthday held in May 2015 in Prague.

Jan Bouzek has been one of the most influential and prolific archaeologists in Europe over the course of his career, with interests spanning climate change, the world of later prehistory in central and eastern Europe, and the archaeology of the Iron Age and Classical world from central Europe, through Bulgaria, to Turkey and the Black Sea area. The papers in this volume reflect these concerns. The world of ancient Thrace is an important area of interest, especially in view of the excavations at Pistiros (Bulgaria) which he led between 1993 and 2015. Contributions relating to the prehistoric Aegean, to Bronze and Iron Age central Europe, to the Classical and Hellenistic Balkans, and to the ancient Pontic world, are among those which reflect the many interests of this wide-ranging and learned – but very human – scholar, and the numerous friendships he formed over the whole of Europe and beyond.

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
Univerzita Karlova

Opera Facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis vol. XVIII

ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ

STUDIES IN HONOUR OF JAN BOUZEK

Peter Pavúk – Věra Klontza-Jaklová –
Anthony Harding (eds)

Opera Facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis,
series editor: Michal Stehlík

This book was published with the assistance of the Institute of Aegean Prehistory (INSTAP) – Philadelphia, USA
and as part of the Charles University program PROGRES Q 09: *History – The key to understanding the globalized world*.

Copy readers:
Alexandros Mazarakis Ainian
Peter Warren

Opera Facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis
vol. XVIII

Peter Pavúk – Věra Klontza-Jaklová – Anthony Harding (eds)
ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ. Studies in honour of Jan Bouzek

Published by the Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague, nám. J. Palacha 2, Prague 1
in cooperation with Masaryk University, Žerotínovo nám. 617/9, 601 77 Brno

Cover and typography: Jana Vahalíková
Cover illustration modified from CMS II,6 no. 11. Image courtesy of the CMS Heidelberg
Fedra typesetting: Dušan Neumahr
Press: Togga, spol. s r. o., Prague
First edition, Prague 2018
ISBN 978-80-7308-767-8 (Charles University, Faculty of Arts)
ISBN 978-80-7308-795-1 (online : pdf)
ISBN 978-80-210-9025-5 (Masaryk University. Brno)

CONTENTS

V. Thrace and its Rulers

VI. Black Sea Area

DECONSTRUCTING ACHILLES. THE STORIES ABOUT PIYAMARADU AND THE MAKING OF A HOMERIC HERO

Konstantinos KOPANIAS

Abstract

Piyamaradu was a nobleman with a Luwian name, who lived during the second to third quarters of the 13th c. B.C. It is possible that he was a grand-son of king Uhha-ziti of Arzawa, who was defeated by the Hittite king Mursili II, lost his throne and died exiled on an Aegean island within the realm of the king of Ahhiyawa. Piyamaradu used Millawanda as a base for his military operations, and later on an Aegean island. He was a military leader who served the king of Ahhiyawa, although he retained a great degree of autonomy from him. Several Hittite texts describe his deeds, as well as the unsuccessful efforts of at least two Hittite kings to neutralize him. Piyamaradu was able to defeat the king of the Seha River Land and he raided the island Lazpa; he attacked the land of Wilusa, but in the end its king Alaksandu was restored to the throne by Hittite intervention; he was active in the land of Lukka and raided many lands in west Anatolia. The case of Piyamaradu, an individual, who was not even a king, and still managed to cause so many problems to one of the superpowers of the time, is unparalleled. In this paper it will be argued that the legends about Piyamaradu found an echo in the Homeric Iliad.

Keywords

Anatolia; Hittites; Ahhiyawa; Wilusa; Homer

Achilles is quite an atypical Homeric hero. On the one hand, he is the strongest, swiftest, handsomest and most valiant warrior in the Achaean army. But on the other hand, he was just a young prince, who died without ever becoming a king. A hero who spent most of his youth hiding. A hero who started and ended his career within the framework of the Trojan

War and is absent from the other important mythical cycles. A hero who was killed ingloriously by the most ungallant opponent. Even though his name is attested in Linear B (*KN* Vc 106, Pylos Fn 79.2), he is a fictional character, sprung from the imagination of the epic poets. Nevertheless, there is maybe reason to believe that there was indeed a historical person, who served as a source of inspiration for this fictional character.

A Prince without a Kingdom?

His father's kingdom, Phthia, was small and obscure. Homer never specified too precisely its location and extent, but it seems that it lay in the area of the Spercheius river (Hom. Il. 16.173–6, 23.140–4); astonishingly no significant urban centre existed in it, which could be located even in ancient times. Although Achilles was the son of Peleus and the grandson of Aiakos, both kings in Phthia, and his mother was the Nereid Thetis, he spent most of his childhood away from his palace. Apparently, it was not safe for him to remain within the boundaries of Phthia, so either his father (Paus. 3.18.12; Pind. Nem. 3.43; Schol. Il. 9.486; Schol. Rh. IV 813) or his mother (Stat. Ach. 1.189f) brought him to Centaur Cheiron, who became his teacher on mount Pelion. Achilles was then reared by Phoenix, who ruled over the Dolopians at the furthermost border of Phthia (Il. 9.484–492). When Achilles came of age, he moved on to conquer the island of Skyros (Il. 9.668b). Either prior to the Mysian Campaign or at the time of the (second) muster at Aulis (Sch. Il. 9.668), he married a princess on the island: either Deidameia the daughter of Lykomedes (Stat. Ach. 1.42f, 2.229; Sen. Troad. 350; Paus. 3.13.8), or Iphigeneia the daughter of Agamemnon (Schol. Il. 19.328) and produced a son, Neoptolemos. The identification of Skyros not with the island, but with a (and otherwise unknown) city of Phrygia is based solely on Schol. Il. 9.688a, and cannot be sustained (Huxley 1975, 249).

Achilles' parents did not want him to participate in the Trojan War, so one of them (Peleus: Schol. Il. 19.326; Thetis: Apd. 3.13.8; Hyg. f. 96; Bion XV; Stat. Ach. I) brought him to Skyros and hid him there, hoping to avoid military service under Agamemnon; some later authors even suggested that the mighty Achilles wore women's clothes and behaved accordingly, in order to conceal his true identity (Apd. 3.13.8; Paus. 1.22.6; Ov. met. 13.162f.; Heslin 2005, 57). His mother brought him then to Phthia for a suspiciously short period of time, just enough to give him his Olympian armour, and then transported him to Aulis (Philostr. Her. 198K). In another version of the myth his recruitment by Nestor and Odysseus took place not in Skyros, but in Phthia (Il. 11.765–90). When the time came to leave for Troy, he left his family on Skyros, not in Phthia. His father Peleus still ruled over Phthia, so it is very strange that Achilles did not choose to take leave his family at his palace. All existing versions of the myth agree

that his son Neoptolemos was born and raised in Skyros, until he was also summoned to fight in Troy (Il. 19.326–7), despite the fact that there was no enmity between Achilles and Peleus (e.g. Il. 19.322–8; I thank T. Palaima for pointing this out to me).

