The study at hand presents a new evaluation of our data and our understanding of the political landscape in Greece during the Late Bronze Age, especially during the 14th and 13th century BC. Over the last few years there has been a flood of new publications on this topic, both in popular magazines and monographs and as more scholarly publications. It seemed time to bring the various different views together and evaluate them, and –of course- to propose my own ideas on the topic. During my studies, I increasingly came to see the Mycenaean world as a unified state; a concept that –as a result- has become the main argument of this thesis. Below, I will argue for the existence of a large territorial entity covering most of the Greek mainland, the isles in the Aegean and the centre which was later known as Miletus on the Anatolian west coast. This entity was known as Ahhiyawa to the Hittites and Tanaju to the Egyptians, and Mycenae was its capital –its focus of economic, political and ritual life.

I am not the first to venture in this field, nor do I expect to be the last. In the pages below, I will deal with contemporary scholarship, but before that, I should perhaps provide an overview of that long line of thought on this topic before me. As seems to be customary in this field, I begin with that very man that is generally considered to have been the father of the study of Aegean prehistory, Heinrich Schliemann.

Schliemann’s excavations at Hissarlik brought him fame with the general public and, certainly at the end of his life, recognition by most of his fellow colleagues in the field of archaeology and philology. Notwithstanding the many objections against the man, his methods and his interpretations, Schliemann had brought to life a society that was far older than the known Classical Greek world.¹

Before Schliemann, the Mycenaean world could only be studied by reading the Classical texts (mainly Homer) which had, essentially since Antiquity, been considered to be a more or less real reflection of the Greek world in the Late Bronze Age. It was only during the late 18th century that a need was felt to check the reality of the Homeric epic, and that

¹ See for a comprehensive overview of Schliemann’s exploits, Wood 1985.
questions were raised whether the Iliad was not largely, or even wholly, fictional. From these questions sprang two “groups” of scholarship, which Joachim Latacz\(^2\) calls the “Positivisten” (who believed that at least the essence –Grundtatbestände- of the Homeric stories reflected Bronze Age reality) and the “Fiktionalisten” (who believed that even the essence of the stories were fictional). I use the word “believe” here with a reason, as both opinions at that time were based on nothing but conviction. It is worthwhile to quote in this place two protagonists of both convictions, first the fictionalist Rückert, who argued that the Homeric tales were composed as a justification for the seizure of the Troad by Aeolic settlers in the 8\(^{th}\) century BC:

\textit{Die Sage, die sich später an den ungeheuren kyklopischen Trümmern Ilions und den hohen Grabhügeln am Gestade des Hellesponts emporrankte, schiebt ihn [the Aeolic seizure of the Troad] weit in die mythische Zeit zurück und lässt die Mythischen Ahnherren der Achäer, die Aeakiden und Pelopiden, ihren Nachkommen die Ansprüche auf jenes schöne Land erkämpfen...} \(^3\)

Second the positivist Welcker, who argued that a story as grand as the Iliad could not possibly have been the product of imagination and the need to justify the seizure of new lands:


\(^2\) Latacz 2007, unpublished lecture at the University of Amsterdam. But see for a general discussion Latacz 2001 with references.
\(^3\) Rückert 1846, VI-X.
The excavations of Schliemann changed this discussion. Schliemann’s uncovering of a powerful Bronze Age settlement at the site of what –at least in later Classical times- was known as Ilion (even if his initial identification of Troy II as the “Homeric Troy” was utterly wrong), his findings at Mycenae, Tiryns and Orchomenos showed that the world described in the Homeric Epics was remarkably reminiscent to Bronze Age reality. By many, this was taken as proof that the Homeric songs were “real”; that Agamemnon and his companions once lived and fought for Troy and that they had lived in splendid palaces such as they were now known at Mycenae and Tiryns. This was most of all the case with Schliemann himself who, of course, always had been a believer, a “positivist”.

In general, it seems that after Schliemann’s excavations, the popular consensus was that the Homeric stories held at least some core of Bronze Age reality, a belief that grew with the slightly later discoveries in Crete, where several large “palatial” structures were excavated. Most notable amongst these was the palace at Knossos, which was being dug by Sir Arthur Evans. Evans’ excavations at Knossos on the one hand put Schliemann’s finds in a better perspective; not only showing that a much older culture had preceded the mainland civilization that had by now been coined “Mycenaean”, but also that Mycenaean society owed much to its Cretan predecessors in virtually every field of religion, “art”, social organisation. On the other hand, Evans’ excavations also cast a shadow on scholarship that was to last for several decades. Although not explicitly stated in his early work, Evans increasingly considered the Minoan civilization not only as a major influence on the Mainland society of the Mycenaean palaces, but even saw those palaces as Minoan dependencies, subject to the rule of Knossos. This view was to dominate scholarship for decades to come. Indeed, such was his influence on contemporary scholarship that those that did not

---

4 Welcker 1849, 43.
5 See for example the preface to Schliemann’s “Mycenae” (1880) by W. E. Gladstone.
6 Cf. Dickinson1994; Schachermeyr1987, with references.
7 See for an extensive discussion of the term “Minoan” before Evans, Karadimas / Momigliano 2004.
agree with his views (but rather thought of Mycenaean society as an independent phenomenon) were stripped of their positions. The most famous example in this respect was the director of the British School at Athens during those years, Alan Wace.\(^8\) Wace, and his American colleague Carl Blegen, were among the few archaeologists that openly questioned Evans’ views of Minoan overlordship over Greece and argued—vice versa—that it was the Mycenaeans that had eventually overrun Minoan Crete.\(^9\)

Time would redeem Wace, and with the decipherment of Linear B by Michael Ventris, it became clear that there was no evidence whatsoever that the palaces of the Mainland had been Minoan dependencies. Rather, it was now put beyond doubt that the Mycenaeans spoke Greek—an archaic variant of it, but Greek nonetheless. It also indicated that it was the Mycenaeans that eventually had overrun Knossos, and not vice versa, for the texts in Knossian archives were written in Linear B Greek, not in Linear A.

The shock brought about by the realisation that Evans’ Minoan paradigm had stalled academics for decades and that Linear B now offered a wealth of information coming, so to say, directly from the Mycenaeans themselves, was no doubt enormous and we may suspect that it was this shock that resulted, at least occasionally, in an overestimation of the value of Linear B texts. Ventris himself was already painfully aware of the limitations of the texts,\(^10\) pleading for caution as to how far the texts could bring scholarship to a realistic reconstruction of the Mycenaean world. Indeed, over the years it has become increasingly clear that the Linear B texts refer only to (an unspecified) part of the palatial economies, often dealing with the last months or even less of the lives of the respective palaces,\(^11\) but although these limitations are noticed, the tendency still is to model most of the Mycenaean palatial societies and states along the information derived from Linear B texts. The most striking example is, I think, the reconstruction of the territorial extent of the Theban Kingdom, with some arguing that parts of Euboea fell under Theban sway because of occasional shipments of cattle to the centre on the

---

\(^8\) Robinson 2002, 133.

\(^9\) As is clear from private correspondence between the two. Cf. Wood 1985, 112.


\(^11\) Cf. Chadwick 1973
Kadmeion hill, but examples abound and I should perhaps simply quote Galaty and Parkinson in stating that:

“Unfortunately, the majority of these theoretical models [of Mycenaean palatial society] are vestiges of the era in which Linear B was first deciphered.”

Another result of the decipherment of Linear B texts was the total loss of belief of the academic world in the “historicity” of the Greek legends. Oliver Dickinson in his handbook “The Aegean Bronze Age” commented the following:

“The belief in the warlike propensities of Mycenaean society in this period seems in fact to derive largely from the belief that this society is accurately mirrored in the Homeric epics and other legendary material. But the world of Homer’s heroes, in which wealth is essentially represented by livestock and movable treasures, and to acquire these by raiding is not thought at all reprehensible, seems completely at odds with the world of orderly taxation of territories’ produce reflected in the Linear B texts.”

With the belief in Homer gone, there was no reason to suppose a larger political entity anymore. The result was that the administrative units, i.e. the palatial realms, were considered to be political entities themselves. As will be discussed below, there is little against this notion in the Linear B texts, nor does archaeology necessarily indicate a different situation. The fact that Hittite and Egyptian texts spoke against such a model of regional states, was –of course- problematic, but put aside with the excuse that those texts only reflected the perception of the Hittites and Egyptians on the Aegean, and that these texts did not necessarily reflect Late Bronze Age political reality, or –more strikingly- was not even mentioned.

---

12 See below for discussion, p. 11.
13 Galaty / Parkinson 1999b, 6.
14 Dickinson 1994, 81.
However, the number of Hittite texts dealing with the Aegean has over the years increased and the contents and contexts of these texts are increasingly better understood. Also, archaeology indicates that the Aegean was, in the 14th and 13th century at least, fully incorporated in a system of gift exchange of prestige goods; items often specifically manufactured for the purpose of enhancing the social status of their recipient (and therewith the status of the one who had sent it). These items were made specifically for the purpose of tying the various elites throughout the Late Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean together, using a range of hybrid symbols of power and prestige that were widely understood throughout the region. Because of that, it is increasingly untenable to argue that the Mycenaean world was a remote **terra incognita** for the royal houses of the Near East and that neither the Egyptians nor the Hittites had any notion of the political structures and relations in the region they evidently had contact with. If we want to discard the contemporary Near Eastern texts dealing with the Aegean, we need to prove that they cannot be relied on. As far as I can see – and I will deal with this *in extenso* below – we do not have that proof.

We are thus faced with the problem that our current understanding of the political layout of the Mycenaean world, with its various smaller political entities, does not fit the picture of the contemporary Near Eastern texts. This then, is the problem that stood at the beginning of the present research; a problem I hope to solve in the pages below.

---

Traditionally, Greece during the Late Bronze Age is seen as a patchwork of small states, states that were culturally similar, but politically independent from each other. This view was mainly informed by Linear B texts, which suggest that each of these states was ruled from a palatial centre, where the revenues from the realm where brought to be stored, administered and redistributed. To control the flow of goods and men within their respective realms, the palace administration kept records on unbaked clay tablets, examples of which have survived at various centres, mainly because of their accidental burning in the fiery destructions that brought about the end of many of the palaces around 1200 BC. The records kept track of the distribution of goods and manpower throughout the region. So far, no Linear B tablets have been found dealing with anything else: in contrast with neighbouring lands, such as Egypt or Hittite Anatolia, Greece has not yielded historical or juridical texts and no such things as treaties or diplomatic letters have been found.

On the other side of the Aegean, just two hundred kilometres to the east, Hittite texts dating from the period between 1400 and 1220 BC refer to a Kingdom of Ahhiyawa, which, according to recent developments in our understanding of Hittite geography, should be sought beyond the Anatolian coast, i.e. on the isles in the Aegean or on the Greek mainland. Around 1250 BC, the Hittite King Hattušili III writes a letter full of
complaints about Ahhiyawan activity on the Anatolian west coast, but respectfully calls his Ahhiyawan colleague “Great King”. This title has been the topic of much debate and its exact connotation seems to have differed through time and per region, but it is clear that it was more or less the equivalent of what one nowadays calls a “Great Power”: an independent state, with significant military power and of sizable territory. As such, the title was only attributed to those monarchs that, in effect, ruled the urban, civilized world. Most notable amongst these were the King of Egypt, the King of Hatti (the Hittites) and the King of Babylon. Over time, the King of Mitanni and, after his demise, the King of Assyria would become part of this “Great Powers’ Club”. Not recognized as such by the Hittites, but accepted as equals by the Kings of Amarna Age Egypt, were the rulers of Alashiya (now safely identified as –part of- Cyprus) and Arzawa, a Kingdom that rose to prominence in western Anatolia during a period of Hittite decline.

Ahhiyawa as part of the Great Powers’ Club appears to have been an exclusively Hittite perception on interstate politics. There is no certain reference to an Ahhiyawan Kingdom in Levantine or Egyptian texts, although we know from a Hittite text dated to ca. 1220 (the so-called Šaušgamuwa treaty) that Ahhiyawan ships did frequent Levantine harbours. Only during the reign of Merenptah is there mention of “Ekwesh”, what may be the Egyptian pronunciation of Hittite Ahhiyawa, as part of the Sea People movement.

On the other hand, Egyptian texts dating to the reign of Thutmose III and Amenhotep III do refer to the Kingdom Tnj, usually vocalised as Tanaju, comprising at least parts of the Greek mainland. On at least one occasion, messengers from the King of Tanaju are reported to have brought greeting gifts to the Egyptian court. Textual reference to Tanaju from after the reign of Amenhotep III is not yet attested.

Both in Egypt and the Levant, the Mycenaean world is omnipresent in the archaeological record. The Levant, especially, has yielded an abundance of Mycenaean pottery, mainly

---

linguistic correspondence between Ahhiyawa and Akhaioi via (the unattested) *Ahhiaw- > *Ahhyaw- > *Akhaw-.

21 Cf. Ragonieri 2000, esp.45-53 for discussion on status in Great King diplomacy. For the identification of Alashiya as –part of- Cyprus, see Goren / Bunimovitz / Finkelstein / N’aman 2003, 233-255.
24 Cf. Latacz 2001b, 166; Cline 1998; Helek 1995, 24; Edel 1988; Goedicke 1969; Edel 1966. For an extensive discussion, see below.
25 Cf. Haider 1988a, 10; Latacz 2001b, 164. See extensive discussion below.
in harbour cities such as Ugarit.\textsuperscript{26} The Mycenaean pottery seems to have had a limited diffusion to inland centres. In Egypt, Mycenaean pottery is found less frequently, although several major centres have yielded considerable amounts of Mycenaean vessels. Chief amongst these is the site of El Amarna, known in Antiquity as Akhetaten, the “Horizon of the Solar disk”, and the capital of Egypt under its heretic King Akhenaten. Other important sites include Deir el Medina near present-day Karnak and Luxor, and Qantir, the site of ancient Pi-ramesse, in the eastern delta.

The abundance of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant and Egypt is not paralleled in western Anatolia. Finds of Mycenaean pottery and, for that matter, other artefacts in western Anatolia have been remarkably few and are concentrated among a few major centres, including the site of Miletus and Hissarlik. The scarcity of Mycenaean artefacts in Anatolia is matched by the dearth of Anatolian objects found on the Greek mainland. Egyptian objects are, on the other hand, more common, especially at Mycenae.

The observations above present us with a problem. How do the various Mycenaean principalities, argued for on the grounds of Linear B texts, relate to Hittite Ahhiyawa? How does Ahhiyawa relate to the Aegean Kingdom that the Egyptians called Tanaju? Is it all compatible with the –admittedly scrappy- archaeological record in Greece, western Anatolia and Egypt? It is the aim of this research to present some new thoughts and to offer a new synthesis of the various historical and archaeological datasets.

To do so, the various datasets will be presented separately to be compared to each other. The major questions while doing so are to what extent these datasets overlap, and how discrepancies should be understood. The datasets are presented in roughly the same order as they are introduced above: Linear B texts first, followed by the Hittite texts, the Egyptian texts and the archaeological data.

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. van Wijngaarden 2003, with references, for an exhaustive discussion of the distribution of Mycenaean pottery in the Levant
EVIDENCE FROM THE LINEAR B TEXTS

The palatial realms

The period known as the Late Bronze Age spans the years between 1600 and ca. 1100 BC. In Greece, this period was characterized by the rise of several palatial centres, of which Pylos, Tiryns, Midea, Orchomenos, Thebes and Athens are notable. Most famous of all is the site of Mycenae, situated in the northeast of the Argive plain, to which the material culture of Late Bronze Age Greece owes its name. Although many of these centres appear to have been sizable settlements during the Middle Bronze Age and the first two centuries of the Late Bronze Age, it is from ca.1400 BC onwards that these centres can be characterized as “palatial”, with large, imposing megaron structures as the focus of economic, and presumably social and religious life.\(^{27}\)

A salient feature of palatial Greece is the use of script for the administration of each palace’s realm. The script, Linear B, was used for the day to day administration of each palace economy and inscribed on clay tablets. Lists of produce, men, women, livestock and other goods that were at the palace’s disposal are preserved, as well as lists concerning the movement of people and goods, and such things as offerings to specific gods. Linear B tablets have been found at various centres, including Mycenae, Tiryns, Thebes, Knossos and Pylos. As has been noted, the texts only concern administrative issues and, whilst they do offer some insight in the administrative reach of the various palatial centres, are of limited value when reconstructing ancient Greece’s political landscape. Also, the fact that most “archives” represent the day to day administration of the palaces’ final year(s),\(^{28}\) i.e. shortly before the destruction of the palaces around 1200 BC, makes the Linear B texts \emph{a priori} of limited value when dealing with earlier periods. Despite these observations, the point remains that the Linear B texts represent the only written records from the Mycenaean world.

\(^{27}\) Cf. Dickinson 1994, 291; Shelmerdine 1999; Chadwick 1976a, 102 ff. esp. 139-156; but see Sherratt 2001.

\(^{28}\) See Chadwick 1976a, 18 ff.; Hooker 1982, 209. Bennett 1956, 109 notes that in some cases the tablets (esp. The E-series) cannot have ante-dated the fire by more than a few weeks.
Although most of the palatial archives have only partly been preserved, the impression from the tablets is that the palatial administration throughout Greece was highly uniform, using the same language (Mycenaean Greek), the same terminology and the same systems of taxation and distribution.\(^{29}\) Indeed, and we will come to that below, even the shapes and sizes of the clay tablets used for the various palatial administrations appear to have been uniform throughout Greece.\(^{30}\) Considering this sense of uniformity, the evidence coming from the most fully preserved and most completely published archive, that of the palace of Pylos, is usually taken as representative for all of the palatial centres.

As noted above, the Linear B texts mainly concern administrative issues; the flow of goods and people throughout the realm of the respective palace. The lists of revenues from subsidiary centres are generally used to reconstruct the approximate territorial extent of the various Mycenaean palatial states.\(^{31}\) In the case of Pylos, it appears that the palace ruled an area roughly comparable to the modern “nome” of Messenia, with prominent hills and ridges serving as boundaries. This seems to have been the case with most palaces: they exercised a regional rule, which seldom extended beyond the natural borders of their realm. Only at Mycenae can a case be made for a larger territory, including the Argolid, Korinthia and Achaea, as shall be argued below. For Thebes, it has been proposed that its territory covered the eastern part of Boeotia.\(^{32}\) While some even argue that parts of Euboea should be included on the basis of an occasional delivery of animals from the towns of Karystos and Amarynthos to Thebes,\(^{33}\) I fail to see why the occasional exchange should indicate Theban dominance over that centre in Euboea. Whatever the case, each Mycenaean Kingdom was in principle governed from the palace. Palaces exercised control over most, if not all, the industries within their realm.\(^{34}\) This included not only those in or near the palace, but also those at large provincial centres.

\(^{29}\) See for the uniformity of language (and hints of underlying dialects) Chadwick 1976a; for terminology and systems of taxation, Vermeule 1957, 200; Shelmerdine 1999b (who does argue for –very minor-regional differences in the Linear B administration); Olivier 1984. See also Ventris / Chadwick 1956, 199; Palmer 1955.


\(^{33}\) Eder 2003, 303.

\(^{34}\) Killen 1999, 88-89.
It appears that palatial territory was divided into several provinces, each headed by its own administrative centre. Pylian territory was divided into two provinces, generally called the “hither” and the “further” province, of which the latter was probably administered by the secondary capital of Leuktron; re-u-ko-to-ro in Linear B. The Aigaleon ridge in all likelihood served as a natural boundary between the two, although some have argued for an east-west division of the Pylian realm. The provinces themselves were divided into several smaller districts, known as damoi. Some of these may have been headed by a g$\text{asileus}$, the ancestral form of the later Greek basileus. To the Mycenaeans this title seems to have had a less exalted meaning than to the later Greeks, as it is also used to designate the chief of, for example, a group of smiths.

The “wanax” and the “lawagetas”

There is little doubt in the scholarly discourse about the head of state of the typical Mycenaean state. The activities of the wanax cover virtually all aspects of palatial life, as the Linear B texts show the wanax partaking in religious feasting and offerings, as well as being involved in the distribution of goods and craftsmen or troops. On the basis of his widespread involvement in Mycenaean society, the wanax is generally understood as the “King” of the typical Mycenaean state, while the lawagetas, an official whose activities seem to roughly overlap with the wanax’s, is usually seen as each Kingdom’s second in command (though the specific function of the lawagetas remains debated; I will come to this below). Both appear to have had an exalted status, as only the wanax and the lawagetas are reported to have been the holders of a temenos (an officially designated plot of land, possibly with some religious connotation). The texts, moreover, indicate that both were the major (though not the only) landholders within the Pylian realm, although the wanax, whose lands appear to have been three times the size of those of the lawagetas, seems to have been most important in that respect.

With the wanax widely considered as each Kingdom’s head of state, the absence of an overlord in the palatial archives flies in the face of any argument in favour of any degree

38 Ventris / Chadwick 1976a, 70. This rather ordinary connotation may be compared to Homer, as we read in the Odyssey of many basilees in Ithaka (Od. I.394-5).
of overarching authority – as various Hittite texts seem to indicate. But how firm are our data on the political structure of the Mycenaean world? Is there indeed no trace of an overlord in the Linear B texts? Any attempt to address these questions must naturally start with the evaluation of our evidence regarding the position of those officials that appear to have been most prominent in Mycenaean society: the wanax and the lawagetas. This is what will be done in the lines below. We will first focus on the position of the wanax, and after that, on the position of the lawagetas.