Achilles spent most of his life away from his home. Moreover, he changed his name three times. His initial name was Ligyron (Apd. 3.13.6), then it was changed into Pyrissos, and finally by Cheiron into Achilles, because he had not put his lips to a suckling breast: a-kheil-eus = no-lips--eus (T. Palaima, pers.com.). Supposedly, he also assumed the female name Pyrrha, when he was hiding in Skyros to avoid military service. His son Neoptolemos was also called Pyrrhos and, strangely enough, the latter seems to have been his main name, since that was the one adopted by his descendants in Epirus.

It is often implied in the Iliad that during the Trojan War Peleus was in a precarious position in his kingdom (e.g. Il. 24.488f; Od.11.494–7) and that, after the death of Achilles, he eventually lost it. The timing is convenient for the plot of the Iliad, otherwise the poet would have had a hard time explaining why Achilles did not return to Phthia to reclaim his father's kingdom. Also, Neoptolemos chose to fight in Troy, instead of helping his own grandfather. What is even more inexplicable is that Peleus tried to reach Neoptolemos in Troy, but was then driven by a storm to the island of Kos, where he remained for the rest of the Trojan War (Schol. Eur. Troj. 1128). There are contradictory stories, whether he died on the island, or if he ultimately found refuge in Epirus, after it was conquered by Neoptolemos (Procl. Returns). It is also hard to explain the fact that the storm led him to Kos, an island in the southeastern Aegean, and not to a northeastern island near Troy.

Furthermore, Neoptolemos did not settle in Phthia after the end of the Trojan War. It is mentioned in the Odyssey (3.186–9) that the Myrmidons returned safely, but that then they travelled overland through northern Greece and arrived in Epirus, an unwelcoming region, which they first had to conquer (Procl. Returns; Pi. Nem. 7.36–7; Schol. Od. 3.188, 189). Neoptolemos established there a dynasty and his son became the eponym of the Molossoi of Epirus (Eur. Andr 504ff; Lysim. FHG III 338f; Apd. E. 6.12 – 3; Paus. 1.11.1; Schol. Od. 3.188).

Moreover, the Myrmidons, the elite force that was directly under the command of Achilles during the Trojan War (Sears 2010, 150), had but a very loose connection with Phthia. It all starts with Aiakos, the grand--father of Achilles, who helped to build the impregnable walls of Troy (Pind. Ol. 8.30ff.). Apparently, Aiakos was then an ally of the king of Troy, but somehow ended up later in the island of Aegina. A pestilence devastated its population, and Zeus created for Aiakos the Myrmidons by transforming ants into humans (Hes. fr. 205M-W; Theog. FGrH 300 F1; Schol. Pind. Nem. 3.13; Ovid met. 7.470ff.). Evidently, the myth was invented in order

to explain the sudden appearance of a group of immigrants on the island, which found a temporary refuge there. The myth does not explain why Aiakos and the Myrmidons eventually abandoned the island and moved on to far-away Phthia. It also remains a mystery why two generations later, when Neoptolemos came of age, the Myrmidons moved to an even more remote place, Epirus.

In my opinion, the above-mentioned inconsistencies show that, in an earlier version of the myth, Peleus lost his kingdom early on, and Achilles grew up away from it. But for the plot of Iliad it was more convenient to claim that this happened immediately after the death of Achilles. This explains also the perplexing proposal of Agamemnon to hand over to Achilles seven cities in Peloponnese (Hope Simpson 1966). Achilles was the only son of Peleus and heir of his kingdom, so how would it have been possible to govern seven Peloponnesian cities from afar? Such a gift would only make sense, if the kingdom of Peleus was already lost.

A freebooter roams throughout West Anatolia

The leader of the Achaean campaign against Troy was Agamemnon, king *"of many an isle, and of all Argos"* (Il. 2.108). The Catalogue of Ships in the *Iliad* allows an estimation of the size of the Achaean army at over 100,000 men and 1,186 ships (Thuc. 1.10–15). On the other hand, the Catalogue (Il. 16.168–171) mentions that Achilles had only 50 ships under his command, each with a 50 men crew, which means that the Myrmidons numbered only 2,500 men in total. Despite the fact that Achilles' contingent was so small, the main burden of the war effort seems to have rested on his shoulders to such an extent that he was later thought of as the actual leader of the Achaean army, not Agamemnon (Apd. E. 17.1).

Surprisingly, according to later tradition, Achilles did not only fight against Troy. He had a leading role in the unsuccessful campaign of the Achaeans against Mysia/Teuthrania in the area of the Kaikos river, which they mistook for the Troas (Paus. 1.4.6, 8.45.7, 9.5.14; Apd. E. 3.17; Phil. Her. 3.28–36; Dict. 2.1–7). Its king Telephos repelled the attack successfully, but was injured by Achilles (Procl. Kypr. 18f.; Schol. Il. I 59; Lyk. 206f.; Schol. Pind. Ol. 9.70f.; Sen. Troad. 215f.; Dict. 2.1f.). When the Achaeans realized their mistake, they departed from Mysia, but instead of sailing directly to the neighbouring Troy, they returned all the way back to Greece and went home, with the exception of Achilles, who chose not to return to Phthia, but to remain in Skyros. Now the story becomes even more curious: the injured king of Mysia travelled all the way to Argos, in order to heal his incurable wound (Procl.; Hyg. f. 101; Euripides Tel. fr. 723; Suid. s.v. Τήλεφος; Schol. Il. 46.39; Ov. met. 12.112; Prop. 2.1.65). Achilles cured him and then Telephos decided to return the favour and agreed to guide the Achaeans to Troy. The Mysian Campaign was narrated in detail in the

now lost *Kyrpia*, and there is an indirect reference to it in the Iliad: Helen mentioned that she left Sparta 20 years ago, referring to the 10 years that followed the Mysian campaign and the 10 years of the actual Trojan War (Il. 24.765–6; Kullmann 1960, 189ff.). The Mysian incident is not a later addition to the myth, but an integral component of the Trojan Cycle (Davies 2000). One suspects that a historical event is hiding behind this myth (Rzach 1922, 2388), and maybe the mythological figure of Telephos is derived from the older Anatolian myth (Stewart 1997; I thank S. Morris for pointing this out to me).

During the actual Trojan Campaign, while the Achaeans remained entrenched at Troy, Achilles conducted a series of raids in the northeast Aegean in the name of Agamemnon, with whom he had to share his booty. He looted 23 cities and at least two islands (Tenedos and Lesbos: Il. 9.32–33). The Lesbos incident was apparently very important, because a number of ancient sources offer many additional details. Achilles conquered the cities Chryse (Il. 1.430f., 9.128f), Methymna (Parth. Erot. 21), Arisba (Serv. Aen. 9.264), and Lesbos seems to have remained thenceforth on the Achaean side (II. 24.544). Its king Makar supposedly was of Peloponnesian origin (Diod. Sic. 1.3, 5.57.2), and Penthilos, the son of Orestes, and grand-son of Agamemnon, was the ancestor of the ruling family of Lesbos (Hellanikos = Tzetz. Lykophr. 1374; Pind. Nem. 11.33; Strabo 13.1.3; Paus. 3.2.1).

Remarkably, Miletos is not included in the list of cities that were attacked by Achilles, although it belonged to the Trojan allies (Il. 2.867–9). Instead, after conquering Lesbos, Achilles travelled to Miletos in order to be purified for the murder of Trambelos, which he committed either on Lesbos or in Miletos itself (Athen. 2.43d; Schol. Lyk. [232]467; Aristokr. Mil. b; Parth. Erot. 26B; Aristob. Ath. 2.43D; Schol. Il. 9.343). Miletos appears to be a safe place for Achilles, given that such a purifying ritual could take place there. The name Trambelos *"seems to be a version of that of the Trmmili of Lycia, which the Greeks usually rendered as Tremilai or Termilai"* (Miller 1971, 151; for the Trmmili, see Bryce 1986, 21).

Most of the heroic deeds of Achilles are described in the poems of the *Epic Cycle*. Interestingly, artists of the Archaic Period usually preferred scenes not from the Homeric epics, but from the rest of the Cycle. The first heroic deed of Achilles took place right after the landing of the Achaeans in the Troad. The most formidable warrior in the Trojan army was then Kyknos, the king of Kolonai in Troad and a Trojan ally (Procl. Cypr.; Arist. Rhet. 2.24, 1396b). Achilles killed him and thus allowed the Achaeans to establish a bridgehead in Troad, where they remained entrenched for the next ten years. The name Kyknos (i.e. "swan") is quite unusual and unsuitable for a great hero, so later authors tried to come up with a plausible explanation: they attributed it either to his white head (Hes. fr. 237), his particularly white skin (Hellan. 4F148), or assumed that he was raised by swans (Athen. 393b). Some scholars consider it to be the Hellenized version of the name of

king Kukkunni of Wilusa, (Röllig 1992, 194; Fowler 2013, 534–535), which is Luwian, since it also appears in Lycian (Oreshko 2013, 357).

Later on, Achilles killed Hector, and Patroclos (as his alter ego) killed Sarpedon. Zeus then commanded Hypnos and Thanatos to carry the dead body of Sarpedon back to Lycia, in order to be buried there. This was an honour granted to no other hero, so we can assume that this particular mythical episode was originally anchored in Lycia. This is also suggested by the fact, that, out of all the Achaeans, Sarpedon killed Tlepolemos (Il. 5.627–59), the founder of three Rhodian cities (Diod. Sic. 4.58.8; possibly Il. 2.656). For whatever reason, the poet of the Iliad apparently wanted to incorporate this episode in his poem, but he needed to come up with an explanation for the fact that the tomb of Sarpedon was thought to be in Lycia, not at Troy. The solution was to magically transport his dead body back to his homeland.

The epic Aithiopis described the next important victories of Achilles. First against Penthesileia, the queen of the Amazons (Procl. Aith. 33K, fr. 1; Apd. E. 19.1). After the death of the Amazon, Achilles also killed Thersites, because he scolded him for falling in love with her. Curiously, Achilles needed to visit Lesbos again in order to be purified for the murder. According to an alternative tradition, Achilles had a short affair with Penthesileia. The fruit of their passion was the eponym of the river Kaystros (= Küçük Menderes), and his son was Ephesos, the eponym of the city known as Apasa in Hittite texts. Hence, it seems that this particular myth was originally anchored in that area, and was later added to the Trojan War.

The second important opponent of Achilles in the *Aithiopis* was Memnon, a far mightier adversary than Hector. Just like Achilles, he is the son of a goddess (Eos), and carries weapons crafted by Hephaistos (Pind. Ol. 2.91; Nem. 3.62f.; Isthm. 4.40f, 6.54; Qu. Sm. 2. 388f). Both heroes were equal in valour, so Zeus conducted a psychostasia, in order to determine the outcome of their duel (Aisch. fr. 123f., 273f.; Schol. Il. 8.70, 22.209). Both the Amazons and the Aithiopians lived very far away from Troy: the former in Paphlagonia, and the latter in the fringes of the world.

After defeating so many valiant opponents, Achilles' end seems to be undignified. As Dio Chrysostom (11.11) rhetorically asked: *"Can you believe... that this same Achilles, so pre-eminent a hero, was slain by the most faint-hearted man in the world?"* Paris did not kill Achilles in a duel, but by using his bow from quite a safe distance. This weapon seemed unheroic and suitable for cowards by the time the Iliad was composed (e.g. Il. 11.385–95). But this was not the case during the Late Bronze Age, when it was the weapon preferred by most of the great kings in the Near East (e.g. Wilkinson 1991). So, if Paris is the one who uses a king's weapon and manages to kill the mightiest hero of the Achaeans, maybe there is more than meets the eye in this Homeric persona.

Paris was a son of Priamos and Hekabe, but his parents exposed him on mount Ida because of an ominous oracle. Nevertheless, the child survived and a bear breastfed him (Lyc. 138; Apd. 3.12.5; Ael. V.H. 12.42), a myth suitable for kings (Wüst 1959, 1492 no. 4). Paris was not only the judge in the fatal beauty contest of the three goddesses, but also the one who kidnapped/seduced Helen, a daughter of Zeus, the most beautiful mortal woman, wife of king Menelaus, and sister-in-law of the mightiest king of the Achaeans. Not only Paris did take her with him, but he was also allowed to keep her in Troy: even after a menacing Achaean army landed at its gates, even after ten years of horrible war, even after the Trojans suffered so many casualties, Priamos still did not want to hand her over to Menelaus, who, after all, was her rightful husband. Homer tried to fix this inconsistency in his plot, but he made things even worse: he suggested that Helen was a woman of such an extraordinary beauty, that the Trojans thought it was all worth it. This made no sense already in antiquity (e.g. Dio Chrys. 11.66), so later authors and poets tried to offer a more convincing reason (e.g. Eur. Hel.). A much simpler explanation would be that Paris, not Priamos, was the king of Troy in an older version of the myth.

The image of Paris in the Homeric epic is not a positive one. He is presented as a coward, and is often scorned as Δύσπαρις (= bad Paris). Nevertheless, Homer gives Paris a gallant second name (Alexandros = saviour of men), which is actually used more often than the first one. Despite several attempts to establish a pattern, the use of the names seems random (Lloyd 1989, 77). Later authors were also baffled about this: some proposed that Alexandros was a title given to Paris in his early years, when he repelled some robbers (Apd. 3.12.5). But this explanation creates more problems than it solves, because then Paris somehow turned into a coward, when his compatriots needed him the most.