Linear B texts found at Pylos, Knossos, and Thebes (while at Tiryns and Chania the wanax is attested in inscriptions on pottery)\(^{39}\) indicate that the wanax was engaged in religious, economic, and military life. A number of these texts, which we review below, have been interpreted as indicative of the wanax’s exalted status in the Mycenaean Kingdoms. However, as will be argued in the lines below, there is no further specification of his function within the Pylian state; there is no indication of the wanax’s duties, rights and powers in the Linear B texts. As a result our understanding of the political composition of the various Mycenaean Kingdoms remains very limited – to the extent that their respective political independence must be considered unproven. Let us now turn to the various relevant Linear B texts.

From a text from Pylos, Er 312, we can infer that the wanax is the owner of a temenos 3 times the size of that of the lawagetas:

Er 312.1. wa-na-ka-te-ro te-me-no
   2. to-so-jo pe-ma GRA 30
   3. ra-wa-ke-si-jo te-me-no GRA 10
   4. *vacat*
   5. te-re-ta-o to-so pe-ma GRA 30
   6. to-so-de te-re-ta VIR 3
   7. wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo e-re-mo

---

\(^{39}\) Hooker 1979, 100 lists the occurrences of “wanax” at Pylos; see Hallager 1987, 117 for Chania; Catling / Millett 1965, esp. 48 for Thebes (but note that most of the inscribed stirrup jars at Thebes were of Cretan manufacture); Catling et al. 1980, 88 ff., Godart / Olivier 1975, 38 and Sacconi 1974, 41 (with Fehlzitat) for attestations at Tiryns.
This has been taken as evidence for the wanax’s superior position over the lawagetas but, whilst the text clearly indicates the prominence of the wanax as a (perhaps the) major landholder and that temenos, with its close analogy in Homer’s temenos basileion (Σ 550), seems to indicate an exalted status of the wanax within the Pylian Kingdom, these inferences about Er 312 cannot “serve to establish this as proof of the proposition that the wa-na-ka stood at the head of state. [...] It does indeed, go some way towards establishing the status of the wa-na-ka, but it enables nothing to be said for certain about his functions; and a knowledge of his functions would be of far greater significance, since it is quite possible for an office-holder to continue to enjoy high status long after his functions have become purely honorific.”

That craftsmen are designated as ‘wanaktero’ in various other texts is of a similar ambiguity, as this does not say anything about their precise status (they may work permanently for the wanax; they may occasionally be called into service). It is, of course, of interest to note that the wanax had an interest in the production of pottery (Eo 371) or in a fuller (En 74.3) but so too, one might presume, did the average farmer in the Pylian kingdom. There is, moreover, often no clarity about the nature of the wanax involved – he may have been divine, he may have been human.41

40 Hooker 1979, 102.
41 “Anax” in Homer is also used to designate Zeus. Palmer considers the wanax (written wa-na-ka-te, i.e. dative) as the recipient of the olive oil listed in the Fr. Series (above), and therefore considers the wanax...
Whatever the details, there can be no doubt that the Pylian Kingdom knew at least one human wanax, considering text Ta 711: o-wi-de pu₂-ke-qi-ri o-te wa-na-ka te-ke au-ke-wa da-mo-ko-ro, which is usually taken as *when the wanax appointed au-ke-wa (as) da-mo-ko-ro* (a title rather than a personal name).\(^\text{42}\) Here, the wanax is clearly regarded to be human, performing an act of considerable importance (since otherwise, it wouldn’t have been mentioned in the text). In the same text, the wanax is associated with the inspection of precious items that can only be considered to have been property of the palace – therewith placing the wanax in that same context. Despite the fact, however, that Ta 711 thus proves that the wanax was an official of significant stature, it does *not* prove that he was the only ruler of the Pylian Kingdom.\(^\text{43}\) Moreover, there is reason to question the notion of the wanax as the supreme ruler of the Pylian kingdom since, although he holds a temenos, the revenues of this temenos as listed in Er 312 are equalled by the revenues of the holdings of only three *te-re-ta* (a designation for common landholders; compare to Classical Greek *telestai* -> *telos*, ‘service’, ‘duty’).\(^\text{44}\)

At Knossos, too, the wanax must have been a person of distinction, since specific cloths were made for him and it is also clear that the wanax at Knossos was involved in economic (the production of olive oil and perfumes) and religious matters, but there is no unequivocal evidence to consider the wanax the supreme head of state, nor is his relation to other important figures, such as the lawagetas, clear in any way. The same, I fear, holds for the texts and inscriptions from the other sites, especially since a number of texts inscribed on pottery may have been imported (e.g. a number of inscribed stirrup jars from Thebes seem to have come from Crete).\(^\text{45}\)

---

\(^{42}\) Cf. Palmer 1963, 247-258. But see P. Carlier, 1987; Adrados 1969, esp. 149-150, for the argument that the wanax “era un dios agrario innominado” and that the te-re-ta where priests of his cult.


\(^{44}\) I do consider this text as a clear indication that the Kingdom of Pylos knew only one wanax (whatever his position in the Pylian state may have been), since had there been more, this wanax would have been specified (named). *Contra* Hooker 1979.

\(^{45}\) Cf. Hooker 1979, 105. See also Hallager 1987, 182, for similar doubts on the status of wanax in post LM IIIA2 Crete (Knossos).

\(^{45}\) Cf. Catling / Millett 1965, 7; Catling et al. 1980; Palmer 1963.
These uncertainties apply, to an even greater extent, to the position of the lawagetas. The lawagetas, ra-wa-ke-ta in Linear B, is attested in texts from Pylos and Knossos. The most important text, usually seen as indicative for the lower status of the lawagetas in regard to the wanax, comes from Pylos:

Un 718.1: sa-ra-pe-da po-se-da-o-ni do-so-mo
   .2: o-wi-de-ta-i do-so-mo to-so e-ke-ra₂-wo
   .3: do-se WHEAT 4 WINE 3 BULL 1
   .4: tu-ro₂ TU + RO₂ ko-wo SKIN + KO 1
   .5: me-ri-to CT 3
   .6: vacat
   .7: o-da-a₂ da-mo WHEAT 2 WINE 2
   .8: RAMS 2 TU + RO₂ 5 a-re-ro A + RE + PA + CT 2 SKIN + KO 1
   .9: to-so-de ra-wa-ke-ta do-se
   .10: RAMS 2 me-re-u-ro *65 CAS 6
   .11: WINE CQ 2 o-da-a₂ wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-‘ma’
   .12: WHEAT CAS 6 WINE CQ 1 TU + RO₂ 5 me-ri[
   .13: [ ] CQ 1 CT 1

.1: The Sa-ra-pe-da to Poseidon, its contribution
.2: As far as one can see, Ekhelawōn will give so much as a contribution:
   .3 480 l. wheat, 108 l. wine, one bull,
   .4: ten cheeses, one sheepskin,
   .5: 6 l. of honey
   .6: vacat
   .7: And similarly the village (will give): 240 l. wheat, 72 l. wine,
   .8: two rams, five cheeses, 4 l. Fat, one sheepskin.
   .9: And the lawagetas will give so much:
   .10: two rams, 72 l. flour,
   .11: and 24 l. wine. And similarly the estate of the cult association (will give):
   .12: 72 l. wheat, 12 l. wine, five cheeses,
   .13: 14 l. of honey.

Translation adapted from Ventris / Chadwick 1973, 282-3
Here, the lawagetas is listed as one of the contributors to a sacrifice in the otherwise unknown Pylian district sa-ra-pe-da. On the basis of analogies with other Linear B texts (for example, Er 312), it has been proposed that the contributor listed first (and who is contributing most to the sacrifice) may have been the wanax—in which case this text would provide us with the only name of a Mycenaean monarch, E-ke-ra₂-wo (Ekhelawōn), so far.  

It is on the basis of this text, and the aforementioned text Er 312, that the lawagetas is usually considered to have been second in power (after the wanax), as his entry in the tablets is second—after, normally, the wanax- and his landholdings seem smaller than those of the wanax (in Er 312 a third of the wanax’s property).

Other attestations of the lawagetas in Pylian tablets include An 724.7 and Un 219.10, as well as ra-wa-ke-si-jo in Ea 782, Ea 814, Ea 882, Eq 59.4, Er 312.3 and Na 245, and ra-wa-ke-si-jo-jo in Ea 421, Ea 809 and Ea 823. These texts indicate that, apart from being a landowner and having a number of skilled workmen attached to his office, the lawagetas was also engaged in the deployment of rowers (An 724).

Contrary to Palaima’s claim that there is a clear distinction between the spheres of influence of the wanax and the lawagetas in the Linear B texts (this remark appears to be entirely based on the fact that the affairs of both officials are listed in separate series—Ea and Eb/En/Eo/Ep), their actual state-business in effect seems to have been much the same—if on a different scale: they both hold plots of land (the designation temenos seems to be exclusively used for the plots of land held by these two officials, and is not used to denote the landholdings of, for example, the te-re-ta), they both appear to have had specialized craftsmen in their service, they are both recorded to partake in religious activities (or provide offerings for that), and they both are involved (though not unequivocally proven) in military affairs (such as the deployment of troops). As far as I can see, the only clear distinction between the wanax and the lawagetas in the Linear B texts is the size of their property. The wanax seems to have outdone the lawagetas in this

---

46 The list is similar in structure as the aforementioned Er 312. See for extensive discussions Palaima 1998-1999, 205-221; Heubeck 1966, 64.
47 Palaima 1995, 129.
48 See for example PY Un 718 for their contributions to a ceremonial banquet to Poseidon, or PY An 724, for their involvement in the deployment of rowers in the Pylian fleet.
respect, and therefore can be plausibly considered to have been of a higher social status. But that is about all we can reasonably deduce from the texts.

Similarly, attempts to deduce the function of the lawagetas in Mycenaean society on etymological grounds appear to be problematic. Of these attempts, the one most often heard is that the lawagetas was the military commander of the typical Mycenaean state, a concept based on the assumption that *laos* refers to the population able to carry weapons, i.e. the army. As noted, this is an assumption and there is, in fact, no shred of direct evidence for it.49

In sum, although we can grasp the nature of some of the activities of the wanax and the lawagetas in Mycenaean society, we have little idea about their exact position within the political organization of the Mycenaean states. Whether the wanax exercised regional authority only, or was in fact an overlord of several palatial polities (each perhaps ruled by a lawagetas –a leader of the people, as his title implies?) cannot possibly be said on the basis of the Linear B texts only.

**Supra-regional affairs**

The dearth of conclusive evidence on the exact position of the wanax and the lawagetas in the Linear B texts is matched by the absence of evidence on the relations between the various palatial polities. Though there is the occasional reference to areas that appear to have been outside the administrative grasp of the respective palaces, the implications of these references appear to be rather ambiguous. In the lines below, we will explore some examples.

Pylian troops are reported to have ventured far from home, with small numbers being dispatched to centres in Elis and Oikhalia, the latter on the Pylian-Arcadian border. Though that specific detachment of men may have consisted of “special forces”, as

---

49 But see Wundsam 1968, 58; van Effenterre 1968, 559-573. See Lindgren 1973,134 ff. for full references on the etymology of *lawagetas*. See, for an alternative derivation (*ἀγω*), Auro Jorro 1993, 230, who also notes that the attestations of the lawagetas in various contexts in the Linear B texts “sin que sea posible limitar su esfera de acción a una función específicamente militar o cultural, como campo professional exclusive de este alto dignitario”. Nikoloudis, in an as yet unpublished PhD, proposed that the lawagetas served as a liaison between the palatial elite and the lower classes of the Pylian realm; as a “minister of multi-cultural affairs” (lecture in Melbourne, October 2007).
Geschnitzer suggests, more common troops, such as rowers are known to have been sent to regions beyond the Pylian border. Tablet An 12 [1] from Pylos reports that 27 of these rowers were dispatched to pe-re-u-ro-na-de, which may plausibly be equated with Pleuron, on the northern shore of the Gulf of Corinth. One may wonder why such small numbers of men were deployed in regions far beyond the borders of the Pylian state. Whatever the exact nature of this, it demonstrates that at least occasionally, the palace of Pylos was engaged in regions well beyond its borders. This is further illustrated in other tablets, naming slaves from several centres and regions in the Aegean, including Miletus and Lesbos. The Pylians certainly had the naval capacity to travel to these areas, as is clear from the Linear B texts and the Mycenaean harbour installations near Voidokoilia.

Tablets from other centres indicate some supra regional contacts as well: goods go from Mycenae to Thebes and at Knossos people from Nauplion and Cyprus are present, as well as an Egyptian. The problem with the evidence as quoted above is that although supra regional contacts are attested, the nature of these contacts remains difficult to establish. At Pylos, for example, women from Miletus (and various other western Anatolian regions) are recorded as slaves, yet Miletus was a Greek centre – at least culturally speaking. This then may indicate bellicose actions between Mycenaean centres, but another option is that these slaves were acquired at Miletus, but were themselves not of Mycenaean origin. Interstate contact was, perhaps, not confined to trading encounters or even the deployment of small numbers of troops. The recurrence of the names of officials at several major centres is an indication of supra regional engagement. Indeed it may point to more, as has been noted by Killen: “several names [...] appear in more than one archive, suggesting at least the possibility that all these persons were members of a
The texts indicate that these people served as collectors, which might point towards some centralized gathering of resources, although it is equally possible that these collectors served in the process of gift exchange between the different Mycenaean centres. It is not clear, however, whether we are dealing with the same people in different centres or with different people bearing the same names. But even in


60 Although at Knossos, “collectors” may have been owners of land and livestock in regions at some distance from the palace, rather than palace officials. Cf. Bennet 1992, 65-101; 1988, 32-33. Deger-Jalkotzy argues that the “collectors” at Pylos and Thebes do not indicate supra-regional government, but are the result of the cultural koiné of Mycenaean Greece, with virtual identical bureaucracy, palatial architecture and ideology. That some collectors have the same name can be ascribed to the wide-spread occurrence of Greek names in general on the Greek mainland during the 13th century BC. At the same time, she does however allow for dynastic and political ties between the various polities, including military cooperation. Cf. Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 19-35. See also Parkinson 1999, 84; Olivier 2001, 129-159 and the comment of Postgate (p.160), noting that the recurrence of specific names as ‘collectors’, “if we are indeed looking at 200 years and five or more generations” is surprisingly strongly motivated. See also Carlier 1992 for the differences in functions of the collectors at Knossos and Pylos.

61 The precise status and function of these ‘collectors’ is a matter of debate. At Knossos, some of these ‘collectors’ appear to have been owners of land and flocks of sheep in regions at some distance from the palace, and this has been taken as evidence that they cannot have been officials of the Knossian palace (Bennet 1992, 65-101). However, these persons also appear also in the archives of Boeotian Thebes, again with the same function (as collectors or ‘owners’ of flocks and workers in the sheep and cloth industry). This striking degree of coincidence had already been observed by John Killen in 1979 and is difficult to explain within the framework of independent Mycenaean palatial states (Killen 1979, 176.). One explanation would be that the ‘collectors’ were divinities, but at least some of the collectors appear in the archives in contexts which make it clear that they were humans. Killen proposed that these collectors are most likely to have been members of a ruling dynasty, especially considering the close connection at Pylos between ‘collectors’, the e-qe-ta and the lawagetas (Cf. Killen 1979, 177-178; Killen, 1999, 88; Lindgren 1973, 143-144). If this were the case, the recurrence of names in these high social echelons could be the result of an ‘upper class tradition’, in which royal scions were only given names from a certain limited stock (Killen’s argument that the collectors, with the same name, function and activities, may have been members of a single ruling family was supported with parallels from contemporary European royal houses: the high proportion of Danish Kings called Christian, and of English monarchs called Edward (Plantagenet, esp. Angevins), Henry (Plantagenet; esp. Lancaster) and George (House of Hannover). The important point here is that ruling families, regardless of intermarrying with other (foreign) nobility, tend to retain a number of specific names –names that could almost be called emblematic for a certain dynasty. This phenomenon is also apparent in Late Bronze Age states in the Near East, such as Egypt (18th dynasty names: Amenhotep, Thutmoses; 19th dynasty names: Ramesses and Seti) and the Hittite Empire (Hattušili, Šuppiluliuma, and Muršili)). This hypothesis has received only limited attention in the scholarly debate, and has not gained wide-spread acceptance. Deger-Jalkotzy argued that the recurrence of names may be ascribed to the wide-spread occurrence of Greek names in general on the Mycenaean world (Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, 19-35). At the same time, she did, however, allow for dynastic and political ties between the various polities, including military cooperation. Of course, the possibility that high status persons, holding identical titles in the various palatial administrations, bore the same names as a result of a wide-spread cultural koiné cannot be excluded, but it seems unlikely that the combination ‘name + title’ reappears in the archives of various sites in a similar setting (cloth industry) only as a result of cultural uniformity. Moreover, as has been observed by Nicholas Postgate, the recurrence of specific names as ‘collectors’, if we are indeed looking at 200 years and five or more generations is surprisingly strongly motivated. I am aware of the discussion surrounding the date of the Linear B archives at Knossos. For convenience’s sake, I will follow the ‘traditional’ date, holding that Knossos was destroyed ca. 200 years before the end of the Mycenaean centres on the mainland. Considering the early date of the archive of Knossos, this dynastic tie
case of the latter, one could argue that the recurrence of names in elite families all over Greece points towards at least dynastic ties. In addition, the fact that the way of administrating the palatial territories—including several flaws—is more or less similar at all palatial centres is difficult to explain as a result of a cultural “koinè” only.  

Despite this, there is no indication for a supra regional entity such as Ahhiyawa known in the Linear B texts. Ahhiyawa itself is mentioned only once: in a tablet from Knossos, as *a-ka-wi-ja-de*, but this may refer to a town just as well as a state. As a result, the Linear B texts offer only limited and ambivalent evidence with regard to supra regional, interstate contacts between the different palatial states and, for that matter, their relation with regions beyond the Aegean. Although the existence of such a state as Ahhiyawa from the Hittite texts certainly is not contradicted in the Linear B texts, clear evidence for it is absent. For that matter, let us take a closer look at the Hittite texts.

---

62 Nicholas Postgate noted that the uniformity of shape and size of the Linear B tablets throughout Greece, to a Near Eastern archaeologist, appear to indicate political unification, since in the Near East, every polity was characterized not only by its own specific way of administration, but also by the shapes and sizes of the tablets. See Killen / Voutsaki 2001, 160.

As has been noted in the introduction, Hittite texts referring to Ahhiyawa date to the period 1400 to 1220 BC. For almost two centuries, there evidently was diplomatic contact between the Hittite court and the Ahhiyawan court, sometimes of an apparently peaceful nature, but more often involving Ahhiyawan aggression in areas subject to the Hittite crown. Sommer listed a total of 16 Hittite texts referring to Ahhiyawa in his 1932 Ahhiyawa Urkunden. Today the number of texts referring to Ahhiyawa has grown to ca. 25, with an additional number of fragments that may bear the name Ahhiyawa.64

The scene for Hittite–Ahhiyawan relations was the west coast of Anatolia (see map 4 for an overview). There are several Hittite texts dealing with this region. Six Hittite texts deal with the Aššuwa League (KUB XXIII 11; KUB XXVI 91; KUB XL 62 I+ XIII 9; KUB XXXIV 43:10; and a text on the mycenaeanizing sword found at Hattuša), which dominated western Anatolia until its fall to the Hittites in the late 15th century BC. Another text, KBo XII 53 rev.7', has little relevance, although some reference to Aššuwa is made. Arzawa, a Kingdom which rose to power after the collapse of Aššuwa, is mentioned several times too, most notably in the Annals of Muršili II65 and several treaties (KBo V 4; KUB XIX 49; KUB XIX 50; KUB XXXI 83 1’-26’; KUB XXVI 59 + KUB XIV 26). Apart from Hittite texts, a letter from Egyptian El-Amarna is apparently written to the King of Arzawa while another was sent from Arzawa to Pharaoh’s court.66

This adds to the impression that Arzawa was a major power indeed during the Amarna era. Other Egyptian sources refer to Isy, apparently the Egyptian name for Aššuwa, while a-su-ja in Linear A texts may be the Minoan designation for the Aššuwa League.67 A-si-wi-ja and other variations probably were Linear B designations for the same region which must be situated north of the later Arzawa territories, comprising most of west and northwestern Anatolia, although some overlap with the Arzawa lands is possible.68

64 Heinhold-Krahmer 2003, 204. For the purposes of this research, only texts that are generally well understood are used. Minority views are referred to in footnotes. Unintelligible texts have been ignored.
67 Cline 1997, 191.
68 Chadwick 1976a, 80; Cline 1996, 141-142.
In this politically unstable region, Ahhiyawan activity was to haunt Hittite aspirations for superiority over western Anatolia over the course of almost two centuries. From the scraps of the Hittite texts, one can recall a story of continuous Ahhiyawan interference in Anatolian affairs, of support to anti-Hittite uprisings and of raids on various Hittite vassal cities, including Troy. Although not all of the Ahhiyawan actions met with unqualified success, it appears that the Kings of Ahhiyawa were generally able to exercise rule over at least one centre on the Anatolian coast, Millawanda -now generally accepted to be the Hittite name for Miletus. Despite several Hittite incursions in the area, Millawanda appears to have been the major Ahhiyawan foothold in Anatolia from where, presumably, Ahhiyawan armies roamed the regions on the Anatolian west coast. The first of these armies was headed by an Ahhiyawan King with a familiar name.

Around 1400 BC, the Hittite King Arnuwanda dictated a text to his scribe, which is now generally known as “the Mischief of Madduwatta” or “the Indictment of Madduwatta”. The text deals with the deeds of one Madduwatta; possibly an Arzawan prince and certainly a troublesome Hittite vassal, who has come into conflict with a man from Ahhija (an older form of Ahhiyawa), named Attariššija (Madd. §1.1).

“Attariššija, the man from Ahhija, chased [you] Madduwatta, out of your land. Then he harassed you and kept chasing you. And he continued to seek an [evil] death for you, Madduwatta. He [would] have killed you, but you, Madduwatta, fled to the father [of My Majesty], and the father of My Majesty saved you from death. He [got] rid of Attariššija for you. Otherwise, Attariššija would not have left you alone, but would [have killed] you.”

KUB XIV 1, §1, 1-5. Adapted from Beckman, 1996.

Apparently, Attariššija has come into armed conflict with Madduwatta, causing the latter to flee for safety to the Hittite court. The father of Arnuwanda, the Hittite King Tudhaliya I, installed Madduwatta as a vassal in the country of Zippasla, with as a later addition the

70 KUB XIV 1; Cf. Götte 1968.
territory known as the Siyanti Land, part of the former Kingdom of Arzawa. Although Madduwatta now was a vassal of the Hittite King, the man from Ahhija attacked a second time. Madduwatta was forced to flee again –to be saved by a Hittite expeditionary force.

*But [later] Attariššija, the man from Ahhija, came and was plotting to kill you, Madduwatta. But when the father of My Majesty heard, he dispatched Kisnapili, infantry, and chariots in battle against Attariššija. And you, Madduwatta, once more did not resist Attariššija, but broke ranks before him. Then Kisnapili came and took charge of you [...] from Hatti. Kisnapili went in battle against Attariššija. 100 [Chariots and ... infantry] of Attariššija [drew up]. And they fought. One officer of Attariššija was killed, and one officer of ours, Zidanza, was killed. Then Attariššija [...] to Madduwatta, and he went off to his own land. And they installed Madduwatta in his place once more.*

KUB XIV 1, §12, 60-65. Adapted from Beckman, 1996.

According to the text, Madduwatta was later found raiding the coast of Cyprus. This act aroused the anger of his Hittite overlord, as Cyprus was considered subject to the Hittite crown (Madd. §36.85). In this context Attariššija is mentioned again, also raiding the Cypriote coast together with a “man from Piggaja”. The Madduwatta text represents the first textual evidence for Greek incursions on the Anatolian mainland. Excavations at Miletus suggest that Mycenaean settled there already during LH IIB (around 1450 BC), although Mycenaean prevalence at Millawanda only came about later, possibly as a result of new waves of immigrations. It is likely that Attariššija had a base on Anatolian soil, although Hawkins noted that Ahhiyawa itself at this time must be situated “across the sea” and that Arzawa represented its point of contact with Anatolia. Ahhiyawa proper without a doubt must be sought off the Anatolian mainland, but this

---

73 Bryce 1998, 141.
74 Güterbock 1983, 134-5.
75 Niemeier 1998, 142.
76 Niemeier 2002, 295; see below for the archaeological evidence.
77 Hawkins 1998, 30; KBo III, 4 iii 1-6.
does not exclude the possibility that already at an early stage, Mycenaeans used Millawanda as a basis for further action. They evidently did so during later years.

The activities of Attariššija in western Anatolia and, later, Cyprus, roughly fall together with the Hittite invasion of Aššuwa around 1430 BC. Before its fall to the Hittites, Aššuwa had been the major power in western Anatolia and a serious threat to Hittite hegemony in Anatolia. The best testimony to this can be found in the Annals of the victorious Hittite King Tudhaliya I/II. According to the Annals, after defeating his enemy, the Hittite King deported 10,000 Aššuwan soldiers and 600 teams of horses with their charioteers, along with the Aššuwan King Piyama-₄kāl and his son Kukkuli, to the Hittite capital. Although these numbers may have been exaggerated, it is clear that Aššuwa had been a formidable power. It has been proposed that the upheavals in western Anatolia around 1400, with clashes between the Hittites and Aššuwa while at the same time the area appears to have been subject to the first Greek intrusions, were the source of various pre-Trojan War legends, including Achilles’ failed expedition in Teuthrania—a region at the mouth of the Caicus River. Although this is far from proven, the “mycenaeanizing” sword dedicated to the storm god in the Hittite capital Hattuša after the Hittite victory over Aššuwa may relate to some Mycenaean involvement.

After the reign of Tudhaliya I/II, Hittite resources were increasingly drawn to the East, were Hurrian expansion proved itself a serious threat to Hittite interests. During this time, the Kingdom of Arzawa filled the vacuum left in western Anatolia. With the Hittites busy elsewhere, Arzawa was to challenge Hittite dominance in Anatolia and its armies are

---

78 Mountjoy 1998, 51.
79 Due to poor understanding of the sequence of the earliest Hittite Kings, there is some uncertainty concerning Tudhaliya. Some discern two separate Kings, reigning shortly after each other, whereas others only see one. Without choosing between these options, I refer to Tudhaliya I/II in this case for simplicity’s sake.
81 Cline 1997, 202 ff. The legend deals with the slaying of Eurylyos, son of Telephus and prince of the Ceteians, by Neoptolemos (see for example Quintus of Smyrna VIII, 133-220). Huxley (1960, 40) proposed that Telephus may be the Hittite name Telepinu, while “Ceteians” (Κητειοι) remarkably resembles “Khatti”; the Hittites. The Caicus River is most likely to be identified with the Seha River known from Hittite texts (Gurney 1992, 221), which means that these legendary events happened in the region just south of Hittite Wiluša, now generally seen as the Greek Ilion (Bryce 1998, 395; Starke 2001, 34).
82 Cline 1996, 137-151; Hope Simpson 2003, 205.
believed to have made incursions towards the Hittite heartland. The capital of Arzawa was Apaša, generally equated with later Ephesus.\footnote{Cf. Bammer 1986-1987, 32.} As such, it must have been the seat of Tarhundaradu, the King of Arzawa known from the Amarna letters.\footnote{EA 31, EA 32; Moran 1987, 101-103.} Under his sway, the Kingdom for some time was considered a Great Power, at least in Egyptian eyes.

Ahhiyawan relations with the Hittites remained hostile over the course of the 14th century. When, around 1315 BC, the Hittites return from the Hurrian front to re-establish their rule in western Anatolia, we find the King of Ahhiyawa supporting the King of Arzawa against the Hittites. The relevant text, KUB XIV 15 I, line 23-26, is rather fragmentary, but what can be discerned refers to the mobilization of troops, the land and the King of Ahhiyawa, as well as the King of Arzawa, Uhhaziti. Although the exact meaning of this text is a matter of dispute (some proposed that it was the Ahhiyawan King who summoned his troops to quell a rebellion, but another reading, now favoured by most scholars, suggests it was not the Ahhiyawan but the Hittite King Muršili),\footnote{For the first, Sommer 1932, 307; for the latter Bryce 1989b, 299; Güterbock 1983, 135.} the text indicates that the centre of Millawanda now was part of the Ahhiyawan realm.

Around the same time, Ahhiyawa is reported to have seized various islands, presumably in the Aegean. Although the relevant text does not specify which islands have been seized, it adds to the impression of Greek encroachment in western Anatolia during the later part of the 14th century BC.\footnote{KUB XXVI 91; Sommer 1932, 268-271. The text is dated to reign of Muršili II or his successor Muwatalli. Cf. Easton 1985, 192; Gurney 2002, 136. I will return to a newly proposed reading of this text below.} This impression is supported by archaeological evidence. A destruction layer at the site of Miletus / Millawanda has been interpreted as the result of a Hittite attack in retaliation for Ahhiyawan support to the Arzawan cause.\footnote{In KUB XIV 15, Millawanda is reported to have been sacked by a Hittite strike force sent by Muršili II under the command of the generals Gulla and Malliziti (Cf. Güterbock 1983, 135; Bryce 1989b, 299). This “kriegerische Zerstörung” is also adduced to by Schiering (1959-60, 12-13), who notes the rebuilding of Miletus immediately after the destruction and the construction of a defensive wall with features resembling Hittite fortifications at Hattuša. Cf. Schiering 1979, 80-82; Mee 1978, 135. For an extensive discussion of the archaeological evidence, see below.} Even if this interpretation is correct, the Hittites evidently did not consolidate their grip
on Millawanda, as the centre in later texts appears to have been firmly in Ahhiyawan hands.\textsuperscript{88}

One of these later texts is the so-called Tawagalawa letter; a letter sent by a Hittite King, probably Hattušili III, to an unnamed King of Ahhiyawa.\textsuperscript{89} The texts relates to several problems on the western fringe of the Hittite Empire, apparently the result of Ahhiyawan activity in the region. Ahhiyawan activity was centred on two men: one Piyamaradu and a certain Tawagalawa. In the letter, Tawagalawa is regarded as the brother of the Ahhiyawan King and appears to be operating in and around the Ahhiyawan dependency Millawanda, recruiting Anatolians for labour in Ahhiyawa.

It has been suggested that the recruitment of Anatolian labourers referred to in the Tawagalawa letter relates to the inception of various monumental building projects in Greece, such as the extension of the fortifications at the citadels of Mycenae and Tiryns (it has been proposed that especially at the latter site there are architectural parallels with Anatolia) and the drainage of the Nemea Valley and the Kopais basin.\textsuperscript{90} Although there is no definite proof for a relation between Anatolian and Mycenaean architecture, the Tawagalawa letter certainly shows that there were personal ties between Ahhiyawan and Hittite nobility, as Tawagalawa, the brother of the Ahhiyawan King, is reported to have stood in a chariot with the personal charioteer of the Hittite King himself (Taw. §8, 59-62). While it is beyond doubt that Tawagalawa was a major political figure at that time,\textsuperscript{91} his

\textsuperscript{88} Given the fact that around 1315 BC, Muršili II had conquered the centre because of its support of the Arzawan uprising, somewhere between Muršili’s early years and the reign of Hattušili III, when Millawanda is reported to belong to the King of Ahhiyawa (see below), the Ahhiyawans must have taken control of the centre. Bryce (1989b, 302) suggested that the Hittite King Muwatalli II ceded the centre to the Ahhiyawan King, under the understanding that this would still his hunger for territory on the Anatolian coast. Indeed, the concept is attractive, if only because—as Bryce rightly points out—Ahhiyawa is omitted in the so-called Aleksandu treaty (CTH 76). This text is dated to the reign of Muwatalli II and is of interest because it signals the formal incorporation of the Kingdom of Wiluša, situated in the Troad, in the Hittite Empire. In it, one would expect references to other powers in the region, especially to the formerly so troublesome Ahhiyawans. As this is not the case, Ahhiyawa apparently was of no threat to the Hittites at that time—which could only be achieved by means of some kind of understanding. If we assume the reality of Bryce’s hypothesis, it is of interest to note that once Ahhiyawa had been tamed by political means, the Hittites lost interest in it and did not even bother to mention the land in a treaty with Wiluša—a country close to the Greek sphere of influence.


\textsuperscript{90} Bryce 2003b, 203; Sandars 1978, 63-65.

\textsuperscript{91} The name Tawagalawa has been the subject of much debate concerning the equation of Tawagalawa with Greek Ete(w)okles (and should Ahhiyawa proper therefore be situated in the Thebaid?). Cf. Niemeier 1998 with references.
actions appear to have been less important to the Hittite King than the deeds of Piyamaradu. Piyamaradu seems to have been of Anatolian origin and must have been a man of some stature.\textsuperscript{92} The Tawagalawa letter is too fragmentary to inform us on the exact nature of his deeds (though a roughly contemporary text provides us with much more information; see below) but whatever it was, the Hittite King demanded the extradition of Piyamaradu, who had by now found refuge at the Ahhiyawan centre Millawanda. Millawanda at that time was governed by a representative of the King of Ahhiyawa, in the Tawagalawa letter named Atpā. The latter is known to have been the brother in law of Piyamaradu (Taw.I§5.64). On hearing the demand of extradition, the Ahhiyawan King is reported to have sent his governor orders to hand over Piyamaradu to the Hittite King (Taw. I§5, 53-56):


\textit{And when [the messenger of my [Brother] arrived, he did not bring me any greeting nor did he bring me any gift, but thus he spoke: he has written to Atpā: Place Piyamaradu in the hands of the King of Hatti!}

Transcription from Sommer 1932, 4. Translation adapted from Sommer 1932, 5.\textsuperscript{93}

It is important to pause here for a while to note that the King of Ahhiyawa appears to have had a near direct control over Millawanda, sending orders to his attaché Atpā.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{92} Götze 1986, 40; Houwink ten Cate 1983, 37; Hawkins 1998, 17.
\textsuperscript{93} I thank ms. W. Waal for her help concerning this text.
\textsuperscript{94} That the King of Ahhiyawa did not only write to his attaché, but also to the Hittites, is indicated by the fragmentary text KUB XXVI 91 (CTH 183), in which a letter from the Ahhiyawan King is quoted (Gurney 2002, 135). Even if one argues that \textit{IŠ-PUR} does not necessarily mean “writing” but more generically
This, if anything, attests to our lacunose understanding of the Mycenaean world on the basis of Linear B texts only, as no such orders have been found in the various Linear B archives. Moreover, there is no reference in any Linear B text to a sizable Mycenaean centre as a dependency of a Mycenaean palace. The high degree of control of the Ahhiyawan King over his overseas territories is further attested by the presence of his own brother in the area, a practice that seems to find its parallel in the Hittite world, where important members of the royal family were often installed as governors over important provinces.  

At any rate, the time needed to send a messenger to and from Ahhiyawa was enough to let Piyamardu escape by ship to the Ahhiyawan held isles of the Aegean. Hattušili’s eagerness to apprehend Piyamardu becomes understandable when we read KUB XIX 5, better known as the Manapa-Tarhunda letter and dated around the same time as the Tawagalawa letter.  

Manapa-Tarhunda was the King of the Seha River Land, a vassal of the Hittites in western Anatolia, and had—according to his letter—just suffered a “humiliating defeat” at the hands of Piyamardu. Piyamardu’s victory over the Hittite vassal was crowned with the armed takeover of the island of Lesbos (Lazpa in the Hittite texts), which was subsequently handed over to the King of Ahhiyawa. Prior to that, Piyamardu had been ravaging the land of Wiluša, a Hittite vassal state in north western Anatolia, now generally equated with Greek (W)ilion.  

This appears to have been the trigger for Manapa-Tarhunda to intervene, and the occasion of his defeat at the hands of Piyamardu.  

This again is a moment for a break to consider the implications of the text. For one thing, it is clear that Piyamardu was a direct threat to Hittite interests in the region. The seizure of Lesbos and its subsequent incorporation in the Ahhiyawan state, the personal ties between Atpā and Piyamardu (brothers in law), and Piyamardu’s ability to

---

“sending” (and that, consequently, this could also mean “sending a messenger”), the point remains that clearly, Linear B texts failed to cover this (political) aspect of Mycenaean society.

96 Cf. Houwink ten Cate 1983.
98 The exact order of events is unclear, but it likely that Manapa-Tarhunda was defeated while attempting to relieve Wiluša, rather than during an invasion of the Seha River Land itself. Cf. Bryce 1989b, 302-3; Easton 1985, 192; Güterbock 1984, 117-8.
99 Taw.I§5.64; Cf. Houwink ten Cate 1983, 37.
retreat to Ahhiyawan held territory, all strongly suggest that Piyamaradu was acting on behalf, or at least with the blessing of the Ahhiyawan King. Moreover, the army at his disposal must have been a considerable force. Piyamaradu is able to overrun the Kingdom of Wiluša, defeat the neighbouring Seha River Land, embark for Lesbos, conquer the island and establish permanent control over it before leaving for Millawanda.\textsuperscript{100}

There can, as a result, be no question that Ahhiyawa at that point in time posed a serious threat to Hittite hegemony in western Anatolia, a fact actually stressed by Hattušili himself, noting that, although in the past he had gone to war against the Ahhiyawan King over the land Wiluša, now a “war would be wrong for us!” (Taw.IV§12.10). Claims that Hattušili’s apparent respect for the King of Ahhiyawa is the result of temporary Hittite weakness, or preoccupation with troubles elsewhere,\textsuperscript{101} not only remain hypothetical, but also miss the point. Around 1250 BC, the Hittites were faced with the reality of Ahhiyawan military might,\textsuperscript{102} and they dealt with it in the established political manner: the King of Ahhiyawa now belonged to that Club of Great Powers and was considered a Great King—at least as far as the Hittites were concerned.

It was now 150 years after the first military actions of Ahhiyawan forces on Anatolian soil, and clearly, these years had not been without success. But, towards the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, the eastern Mediterranean began to experience the first signs of trouble. Already during the reign of the Egyptian King Ramesses II the coast of Egypt had been subject to occasional raids of marauding peoples, which were to increase over the course of the last half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. Elsewhere, the growing power of Assyria caused a constant drain of Hittite military resources, while the unruly Kaska people in the north of Anatolia remained a looming threat to the Hittite heartland. The picture in Greece is less clear, but around the time when the Tawagalawa letter was written, things were going wrong in Central Greece. In Boeotia, the hitherto flourishing centre of Thebes was destroyed (though subsequently rebuilt); a fate shared by several smaller and larger centres in the region, including the important palatial centre of Orchomenos, where

\textsuperscript{100} Kelder 2005a.
\textsuperscript{102} Güterbock 1983, 136; Klengel 2002, 73; Meier 2000, 166-7.
palatial life did not revive.\textsuperscript{103} Around 1220 BC, the palace of Pylos in Messenia shared a similar fate.\textsuperscript{104} The archaeological data will be further discussed below, but the troubles Greece was experiencing during the later part of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century BC may be reflected in two Hittite texts dated to the reign of the Hittite King Tudhaliya IV. The first of these is the so-called Millawata Letter (Millawata is an alternative writing of Millawanda) which may indicate the loss of Ahhiyawan control over Millawanda.\textsuperscript{105} This fragmentarily preserved letter was probably sent by the Hittite King to a vassal ruler. Though it has been suggested that the addressee was the King of Mira (a vassal of the Hittite King, Mira consisted of the rump state of what once was Arzawa), others propose it was the ruler of Millawanda to whom the letter was sent.\textsuperscript{106} Although the final word on this matter has not been said, archaeology might indeed indicate Hittite prevalence at Miletus at this time.

Around the same time as the composition of the Millawata Letter, the Hittite King Tudhaliya IV concluded a new treaty with Šaušgamuwa, vassal King over the land of Amurru. Amurru had long been a border / buffer state between the Egyptian Empire and the Kingdom of the Hittites, which made it a strategically important region, but it also included various thriving ports on the Levantine coast. It is hardly surprising that the treaty between Šaušgamuwa and his Hittite overlord was full of stipulations concerning foreign contacts, be it of diplomatic nature or trading encounters.\textsuperscript{107} It is in this context that a list of foreign potentates was compiled, whom the Hittite King evidently considered as equals. This list naturally included the King of nearby Egypt, as well as the King of Assyria. Originally, it also included the King of Ahhiyawa, but his name had been erased, which has caused much scholarly debate. Broadly speaking, two explanations have been proposed. The first explanation for the erasure of Ahhiyawa in the treaty is that at the time that the treaty was drawn, Ahhiyawa met with some serious setbacks, archaeologically attested as the first destructions of several palatial centres and

\textsuperscript{104} Cf. Bennet / Shelmerdine 2001.
\textsuperscript{106} KUB XIX 55; Sommer 1932, 198 ff. See also Niemeier 2002, 298; Niemeier 1998a, 42 with references.
\textsuperscript{107} Šaušgamuwa treaty, KUB XXIII 1 + KUB XXXI; Sommer 1932, 320-327.
in the Hittite texts reflected in the final loss of Miletus to the Hittites. The other explanation holds that Ahhiyawa was included in the list by “habit” of the scribe and that in the end, its inclusion was deemed irrelevant for a treaty with a region so distant from the area of Ahhiyawan influence. Whatever the case, the same text reveals that Ahhiyawan ships at that time were still frequenting Levantine harbours, as it is stipulated that Ahhiyawan ships are prohibited to reach Assyria (clearly, the cargo rather than the ships are meant), which points to a trade embargo imposed on Assyria. It is not clear what the Ahhiyawans brought to Assyria that triggered the Hittite ban. Mycenaean pottery in any case, which is the clearest marker for contacts with the Mycenaean world in the Levant, is absent at Assyrian Late Bronze Age sites. As shall be pointed out below, a similar situation occurs in Hittite Anatolia, where Mycenaean pottery is mostly found at sites on the Anatolian west coast, but scarcely at inland sites.

Though the Hittite text thus may indicate the gradual weakening of the Ahhiyawan state, there certainly is no conclusive evidence for it. Rather, the Hittite texts indicate that Ahhiyawa around 1220 BC still was of sufficient importance to be mentioned, not so much as an important state but as an important economic factor, in Hittite diplomatic texts. The last Hittite texts in which Ahhiyawa is mentioned is KUB XXIII 13, also dated to the reign of Tudhaliya IV. This last reference to Ahhiyawa is almost typical for the preceding ones: Ahhiyawa is supporting an anti-Hittite rebellion in former Arzawan territory:

“The Land of the Seha River transgressed again for a second time (?). [They said (?): In the past (?) the great (?) –grandfather of his Majesty did not conquer us by force of arms. (...) [Thereafter Tarhunderadu] (the rebel leader) waged war and relied on the King of Ahhiyawa. [And] he took refuge [on Eagle Peak]. But I, the Great King, set out [and...] and raided (lit. took down) Eagle Peak.”