The Iliad is only marginally concerned with Paris/Alexandros, Hector is the Trojan protagonist (Wüst 1959, 1509–1510). But there are some parts of the poem which reveal that Paris/Alexandros was actually a person admired by his people as a courageous warrior; at one point, Hector speaks very highly of him (Il. 6.522), and also Paris/Alexandros mentions this casually about himself, as if this was a well-known fact (Il. 13.777). In the most critical part of the battle, when the Trojans were in mortal danger, their leader Hector leaves the battlefield, in order to tell his mother to ask Athena to save the city (something that a simple messenger could have done), but also to convince Paris/Alexandros to return to the battlefield (Il. 6.280). However, Paris/Alexandros is angry, a feeling which is not in accordance with the preceding events (Il. 6.326; Heitsch 2001). This wrath of Paris/Alexandros has no place in the Iliad, so it was explained as a remnant from an older, now lost poem (Schadewaldt 1943, 142–3; Kakridis 1949). Some proposed that this older poem was an Achilleis, i.e. a poem about the deeds of Achilles (Bethe 1914, 1:246ff, 253; Robert 1920, 1:977–8; Pestalozzi 1945).

Piyamaradu: a "freebooter" in the service of the King of Ahhiyawa

But let us now leave the misty territory of mythology and enter into the realm of history (see also Kopanias 2015). Several Hittite documents mention a very unusual individual, who acted in the service of the king of Ahhiyawa and managed to upset more than two Hittite kings (Muwattalli II, probably Urhi-Teššub, Hattušili III). This individual became a genuine nuisance for the Hittites, who used not only military force, but also diplomacy and magic in order to neutralize him. He is known by his Luwian name Piyamaradu.

The surviving texts offer no biographical information about him, except for his brother's name, Lahurzi (Heinhold-Krahmer 1986, 48–49; Miller 2010; Beckman et al. 2011, AhT 4 § 2), and the fact that he was the father-in-law of Atpa, the ruler of Millawanda (Beckman et al. 2011, AhT 4 § 5). Piyamaradu is never described as a king, or even a prince in the surviving texts (Hoffner 2009, 300). Piyamaradu was either a rebellious Hittite dignitary (Heinhold-Krahmer 2007, 194; Hoffner 2009, 300), or a prince of a vassal Anatolian kingdom (Mellaart 1986, 216; Hawkins 1998, 17; Bryce 2005, 224; Heinhold-Krahmer 2007, 194), who somehow never inherited his throne.

Starke (1997, 450–454; 2001, 40) proposed that Piyamaradu was one of the grandsons of king Uhha-ziti of Arzawa, an ally of the king of Ahhiyawa, who revolted against the Hittite king Mursili II. Uhha-ziti lost the war and found refuge on an island of the king of Ahhiyawa (probably Rhodes or Kos), where he died. His son, Piyama-Kurunta tried unsuccessfully to regain his father's kingdom, and then returned to the island. Mursili II asked the Ahhiyawan king to extradite him, and he probably got what he wanted, but his son Piyamaradu remained in the land of the king of Ahhiyawa. Such a reconstruction of events is very tempting (Mellaart 1986, 220–221; Hawkins 1998, 17; Niemeier 2007, 79), albeit hypothetical. Nevertheless, the fact that Piyamaradu's daughter would be accepted as a suitable bride for the ruler of Millawanda reveals that he was (or at least he was thought to be) of noble birth. Such claims were apparently not dismissed by the Hittites, since the Hittite king was willing to offer him a vassaldom in exchange for his loyalty (Beckman et al. 2011, AhT 4 § 1). Be that as it may, Piyamaradu was a prince without a kingdom, and his aim was to secure a vassaldom for himself somewhere in West Anatolia (Bryce 2005, 225).

In a letter sent from a king of Ahhiyawa to a king of Hatti (probably Muwattalli II) in the first quarter of the 13th century (Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 6 § 3), a dispute is mentioned concerning some islands near Wilusa (probably Lesbos, Tenedos, Imbros or Lemnos). Unfortunately, the surviving text is fragmentary, but it is evident that the king of Ahhiyawa claimed those islands as part of the dowry promised to his great-grandfather

by the king of Assuwa (Wiener 2007, 17; Bryce 2008, 40–41; Latacz 2010, 311–312; Niemeier 2012, 162 no. 181; Melchert *forthcoming*). Nevertheless, the ancestor of Muwattalli II (probably Tudhaliya I/II) had defeated the King of Assuwa and claimed the islands for himself (Beckman *et al.* 2011, 138). The king of Ahhiyawa had probably an involvement in this affair (Cline 1996; 1997). This old dispute was apparently revived during the reign of Muwattalli II. These events can be linked with the events mentioned in the Manapa-Tarhunta letter (Taracha 2001, 418–419; Hoffner 2009, 291; Beckman *et al.* 2011, 138).

During the reign of Muwattalli II the relations with the king of Ahhiyawa became tense. Piyamaradu attacked the island of Lesbos and brought some dyers, who belonged to the king of the Seha Land (Manapa-Tarhunta) and the Hittite king, to Atpa, the ruler of Millawanda (Singer 2008; Hoffner 2009, 294; Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 7 § 4; see also Beal 2007, 85). At the time, Atpa was a vassal of the king of Ahhiyawa (Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 4 § 5). This shows that Piyamaradu did not act on his own but in accordance to the interests of the king of Ahhiyawa, maybe with the aim of regaining the islands which the latter considered as part of his inheritance (Hoffner 2009, 291; Beckman *et al.* 2011, 138). Piyamaradu also "humbled" the king of the Seha River Land (Manapa-Tarhunta) and subjected him to Atpa, the ruler of Millawanda (Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 7 § 4. The word "humbled", used by Manapa-Tarhunta himself, is surely an understatement, designed to sugar-coat a humiliating defeat by Piyamaradu (Heinhold-Krahmer 1983, 93; Bryce 1985, 15; 2003a, 114; Starke 2001, 40; Hoffner 2009, 293; Hawkins 2015, Text 12). The fact that Piyamaradu did not claim the Seha River Land for himself, but placed it under the jurisdiction of Atpa (and by extension to the king of Ahhiyawa) is an additional clue that he did not act on his own, but as an agent of the king of Ahhiyawa, as in the case of the attack against Lesbos (Güterbock 1984, 119; Hoffner 2009, 291).

Muwattalli II decided to take action, so he sent a Hittite expeditionary force under the leadership of Kassu to the Seha River Land (Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 7 § 4). With his assistance, Manapa-Tarhunta regained his independence from Atpa, and the king of Mira (Kupanta-Kurunta) could finally request Atpa to release the above mentioned dyers captured in Lesbos, though Piyamaradu pleaded to him not to comply. A direct attack on Millawanda is not mentioned, so it seems that the Hittite show of force was enough to make Atpa accept the request, against Piyamaradu's expressed opinion. In the Seha River Land the Hittites prepared their attack against Wilusa, but the king of the Seha River Land (Manapa-Tarhunta) could not participate in it because of his poor health, or at least that was what he wrote to Muwattalli II (Beckman *et al.* 2011, *AhT* 7 § 3). The reference to the subsequent events in Wilusa is brief, so it seems that the problem was already solved by the time Manapa-Tarhunta wrote his letter. It is not mentioned whether Wilusa faced a local rebellion or an attack from

an external enemy, nor whether Piyamaradu was somehow involved in this affair (Hoffner 2009, 293–294). Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that not only was Piyamaradu involved, but also the king of Ahhiyawa.

More information is offered by a somewhat later text dated to the reign of Muwattalli II, the so called Alaksandu Treaty (Beckman 1999, 82–88 no. 13; Latacz 2010, 162). Wilusa is presented as a faithful ally of the Hittites throughout the wars of Tudhaliya I/II [§ 2] and Suppiluliuma [§ 3] against Arzawa. During the reign of Suppiluliuma, Kukkunni was king of Wilusa. Mursili II gave later the land of Arzawa to Piyama-Kurunta, the land of Kuwaliya to Mashuiluwa, the land of Seha River Land and Appawiya to Manapa-Tarhunta, as well as the land of Hapalla to Targasnalli [§ 3]. No new king is mentioned in Wilusa; hence it is safe to assume that Kukkunni still remained its king. Things became more dramatic, after Muwattalli II ascended to the Hittite throne. Alaksandu was by then king of Wilusa. No problems are reported in Wilusa after the death of Kukkunni, so we can assume that Alaksandu was his unopposed heir (Starke 1997, 454; 2001, 41; Klengel 1998, 19–194; Bryce 2005, 452 no. 15).

Men from a land, whose name is no longer preserved on the tablet, started a war against Muwattalli II. They invaded Wilusa; Alaksandu asked the Hittites to help him [§ 4]. Muwattalli II sent an army to save Alaksandu. In the process, the Hittites destroyed the land of Masa and other lands, whose names are not preserved on the tablet, which have been adversary to them [§ 4]. After this military intervention by the Hittites, the king of the Seha River Land was no longer Manapa-Tarhunta, but a certain Manapa-Kurunta [§ 14]. It is not clear whether the scribe misspelled the name of Manapa-Tarhunta (Heinhold-Krahmer 1977, 146–147; Houwink ten Cate 1983–84, 62, 66; Hawkins 1998, 16 no. 68), or if there was indeed a dynastic change (Beckman 1999, 124 no. 20). At a somewhat later point, there was in fact a dynastic change in the Seha River Land: the Hittites appointed Masturi to the throne to secure a more reliable ally (Bryce 2003b, 70; 2005, 227). The treaty confirmed Alaksandu as king of Wilusa, which shows that the force, which attacked his kingdom, remained unsuccessful in the long run [§ 14].

The surviving third tablet of the Tawagalawa Letter offers some additional information on the subject (Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 4). It is usually dated to the reign of Hattusili III (Collins 2007, 64; Heinhold-Krahmer 2010, 106; Beckman *et al.* 2011, 119–120), but with some reserve, because of Gurney's (2002) argument in favor of a date to the reign of Muwattalli II. The letter reveals that Piyamaradu was involved in the land of Lukka. Some people from the land of Lukka appealed to Tawagalawa (= Eteocles) (Wiener 2007, 15–16 n. 100; Beckman *et al.* 2011, 120; Niemeier 2012, 153 and no. 124), who was at the time in Millawanda; it was recently argued that Tawagalawa was actually a king of Ahhiyawa, probably the predecessor of the unnamed recipient of the letter and current king of Ahhiyawa

(Heinhold-Krahmer 2010, 120; Miller 2010, 159). Some other people from the land of Lukka asked for the assistance of the Hittite king, possibly because of the threat of Piyamaradu (Güterbock 1984, 120). Tawagalawa seems to have had no further involvement in the matter. Piyamaradu asked to become a vassal of the Hittite king and was offered a kingdom, possibly in Mira [§ 1] (Hawkins 1998, 17). However, he did not trust the Hittite king, so no deal could be struck, thus adding insult to injury [§ 2]. Piyamaradu fought bitterly in Iyalanda, but eventually lost and had to seek refuge in Millawanda [§ 4]. The Hittite king wrote to the king of Ahhiyawa and asked him to tell Atpa to deliver Piyamaradu to the Hittites; the king of Ahhiyawa did that, but his answer to the Hittite king was almost disrespectful [§ 5]. The Hittites arrived in Millawanda, although they do not seem to have violated its territory (Singer 1983, 215; Hawkins 1998, 19 and n. 89, 92; Niemeier 2007, 8; 2012, 166; Hawkins 2015, Text 7; contra Beckman et al. 2011, 120). A recent archaeometric analysis showed that the clay for the tablet of the Tawagalawa Letter was indeed acquired in the wider area of Ephesos, not in Miletos (Goren *et al.* 2011, 693–694). But Piyamaradu eluded capture once again, and the Hittite king could barely hide his anger: *"Then Piyamaradu departed by ship, while Atpa and Awayana listened to the charges that I made against him. Why are they covering up the matter – because he is their father-in-law?"* [§ 5].

An additional problem was that Piyamaradu took with him 7,000 civilian captives from the land of Lukka and transported them somewhere into the land of Ahhiyawa [§ 9]. The proposal of the Hittite king to ask the captives whether they preferred to remain in the territory of the king of Ahhiyawa or to return to his own territory is quite extraordinary, because the refusal to return captives or fugitives constituted a hostile act (Bryce 2003a, 196). But the Hittite king was apparently willing to look the other way, as long as the Piyamaradu affair would be solved once and for all.

The Hittite king also knew about the future plans of Piyamaradu: "I [i.e. Piyamaradu] *will cross over to the land of Masa or the land of Karkiya, but I will leave behind here the civilian captives, my(!) wife, children, [and] household. Will it (indeed) be like this plan? While he leaves behind his wife, children, and household in my brother's land, will your land support him? This person keeps attacking my territory. But if I... it to him, he returns to your land. Do you approve, my brother? Did you now [...] this?"* [§ 11]. Despite those hostile intentions on the part of Piyamaradu, the Hittite king has yet another reconciliatory proposal to offer to the king of Ahhiyawa: the latter should either make Piyamaradu surrender to him (with the assurance that no harm would come to him) or ask him to leave his land and go wherever he wanted. He urged the king of Ahhiyawa to tell Piyamaradu: *"Do not be hostile from my land. If you(!) would rather be in Karkiya or Masa, go there."* [§ 12]. The fact that the land of Masa is mentioned as a place which Piyamaradu could regard as relatively safe for him brings to mind the text of the "Alaksandu Treaty", where the land of Masa is

mentioned as one of the aggressors against Wilusa. This is another hint that Piyamaradu was indeed involved in *"the matter of Wilusa"*, whatever that was exactly. Piyamaradu's exact location is never mentioned in the text; it is usually assumed, that, since Piyamaradu was planning his next raids into the Hittite territory, he must have found shelter in an Aegean island, as a matter of fact one that would not have been too far away from the Anatolian coast (Beckman *et al.* 2011, 120–121). Of particular interest is also the plan of Piyamaradu to leave his family in this safe haven, while he continued his raids with his followers.