108 Bryce 2003b, 210-212 and 21 for Miletus as a prerequisite for Great Kingship.
With the advance of Tudhaliya’s army, Ahhiyawa finally disappears from the Hittite record. Shortly thereafter, the palatial centres of Greece were destroyed or abandoned. The palatial administration collapsed and with it the use of script disappeared. Not long after 1200 BC, a similar fate befell a number of other states in the Near East. In the turmoil that heralded the end of the Bronze Age, the Hittite capital Hattuša was burnt to the ground and the Hittite Empire ceased to exist. Assyria experienced a period of decline, whereas Egypt lost a significant part of its Levantine Empire. No further written sources on the Aegean or western Anatolia are known until well into the Iron Age.

In effect, the Hittite texts thus tell the story of almost two centuries of warfare between two states, Hatti and Ahhiyawa, over the lands on the Anatolian west coast. At least seven separate Ahhiyawan actions can be discerned:

1. Attariššija’s campaigns against Madduwatta, around 1400 BC.
2. Ahhiyawan support to Arzawa, around 1315 BC.
3. Ahhiyawan takeover of several isles, around 1300 BC.
4. Piyamaradu against Wiluša, Manapa-Tarhunda, and Lazpa, around 1250 BC.
5. Tawagalawa in Miletus, around 1250 BC.
6. Ahhiyawan shipments of goods to Assyria, before 1220 BC.
7. Ahhiyawan support of an anti-Hittite rebellion in the Seha River Land, around 1220 BC.

Over the course of these two centuries, neither Ahhiyawa nor Hatti appears to have been able to establish secure, unchallenged authority over the region. While the Hittites generally were able to maintain a nominal overlordship over much of what used to be the Arzawan state, they were not able to prevent the Ahhiyawan seizure of several islands off the coast of Anatolia, nor where they able to drive the Ahhiyawans out of their stronghold Millawanda –at least not until the very end of the Bronze Age. Elsewhere, I have argued that the sheer numbers needed for the military expeditions listed above cannot realistically be attributed to any of the Mycenaean palatial states, as reconstructed
In that article, I failed to sufficiently stress the large time span during which Ahhiyawa manifested itself on Anatolian soil. During this period, a good amount of Mycenaean palatial centres had suffered setbacks that, one is inclined to think, would hardly spare them the means needed for the attested Anatolian campaigns. To name just a few: Knossos, whose powers waned during the 14th century, Thebes, which was burnt to the ground around 1250 (or slightly later, towards the end of LH IIIB1), Orchomenos, which never recovered from a similar fate around the same time, and Gla, which was deserted in “advanced, but not late LH IIIB”.

These troubles notwithstanding, the Mycenaean did not venture into Anatolia only. As has been noted, Ahhiyawan ships were not unknown in Levantine harbours and –in view of the amounts of Mycenaean artefacts (mainly pottery) at Cypriote sites- must have found their way to Cypriote shores just as well. In the introduction, I already noted that, so far, no reference to a state with the name Ahhiyawa has come from the Egyptian textual record. Mycenaean Greece, however, certainly was not unknown to the Egyptians. From the reign of Thutmose III, the Mycenaean appear in Egyptian texts, under the name Tnj, usually vocalized as Tanaju.

---

112 Kelder 2005a.
113 Cf. Iakovidis 2001, 145 (his “shortly before 1200 BC” is, on the grounds of pottery styles, to be read as ca. 1230-1220 BC). See also De Ridder 1894. Note that Gla is not a Mycenaean palace; the melathron uncovered on the citadel appears to have been a local administrative centre, which fell to the palace of Orchomenos.
Egypt has long been considered a country that never looked far over its borders. There is some truth in this. Both during the Old and the Middle Kingdom Egyptian armies seldom operated outside Egypt with the exception of Nubia, which was incorporated into the Egyptian state during the Middle Kingdom. As a result, Egypt never was an imperial power; it never was expansionistic and never sought to control regions beyond its borders on a permanent base. Rather, the Kings of the Old and Middle Kingdom adopted a policy based on diplomatic marriages and, if necessary, the occasional punitive raid to secure the safeness of the Levantine trading routes and the import of exotic goods. The Hyksos occupation of Egypt during the so-called Second Intermediate Period changed all this. From that moment on, the Egyptian monarchs were acutely aware that the various Levantine principalities just over the border should not be left unchecked. The King responsible for the expulsion of the Hyksos and the reunification of Egypt, Ahmose, led the way in capturing the Hyksos stronghold Sharuhen in southern Palestine after a three year siege—thereby bringing the Hyksos period to a definite end. Although his immediate successors devoted much of their reigns to stabilizing the reunited country, as the reestablishment of Theban rule did not go totally unopposed (there are references to shadowy rebellions late in Ahmose’s reign), we find Egyptian armies campaigning in the Levant from the reign of Thutmose I (1504-1492 BC) onwards. Although the exact date is unclear, it is plausible to see this new interest in the Levant as one of the motives

---

116 Stabilizing the country also involved the gradual extension of Egyptian control over Nubia and campaigns against the Kingdom of Kush—its core roughly situated near the 3rd cataract—are attested from the reign of Ahmose onwards. With the mounting Egyptian pressure, this Kingdom gradually dissolved in smaller tribal entities, which were gradually incorporated in the Egyptian state. During the reign of Thutmoses III, Egyptian rule extended as far as the 4th cataract, deep in Nubia. By this time, however, Nubia had already ceased to be a military threat and further expansion of Egyptian rule in the region was because of economic motives rather than having anything to do with military of political considerations. The best introduction to Egyptian history is provided by the *Oxford History of Ancient Egypt* (Shaw 2001).
to transfer the administrative heart of the Kingdom from Thebes in the south to Memphis, situated near the apex of the Nile delta.\textsuperscript{117}

From the reign of Thutmose I onwards, the Kings of the 18\textsuperscript{th} dynasty gradually expanded their rule in the Levant, until, during the reign of Thutmose III (1479-1425 BC), Egyptian borders were pushed to the banks of the Euphrates River.\textsuperscript{118} It was during Thutmose III’s campaign in the Levant that he received an envoy coming from a land hitherto unknown, across the Great Green of the Mediterranean. Thutmose’s Annals, describing his exploits in the Levant in considerable detail, make only a short reference to the occasion. Messengers from a land called \textit{Tnj}, usually vocalized as \textit{Tanaju}, came to the Pharaonic court and brought greeting gifts to the great Egyptian conqueror. These gifts included a silver jug in \textit{Keftiu}-style and what is usually translated as three copper cups with silver handles.\textsuperscript{119} This reference is the first attested contact between the Egyptian court and Tanaju, and dates to the 42\textsuperscript{nd} regnal year of Thutmose III, ca. 1437 BC. Tanaju only sporadically appears in the Egyptian sources, and its location has been a matter of debate.\textsuperscript{120} However, an inscription from the reign of Amenhotep III (1427-1400 BC) indicates that Tanaju should be sought on the Greek mainland, comprising at least various regions in the Peloponnese. This inscription is known as the Kom el Hetan Text, named after a village on the west bank of the Nile, not far from modern Karnak and Luxor.\textsuperscript{121}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{117} The date of the establishment of Memphis as the capital is debated. Although some lean towards a date as late as Thutmose IV, a date in the early 18\textsuperscript{th} dynasty is generally preferred (Strudwick / Strudwick 1999, 31). I take Thutmose I as the principal agent in this process, because of his attested activity in the Levant. A parallel with clear military and political considerations is the later shift of the administration from Memphis to Pi-Ramesse, during the reign of Ramesses II.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Redford 1992 provides a detailed and readable account of the Egyptian – Mitanni wars, as well as a good introduction to the organization of the Egyptian Empire in the Levant.
\item \textsuperscript{119} Latacz 2001b, 164. Haider (1988a, 10) reads “iron” cups, which would make the gift even more extraordinary, as iron at this early stage was an extremely rare commodity, and difficult to work. It appears that the reading ‘bia’ - ‘iron’ is now widely preferred (written communication M. Raven). Although the text is damaged on the relevant spot, it appears plausible (on the basis of analogies with preceding sections of the Annals) that Tanaju is headed by a King (the text is damaged, but generally ‘completed’ as [Tribute from the Chief] of Tanaju). Most relevant Egyptian texts regarding Keftiu have been published in Vercoutter 1956. Tanaju appears for the first time in the Egyptian record during the reign of Thutmose III. Almost all Egyptian references to the Aegean (Keftiu, Tanaju and ‘the islands in the midst of the great Green’) are found in Cline (1994, 108-20), the most recent compilation.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Cf. Helck 1979 [rev.1995], 24, esp. note 27 with references therein.
\item \textsuperscript{121} The integral publication of the text is provided in Edel 1966. Discussions in Helck 1992; 1995; Cline 1987; 1994; 1998. See below for extensive discussion.
\end{itemize}
Kom el Hetan is the site of what once was the mortuary temple of Egypt’s “roi soleil”, Amenhotep III. Although little of it remains today, the complex once boasted an impressive array of pillared halls, courts and monumental gates, flanked by monolithic statues of the deified King. Virtually the sole survivors of it all are the famous colossi of Memnon.

The Kom el Hetan text was inscribed on the bases of similar, but long-gone statues of the King. Most of the list described areas in Asia, mainly with regard to the traditional “nine bows”, the enemies of Egypt. The lists are composed in a fairly uniform way. In one row various lands are listed, while a second row lists the cities of these lands. The “lands” of the first row seem to have been conceived as political entities and not merely as geographical regions. This is illustrated by the listing of the Great Powers Hatti, Babylon and Naharin (Mitanni), dependencies such as the Mitanni stronghold Carchemish and smaller states such as Aššur.\(^\text{122}\) As a result, we may reasonably assume that this holds true also for the last part of the Kom el Hetan list, dealing with the Aegean.

Part of the list dealt with the areas to the north, across the “Great Green” of the Mediterranean.\(^\text{123}\) Only two lands are listed, one of which is the well-known Egyptian designation for Minoan Crete, Keftiu. Second comes Tanaju, and from its position in the list alone (after Keftiu), one could already argue that it must have lain beyond, i.e. north of Keftiu.\(^\text{124}\) This is proven in the second row of geographical names, which includes such centres as Mycenae and Nauplion. Although some of the names in the Kom el Hetan text remain unidentified,\(^\text{125}\) there can be no doubt that Tanaju lay in the Aegean and, 

\(^\text{122}\) Edel 1966, 8-9.
\(^\text{123}\) Generally regarded as the Egyptian name of the Mediterranean Sea. Cf. Shaw / Nicholson 1995, but see Duhoux 2003 for a different interpretation.
\(^\text{125}\) Although it has been proposed that Tnj refers to a region in Northern Syria / Cilicia (Cf. Edel 1975, 63 ff.), the identification of various Mycenaen centres and regions in the list strongly indicates that Tnj should be sought in the Aegean (see Haider 1988b, 8 ff. for extensive evaluation of the arguments). The fact that the messengers from Tanaju in the Annals of Thutmose III brought a vessel in Keftiu style may strengthen an Aegean identification of Tanaju. Edel (1966) proposed the following identification for these names: Amnisos, Phaistos, Kydonia, Mycenae, Messenia, Nauplia (?), Kythera, Illios (?), Knossos, Amnisos and Lyktos. The enigmatic dq’s (di-qa-ê-s) has been identified by some as Tegea, by some as the upper Helisson valley, by Helck (1992, 13) as Διπαιεις and by Edel (1988, 30) as the Thebaid. This identification seems to have been generally accepted. The name Illios for wi-’i-r-li-ja, however, is not generally accepted as a correct identification (Helck 1995, 25-26). Wi-’i-r-li-ja has also been identified as Aulis (Goedicke 1969, 10), which –if correct- would fit nicely in Edel’s identification of dq’s (as Aulis is supposed to have been the principal harbour of Thebes) and most recently as Elis (Latacz 2001b, 163). The identifications of
more specifically, comprised much of the Peloponnese. Moreover, the identification of Mycenae and Nauplion has gone unopposed, whereas the inclusion of Kythera, Messenia (whether as a region or as a centre) and the Thebaid appears more likely than not.\footnote{For the most recent discussion see Latacz 2001b, 163 ff.}

Tanaju is referred to in several contemporary and later texts, but these generally are regarded as copies of geographical lists like the one mentioned above, originally dating to the reign of Amenhotep III.\footnote{Cf. Edel 1980, 63-73. Discussion in Cline 1998.} After Amenhotep III, Tanaju in effect disappears from the Egyptian record and textual references to the Aegean in general disappear.\footnote{With the possible exception of a number of Sea People (ca. 1200 BC), such as the Ekwesh Ḫḫḥiwyaw, and Denyen Ṭanaju (compare to the biblical tribe of Dan). Cf. Woudhuizen 2006 with references.}

This is the moment to pause and consider the consequences of the Egyptian texts for the present subject. Although any reference to Hittite Ahhiyawa is absent in the Egyptian record, the Greek mainland certainly was not uncharted territory for the Egyptians. Analogies with other parts of the Kom el Hetan texts, referring to regions whose political structures are known, as well as the fact that gifts from Tanaju in the Annals of Thutmose III are listed alongside gifts from other independent states (Hatti, Babylon, Assyria, ‘Assija’ (=Aṣṣuwa?), and Alalakh, indicate that Tanaju was an independent state, not merely a vaguely known region. The evidence from the Kom el Hetan text and the Annals of Thutmose III, in short, indicates that the Egyptians, from the reign of Thutmose III onwards, perceived Tanaju as an Aegean Kingdom, encompassing (at least during the reign of Amenhotep III) significant parts of mainland Greece, including the Argive plain, Messenia, Kythera, probably the Thebaid and possibly Elis in the northwest of the Peloponnese. It appears likely that the ruler of this Kingdom resided at one of the two centres mentioned in the Kom el Hetan text: Nauplion or Mycenae (as these are the only two centres –as opposed to regions- mentioned in that text). As shall be argued below, the archaeological record suggests that it was the latter centre, though the evidence is, admittedly, somewhat patchy.

Before continuing, it should also be stressed that the Kom el Hetan text, if we accept Edel’s identification of ḏqʾs as the Thebaid, suggest that eastern Boeotia was part of the

\footnote{Amnisos, Kydonia, Mycenae, Messenia and Kythera and Lyktos have not been opposed (Cf. Haider 1988b, 9).}
Kingdom of Tanaju, too—at least during the reign of Amenhotep III. The consequences are far-reaching, if only because, with Tanaju covering most of the Greek mainland, this severely limits our options in locating the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa known from the Hittite texts. This problem will have to be tackled with archaeological data, as the textual evidence presented above clearly is insufficient in this respect.
Before turning to the archaeological evidence, I should mention three pieces of evidence that are valuable to the current research, but fall somewhat in between the textual and archaeological sets of data. These are a Hittite incised pot-sherd from the Hittite capital Hattuša, papyrus-fragments from the site of El Amarna, in central Egypt, and the wall paintings on the wall of the tomb of Queen Nefertari, “Great Wife” of Ramesses II. The pot-sherd from Hattuša is of importance because it adds to our understanding of the bellicose Ahhiyawan – Hittite relations, while the other two artefacts suggest contacts between Egypt and the Mycenaean world, other than trade.

The pot-sherd from Hattuša dates to ca. 1400 BC, i.e. the time of the clash between Attariššija and Hittite forces. What appears to be a Mycenaean warrior is incised on its outer surface, carrying a sword and what should be elaborately decorated body armour. Moreover, the warrior wears a plumed helmet with horns that finds its closest parallel in the helmets of a group of warriors on the (LH IIIC) warrior vase from Mycenae. As such, the incision is a testimony to the impression of military might that the earliest Mycenaean incursions in Anatolia left in the Hittite mind.

Depictions of Mycenaean warriors may have been found in Egypt, too, on a number of papyrus fragments. These papyrus fragments were found in December 1936 by John Pendlebury, in a house (R43.2) on the eastern edge of the Central City at El Amarna, in association with (the remains of) a wooden shrine, various cultic items, a complete Mycenaean vase, and an inscription mentioning the “great statue which the King caused to be made”. It is likely that the building served as a chapel for the divine King (Amenhotep III or Akhenaten) and that the artefacts found inside the building played some role in that context.

Although the papyrus survived only in fragments, it appears to have been a purely pictorial papyrus, depicting a battle between Egyptians and Libyan warriors. Coming to the aid of the Egyptians are a number of warriors who, while wearing typical Egyptian

---

129 See illustrations 1 to 3.
130 Bittel 1976, 9-14.
131 Pendlebury 1951, 140-1; Schofield / Parkinson 1994, 159-160.
white kilts, are equipped with helmets and various types of what may plausibly be argued to represent leather armour. Both the helmets and the two identifiable types of armour are not present elsewhere in the Egyptian iconographical record, and seem to identify a people other than those usually depicted in Egyptian paintings. It has been forcefully argued that the helmets depicted on the papyrus should be identified as boar’s tusk helmets and that the armour worn by the warriors has close parallels with known Aegean types of armour. As a result, the warriors depicted on the papyrus most likely represent Mycenaean, apparently in the service of the Pharaoh.\footnote{132 Schofield / Parkinson 1994, 157-170; Schofield / Parkinson 1995, 125.} This identification is strengthened by the find of a piece of boar’s tusk, with perforations for attaching it to a leather frame, during excavations at Qantir, the site of the Ramesside capital Pi-ramesses in the eastern delta. It appears likely that this piece was part of the famous boar’s tusk helmets worn by the Mycenaean elite.\footnote{133 Pusch 1985, 254.} The thought of foreigners in the Egyptian military is not wholly hypothetical: Egyptian Kings from the Middle Kingdom onwards used Nubian archers in their armies, whereas during Ramesside times defeated Sea Peoples were incorporated in the Egyptian army.\footnote{134 Note in this respect the identification of two Minoans as fan bearers on a relief from Amarna (Cf. Kozloff 1977, 101-103; Haider 1996, 146, fig. 7), whilst it has been argued by Haider (1990, 19-22; 1996, 144-5) that Minoan shipwright lived at Peru-nefer (long thought to have been the harbour town of Memphis, but recently identified as the harbour of Avaris (Cf. Bietak 2005, 17)).} More circumstantial, but worthwhile mentioning here, is the observation that Aegean (Mycenaean) jewellery figures prominently in the wall paintings of Queen Nefertari’s tomb, in the valley of the Queens. It has been proposed that the four sets of silver earrings worn by the queen may have been part of a greeting gift from the Aegean, donated to the Queen on the occasion of her husband’s coronation.\footnote{135 Koehl 1999, 424.} The lack of textual evidence obviously weakens this hypothesis, but, on the other hand, four sets of finely crafted, silver earrings seem too extraordinary to have arrived at the Egyptian court other than via diplomatic missions. Aegean objects are present in the Egyptian iconographical record on various other occasions, but never with a similar suggestion of a diplomatic connotation.
With the presented textual and iconographical data the following preliminary observations are in place. In the first place, our understanding of the Mycenaean world on the grounds of Linear B texts is demonstrated to be lacunose and fraught with problems. Most prominent amongst these is the absence of any reference to large, dependent centres in any of the Linear B texts. Miletus is mentioned several times, but nowhere is it reported to fall under the sway of any of the known palaces, yet the Hittite texts demonstrate that it fell under the sway of the King of Ahhiyawa. Similarly, the absence of any Linear B document other than purely administrative texts is worrying, considering that the Hittite texts indicate that at least one Mycenaean King “wrote” not only to his attaché in Miletus, but also to the Hittite King himself.\footnote{See page 20, especially note 93.}

The Hittite texts, moreover, clearly indicate that Ahhiyawa was a threat that had to be reckoned with. It is difficult to see how any of the Mycenaean palatial states by itself can be held accountable for Ahhiyawan actions in Anatolia over the course of some 200 years. Even though the Hittite texts may represent short snapshots of a particular period of time, those texts that have been read appear to suggest a more or less continuous Ahhiyawan presence (and pressure) in 14th and 13th century western Anatolia, whilst at the same time, several Mycenaean palaces suffered setbacks (even though, in the long run, most of the palaces during the 14th to mid 13th century would gain rather than lose importance) which, one would argue, would hardly spare them the resources to engage in western Anatolia at the same time.

Even without the attribution of the title Great King to the King of Ahhiyawa, we would have had reasons to doubt whether Ahhiyawa could be equated with a single palatial state at all. The fact that Hattušili III acknowledged Ahhiyawan might in considering the King of Ahhiyawa his equal forces us to accept that Ahhiyawa must have had military and territorial proportions that exceeded those of even the largest Mycenaean Kingdoms reconstructed on the grounds of the Linear B texts. It follows that Ahhiyawa must have been a conglomerate of several of these Kingdoms.
This does not force us to totally abandon the social or territorial composition of the Mycenaean Kingdoms as they appear in the Linear B texts. To the Hittites, a Great King originally was no more than one King ruling others.\textsuperscript{137} It did not specify the level of authority involved and indeed, most of the Hittite vassal rulers appear to have been members of an indigenous royal house that had retained most of its former powers. In the case of the Hittites at least, vassals usually only had obligations to aid their overlord in battle (supplying troops and assist the Great King personally), send tribute and were restricted in their outward communication.\textsuperscript{138} If we implement such a scenario in the Aegean, it would not at all be that surprising to find scarce reference to other entities in the Linear B texts.

It has already been noted that our understanding of the position and function of the wanax and the lawagetas, the only two officials in the Mycenaean palatial states active within virtually every aspect of Mycenaean society, is extremely limited. On the whole, considering his unsurpassed possessions in land, and the fact that only the wanax is demonstrably \textit{acting} (namely appointing an official), it seems reasonable to consider him the head of state. But, with the scenario proposed above in mind, \textit{which} state? Was the wanax the independent King of Pylos, or could we, perhaps, identify him as the overlord—in which case the lawagetas (who seems to have been active in much the same aspects of society as the wanax, but whose property—and therefore status?—was smaller) could be identified as the local vassal King?

These questions appear difficult to address on the basis of our current evidence. As a result, it seems that we must content ourselves with the possibility—and no more than that!—that the Mycenaean equivalent for Great King \textit{might} have been the wanax, whereas each of his vassals, \textit{might} have been designated as lawagetas (ill. 4).

While the presence of this Great Kingdom in the Aegean can be deduced from the Hittite text, the Egyptian texts are even more explicit. That Tanaju was headed by one King is indicated in the Annals of Thutmoses III, whereas its territory, according to the Kom el Hetan text, comprised the larger part of mainland Greece. Moreover, the same text

\textsuperscript{137} Otten 1951, 35-43; Bryce 1998, 37.
\textsuperscript{138} Bryce 2003b, 42-3.
strongly suggests that the core territory, the heartland, of Tanaju should be sought in the Argolid, around the centres Mycenae and Nauplion (as these are mentioned first, and are the only centres mentioned –as opposed to the regions that follow). Tanaju only appears for a relatively short period in Egyptian sources: from circa 1437 BC (the 42nd regnal year of Thutmose III), till latest around 1352 BC (the death of Amenhotep III). I have already noted that, since Tanaju covers the largest part of the map of mainland Greece, we are essentially left with two options; either to equate Tanaju with Ahhiyawa, or to look for Ahhiyawa elsewhere, on the isles or in the north of Greece. The fact that the Mycenaean Kingdom Tanaju appears in Egyptian texts around the time of the first Ahhiyawan incursions in western Anatolia, may suggest that the two were, in fact, one and the same.\textsuperscript{139}

Regardless of these details, the Mycenaean world bursts into the archaeological record from the early 14\textsuperscript{th} century BC onwards, with large quantities of Mycenaean pottery reaching western Anatolia, Cyprus, the Levant and –to a lesser extent- Egypt. Although the mechanisms behind the import of these vessels almost certainly differed per region and through time,\textsuperscript{140} it is thought that some of these imports –especially in Egypt- should be considered in the light of diplomatic gift exchange, whereas some concentrations of Mycenaean artefacts on the coast of western Anatolia have been interpreted as markers of Mycenaean territorial expansion.

Both of these proposed interpretations could potentially have important implications for this study and should therefore be reviewed on the basis of the latest (published) finds. The pages below are devoted to the archaeological data coming from western Anatolia and Egypt. Where possible, I will refer to related data from the texts. First, the data from western Anatolia will be examined, followed by a brief synthesis of the archaeological and textual evidence. Thereafter, the archaeological data coming from Egypt will be dealt with.

\textsuperscript{139} Tnj, Tanaju, has been equated with the ethnicon Danaoi –the name of one of the legendary royal families in the Argolid, which came to be used as a designation for the troops under the command of Agamemnon in the Iliad (Helck 1995, 24; Latacz 2001b, 166).

The pages below are devoted to the archaeological data coming from western Anatolia. Ultimately, the aim is to compare this data with the picture of Ahhiyawan expansion in western Anatolia that evolved from the Hittite texts. As a result, focus is directed towards Mycenaean artefacts dated to the palatial period, i.e. LH II to LH IIIB2. Earlier and later material will be listed for completeness’ sake, but is of limited relevance to this study. Also, I will not deal with the material from the islands in the Aegean, as their political situation is not revealed by the Hittite texts (though “islands” are occasionally referred to) and thus cannot be compared with archaeological data.

The Hittite texts presented above indicate Ahhiyawan activity in especially Arzawa lands, in the period from ca. 1400 to 1220 BC. From these texts, it appears that Ahhiyawan incursions remained confined to the coastal regions of western Anatolia; there is no indication of deeper penetration by Ahhiyawan armies towards central Anatolia. Ahhiyawan activity was almost certainly largely seaborne, while Millawanda / Miletus was without a doubt the Ahhiyawan foothold in Anatolia. Archaeology confirms Miletus’ position as an important Mycenaean centre on Anatolian soil, yielding a vast array of Mycenaean features and artefacts, including kilns, houses, figurines and pottery. There are several other sites on the shores of western Anatolian where Mycenaean settlement is suspected, especially at Müsgebi and perhaps at Clazomenae. On the whole however, Mycenaean artefacts, if present at all, represent a minority in the total corpus of finds in western Anatolia.

The first to present a comprehensive study of Mycenaean artefacts in western Anatolia was Christopher Mee in his *Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium BC*. While heavily drawing upon Mellink’s successive reviews of the state of Anatolian Archaeology, Mee presented a division of Anatolia in six geographical regions (the area north of the Gediz / Hermus (“North-West Anatolia”), the area between

---

141 See map 6 for Ahhiyawan incursions in the relevant area.
142 Mee 1978, 121-155.
143 Mellink 1966 and later publications in the same series.
the Büyük Menderes (Maeander) and the Gediz (“Western Anatolia”), the region south of the Maeander (“South-West Anatolia”), the “south coast with the lakes”, “Cilicia” and “Central Anatolia”), of which especially the first three regions were prone to Mycenaean influence during the palatial period.\textsuperscript{144}

Two centres on the Anatolian west coast stood out already at the time of Mee’s research: Troy (Hissarlık) near the Bosporus and Miletus in the south west had yielded considerable amounts of Mycenaean artefacts, especially pottery. Since Mee’s study, the corpus of Mycenaean finds, not only at Troy and Miletus, but also at other sites, has grown. Despite that, these two sites still stand out as the largest concentrations of Mycenaean ware on Anatolian soil and although extensive Mycenaean settlement at Troy is still far from proven, it is now beyond doubt that the north-western coastal region of Anatolia culturally speaking belonged to the Aegean just as much as to Anatolia,\textsuperscript{145} which, if anything, indicates at least frequent contacts between bearers of the Mycenaean culture (as it manifested itself in especially the Dodecanese) and bearers of (west) Anatolian culture.

With this in mind, let us now take a look at the current state of knowledge of the region under study. The sites in the catalogue are shown on map 7.

\textsuperscript{144} Cilicia has yielded several sites with Mycenaean pottery, such as Mersin, Kazanli and Tarsus. Sporadic contact must have occurred during LH IIA to IIIB, but it is during LH III C that a dramatic increase in imports can be observed. The pottery of this period seems related to Mycenaean pottery made in Cyprus and some Mycenaean settlement in the area seems likely. In Central Anatolia, Mycenaean pottery was found almost nowhere, with the notable exception of Maşat. There, Pottery was found in association with spindle flasks and libation vessels, indicating that the Mycenaeans imports could have arrived in Levantine-Cypriote context (Mellink 1981, 470). See Mee 1978 for discussion and further references.

\textsuperscript{145} The so-called East Aegean – West Anatolian Interface; Cf. Mountjoy 1998, 33-67.
SITES IN WESTERN ANATOLIA

Troy – Hissarlık

The site of Troy has yielded a large amount of Mycenaean artefacts, predominantly pottery. Mycenaean pottery is first attested in Troy VIId, which appears to be contemporary with the stylistical period LH IIA.\(^{146}\) LH IIB and LH IIB late pottery has been found in the layers of Troy VIe and VIf, respectively.\(^{147}\) While some LH IIIA1 pottery has been found in the layers corresponding with Troy VIg, it was only during the occupation phase Troy VIh that Mycenaean pottery, of LH IIIA2 style appeared in great numbers.\(^{148}\)

It has been suggested that most of the Mycenaean style pottery found at Troy was of local production,\(^{149}\) but at least part of the corpus appears to have been imported. Chemical analysis suggests that most of the imported pottery came from Boeotia, although pottery coming from Attica, the region around Dimini and Aegina may be present as well.\(^{150}\) A similar analysis suggested that at least one group came from the Argolid.\(^{151}\) It appears that the corpus of imported Mycenaean vessels at Troy was of a rather mixed nature.

While exact numbers are not provided, it is now beyond doubt that the corpus of Mycenaean style pottery numerically exceeds any other corpus in Anatolia, with the

---

\(^{146}\) The site of Troy appears to have been inhabited from late Neolithic times onwards. The different periods of occupation have been labelled from the first occupation onward (i.e. starting with Troy I), but later modifications and specifications have resulted in a rather complicated array of sub-divisions. The habitation layers corresponding with the Late Bronze Age all fall under the generic phase of Troy VI, with a last phase extending to Troy VIIa (which, confusingly, is culturally identical to the preceding phases). See table 2 for further explication. Cf. Stronk 2002-3 for a recent assessment of the ongoing excavations at the site of Troy.

\(^{147}\) Mountjoy 1997c, 292.

\(^{148}\) LH IIIA2 seems to have been the period of most intensive contact as 40% of the Mycenaean pottery then found was dated to this period. Cf. Mee 1978, 147; compare to LH IIA-14%, LH IIB-10%, LH IIIA1-9%, LH IIIA2-40%, LH IIIB-20%, LH IIIC-7%.

\(^{149}\) Mountjoy 1997a, 259-267.

\(^{150}\) Mommsen / Hertel / Mountjoy 2001, 173.

\(^{151}\) A group found by Schliemann. At least 120 samples taken, in contrast to the 3 taken from the “Boeotian” Group. Certain elements in the same article remarked upon as to be irrelevant or difficult to measure, appear to be taken only into account to discard the earlier Argive assignment of this group (A), with unspecified archaeological considerations apparently pointing to the same direction. Cf. Mommsen / Hertel / Mountjoy 2001, 173 ff. A discussion with Dr. Tomlinson, assistant-director of the Canadian Institute at Athens, brought up many objections against the methods used by Mommsen. Being unqualified in this matter myself, I prefer to consider the corpus at Troy of a very diverse nature, including imports from both Boeotia and the Argolid, but comprising mainly local material, without attributing too much weight to it all.
exception of Miletus. Already at the time of Blegen’s excavations over a 1000 sherds were known, representing an estimated 700 to 800 pots, from the layers of Troy VIIf to VIh alone.¹⁵² Even Troy VII was found to yield Mycenaean pottery, of which—at that time at least—less than 20% was considered imported. Most of the Mycenaean pottery at Troy has a linear or patterned decoration; undecorated or pictorial material has scarcely been found.¹⁵³ The corpus comprises a wide range of shapes, open and closed, including goblets, kylikes and bowls.

**Beşik Tepe**

Beşik Tepe is the site of what was the harbour of Troy, and includes a nearby cemetery dating to the Late Bronze Age. It has yielded a small amount of Mycenaean style pots,¹⁵⁴ but, with the sea nearby, it should be considered that at least part of the site has suffered because of the waves. Testimonies to this are the reported rolled and washed sherds from this site. The cemetery certainly was very rich and knew a great diversity in burial types, including pithos graves, clay-lined structures and stone circles designating the graves. The pottery found is comparable to the material from the “Pillar House” in Troy, i.e. representing LH IIIB₂, with shapes ranging from kraters and bowls to alabastra and kylikes.¹⁵⁵

**Pitane – Çandarlı / Kocabağlar**

Though Pitane did yield some Mycenaean pottery, the material is poorly documented and appears to be of post-palatial, i.e. LH IIIC, date. The finds include a LH IIIC stirrup jar with octopus decoration and possibly an attic stirrup jar, previously thought to have been found by Schliemann at Troy.¹⁵⁶ The material appears to have been found in pit graves, in association with locally made monochrome pottery.

¹⁵³ A notable exception appears to be an LH IIIC krater with a lion and a bird as painted decoration. Cf. Mountjoy 1997b, 296-274.
¹⁵⁴ According to the catalogue in van Wijngaarden (1999), the amount ranges from anywhere between 10 to 50 pieces. I have not been able to specify the exact amount of Mycenaean sherds found at the site, but I gather that the total number will indeed not have exceeded the fifty.
¹⁵⁶ Mee 1978, 143; Mountjoy 1998, 60.
Elaia – Karzikbağları

Mellaart mentioned one Mycenaean sherd from this site, but did not provide further data on stylistic phase or context.\(^{157}\) Because of the proximity of Lesbos, the occurrence of Mycenaean imports in this region would be hardly surprising.

Panaztepe - Menemen

The cemetery at Panaztepe displays a wide variety of burial types, including tholos tombs\(^{158}\), cist graves and chamber tombs. Those that where buried at the site appear to have been relatively wealthy, but also had a good deal of foreign contacts, judging by the amount of imports. Grave gifts include a Palestinian cylinder seal with Egyptian hieroglyphs (from a tholos tomb), faience spindle whorls, gold beads, and bronze figurines and Mycenaean pottery.\(^{159}\) Nearby, at least one ashlar building was found, with LH IIIA-B pottery in association with a grey Minyan fenestrated fruitstand and a stone mould. Material originally thought to have been found at Çiğli appears to have come from this site instead and includes a variety of Mycenaean LH IIIA2 pottery and weapons.\(^{160}\)

Phocaea – Eski Foça

Despite several early but false reports of Mycenaean pottery at this site,\(^{161}\) Phocaea may have yielded some Mycenaean pottery from a stratum below the archaic level.\(^{162}\) As this was found in association with Protogeometric ware, I assume this to be mainly of Late Mycenaean date. In the pre Archaic stratum two megaron structures were identified, possibly pointing towards Mycenaean settlement in Mycenaean times. It is, at any rate, unlikely that more than a few pieces have been found.\(^{163}\)

\(^{157}\) Mellaart 1968, 188.
\(^{158}\) See below (Kolophon) for a brief discussion of this burial type.
\(^{159}\) Gates 1996, 304.
\(^{161}\) Cook 1960, 40 against Hanfmann 1948, 145; Bittel 1934, 92 n.2; Mee 1978, 143.
\(^{162}\) Mitchell 1999, 144.
\(^{163}\) Cf. van Wijngaarden 1999, 490.
Egriköy

Two doubtful pieces of Mycenaean pottery have been reported from this site,\textsuperscript{164} but similar material found at Sardis is now not considered to be Mycenaean anymore. It has been suggested that the nearby site of Çerkes Sultaniye was the burial ground of Egriköy.

Çerkes Sultaniye

Though this site was never systematically excavated, a pithos grave was found by a local inhabitant. In it, one Mycenaean piriform jar (LH IIIB) was found, together with a local vase and a local monochrome jar.\textsuperscript{165}

Buruncuk - Larisa

This site has not yielded any Mycenaean pottery from the palatial period. One LH IIIC1 sherd, with a decoration of spirals, from the shoulder of a jug or jar was however found, in association with local, Anatolian ware.

Çiğli

Although partially robbed, five tholos tombs at the site of Çiğli yielded a variety of local and Mycenaean artefacts, including goblets, piriform jars, 3-handled pyxides, a large local pilgrim flask, as well as a socketed spearhead, a sword, a knife, a razor and arrowheads. A sixth tholos was found during the 1985 excavations, as well as several cists and ten pithos graves. LH IIIA stirrup jars, pyxides, lentoid flasks and three-handled jars were found then and in later years. A total of 52 vases could be restored.\textsuperscript{166} Also, local ware (jars for cremations) and two scarabs, at least one of which dating to Amenophis III, were found.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{164} French 1969, 73.  
\textsuperscript{165} Hanfmann / Waldbaum 1968, 52, n.13; compare to Desborough 1964, pl.1b.  
\textsuperscript{166} Mellink 1988, 114.  
Bayraklı – Old Smyrna and Izmir

Several sherds were found during the 1951 excavation at Old Smyrna, though in unstratified conditions;\(^\text{168}\) as strays in Protogeometric and latest prehistoric levels.\(^\text{169}\) Cook published a picture of five of these sherds, two of which may belong to the same pot. The decoration of lines and spirals indicates a LH IIIA2 date, though the shape of the vessel remains uncertain. Furthermore, the stem of a LH IIIA2-B kylix, as well as the false neck and the shoulder of a LH IIIB stirrup jar –decorated with a flower motive?–have been published.\(^\text{170}\) These two sherds may have belonged together as well. An earlier report by Akurgal (1967, \textit{non vidi}) is said to mention another LH IIIA2-B sherd.

At Izmir a Mycenaean sword was found that, albeit from unstratified circumstances, is thought to have come from a tomb.\(^\text{171}\) A LH I date has been proposed, linking the sword to the rapiers found at the shaft graves at Mycenae. In general, Bronze Age levels at Smyrna seem scarcely touched upon, and one gains the impression that more Mycenaean material awaits the future archaeologist.

Clazomenae – Urla Iskelesi

Some 25 sherds on display in the National Museum at Athens are reported from this site, although the excavation reports do not refer to any Mycenaean find.\(^\text{172}\) Except for two sherds, the sherds have a patterned decoration and, as a consequence, cannot be considered representative for the original corpus (as one would expect linear decoration to be prevalent). The sherds are mostly of closed shape, although a cup, a krater, a mug and a stemmed bowl have been identified, too. The majority of the material is dated LH IIIA2-B, except for one LH IIIC krater. The context is unknown; possibly of domestic nature (housing). Later excavations yielded more LH IIIA pottery,\(^\text{173}\) in association with grey “Minyan” and in clear domestic context.\(^\text{174}\)

\(^{168}\) Mee 1978, 142-143.
\(^{169}\) Cook 1952, 104-105, fig.10.
\(^{170}\) Mee 1978, 143.
\(^{171}\) Mee 1978, 130; Bittel 1967, 175.
\(^{172}\) Mee 1978, 125.
\(^{173}\) Mellink 1980, 507.
\(^{174}\) Private houses of the megaron type; Cf. Mellink 1981, 467.
Liman Tepe
Late Bronze Age strata at Liman Tepe were heavily disturbed; only a well and part of the fill remained undisturbed. The site yielded “Minyan” as well as Mycenaean pottery, dated LH IIIA1 to LH IIIB. Shapes range from open to closed, including cups, jugs and an alabastron. Painted and unpainted pottery was found, including one lid with a linear sign, which may be a potter’s mark.

Bakla Tepe
At nearby Bakla Tepe, a LH IIIB cup of the 13th century was found in a grave cut into a mound. In association, 20 pots of local origin, as well as an ivory appliqué rosette ornament were found.

Reisdere – Erythrae
An unknown number of Mycenaean sherds was found on a small peninsula about 8 km from Erythrae, between the villages of Şifne and Reisdere. Shapes, context and date are unknown. In addition, Akurgal is reported to have identified a Mycenaean settlement closer to Erythrae.

Torbah- Bademgediği Höyüği
Rescue excavations at the site of Torbah resulted in the discovery of a sizable settlement encircled by a LH IIIC cyclopean wall, of which 750 meters were uncovered. Many sherds of local Mycenaean pottery were found, ranging from the 14th to 12th century BC. LH IIIC early and middle pottery, such as a stirrup jar and two straight-sided alabastra, was found in the latest Bronze Age level.

175 Günel 1999, 80-1, no. 52-57.
176 Mitchell 1999, 147.
177 Günel 1999, 59, 97, ill. 51.
178 Mitchell 1999, 147.
179 Mellink 1968, 134; Akurgal 1967, 461.
180 Cook / Blackman 1971, 41; Akurgal 1967, 461.
182 Meriç / Mountjoy 2001, 137.
Ephesus – Selçuk – Kuşadası

That Ephesus was an important centre in the Bronze Age is unquestionable. The exact location of the Late Bronze Age centre is, however, debated. The presence of what may be the remains of a Hittite (style) fortification wall on the Medieval citadel has been taken as evidence that the Late Bronze Age acropolis lies beneath the Medieval one, but it has also been sought at nearby Ilichepe. Whatever the exact location of the Late Bronze Age centre, it is clear that it must be sought in or around the modern city of Ephesus. To this testifies the abundance of finds from that era, including several Mycenaean artefacts. As a result, the wider region of modern Ephesus will be presented in the lines below. Only sites where Mycenaean artefacts have been found are listed; contemporary sites without (reported) Mycenaean objects are not dealt with.

A disturbed tomb on the Medieval citadel, found during excavations in 1963 yielded a total of six Mycenaean vases: a LH IIIA1 piriform jar, a LH IIIA1 handleless flask, a LH IIIA2 krater decorated with Argonauts, a LH IIIA2 pilgrim flask, a LH IIIA2 rhyton and an undiagnostic jug. Apart from the pots, a number of linear decorated sherds were found.

At Kuşadası a stirrup jar dated to LH IIIA2 was found; this object is now on display with the artefacts listed above in the Museum at Ephesus.

At the site of the later Artemision a variety of Mycenaean objects has been found, including Mycenaean pottery, a bronze double axe, two pieces of figurines, of which one (a head) shows a distinct resemblance to the so-called “Lord of Asine”. This variety of objects led to the suggestion that the site of the Artemision may have been a Mycenaean cult centre; a concept that is all the more attractive because of Late Bronze Age walls of Mycenaean character at that same site.

In the village of Halkapinar, east of Belevi, a Mycenaean oinochoe was found in pithos.