The Hittite king urges the king of Ahhiyawa to send Piyamaradu the following message: *"The King of Hatti has persuaded me about the* ***matter of the land of Wilusa*** *concerning which he and I were hostile to one another, and we have made peace. Now(?) hostility is not appropriate between us"* (Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 4 § 12). Obviously in the past, both kings have been hostile to each other because of the "*matter of Wilusa*". It seems that Piyamaradu did not let this enmity pass, and kept harassing the Hittites, otherwise the Hittite king would not have mentioned this explicitly in his letter. And it seems that, despite the fact that they had by then peaceful relations, also the king of Ahhiyawa still seems to have held a grudge against his Hittite counterpart on the matter. Interestingly, the Hittite king adopts a very apologetic tone in his letter: *"And concerning the matter [of Wilusa] about which we were hostile [because we have made peace], what then? If [a certain ally] confesses an* ***offense*** *before his ally, [because he confesses] the offense before his [ally], he does not reject [him]"* (Beckman *et al.* 2011, *AhT* 4 § 13). We do not know if this incident refers to a war, a raid, or some other kind of military confrontation (Güterbock 1986, 37; Bryce 2006, 185). It is evident from the remaining text that the Hittite king used force in *"the matter of Wilusa"*, but then mentions to his defence that he was still young back then (Beckman *et al.* 2011, *AhT* 4 § 15). The reference to the young age of the Hittite king at the time of these events shows that, even if the sender of the letter was indeed Hattusili III, the events took place during the time of the reign of his predecessor (Muwattalli II), when he was already active in political and military affairs (Beckman *et al.* 2011, 122). The existing evidence shows that Piyamaradu and indirectly maybe also the king of Ahhiyawa have fought against the Hittites in Wilusa, but lost. Piyamaradu probably attacked, even occupied Wilusa in the beginning of the reign of Muwattalli II, as has been suggested by many scholars (Houwink ten Cate 1983–1984, 33; Bryce 1985, 15, 21; 1992, 125; 2003a, 114; 2003b, 67–68, 71; 2005, 226, 245; 2006, 110, 182; Gurney 1990, 41; Starke 1997, 453–454; 1997, 453; 2001, 40; Latacz 2010, 122; Collins 2007, 53; Wiener 2007, 16; Niemeier 2012, 165; Morris 2013, 160). Piyamaradu could have claimed the throne of Wilusa for himself (Kelder *et al.* 2012, 58).

Piyamaradu is mentioned in several other Hittite texts, but they are fragmentary. Of particular interest is the tablet with a votive prayer offered by Puduhepa, the wife of Hattusili III, who promised gifts to various

gods, if they would deliver Piyamaradu to her (Beckman *et al.* 2011, AhT 26). Interestingly, Morris (2013, 160) used this particular text, in order to show that the prayer of Hekabe to Athena and her offer of gifts to fend off Diomedes is based on an older Anatolian theme.

Conclusions

Achilles and possibly also Piyamaradu were sons and grandsons of kings. Their father (and respectively grandfather) lost their kingdom and found refuge on an island near the Anatolian coast. Interestingly, Aiakos was active in west Anatolia and Achilles was connected with Ephesos. Achilles and Piyamaradu never became kings. They both found refuge in an Aegean island, where they left their family, in order to attack cities in West Anatolia. They both were fearsome military leaders, conducted raids in Anatolia under the command of the Achaean king, shared their booty with him, but had a great degree of autonomy from him. They both found refuge in Miletos: Piyamaradu after his defeat in Lycia, Achilles after killing Trambelos, a name connected with Lycia. They both campaigned against Mysia and made its king a subject of the king of the Achaeans, at least temporarily. They both attacked Lesbos. They both fought in Troy, under the command of the Achaean king. But, in both cases, an opponent called Alexandros/Alaksandu prevailed in the end, although not because of his own military valor. Achilles also defeated Kyknos, whose name is connected with Kukkunni, the predecessor of Alaksandu of Wilusa. They both fought against expeditionary forces sent against them from the east.

In my opinion, the similarities between what we know about the deeds of Piyamaradu from the Hittite texts and Achilles from the Epic Cycle are too many to ignore. No other single person, especially one who was not even a king, ever caused so much trouble to the Hittites as Piyamaradu. Not only is the longevity of his career extraordinary in itself (Beckman *et al.* 2011, 251–252), but he also proved to be a mortal threat, that neither military force, nor diplomacy, nor even magic could eliminate. The remarkable deeds of Piyamaradu most certainly impressed his contemporaries. We can presume that they inspired stories and songs, which later evolved into legends in both sides of the Aegean. Already during his lifetime, people of the land of Ahhiyawa would have transformed his Luwian name into something more convenient to their language. Was his name maybe hellenized as Pyrisoos, or simply Pyrrhos?

If this is true, then Hector, Priamos (despite his apparently Luwian name: Watkins 2006, 56–57; Palaima 2006, 58) and Patroclos are fictive characters, created entirely by the epic poets, as several neo-analysts have suggested (e.g. Scheliha 1943; Schadewaldt 1965, 177; Kullmann 1960, 42–44, 182–188; Kramer-Hajos 2012, 97–103). It would also explain the vague similarity between the Sallis Wastais Ritual and the burial of Patroclos,

the alter ego of Achilles (Rutherford 2007), as well also the cremation of the dead in the Homeric Epic, which was practiced only in Anatolia, not in the Mycenaean Aegean (Kopanias 2012). Most importantly, it would show that the Epic Cycle does indeed have a historic nucleus, no matter how small or distorted. However, it also becomes evident that there was no Trojan War like the one described in the Epic Cycle. It seems that the epic poets compacted a series of raids and mini-wars, which took place in the course of several generations in various parts of west Anatolia, and eventually amalgamated them into a singular, heroic event. As Easton (1985, 189–190) put it, the *heroic tradition may represent that "motley series of mini--wars" which "could have originated in the tensions generated in Western Anatolia by the rival claims there of Hittites and Ahhiyawa"*.

I do not suggest that Achilles is to be identified with Piyamaradu. Achilles is just a fictional character sprung out of the imagination of later epic poets; but this fictive character was not an invention *ex nihilo*. The epic poets did not have at their disposal any of the above mentioned Hittite texts. Their heroic story was based on the oral tradition, i.e. the legends, tales and songs that survived until then (Bachvarova 2009), and incorporated also events which predated the Trojan War (Morris 1989; Cline 1997; Palaima 2009; 2012, 351–352). The transformation of the historical Piyamaradu into the fictive character of Achilles was gradual and probably took place a lot earlier than the Iliad. As Burgess (2009, 8) recently noted a *"coherent life of Achilles also is implied by early Greek poetry and art,"* thus we can assume that an epos dedicated especially to Achilles existed, similar to those dedicated to Theseus and Herakles (Arist. poet. 1451a), as already mentioned.