184 Bammer 1994, 142.
185 Mellink 1964, 157; Mee 1978, 127.
186 Erdemgil e.a. 1989, 97-100.
189 On the grounds of the character of the foliate band (compare to FM 64:20) I suggest a LH IIIA2 date of this vessel.
All in all, Mycenaean artefacts have been found in significant—if unspecified—quantities in the wider region of Ephesus. Of interest in this matter is not so much the presence of Mycenaean pottery—which really was to be expected at and around a centre of the magnitude of Bronze Age Apaša—but the variety of the material. Though there are difficulties in assigning any Mycenaean origins to the various cyclopean style walls in the area, the wide range of artefacts, such as figurines, votive offerings (the bronze axe) and pottery argue for at least strong Mycenaean cultural influence.

**Kolophon**

A tholos tomb at Kolophon yielded pottery that might be considered Submycenaean ware. Though the tholos was dated LH IIIB-C, it did not yield any material from the palatial period. Architectural peculiarities of the tholos itself seem to hint that the tomb was built outside the mainstream of the tholos-building tradition and a Mycenaean connection thus appears improvable, if not unlikely. That those buried at Kolophon had at least some contact with the Mycenaean world is, on the other hand, not wholly hypothetical: in a grave nearby the tholos, a Mycenaean knife was found alongside an Aegean glass paste bead.

**Sardis**

Only few vessels have been found at Sardis that might be Mycenaean. In a sounding in the area of the “House of Bronzes”, spanning the period from the 13th century to the early 7th century, a LH IIIB krater and a LH IIIC deep bowl were found. Some 250 sherds have been reported, some of which were Late Mycenaean, others Submycenaean and a

---

190 See Loader 1998 for a discussion on the various types of Cyclopean masonry.
191 Pottery is not reported in Huxley 1960 (“Fehlzitat” Mee 1978, 125?).
192 Bridges 1974, 266.
193 Arguably, the tholos tomb is not an exclusively Aegean phenomenon, as tholoi also occur elsewhere on the Anatolian west coast, i.e. at Panaztepe, but they occur only at very few sites and are not attested at inland sites, nor are there clear Anatolian predecessors (as opposed to the Aegean; Belli 1997, 251; the derivation of the tholos from the Cretan circular tombs, thought to be fraught with difficulties by scholars like Branigan (1970), now is regarded as a plausible option. Cf. Rutter, Dartmouth website). As a consequence, there is some ground to consider this at least as an Aegean orientated feature.
194 Mee 1978, 125; Ersoy 1988, 67, n.57.
195 Mee 1978, 144.
number of Protogeometric date.\textsuperscript{196} The Mycenaean ware is dated LH IIIB to C2, ranging from the 13\textsuperscript{th} to the 11\textsuperscript{th} century BC. Apart from the previously mentioned krater, a few sherds had been published already in 1967,\textsuperscript{197} a few of which—to my judgement—should be LH IIIB (late?), with a few others labelled Submycenaean that might be Mycenaean, too. Both closed and open shapes are present. Decoration generally is simple; bands and semicircles. Despite the occurrence of some Mycenaean pottery, the majority of the material at Sardis is firmly Anatolian. Only 2-5\% of the total amount of pottery is Mycenaean.\textsuperscript{198} It appears that at least part of the Mycenaean material at Sardis seems to be local production, rather than imported pottery.\textsuperscript{199}

**Gavurtepe - Alaşehir**

A Late Bronze Age settlement has yielded a variety of Mycenaean sherds, ranging from LH IIIA2 to LH IIIB.\textsuperscript{200} Although the material remains unpublished as yet, a sherd from what probably was a LH IIIA2 flask, decorated with linear bands and a wavy line, and what has been either an askos or a rhyton, decorated with dots and wavy lines, are known for some time.\textsuperscript{201} The village got deserted around 1200 BC, after at least part of the settlement, including a megaron structure, had suffered destruction by fire.\textsuperscript{202}

**Beyesultan**

Seven sherds from the 1954 excavations were believed to be Anatolian copies of Mycenaean pottery, of which six proved to be from a painted pilgrim flask of Central Anatolian origin. The seventh, a body sherd of a pyxis, has Trojan rather than Mycenaean affinities and is of local fabric. One sherd of truly Mycenaean origin has been found in a late Beyesultan III (1450-1325 BC) pavement and should be the shoulder of a LH IIIA2

\textsuperscript{196} Cf. Hanffmann / Waldbaum 1970.
\textsuperscript{197} Cf. Hanffmann 1967.
\textsuperscript{198} Hanffmann 1983, 22-23.
\textsuperscript{199} Hanffmann 1983, 23.
\textsuperscript{200} Mellink 1988, 115.
\textsuperscript{201} Mee 1978, 128.
\textsuperscript{202} Mellink 1991, 138 notes a Mycenaean handle coming from the megaron, but does not specify shape or size.
or B imported stirrup jar, decorated with bands of red paint. The pavement was situated within a house (room 1) in area J.  

Saraköy

A possible Mycenaean sherd has been reported from Saraköy in the Meander valley. No further data are provided.

Miletus

The size and variety of the corpus of Mycenaean pottery at Miletus is such that it is impossible—and unnecessary for the current research—to list each and every single specimen here. For that reason I allow myself to generalize here. Mycenaean pottery at Miletus ranges from LH IIB to LH IIIC. LH IIIB appears to have been the period of greatest diversity of shapes and decoration. Already from the size and variety of the corpus of the pottery alone, one could argue that Miletus must have been a Mycenaean settlement at that time, with both open and closed shaped vessels appearing in virtually the same measures. Although it has been argued that Mycenaean pottery presents only a glimpse of the total corpus of ceramics at the site, this, in fact, has been demonstrated to be inaccurate. Mycenaean pottery overshadows the amount of Anatolian pottery by far, although the need for a thorough analysis of the Mycenaean pottery at Miletus still exists. This does not mean that there is no Anatolian influence at Miletus whatsoever. Indeed, especially from the transition LH IIIA2 to B1 onwards, there seems to have been Hittite influence at Miletus. This may be reflected even in a—admittedly rather exceptional—piece of Mycenaean pottery with the possible depiction of a Hittite royal tiara, but is especially evident in some architectural peculiarities of a defensive circuit that was built around the settlement around 1300. The wall appears to finds its closest parallels in Hittite “Kastenmauer”, such as the defences at Hattuša. Whereas Anatolian, or rather, Hittite

---

204 Birmingham 1964, 30.
205 Ünal (1991, 24–non vidi-) stated that perhaps only 5% of the pottery is Mycenaean. This has now been refuted by Niemeier (1998, 33).
206 Niemeier / Niemeier 1997, 204.
influence at Miletus cannot wholly be excluded, the point remains that Hittite imports so far have not been found (or recognized as such). Apart from the pottery, a wide range of other artefacts have been found at Miletus, including Mycenaean phi and psi-type figurines and animal figurines, dated to LH IIIB and LH IIIC. Chamber tombs around the settlement and (scanty) domestic architecture point towards the Mycenaean world, too. The wide range of Mycenaean artefacts in effect covers virtually every aspect of life; religion, funerary customs, housing, day-to-day pottery and related food customs, it all appears to be fully Mycenaean.

As a consequence, on archaeological grounds alone, Miletus could safely be regarded as a Mycenaean settlement from LH IIIB onwards. Before that period, there may have been Mycenaean presence, but then in a predominantly Minoan setting.

Akbük- Teichiussa

On a peninsula 4 km. north of Akbük prehistoric levels were uncovered. Apart from LM I ware and light Minoanizing sherds, LH IIIB and IIIC stray sherds were found. Nearby tombs yielded more Aegean pottery including some Minoan pottery (with Levantine affinities?), ranging from MM III to LM IB. Both open and closed shapes are present.

Domuztepe

This site has yielded some Mycenaean pottery from the post palatial period (LH IIIC). No Mycenaean pottery predating LH IIIC has been found.

---

210 Niemeier 1998, 30; Mee 1978, 133.
211 Niemeier (2002, 295) suggests gradual takeover of the Aegean isles (especially the Dodecanese) and thereafter Minoan settlements on the Anatolian mainland, in an effort to secure trade routes, by Mycenaean settlers. At least the second wave of migrants, dated to the first half of the 14th century BC, is thought to have been initiated by the palaces on the Greek mainland. For further discussion see below.
212 Mellink 1985, 552, 558.
213 Voigtländer 1988, 603-609.
214 Mee 1978, 126; Seton-Williams 1954, 154; Mellaart 1955, 82.
Iasos

During the Late Bronze Age, Iasos must have been an important Mycenaean centre. Mycenaeans must have settled here at least as early as LH IIIA2. Anatolian wares are not mentioned in the excavation reports. Although only a limited area of the LBA site has been excavated, a considerable amount of Mycenaean pottery has been found. “Frammenti Micenei”, dating LH IIIA2 or IIIB (one piece may even date to LH II) were found in the area of the Protogeometric cemetery, below the Agora and below the Basilica and the sanctuary of Artemis Astias. Scanty remains of Mycenaean walls were found, heavily disturbed by later (Archaic) building activity. Some of the sherds found here may very well have been produced locally or elsewhere in the East Aegean – West Anatolian interface, but there certainly was imported ware, too, probably from the Argolid. Moreover, during the 1979 excavations, an Argive psi-idol was uncovered while clearing a large pavement of the Mycenaean period, whereas the stripped base of another Mycenaean idol was found in 1987. Minoan (LM I-II) pottery was found too, imported as well as local fabric, giving the impression that –as has been suggested for Miletus- Iasos initially was a Minoan settlement, later to be taken over by the Mycenaeans.

The corpus displays a wide variety of shapes. Kylikes, deep bowls, kraters, a mug and a stemmed bowl were found in the area of the Protogeometric cemetery, kylikes being most numerous. From the area below the basilica come a LH IIIC krater and a LH IIIC flask. Judging the shapes, it seems that the pottery was used in daily life rather than for storage or ritual use. Remarkable is the abundance of patterned and pictorial decoration. Spirals, zigzags, wavy lines, whorl shells, flowers, but also an octopus occur, while purely linear decoration is not attested.

Of the architecture little is known. The few remains in the cemetery area represent at least one rather large building with walls of worked stone and paved floors, which was found below the Agora and seems to have functioned from MM III to LH III.

---

215 Mellink 1983a, 139.
Mylasa – Milas

Mee reports a LH IIIA2 jug from Mylasa, decorated with stemmed spirals, while Mellink mentions a LH pyxis from the vicinity of Mylasa.\textsuperscript{221} More Mycenaean material from the site is reported, but no further information on shape, decoration or context is provided. I assume that these finds consisted of pottery. The material was reported to be LH II and LH III.\textsuperscript{222}

Stratonicea

A carinated bowl and a stirrup jar now on display in the museum of Eskihisar are said to have come from a tomb or tombs near the theatre of Stratonicea.\textsuperscript{223} The material is supposedly Submycenaean, though a LH IIIB-C date cannot be ruled out.\textsuperscript{224}

Müşgebi

Situated on the Halikarnassos peninsula, Müşgebi is one of the few sites thought to have been a Mycenaean site on Anatolian soil. The cemetery has been studied during the years 1963-1966 and yielded a total of 48 chamber tombs. Both inhumation and cremation occurred, though the number of cremations has not been specified. Pottery was found in abundance, although Mee notes that “most of the tombs are ceramically rather poor”.\textsuperscript{225} Boysal published 162 vessels from Müşgebi; while Mee provides a full account of the corpus’ typological diversity.\textsuperscript{226} Shapes range from piriform jars, stirrup jars, amphoriskoi, flasks, braziers, kylikes and bowls to cups and mugs. An alabastron, an askos and a basket vase have also been found. A considerable, if not quantified, amount of pottery is thought to have been imported from the Argolid and the Dodecanese, most notably Ialysos on Rhodes.\textsuperscript{227} On the other hand, local production should not be ruled out

\textsuperscript{221} Mee 1978, 142; Mellink 1978, 142.
\textsuperscript{222} Hanfmann 1948, 140-145.
\textsuperscript{223} Hanfmann / Waldbaum, 1986, 51-52.
\textsuperscript{224} Hope Simpson 1965, 193.
\textsuperscript{225} Mee 1978, 137.
\textsuperscript{226} Boysal 1969; Mee 1978.
\textsuperscript{227} Cf. Mee 1978, 138 ff. Assignment to any specific place of origin is based on stylistical analysis only. It appears that a good deal of the material came from the Argolid and the Dodecanese; based on Mee’s report
and is likely to have continued until LH IIIC times. Chronologically, the pottery at Müsgebi ranges from LH IIIA2 till LH IIIC. A peak seems to be the LH IIIB (early?) period. Note that the shapes represent a rather complete corpus: pottery seems to have been a common good and used for various activities. Hence the occurrence of both open and closed shapes.\textsuperscript{228}

**Knidos**

Love reports some sherds from the 1968 excavations at Knidos, but provides no additional data.\textsuperscript{229}

**Düver**

An unspecified number of Mycenaean pots from this site are in the possession of the Burdur Museum. The pots, an imported pyxis, a jug and three local pyxides are dated LH IIIA2-B.\textsuperscript{230} Mellink reports squat alabastra from the cemetery at Düver, dated LH IIIB.\textsuperscript{231}

**Dereköy (II)**

This site yielded a LH IIIA2 pyxis and a LH IIIB1 piriform jar. These pots were found in a cemetery close to the site, in association with local, gold washed, pottery.\textsuperscript{232}

**Telmessos - Fethiye**

This site yielded a LH IIIA2-B globular stirrup jar from an unknown context.\textsuperscript{233}

**Beylerbey**

A LH IIIA2 or B1 kylix sherd from unknown context is reported to come from this site.\textsuperscript{234}

\textsuperscript{228} Bass 1963, 353.
\textsuperscript{229} Love 1969, 18.
\textsuperscript{230} Mee 1978, 126.
\textsuperscript{231} Mellink 1969, 212.
\textsuperscript{232} Birmingham 1964, 30-31, ill.2/3; corrected in Mee 1978, 126.
\textsuperscript{233} Walters / Forsdyke, 1930, Pl.10:24; Mee 1978, 145.
This list should not be without a reference to the Ulu Burun wreck, which provided a wealth of information on (trade and exchange) contacts in the Late Bronze Age between the Mycenaean world and various regions in the Near East. The possible presence of Mycenaean nobility onboard will be referred to on a later occasion, but on the whole, the wreck appears to be of little direct importance to the current research about the level of military and diplomatic influence of the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa in western Anatolia.\footnote{Cf. Bachhuber 2006 for the most recent evaluation of the Ulu Burun Wreck.}
What thus appears is a variety of sites on the Anatolian west coast receiving Mycenaean artefacts from circa LH II, i.e. the 15th century BC., onwards till well into LH IIIC—the 12th century BC. As is evident already from the catalogue of sites presented above, the archaeological record is not without flaws; many sites have been only partially excavated, looted, or have suffered badly because of erosion. These problems notwithstanding, the present archaeological evidence suggest that the spread of Mycenaean artefacts in western Anatolia was most extensive during LH IIIA2 and especially LH IIIB1. During this period, ca. 1375-1230 BC, Mycenaean objects appear at well over a dozen sites throughout the region. Finds mainly comprise pottery, but at some sites the range of artefacts is wider and includes figurines or metal objects.

Four sites stand out amongst the others on the grounds of the quantity of Mycenaean objects, the variety of Mycenaean objects and the time span of Mycenaean import. These sites are Troy, Ephesus (region), Miletus and Müşgebi. The pages below are devoted to an assessment of the archaeological data of the first three of these sites and a comparison with textual evidence regarding those sites. Müşgebi will not be dealt with specifically, as its Bronze Age name is unknown and, consequently, a synthesis of archaeology and texts cannot be made. The aim, as mentioned above, is to establish how the texts, indicating Ahhiyawan penetration in western Anatolia over the course of approximately two centuries, relate to the archaeological data.

To that purpose, the three sites will be dealt with in a roughly chronological order, that is “in order of appearance” in the Hittite texts regarding Ahhiyawan activity. As noted above, the first Ahhiyawan activity in western Anatolia attested in the texts is dated ca.1400 BC, with the incursions of Attariššija in western Anatolia, in the land of Zippasla (the original realm of Madduwaṭṭa).236

It is around that time that Miletus becomes fully mycenaeanised—at least in terms of material culture-, with domestic architecture, metal kilns and a wide range of objects with clear Mycenaean parallels. The sudden Mycenaean dominance over what previously was

---

a Minoan colony has been explained as the result of Mycenaean take-over organized by (rather general) the palaces of the Greek mainland, i.e. the implantation of mainland Mycenaeans in a Minoan centre.\textsuperscript{237} Indeed, the years prior to the “Mycenaeanization” of Miletus are characterized by a steady increase of Mycenaean features on the isles in the Aegean –many of which previously were Minoan colonies or trading posts. Whatever the case, there is no indication that the step from Minoan to Mycenaean at Miletus was a violent one; there are no destructions, no traces that the Mycenaeans actually invaded the centre with military force.\textsuperscript{238}

While the first Mycenaeans at Miletus may have settled in a peaceful way, Attariššija’s raids in western Anatolia in the Hittite text appear to run parallel with the archaeological picture of increased Mycenaean presence on the Anatolian west coast during the LH IIB phase. The Mycenaean warrior depicted on a potsherd in Hattuša (see above) points in a similar direction: the final years of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century BC marked the advent of the Mycenaeans in Anatolia.

From the scanty sources arises a picture of Ahhiyawan raids, and initially only limited settlement in western Anatolia. Attariššija is reported to have raided the lands of Madduwatta with some 100 chariots and a number of infantry (the text is destroyed at that point), but in the end, he retreated to his own land, Ahhija. The sherd from Hattuša stresses the military character of the first Ahhiyawan incursions: it is all too likely that Mycenaeans around this time were raiding the coast of Anatolia in much the same way as the Vikings raided the coastal regions of Northern Europe in early Medieval times: small-scale, seaborne attacks on preferably weak but rich targets, and a quick retreat before stronger foes came to meet in battle. Actual settlement in the affected regions was originally limited.\textsuperscript{239} The same seems to hold for the first Mycenaean activity in Anatolia: Miletus appears to have been the only Mycenaean settlement on Anatolian soil during LH IIB, although small quantities of Mycenaean pottery appear at some other sites, too.

\textsuperscript{237} Niemeier 2002, 296; 1998, 29-30; Mountjoy 1998, 34 ff. on the spread of Mycenaean culture on the isles.
\textsuperscript{238} In fact, the first Mycenaean stratum at Miletus still shows a host of Minoan features, including Minoan houses and kilns, which leads to the impressions that the original Minoan inhabitants did not leave the settlement, but stayed to live side by side with the Mycenaean newcomers. Cf. Niemeier 1998, 31; Mee 1978, 135.
\textsuperscript{239} Cf. Tuchin 2006 for a discussion on Viking incursions in Frankish Europe.
In the cases of the parallels offered above, small-scale raids over time would increase in frequency and in scale, until –at some point- the raids became true invasions, with permanent settlement in conquered territories. Again, the Mycenaean objects increasingly often found their way to sites in western Anatolia: at Miletus Mycenaean culture almost completely supplanted the last Minoan traits, while elsewhere Mycenaean pots reach Anatolian centres in ever greater quantities. Especially the region around Ephesus received a good variety of Mycenaean artefacts already from LH IIIA1 onwards. Over the course of the 14th century BC, the corpus of Mycenaean artefacts at Ephesus came to include open and closed shaped pottery and various types of figurines, including relatively large specimens such as the above-mentioned head resembling the Lord of Asine. Indeed, the variety of Mycenaean artefacts in the region of Bronze Age Ephesus has not only given rise to the idea that the centre was home to Mycenaean residents, possibly even with their own sanctuary, but also to the theory that Mycenaean exercised significant control over Arzawan politics. Whereas the variety of Mycenaean objects, including the above-mentioned LH IIIA1 rhyton and various figurines, indeed argues for at least some degree of Mycenaean ritual life in the area, Mycenaean interference in Arzawan politics cannot be argued for on the grounds of the present archaeological evidence only. A Hittite text, however, does argue for Ahhiyawan interest in the fortunes of the Arzawan Kingdom, referring to Ahhiyawan support for the King of Arzawa, Uhhaziti, against the Hittite invasion of Muršili II.

Regardless of these details, the point is that Mycenaean artefacts in the Ephesus area appear only during the LH IIIA1 and LH IIIA2 period; in other words, most of the 14th century BC. After LH IIIA2, Mycenaean material is absent in the region, only to return in the post palatial, LH IIIC, period (although there may be some LH IIIB-C material at Kolophon).