Neither mythology nor the epic poems can be used in a naïve way to reconstruct the history and society of the Bronze Age. But I think that we can do the complete opposite: namely to use the available sources from the Bronze Age to better understand the Homeric poems.

Acknowledgments

I would like to cordially thank T. Bryce, E. H. Cline, J. Kelder, S. Morris, W.-D. Niemeier, N. Polychronakou-Sgouritsa, and, in particular, T. Palaima, for reading a draft of this paper and offering me valuable feedback.

Bibliography

Bachvarova, M. R. (2009) Hittite and Greek Perspectives on Traveling Poets, Texts and Festivals. In R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, 23–45. Leiden.

Beal, R. H. (2007) Making, Preserving, and Breaking the Peace with the Hittite State. In K. A. Raaflaub (ed.), *War and Peace in the Ancient World*, 81–97. Malden, Oxford.

Beckman, G. (1999) *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. 2nd ed. Writings from the Ancient World 7. Atlanta.

Beckman, G., Bryce, T. and Cline, E. (2011) *The Ahhiyawa Texts*. Society of Biblical Literature 28. Atlanta.

Bethe, E. (1914) *Die Sage vom troischen Kriege*, Vol. 3, *Homer, Dichtung und Sage*. Leipzig.

Bryce, T. R. (1985) A Reinterpretation of the Milawata Letter in the Light of the New Join Piece. *Anatolian Studies* 35, 13–23.

Bryce, T. R. (1986) *The Lycians*, Vol. 1, *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*. Copenhagen.

Bryce, T. R. (1992) Lukka Revisited. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 51(2), 121–130.

Bryce, T. R. (2003a) *Letters of the Great Kings of the Ancient Near East: the royal correspondence of the late Bronze Age*. London, New York.

Bryce, T. R. (2003b) History. In H. C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*, 27–127. Boston.

Bryce, T. R. (2005) *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford, New York.

Bryce, T. R. (2006) *The Trojans and their neighbours*. London, New York.

Bryce, T. R. (2008) An Historians' Observations on Troy and Homeric Tradition. In M. Mazoyer (ed.), *Homère et l'Anatolie*, 31–45. Paris.

Burgess, J. S. (2009) *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore.

Cline, E. H. (1996) Assuwa and the Achaeans: the 'Mycenaean' Sword at Hattusas and its Possible Implications. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 91, 137–151.

Cline, E. H. (1997) Achilles in Anatolia: Myth, History, and the Assuwa Rebellion. In G. D. Young, M. W. Chavalas and R. E. Averbeck (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael Astour on His 80th Birthday*, 189–210. Bethesda, MD.

Collins, B. J. (2007) *The Hittites and their world*. Atlanta.

Davies, M. (2000) Euripides' Telephus Fr. 149 (Austin) and the Folk-Tale Origins of the Teuthranian Expedition, *ZPE* 133, 7–10.

Easton, D. F. (1985) Has the Trojan War been found? *Antiquity* 59, 188–196.

Fowler, R. L. (2013) *Early Greek Mythography*. Vol. 2, *Commentary*. Oxford.

Goren, Y., Mommsen, H. and Klinger, J. (2011) Non-Destructive Provenance Study of Cuneiform Tablets Using Portable X-Ray Fluorescence (pXRF). *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38, 684–696.

Gurney, O. R. (1990) *The Hittites*. Harmondsworth.

Gurney, O. R. (2002) The Authorship of the Tawagalawa Letter. In P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, 133–141. Warsaw.

Güterbock, H. G. (1984) Hittites and Akhaeans: A New Look. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 128(2), 114–122.

Güterbock, H. G. (1986) Troy in Hittite Texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa und Hittite History. In M. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War*, 33–44. Bryn Mawr.

Hawkins, J. D. (1998) Tarkasnawa King of Mira 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy Sealings and Karabel. *Anatolian Studies* 48, 1–31.

Hawkins, J. D. (2015) The Political Geography of Arzawa (Western Anatolia). In N. Stampolides, C. Maner and K. Kopanias (eds.), *NOSTOI. Indigenous Culture, Migration and Integration in the Aegean Islands and Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age. Proceedings of the International Conference held in Istanbul 31/3/11–3/4/11*, 15–36. Istanbul.

Heinhold-Krahmer, S. (1977) *Arzawa*. Texte der Hethiter 7. Heidelberg.

Heinhold-Krahmer, S. (1983) Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu (Teil I). *Orientalia* 52(1), 81–97.

Heinhold-Krahmer, S. (1986) Untersuchungen zu Piyamaradu (Teil II). *Orientalia* 55(1), 47–62.

Heinhold-Krahmer, S. (2007) Zu diplomatischen Kontakten zwischen dem Hethiterreich und dem Land Ahhizawa. In E. Alram-Stern and G. Nightingale (eds.), *Keimelion: Elitenbildung und elitärer Konsum von der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur homerischen Epoche*, 191–207. Vienna.

Heinhold-Krahmer, S. (2010) Asyndeton in vorangestellten temporalen Nebensätzen mit der Konjuktion Kuwapi? In I. Singer and J. D. Hawkins (eds.), *Ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins, on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, Monograph series 28, 106–122. Tel Aviv.

Heitsch, E. (2001) Der Zorn des Paris. Zur Deutungsgeschichte eines homerischen Zetemas. In E. Heitsch (ed.), *Gesammelte Schriften,* Vol. 1, *Zum Frühgriechischen Epos*, 178–189. München, Leipzig.

Heslin, P. J. (2005) *The transvestite Achilles gender and genre in Statius' Achilleid*. Cambridge, New York.

Hoffner, H. A. (2009) *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. Writings from the Ancient World 15. Atlanta, GA.

Hope Simpson, R. (1966) The Seven Cities Offered by Agamemnon to Achilles. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 61, 113–131.

Houwink ten Cate, P. (1983–1984) Sidelights on the Ahhiyawa Question from Hittite Vasall and Royal Correspondance. *Jaarbericht ex Oriente Lux* 28, 33–79.

Huxley, G. (1975) Iphis and the Dolopians of Skyros. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 16(3), 245–250.

Kakridis, I. K. (1949) *Homeric Researches*. Lund.

Kelder, J. M., Uslu, G. and Ö. F. Şerifoglu, eds. (2012) *Troy: city, Homer, Turkey*. Zwolle.

Klengel, H. (1998) *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches*. *HdO* I 34. Brill.

Kopanias, K. (2012) Paradise Lost. The Image of the Netherworld in the Near East and in the Aegean. In N. Stampolides, A. Kanta and A. Giannikouri (eds.), *ATHANASIA. The Earthly, the Celestial and the Underworld in the Mediterranean from the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Age. Proceedings of the International Archaeological Conference, Rhodes 28–31 May,* 2009, 191–202. Herakleion.

Kopanias, K. (2015) From the Mythical Atreus to the Ruler Attarissiya. Aegean Kingship in the Late Bronze Age through the Prism of Near Eastern Texts. In I. Kaiser, Ou. Kouka and D. Panagiotopoulos (eds.), *Ein Minoer im Exil. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier*, 149–160. Universitätsforschungen zur Prähistorischen Archäologie 188. Bonn.

Kramer-Hajos, M. (2012) The Land the Heroes of Lokris in the *Iliad*. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 132, 87–105.

Kullmann, W. (1960) *Die Quellen der Ilias*. Wiesbaden.

Latacz, J. (2010) *Troia und Homer: der Weg zur Lösung eines alten Rätsels*. 6th ed. Leipzig.

Lloyd, M. (1989) Paris/Alexandros in Homer and Euripides. *Mnemosyne* 42(1/2) *Fourth Series*, 76–79.

Melchert, H. C. (*forthcoming*) Mycenaean and Hittite Diplomatic Correspondence: Fact and Fiction. In A. Teffeteller (ed.), *Conference and Workshop on the Mycenaeans and Anatolians in the Late Bronze Age: The Ahhijawa Question. Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada; 5 January 2006*.

Mellaart, J. (1986) Some reflections on the History and Geography of Western Anatolia in the Late Fourteenth and Thirteenth Centuries B.C. *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatischen Forschungen* 10, 215–230.

Miller, J. L. (2010) Some Disputed Passages in the Tawagalawa Letter. In I. Singer and J. D. Hawkins (eds.), *Ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins, on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, 159–169. Monograph series 28. Tel Aviv.

Miller, M. (1971) *The Thalassocracies*. New York.

Morris, S. P. (1989) A Tale of Two Cities. The Miniature Frescoes from Thera and the Origins of Greek Poetry. *American Journal of Archaeology* 93, 511–535.

Morris, S. P. (2013) From Kizzuwatna to Troy? Puduhepa, Piyamaradu, and Anatolian Ritual in Homer. In St. W. Jamison, H. C. Melchert and B. Vine

(eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, 151–167. Bremen.

Niemeier, W.-D. (2007) Westkleinasien und Ägäis von den Anfängen bis zur ionischen Wanderung. Topographie, Geschichte und Beziehungen nach dem archäologischen Befund und den hethitischen Quellen. In J. Cobet, V. von Graeve, W.D. Niemeier and K. Zimmermann (eds.), *Frühes Ionien: eine Bestandsaufnahme: Panionion-Symposion Güzelçamlı, 26. September–1. Oktober 1999*, 37–96. Mainz.

Niemeier, W.-D. (2012) Griechenland und Kleinasien in der späten Bronzezeit. Der historische Hintergrund der homerischen Epen. In M. Meier-Brügger (ed.), *Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon: Akten des Hamburger Kolloquiums vom 6.–8. Oktober 2010 zum Abschluss des Lexikons des frühgriechischen Epos*, 141–180. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Neue Folge 21. Berlin.

Oreshko, R. (2013) Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Tradition(s)? In A. Mouton, I. Rutherford and I. S. Yakubovich (eds.), *Luwian identities: culture, language and religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, 345–420. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64. Leiden, Boston.

Palaima, Th. (2006) Wanaks and Related Power Terms in Mycenaean and Later Greek. In S. Deger-Jalkotzy and I. S. Lemos (eds.), *Ancient Greece: from the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, 53–71. Edinburgh.

Palaima, Th. (2009) Continuity from the Mycenaean Period in an Historical Boeotian Cult of Poseidon (and Erinys). In D. Danielidou (ed.), *ΔΩΡΟΝ. Τιμητικός Τόμος για τον Καθηγητή Σπύρο Ιακωβίδη*, 52–536. Athens.

Palaima, Th. (2012) Security and Insecurity as Tools of Power in Mycenaean Palatial Kingdoms. In P. Carlier (ed.), *Études Mycéniennes* 2010. Actes du XIII^{e} Colloque International sur les Textes Égéens, 345–356. Pisa and Roma.

Pestalozzi, H. (1945) *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*. Erlenbach – Zürich.

Robert, C. (1920) *Griechische Mythologie*, Vol. 2, *Die griechische Heldensage*. 4th ed., Berlin.

Röllig, W. (1992) Achäer und Trojaner in hethitischen Quellen? In I. Gamer-Wallert (ed.), *Troia. Brücke zwischen Orient und Okzident*, 183–200. Tübingen.

Rutherford, I. C. (2007) Achilles and the Sallis Wastais Ritual: Performing Death in Greece and Anatolia. In N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, 223–236. Chicago.

Rzach, A. (1922) Kyklos. In G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus and K. Ziegler (eds.) *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft* 11, 2347–2445.

Schadewaldt, W. (1943) *Iliasstudien*. Leipzig.

Schadewaldt, W. (1965) *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. 4th ed. Stuttgart.

Scheliha, R. von (1943) *Patroklos. Gedanken über Homers Dichtung und Gestalten*. Basel.

Sears, M. (2010) Warrior Ants: Elite Troops in the Iliad. *Classical World* 103(2), 139–155.

Singer, I. (1983) Western Anatolia in the Thirteenth Century B.C. According to Hittite Texts. *Anatolian Studies* 33, 205–218.

Singer, I. (2008) Purple-Dyers in Lazpa. In B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Anatolian interfaces: Hittites, Greeks, and their neighbours: proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-cultural Interaction, September 17–19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA*, 21–44. Oxford.

Starke, F. (1997) Troia im Kontext des historischpolitischen und sprachlichen Umfelds Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend. *Studia Troica* 7, 447–487.

Starke, F. (2001) Troia im Machtgefüge des zweiten Jahrtausends vor Christus. Die Geschichte des Landes Wilusa. In J. Latacz and B. Theune-Großkopf (eds.), *Troja: Traum und Wirklichkeit*, 34–45. Darmstadt.

Stewart, A. (1997) Telephos/Telepinu and Dionysos: Distant Light on an Ancient Myth. In R. Dreyfus and E. Schraudolph (eds.), *Pergamon: The Telephos Frieze from the Great Altar*, Vol. 2, 109–120. Austin.

Taracha, P. (2001) Mycenaeans, Ahhiyawa and Hittite Imperial Policy in the West: A Note on KUB 26.91. In T. Richter, D. Prechel and J. Klinger (eds.), *Kulturgeschichten: Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, 417–422. Saarbrücken.

Watkins, C. (2006) The Language of the Trojans. In M. J. Mellink (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposion Held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984*, 45–62. Bryn Mawr.

Wiener, M. H. (2007) Homer and History: Old Questions, New Evidence. In S. P. Morris and R. Laffineur (eds.) *Epos: Reconsidering Greek Epic and Aegean Bronze Age Archaeology*, 3–33. Liège.

Wilkinson, R. H. (1991) The Representation of the Bow in the Art of Egypt and the Near East. *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 20, 83–99.

Wüst, E. (1959) Paris. In G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus and K. Ziegler (eds.) *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft* 18(4), 1484–1518.

Konstantinos Kopanias
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, GR
kkopanias@arch.uoa.gr