240 See table 3.
242 Cf. KUB XIV 15 I, line 23-26 (supra).
243 LH IIIA2 is now thought to last until the very end of the 14th century BC. Cf. Hope Simpson 2003, 205.
This may prove to be significant, as LH IIIA1 and LH IIIA2 fall exactly in the period of Arzawan independence, while LH IIIB in effect represents the period of Hittite dominance over the Kingdom. As a result, Mycenaean artefacts appear to have found their way to Apaša exclusively during the years of independence. After the collapse of Arzawa under the Hittite onslaught, Mycenaean objects did not appear at Apaša for over almost a century -until the closing years of the Bronze Age- yet the centre remained inhabited. The absence of LH IIIB material is all the more notable as elsewhere in Anatolia, LH IIIB1 appears to have seen the pinnacle of the spread of Mycenaean artefacts –as, for that matter, is the case elsewhere in the entire Eastern Mediterranean.\footnote{See table 3; for Egypt, see below.}

While Mycenaean artefacts, mostly pottery, increasingly frequently appeared along the shores of western Anatolia during LH IIIA2 and especially LH IIIB1, the material hardly appears at inland sites.\footnote{Cf. Mee 1978.} The confinement of Mycenaean artefacts to the coastal regions runs parallel with the scope of Ahhiyawan military actions around the same time: both Tawagalawa and Piyamaradu, active during the first half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century BC, appear to have been active on the coast of western Anatolia only; there is no single reference to any Ahhiyawan incursion towards the Anatolian hinterland.\footnote{This in marked contrast with Hittite references to Arzawan incursions threatening the heartland of Hatti itself. See especially the “Deeds of Šuppiluliuma” (CTH 40); Cf. Hoffner 1997, 185ff; Güterbock 1956.}

It has been proposed that the adoption and subsequent adaptation of the Mycenaean style in the pottery production at western Anatolian centres, effectively taking off during LH IIIB1 and flourishing in LH IIIC as the East Aegean –West Anatolian pottery koinè, was related to the dissolution of the Kingdom of Arzawa.\footnote{Mountjoy 1998, 51.} The collapse of that Kingdom would have created a vacuum in western Anatolia that could not be filled by any of the Hittite vassal states carved out of the Arzawan territories, which would have facilitated increased Ahhiyawan control over the region. Although Mountjoy points out that “pottery is not a political indicator” her suggestion that the rise of the East Aegean – West Anatolia pottery koinè is related to the increase of Ahhiyawan power (and wealth) basically implies exactly the opposite.\footnote{Mountjoy 1998, 51.} Moreover, there appears to be no real evidence
from the texts that Ahhiyawa grew increasingly powerful in western Anatolia, as Mountjoy seems to suggest. The impression gained from the Hittite texts dealing with Piyamaradu’s exploits is that Ahhiyawan armies were roaming the Anatolian coastal regions in much the same fashion as they had done already with Attariššija; seaborne raids, followed by quick retreat. Only the capture of Lesbos diverts from that “standard” practice, but this was an island, not a mainland entity prone to Hittite retaliation. It certainly is true that the King of Ahhiyawa was addressed as a Great King in the Tawagalawa Letter, but then this was also the first (and only) letter directly addressed to any Ahhiyawan king and, consequently, the first time there was any need to specify Ahhiyawan status. Note in this respect that already in the Indictment of Madduwatta, the King of Ahhija is specifically referred to as a King independent from Hatti, which is the basic prerequisite of Great Kingship.

Despite the fact that Hittite – Ahhiyawan relations remained strained over the course of the 13th century BC, this certainly did not involve a permanent state of war. The Tawagalawa letter basically tells us that much, and the absence of Ahhiyawa in a treaty between the Hittite crown and the King of Wiluša may suggest that at least periodically, Ahhiyawa and Hatti were at peace which each other. It may be in this context of volatile peace that we should consider the spread of Mycenaean pottery in western Anatolia, rather than a result of Ahhiyawan incursions.249 Gradual diffusion of Mycenaean pottery and pottery styles in western Anatolia appears more likely to have been the result of trading encounters and, indeed, the sheer proximity of Mycenaean centres (such as Miletus, but also centres such as Seraglio on Kos and Ialysos on Rhodes) to the Anatolian entities, than the result of the occasional Ahhiyawan raid.

The problem with this is the dearth of Anatolian objects in the Aegean. If trade were responsible for the gradual diffusion of Mycenaean objects in Anatolia, one would expect Anatolian objects to appear in the Aegean. The fact that only very few objects in the Aegean have been securely identified as Anatolian in origin does not bolster that concept. Elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean, the 13th century BC certainly was a period of

249 Although Bryce (2003a, 62) observed that anti-Hittite rebellions in western Anatolia would not have furthered trade, the spread of Mycenaean pottery in western Anatolia (and elsewhere) appears to have decreased only during LH IIIB2; a decline that cannot plausibly be connected to Ahhiyawan – Hittite conflicts (but rather to domestic issues in Ahhiyawa –note that the first major destructions in the Aegean fall within LH IIIB2).
increased stability and, as a result, of increased prosperity—through trade. It was the period in which the Hittite-Egyptian tensions over control over Syria were settled with a peace treaty (around 1258 BC) and during which long-distance contacts flourished. To this testifies the abundance of imported goods all over the eastern Mediterranean, not only in western Anatolia (with increasing numbers of Mycenaean pottery), but also in the Levant, Cyprus, Egypt and the Aegean, dating to this period. Hittite objects are conspicuously rare—not only in western Anatolia, but also in the Aegean and even in Egypt. This is remarkable, as we know of direct diplomatic contact between Egypt and Hatti and between Hatti and Ahhiyawa. The only plausible explanations for the scarcity of Hittite artifacts outside Anatolia are, as far as I can see, that these objects have either not been recognized as such, or were of perishable nature.

As has been observed above, the diffusion of Mycenaean artefacts in western Anatolia and the scope of Ahhiyawan military enterprises ran parallel, but were not the result of each other: both phenomena were confined to the fringes of actual Mycenaean settlement. The corpus of Mycenaean pottery at Troy may also be seen in this light; as a result of (trading) contacts with the nearby Mycenaean centres in Anatolia and on the islands in the Aegean. While Troy’s exact importance to the Mycenaeans is unclear, Mycenaean pottery appears at Troy from LH IIA onwards, well into LH IIIC, suggesting contacts between Troy and the Mycenaean world from the 15th century onwards. Troy certainly was part of the East Aegean—West Anatolian Interface koinê, as indicated by the abundance of locally produced Mycenaean style pottery. Although the corpus of Mycenaean pottery at Troy does not allow for extensive Mycenaean settlement (one would expect a larger variety of Mycenaean objects and features), it does indicate Troy’s acquaintance with the Mycenaean world. Though Hittite texts indicate that at least on one

250 Korfmann (2001c, 355ff.) suggested Troy was a vital chain in (Aegean) trade with the Black Sea area, but conclusive evidence for extensive contact between that area and any region in the LBA Mediterranean is lacking (Cf. Easton / Hawkins / Sherratt / Sherratt 2002, esp.101-106; but see Hertel / Kolb 2003, 73 ff.). Mee (1978, 148) suggested that Troy was important as a harbour for early fishing expeditions, but evidence for this is lacking as well. For the current research’s purpose, it should suffice to note that the size and the monumentality of the Trojan citadel, as well as the wealth displayed in the artefacts found at the site, indicate that Troy was an important regional centre and therefore an interesting port of trade (and potentially, a target for raids).
occasion, Wiluša was invaded by Ahhiyawan forces,\textsuperscript{251} the distribution of Mycenaean pottery appears unrelated to Piyamaradu’s invasion of Wiluša.

It has been proposed that the limited diffusion of Mycenaean artefacts (especially pottery) towards the Anatolian hinterland was the result of a Hittite embargo. This concept has mainly been informed by the above-mentioned Šaušgamuwa treaty, in which the vassal King of Amurru is ordered not to let Ahhiyawan ships pass to Assyria.\textsuperscript{252} However, as I noted above, there is little to suggest that the diffusion of Mycenaean pottery in western Anatolia was in any way hindered or furthered by Ahhiyawan or Hittite military or political enterprises; indeed, LH IIIB1, the time of Piyamaradu’s raids in western Anatolia, saw the greatest spread of Mycenaean pottery throughout the very same region. As military or political upheavals thus appear unrelated to the spread of Mycenaean objects, there must be another explanation for the dearth of Mycenaean pottery in central Anatolia. One such explanation is that Mycenaean pottery, especially such vessels as stirrup jars and amphorae, was deemed unfit for transport overland.\textsuperscript{253} Indeed, this theory holds some attraction, as virtually all corpora of Mycenaean pottery throughout the Mediterranean are found in close proximity to the shores of either the sea, or a major waterway.\textsuperscript{254}

\textsuperscript{251} For the equation Wiluša – Troy, see Hawkins 1998; but see Heinhold–Krahmer (2003b) for criticism.
\textsuperscript{252} Cf. Cline 1998, 249 (supra).
\textsuperscript{253} Bryce 2003a, 61.
\textsuperscript{254} See map 8. This certainly holds for Egypt, where all corpora have been found in the delta or along the Nile (although, admittedly, most Egyptian sites where clustered in the delta and Nile Valley anyway).
The archaeological data thus support the impression given in the Hittite texts of increased Mycenaean presence in Anatolia from the late 15th century BC onwards. Archaeology indicated that Miletus indeed was the only truly significant Mycenaean settlement in Anatolia, whereas small quantities of Mycenaean objects (mainly pottery) found their way to the north, to the Arzawan lands and beyond. The 14th century may have seen some Mycenaean settlement in the region of Ephesus, at the same time of the floruit and subsequent collapse of the Arzawan Kingdom with Apaša / Ephesus as capital. The presence of –usually small- quantities of imported Mycenaean pottery at various sites in western Anatolia, and especially the rise of the East Aegean –West Anatolian koinè in LH IIIB1 indicate the close relationship between western Anatolia and the Mycenaean world.

Whereas both the Hittite texts and the archaeological evidence indicate that only Miletus and surroundings firmly fell under Ahhiyawan control, the rest of western Anatolia clearly belonged to a sphere of strong Mycenaean cultural influence. Although there is no evidence for Ahhiyawan control over it, the area occasionally fell victim to Ahhiyawan raids. The Tawagalawa Letter suggests that at least one of the aims of these raids was the acquisition of labour, and this may also be reflected in various Linear B texts mentioning slaves of Anatolian origin.255

Western Anatolia appears to have been an unstable and fragmented region, ground between the colliding interests of Hatti and Ahhiyawa, much as the Levant appears to have been a conflict zone between Egypt, Mitanni and Hatti. As was the case in the Levant, the unstable political situation did not prevent trade from happening, even flourishing. But unlike the Levant, equilibrium was never achieved in western Anatolia, where the situation remained unstable until the very end of the Bronze Age. Mycenaean pottery reached various sites in the region until the post palatial period, but it appears to have been unrelated to the gains or losses of either Ahhiyawa or Hatti in the region.

The contacts between the Hittite court and the Ahhiyawan King, as evidenced by Hittite texts, must have involved the exchange of objects other than pottery. The exclamation of

the Hittite King in the Tawagalawa letter that the messenger of the King of Ahhiyawa did not bring him any greeting gift indicates that the exchange of prestige objects would have been normal conduct.256

In conclusion; the distribution of Mycenaean objects throughout western Anatolia supports the picture from the Hittite texts of Ahhiyawan activity in the coastal region. It does not indicate where Ahhiyawa must be situated, although the prevalence of Argive wares among the imports at sites like Müsgebi and at Ialysos on Rhodes may suggest that we should look to Mycenae, but at the same time, only very few corpora of Mycenaean pottery in western Anatolia have been properly analyzed.

This has been done more extensively in that other land known to have had diplomatic contacts with the Mycenaean world: Egypt. Let us for that reason take a closer look at the archaeological evidence coming from the land of the Nile.

256 Taw. §5. 54-55. Cf. Sommer 1932, 5.
Contacts between Egypt and the Aegean have been attested from the final Neolithic onwards. Egyptian proto and early dynastic artefacts have been found at a variety of sites on Crete, whereas objects from the Cycladic islands and Crete have been found at various early dynastic sites in Egypt. Contacts between Egypt and the Greek mainland are attested only at a later stage, but during the Late Bronze Age, Mycenaean objects clearly found their way to Egypt, whereas Egyptian objects made their way vice versa. Despite the abundance of Mycenaean vessels at various sites throughout Egypt and the presence of a significant corpus of Egyptian artefacts at Mycenae, it has been argued that there never was any direct contact between the Greek mainland and Egypt during the Late Bronze Age and that objects from both lands arrived at their place of deposition via middlemen in the Levant and/or Cyprus. Considering that no unequivocal evidence has been offered to support this hypothesis and that the two Egyptian texts cited above (i.e. the Annals of Thutmoses III and the Kom el Hetan text) strongly suggest that there was at least some direct diplomatic contact between the Mycenaean world, in this case the Kingdom of Tanaju, and the Egyptian court, I will not delve in the topic of trade and exchange mechanisms. For the purpose of the current research, it suffices to state that textual evidence suggests a near total monopoly of the state (i.e. the court) on the import of exotica, such as timber from the Lebanon and copper. Apart from the, say, proscribed limitations preventing unchecked exchange across Egyptian imperial borders, equipping a merchant ship –let alone a flotilla- was an affair so costly that one can hardly think of anyone except for high courtiers or the larger temples being able to do so. As a

---

258 Cf. Merrillees 1972, 180-1; 2003, 37; but see Podzuweit 1994, 468, esp. note 68, for criticism.
259 But see for a discussion of the relation between trade and diplomacy Cline 1995c, esp. 146, with references.
260 Only during the Late Ramesside period are there indications that the royal monopoly gradually gave way to a more general accessibility of the foreign markets. Especially temples like the temple of Amun (Thebes) appear to have acquired the right to send merchant flotillas to the Levant, even with a tax exemption. The wealth needed for carrying the costs of such expeditions was generated at the temples’ extensive land holdings scattered throughout the empire and farmed on a complex rented basis, with up to 30 percent of the crop paid to the temple in rent. Cf. Bickel 1998, 166; for the latter Kemp 1989, 191; Baer 1962, 25-45.
consequence, it appears unlikely that ships—whether Egyptian or not—coming from abroad could dock in Egyptian harbours without the Pharaoh’s explicit consent: even trade between visiting foreigners and individual Egyptians is unlikely to have occurred more than occasionally and must have been of a very limited nature.\textsuperscript{261} The distribution of the foreign goods brought by royal missions within Egypt was closely monitored by the palace: as soon as foreign goods reached Egyptian shores, they were taken and further distributed by the royal administration.\textsuperscript{262}

The distribution of Mycenaean artefacts throughout Egypt thus is irrelevant for the present aim of establishing whether there is any ground on the basis of the archaeological data to assume that messengers were indeed, as the texts suggest, sent across the Great Green of the Mediterranean. Instead, we should focus on anomalies; single, but especially groups of objects of extraordinary quality, homogeneity or function, or objects in extraordinary contexts. Unlike the case of (western) Anatolia, the Egyptian story goes two ways and, when possible, we will deal both with relevant Mycenaean objects in Egypt and with Egyptian objects on the Greek mainland.

The pages below should not be understood as an attempt to characterize the typical relation between the Greek mainland and New Kingdom Egypt, but solely as an argument that there was direct, indeed \textit{directed}, contact between the two lands; between the Pharaoh and the King of Tanaju. To that purpose, focus is directed towards the corpora of Mycenaean pottery at the site of El-Amarna (ancient Akhetaten), Deir el-Medina (the ancient Theban workmen’s village), Mit Rahina and Saqqarah (ancient Memphis and its cemeteries) and Tell el Dab’a and Qantir (ancient Avaris / Pi-ramesse), as shown in map 5.

\textsuperscript{261} Cf. Hankey 1993, 110.

\textsuperscript{262} There is no point in dealing extensively with the Egyptian bureaucracy of the New Kingdom here, but in general, it appears that all goods were distributed to various major centres in the provinces, where they were stored at, for example, major temples dedicated to the cult of the divine King. Apart from luxury imports, this also included the more mundane products such as grain. Major storage facilities for the latter have been found at several royal mortuary temples, including the Ramesseum near the modern town of Luxor, in Southern Egypt. It is calculated that the storage capacity of the Ramesseum alone would suffice to feed the population of a medium sized city (Cf. Kemp 1989). Temples such as the Ramesseum, or the nearby (and slightly later built) mortuary temple at Medinet Habu, served as local distribution points, from where the salaries of the state’s employees were paid. It is around the temple of Medinet Habu, for example, where the workmen from “the Village”, now known as Deir el-Medina, gather in protest after the state’s repeated failure to pay them their wages (in grain). This strike (the first attested strike in world history) is exemplary for the failure of the royal administration at the end of the New Kingdom. See especially Romer 1984.
The concept of direct contact

The theory that Mycenaean pottery, or at least some of it, found at Egyptian sites may indicate direct contact between Egypt and the Mycenaean Greek world is not a new one. Already during his excavation at the site of El-Amarna, Petrie was struck by the quantity of Mycenaean sherds he found in the so-called Central City—a district where most of the state’s institutions were housed during the reign of King Akhenaten. Petrie calculated that the sherds belonged to circa 600 Mycenaean vessels; a significant number and to this day the largest corpus of Mycenaean pottery in Egypt.\(^{263}\) During later excavations, Pendlebury found an additional number of Mycenaean sherds in various other districts of Akhetaten, including what is now known as the northern suburb; a residential area where Akhetaten’s “middle class” lived. This area yielded circa 30 sherds, concentrated in and around a house in the western part of the district. The house, T.36.36, also displayed a number of architectural features, such as what is described as a “light well”, that were considered to be “Aegean” in origin. Although the amount of Mycenaean sherds in the northern suburb in no way compared to the more that 1300 sherds that had been found in the Central City, Pendlebury dubbed the house in question “the house of the Mycenaean Greek”, and the street facing it “Greek street”.\(^{264}\) Although Pendlebury clearly thought of Mycenaean residents in Akhetaten, he did not substantiate this hypothesis, nor did he go on to explain how and why these Mycenaeans would have come to Akhenaten’s royal city.

In her “The Aegean Interest in El-Amarna”, Vronwy Hankey presented the first model explaining the presence of the exceptionally large amount of Mycenaean pottery at El-Amarna.\(^{265}\) Following Hankey, contact between Egypt and the Mycenaean world was initiated by King Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC), the father and predecessor of Akhenaten (1352-1336 BC). Late during his reign, he would have sent an official mission to the north, especially to the Peloponnese. Upon reaching the Mycenaean port of Nauplion, Amenhotep’s messengers would have travelled to the north, towards Mycenae, where they met the King of Tanaju. Here, they followed the Near Eastern practice of gift

\(^{263}\) Petrie 1894, 17. See map 9 for an overview of El Amarna. See the next chapter for extensive discussion.

\(^{264}\) Pendlebury 1933, 46.

\(^{265}\) Hankey 1981.
exchange, presenting the Mycenaean King with faience plaques, stamped on both sides with the King’s royal cartouche. In return, the Mycenaean King not only allowed the Egyptians to travel through his realm, but also gave them a shipment of Mycenaean pottery, presumably containing perfumed olive oil. With this cargo, the Egyptian envoys embarked on their voyage home, only to hear upon their arrival that the King had died and that his son had moved the court from Thebes to the new city of Akhetaten. After leaving a description of their voyage at the dead King’s mortuary temple at Kom el Hetan, they made their way to the new capital and delivered the Mycenaean vessels at the royal court.

Hankey’s scenario has received criticism, but for the wrong reasons. Wachsmann’s argument that the Kom el Hetan text is an Egyptian translation of a Minoan text and therefore does not reflect an Egyptian voyage is not sustained by any evidence. The importance of the recent assessment that we are probably dealing with as many as 11 faience plaques on the citadel of Mycenae can hardly be overstated. Plaques like these have not been found elsewhere outside Egypt, nor, in fact, have they been found within Egypt itself. Various similar plaques (with cartouches on only one side) have, however, been found in Egypt, where they appear exclusively in a royal setting; within palace areas or temple deposits. Not only does this make the argument that these were just some wandering souvenirs extremely implausible, but it also strongly indicates some very special status for Mycenae.266 Considering the extraordinary nature of the plaques, the burden of proof lays with those claiming that these plaques—and the contemporary Kom el Hetan text—do not reflect an Egyptian diplomatic mission to the Aegean.

Though an Egyptian mission to the Mycenaean world during the reign of Amenhotep III thus appears more likely than not, Hankey’s notion that the vessels at Amarna are the result of that same mission appears unlikely. Not only is it extremely unlikely that the Egyptian envoys would not immediately have been informed upon their return in Egypt of the change of regime, and thus would have sailed directly to the new capital Akhetaten, but on their very way towards Amenhotep III’s palace at Thebes, they would

---

266 For criticism on the Hankey scenario, see Wachsmann 1987, 113. For a recent study of the faience plaques, see Phillips / Cline 2005, 327. It is noteworthy that the Mycenaean appear to have been relatively “aware” of the plaques’ cultural meaning in Egypt, since the deposition of one of the plaques (the context of the others is less clear) at the Cult Centre, close to the palace, appears to mirror Egyptian practice.
have actually passed the new capital—and would have stopped there. There thus would be no reason to leave an account of their voyage in the temple of the deceased King. A connection between the mission under Amenhotep III and the Mycenaean vessels at Amarna thus cannot be upheld. Consequently, the Amarna corpus must be seen in a different light.
Already in 1981, the late Vronwy Hankey pointed out that the corpus of Mycenaean pots at El Amarna is exceptional, both in its size and in its homogeneity. In addition, Hankey pointed out that the types of vessels present in the corpus are virtually all of closed shape, with pilgrim flasks and stirrup jars prevailing. Compared to the then known corpora in the Levant, the prevalence of closed shapes in the Amarna corpus was remarkable, since the Levantine corpora usually display a more diverse range of shapes, including open shaped vessels (such as kylikes, rhyta and kraters). More recent research elsewhere in Egypt has, however, demonstrated that all corpora in Egypt are dominated by closed shaped vessels (especially stirrup jars) and that the Amarna corpus, in this respect at least, does not stand out as much as had been previously thought.

The Amarna corpus comprises a relatively large number of Mycenaean sherds, estimated between 1500 and 2000 and thought to represent at least 600 whole pots. Apart from the characteristics mentioned above, the Amarna corpus stands out because of the context most of the sherds were found in. The vast majority of Mycenaean pottery at El Amarna has been found in the waste heaps of the Central City; an area reserved for official appearances of the King and his followers and the centre of the royal administration. Though the exact use of these ceramics remains a matter of debate, it is clear that they were used in an official, royal context. The extremely limited occurrence of Mycenaean pottery elsewhere in the city stresses the fact that, at El Amarna at least, Mycenaean pottery was closely related to royal activity.

Amarna does not represent the first Mycenaean pottery in Egypt, although it certainly is the first time that Mycenaean pottery appears in large quantities in Pharaoh’s land. The Mycenaean pottery found at Amarna generally belongs to the stylistic phase of LH IIIA2, although one or two pots may be dated LH IIIB1. Earlier attestations of Mycenaean

---

267 See map 8 for a general geography of, the site of El Amarna. See Table 4 for a complete list of the Mycenaean pottery found at that site that has been published so far.  
268 Podzuweit 1994, 466.  
270 Hankey 1981, 41.  
271 For an extensive discussion, see Hankey, Kelder, Leonard jr., van Wijngaarden, in preparation. The Mycenaean pottery found at El Amarna is first presented in Petrie 1894, 17; Borchardt 1907, 29-52; 1913, 23; Peet 1923,15 ff; Pendlebury 1933, 8 ff; 1951, 38 ff. and Rose 1987, 119. An overview with primary
pottery in Egypt include LH IIA/LM IB pottery at Saqqarah, Abydos and Dra’ Abu el-Naga and LH IIB pottery at Saqqarah, Memphis, Kahun, Gurob, Gurnah and at Malqata as well as some LH II material at Deir el-Medina (see below) and some LH IIIA1 material at Gurnah, Deir el-Medina and (one sherd) Malqata. Though Mycenaean pottery evidently did find its way to Egypt before the Amarna era, the quantities are very small; rarely more than a few pots per site. Amarna really marks the advent of the Mycenaean world in the Egyptian archaeological record, after which Mycenaean pottery is found at sites throughout Egypt until the end of the 12th century B.C.E. Quantities vary, and most sites yielded only a dozen or so pots, though several major sites yielded larger amounts.

references is provided in table 4 (below). Since then, more Mycenaean material has been found in Amarna, though the general pattern of distribution (with a clear concentration in the Central City) has not changed (B. Kemp, personal communication). The best introduction on Akhetaten and the relations between the various quarters of the city is found in Kemp 1989.

272 Hankey 1993a, 114; 1981, 46; for Deir el-Medina, see Bell 1982. More LH IIIA1 material (but as yet unpublished) may be found at Tell el Dab’a; see below.
AFTER AMARNA: THE LATE 18TH DYNASTY AND THE EARLY 19TH DYNASTY

The “boom” of Mycenaean vessels at Amarna thus marked the beginning of an era, during which Mycenaean vessels regularly made their way to Egypt. Following the Amarna period, it is especially a site in the Theban region that yielded significant amounts of Mycenaean pottery. The site is now known as Deir el-Medina, but in ancient times it was simply called “the Village”. The Village was the place where the workmen constructing the tombs of the Pharaohs lived. It was a remote place, away from the arable land near Thebes, amidst the cliffs of the eastern delta and not far from “the Great Place”; the Valley of the Kings. The Village was abandoned during the reign of Akhenaten, but inhabited again during the reign of Tutankhamen (1336-1327 BC). An unspecified number of Mycenaean sherds, thought to represent over a 120 vessels, has been found in the Village and its adjacent tombs. Although there is some LH II material at Deir el-Medina, the majority is dated LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB. It follows that the LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB1 early material must be from the reign of Tutankhamen or his immediate successor, Aye (1327-1323 BC).

Stirrup jars are by far the most common shape at the Village and even appear to have been copied by Egyptian potters, a phenomenon that can also be observed elsewhere in the Egyptian Empire, i.e. Buhen. Little can be said about the social value / appreciation of the Mycenaean pottery at the Village, but the impression is that the material was available to most inhabitants. The fact that the majority of the pottery at Deir el-Medina consists of closed shapes, suggests that –as appears to have been the case at Amarna- the vessels were imported as containers, probably of olive oil. As noted above, Mycenaean pottery was found both within the Village (i.e. in a domestic setting), and in the adjacent

---

273 Cf. Hankey 1993, 114; Bell 1982. Most of the material has been found during French excavations at the site and has been published by Bell (see above). Earlier excavations, directed by Georg Möller (Möller 1918, 217-227) yielded 3 fragments of stirrup jars, whereas Schiaparelli (1927, 3) found a stirrup jar, a horizontal flask and a vertical flask in the tomb of the architect Cha, just north of the Village.

274 Bell 1982, 154. LH II material is found in small quantities elsewhere in the Theban region as well; in the tombs of the nobles at Dra’ Abu el-Naga (see above). Pendlebury (1930, 113) noted a possible LH II sherd from the tomb of Montuhirkhepeshef, although this sherd was previously considered Minoan (LM II) in origin (De Garis Davies 1913, 6-7). Furumark (1950) noted a whole LH IIA pithoid jar coming from the region.

275 Bell 1982.

276 The Egyptian stirrup jars appear to follow so-called “Simple Style” originals, which are most commonly attested on Cyprus. Cf. Bell 1982, 146.
tombs. There thus is the suggestion that Mycenaean pottery –and its contents- were used in day-to-day life (and life in death, which was perceived as a reflection of life amongst the living) in post-Amarna Deir el-Medina.

That is not to say that it was a common good throughout the country; Deir el-Medina certainly was not the average village and the presence of a significant quantity of pottery at the Village should not be misunderstood as representative for all villages throughout Egypt. To this testifies the lack of Mycenaean pottery in strata from this period elsewhere in Egypt. Deir el-Medina was one of the few places were Mycenaean pottery – for whatever reason- was brought to, as it was a place of state interest, where work was done to ensure the eternal life of the Pharaoh.

Another place where Mycenaean pottery did appear was Saqqarah, in the tombs of several high ranking courtiers of the late 18th dynasty.

Even during the reign of Akhenaten, Saqqarah had been a burial ground for Egypt’s elite. It was an old, hallowed place, dominated by the tombs of ancient Kings and their entourage. Nearby, just south of the apex of the Nile, lay the old administrative capital Memphis, allegedly founded by Egypt’s first King, Narmer. Despite the fact that Akhenaton and his court resided at El Amarna, many of the elite still had their tombs built in the shadow of the ancient city, instead of choosing to be buried near the new capital, Akhetaten.

The site of Memphis itself has suffered tremendously because of rising groundwater levels, modern agriculture, and the expansion of the nearby metropolis Cairo. Accordingly, very little remains of Egypt’s once great capital, although visitors can still marvel at the sight of a alabaster Ramesside sphinx, or a colossal statue of Ramesses II. Architecture dating to the New Kingdom hardly survives, though there still are crumbling remains of a palace dating to the reign of Merenptah (1213-1203 BC). Because of the

---

277 Contra Bell 1982. The importance of the Village, with highly skilled –and paid for- inhabitants, labouring on the tombs of the Kings, can hardly be compared with any other town in the country. There was a massive administration responsible for the provisions and supervision of the Village, under the direct responsibility of the vizier of Upper Egypt and the Major of Thebes: there can be no doubt that Deir el-Medina enjoyed a status apart. Cf. Romer 1984.


279 It is in this context that Petrie (1909, 15, Pl.22.4), erroneously identifying the site as a temple, found a sherd from a LH III stirrup jar. Possible Mycenaean ware at Memphis was also found in the vicinity of the
distortion of the archaeological record at the city itself, archaeologists have focussed on the burial grounds nearby. In the tombs of high ranking courtiers from the Amarna and post-Amarna Age, a good amount of Mycenaean vessels has been recovered. The earliest Mycenaean pottery at the Memphite tombs dates back to LH II A1 and was found in the tomb (1N) of two women in the cemetery around the pyramid of Pepi I. The finds include a LH II A alabastron and a LH II A1 late shallow ring-handled cup. Though there thus is some relatively early material in the Memphite region, the majority by far consists of LH III A2 and B1 material. The tombs where this material has been found cover the period from the early Amarna age to the reign of Ramesses II (1279-1213 BC), i.e. the late 18th to mid-19th dynasty. They have been listed in chronological order. I only know of the finds listed below, but as excavations at Saqqarah continue, the corpus of Mycenaean pottery is bound to grow.

In the tomb of Aperel, vizier under Amenhotep III and Akhenaten, a Mycenaean piriform jar and a stirrup jar were found. The tomb of Pay, a harem official of Tutankhamen, yielded fragments of two stirrup jars too, in a late 18th dynasty context. The tomb of Maya and Merit yielded a number of pottery fragments from stirrup jars and a kylix, including LH IIIA-B1 and purely LH IIIB1 material. This material with certainty was not deposited later than the 9th regnal year of Horemheb (ca. 1272 BC). Nearby, in the tomb of Horemheb, several sherds from a total of 7 vessels, dating to LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB early, were found, as well as a LH IIIB1 (possibly LH IIIAB2) sherd from a stirrup jar.

temple of Ptah (the material had linear decoration and was described as “Aegean”; Cf. Anthes 1959, 33-34).

Cf. Kemp / Merillees 1989, 253; Firth / Gunn 1926, 70, Pl. 42D. I myself am inclined to consider the alabastron as Minoan. Doubt concerning the mainland / Mycenaean origin of this vessel may also be reflected in Hankey’s (supra) designation as LH / LM.

Cline 1994, 7.

Cf. Martin 1996, 6

Warren / Hankey 1989, 152.

A FS 166 piriform stirrup jar, a FS 171 globular stirrup jar, two FS 178 squat stirrup jars, an unspecified stirrup jar, a FS 189 globular flask and closed vessel, possibly a jug, could be reconstructed. The material was found in a subsidiary burial shaft, i.e. not the one originally meant to house the body of its owner (Hankey 1980, 2). With the accession of Horemheb to the throne, the tomb was left unfinished. It may have served as a centre for the King’s mortuary cult in Ramesside times and it has been suggested that the person
The disturbed fill from the tomb of Ramose, who was the Field Commander under Horemheb (1323-1295 BC), yielded a number of LH IIIA2 and B1 sherds, including a fragment of a stirrup jar.\(^{285}\)

Similarly, the disturbed fill from the tomb of Tia (Treasurer under Ramesses II) and Tia an unspecified number of LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB1 was found, including one fragment from a stirrup jar.\(^{286}\)

The tomb of Iurudef, who was the private scribe of Tia (see above) yielded two fragments of LH IIIA2-B1 stirrup jars, thought to have been deposited there in Ramesside times.\(^{287}\)

As noted, these tombs all belong to high ranking courtiers from the Amarna period till the mid 19\(^{th}\) dynasty. Without exception, the tombs’ owners were the ‘great men’ of their age: viziers (in effect ruling half of the country of behalf of the King), royal treasurers such as Maya and Tia, members of the royal family and high ranking generals, such as Horemheb –who eventually became King himself. As was the case at Amarna, Mycenaean pottery at Saqqarah appears to have been accessible exclusively to the highest levels of the Egyptian social pyramid. It seems that, at Saqqarah a least, this situation persisted into Ramesside times.

The obvious flaw in this observation is the lack of well excavated tombs of the ‘common people’. In effect, Deir el-Medina appears to be the only place within Egypt where tombs of ‘commoners’ have been investigated properly and even there, as has been pointed out above, we are hardly dealing with the ‘average Egyptian’ (but rather with a social class on its own, with special rights and luxury because of the extraordinary nature of the work done at the Village). This flaw notwithstanding, the lack of Mycenaean pottery in the residential areas and the few excavated burial grounds of Egypt’s lower classes, most conspicuously so at Amarna, but also at various provincial centres (such as Abydos and eventually buried in the tomb was a daughter of Ramesses II who died during the reign of Merenptah, although this is not wholly clear (personal communication Dr. M.J. Raaven). The piriform stirrup jar and the vertical flask, Hankey notes, would have been inconspicuous among others of their types at El-Amarna (Hankey 1980, 3). For the LH IIIB1 (?) sherd, see Aston / Aston 1999, 60.


post-Hyksos Avaris\textsuperscript{288}), strongly suggests that Mycenaean pottery was available only at places where there was a direct royal interest. This may also explain the appearance of a number of Mycenaean stirrup jars in tombs at Buhen, an important fortress and administrative centre far to the south, in Nubia.\textsuperscript{289} Similarly, the increasing numbers of Mycenaean pottery at Tell el Dab’a, coinciding with the foundation of the new royal residence Pi-ramesses near the old centre of Avaris, strongly suggest that the increased demand for Mycenaean pottery was directly related to increased royal interest and activity in that centre. This raises the question why there was a royal demand for Mycenaean pottery in the first place; a question that will be addressed further below. Before that, we will take a closer look at Egypt’s capital under the Ramessides: Pi-ramesses.

\textsuperscript{288} Early references to Mycenaean pottery at Abydos (Cf. Petrie 1902, 6, PI.LIV; 1901, 46; Randall-Maciver / Mace 1902, 72-75; Ayrton / Currelly / Weigall 1904, 50) could, after examination of the published material, be discarded. Petrie’s material is now safely identified as EBA Levantine pottery, whereas the other material thought to be Mycenaean may display some vague influences from the Aegean, but is most certainly not of Mycenaean origin. The site of Tell el Dab’a, ancient Avaris, has yielded some Mycenaean pottery predating the foundation of Pi-ramesses (including some LH IIIA1 pottery) but only during LH IIIA2 and LH IIIB, roughly contemporary with the rise of the 19\textsuperscript{th} dynasty, Mycenaean pottery appears to have reached the centre in substantial amounts. See below for further discussion.

\textsuperscript{289} According to the first excavators of this site (Randall-Maciver / Woolley 1911, 132), “Mycenaean stirrup jars at Buhen were of fairly common occurrence.” Although this fairly common occurrence is regrettably not specified in the excavation reports, later excavations by Emery, Smith and Milard (1979) yielded another 7 or so pots, 5 of which were stirrup jars, 1 pilgrim flask and 1 sherd from a closed shaped vessel. The occurrence of an Egyptian faience imitation stirrup jar next to an original Mycenaean pot in a tomb (H80) is paralleled at Deir el-Medina. Considering that all of these vases came from an 18\textsuperscript{th} dynasty cemetery, it is reasonable to assume that we are dealing with LH IIIA2 pottery here, possibly with a little bit of earlier material (although, considering the scarcity of this material in Egypt itself, this seems unlikely). In a similar fashion, a small number of Mycenaean pottery has also been found at Sesebi, another important Nubian fortress.
To read in English:

The reign of Horemheb (1323-1295 BC) marked the official end of the Amarna Age and with his death, Egypt’s illustrious 18th dynasty came to an end; the line of Theban Kings starting with Ahmose ‘the Liberator’ (who drove the Hyksos out of the Delta around 1550 BC) and including great rulers such as Thutmose III (1479-1425 BC) and Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC), had finally died out. Of course, Horemheb had long served the last Kings of the 18th dynasty as a high ranking official and, during the reign of Tutankhamen (1336-1327 BC), appears to have effectively ruled the country together with the vizier Aye, who later became King. After the death of Aye, he probably was the most logical—and certainly the most powerful—successor to the throne.

Horemheb’s successor was, like Horemheb himself, a man from the army, named Pramesse (ruling as Ramesses I: 1295-1294 BC). Pramesse’s origins are thought to have lain in the eastern Delta and he may have been governor of the provincial town of Avaris, near present-day Tell el Dab’a. His short reign and especially that of his son and successor Seti I (1294-1279 BC), were devoted to the conquest of those Levantine territories which had been lost during the chaos following the death of Akhenaten and as such, were essentially anti-Hittite. While both Ramesses I and Seti I resided at the old centres of Thebes and Memphis, Ramesses II (1279-1213 BC), who succeeded Seti I, decided to move the court to his family’s old Delta estate at Avaris. He embarked on a massive building campaign, remaking the provincial town of Avaris into a giant metropolis, bursting with life and adorned with giant temples, palaces, statues of the Gods and, most of all, statues of himself. On top of that, Ramesses renamed the city after

---

290 In a recent (as yet unpublished) paper held at a conference on Rhodes, Van Dijk demonstrated that the reign of Horemheb cannot have exceeded 14 years. As a result, the regnal years of the Egyptian Kings given here should be taken with some measure of flexibility, though the main argument presented in this research is not affected by this new insight.

291 The historical outlines of the last years of the 18th dynasty can reasonably be reconstructed on the basis of the so-called Amarna Letters, Hittite texts and Egyptian temple inscriptions. It appears that the death of Akhenaten coincided with a period of relative instability in the Egyptian Levantine Empire, during which especially the vassal rulers of the Kingdom of Amurru tried to carve out their own independent Kingdom while playing the Egyptians and Hittites against each other. Ultimately, Hittite forces captured Amurru and several other vassal states originally belonging to the Egyptian sphere of influence. With dynastic troubles solved, Egyptian focus returned to the Levant with the advent of the 19th dynasty and resulted in an Egyptian-Hittite wars that essentially lasted till well into the reign of Ramesses II. Cf. Kitchen 1982; Reeves 2001; Kemp 1989; Klengel 2002, with references.

---
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himself: Pi-ramesse. Its splendour notwithstanding, contemporary texts make it abundantly clear that the new capital primarily served as a major military base, from where campaigns to the Levant were launched: it boasted naval installations as well as infantry barracks and the headquarters of Egypt’s chariot-corps. The sudden change from relatively insignificant provincial town to capital of the world’s largest Empire is not only evident because of the abundance of Ramesside monuments in the area. Of interest to our present research, and confirming the notion that royal interest was closely tied to the import of Mycenaean pottery (see above), is the sudden increase of Mycenaean pottery at the site.

Over the years, Austrian and German excavations at the site of Avaris / Pi-ramesse (present-day Tell el Dab’a and Qantir, respectively) have yielded a variety of Mycenaean material in strata ranging from the mid-18th dynasty to the late 19th dynasty. Unlike the other sites we have dealt with above (and in fact, unlike any other site in Egypt), the site of Pi-ramesse yielded an unprecedented variety of ceramic shapes, not only including stirrup jars, but also kylikes and even kraters, as well as a possible peg-top rhyton. Moreover, in a pottery fragment found in what once were the royal stables of Ramesses’ delta residence, a horse-head was incised in such a manner that it has provisionally been identified as a Linear B sign.

Though a thorough survey of the complete corpus at Qantir and Tell el Dab’a is as yet lacking, the overall picture so far seems to be that preceding the foundation of Pi-ramesse, Mycenaean pottery did appear at Avaris, but in modest quantities. Although LH IIIA1 pottery has been found at Avaris, only during LH IIIA2 Mycenaean pottery appeared on a more frequent pace. It is only during LH IIIB, however, that Mycenaean...

---

292 The author had the honour of visiting the excavations at Tell el Dab’a during the summer of 2002. Dr. D. Aston kindly showed him some of the newly found pottery, which –to me- appeared to be LH IIIA1 and LH IIIA2 material. At least part of this material was found in strata that were dated to the reign of Amenhotep III, which –if true- would be a relatively early attestation of Mycenaean pottery in Egypt (compare to page 69). The Mycenaean pottery at Qantir is under study by Penelope Mountjoy. For both the Qantir and the Tell el Dab’a corpus, a final publication is not yet available.

293 Pusch 1999, 29; Hankey 1993 (ref. to D. Aston), Mountjoy / Mommsen 2000, 146.

294 Pusch 1999, 29, Abb.3.

295 This would have been contemporary with the Amarna and the late Amarna period, i.e. from the reign of Akhenaten till Aye / Horemheb, although Aston (2001, 181) noted that LH IIIA2 may date as late as the early reign of Ramesses II. As we have seen at Memphis, Buhen and Deir el Medina, Mycenaean pottery has been found in modest quantities throughout Egypt and its Nubian territories during this period, albeit always in close relation to royal activity. Our understanding of Avaris during the 18th dynasty is still too...
pottery appears to have reached the centre in substantial amounts. LH IIIB can be roughly equated with the reign of Ramesses II and although it is impossible (without a proper final publication at hand) to provide an exact quantity of LH IIIB material at Pi-ramesse, the occurrence of LH IIIB (and no earlier) sherds in the wider region around Pi-ramesse does suggest that this material, from the reign of Ramesses II onwards, was imported to the centre on a larger scale than had previously been the case.296 As far as the distribution of Mycenaean pottery within Pi-ramesse itself is concerned: this remains uncertain. In general, I have the impression that from LH IIIB1 onwards, Mycenaean pottery is concentrated in the area of Qantir, rather than Tell el Dab’a (though it is not absent at the latter site). As Qantir seems to have been the ‘royal district’ of Pi-ramesse, where the palaces were situated, this would substantiate the above-presented concept that the presence of Mycenaean pottery was closely tied to royal interest even more.

The various corpora introduced in the pages above demonstrate that from the reign of Akhenaten onwards, Mycenaean pottery was imported to Egypt on a more or less regular pace, with small quantities appearing in the tombs, palaces and ministries of Egyptian courtiers, till well into the reign of Ramesses II. We have seen that Hankey’s scenario, holding that Mycenaean pottery at Amarna as a result of Amenhotep III’s mission to the Aegean cannot be upheld. Yet, the apparent close connection between the Egyptian court and the presence of Mycenaean pottery in Egypt, mostly so at Amarna but also elsewhere, does suggest at least some sort of royal supervision in the acquisition of the pottery. This however does not necessarily mean direct contact between Greece and

_296_ Cf. Van den Brink 1987, 14. Pusch (1999, 29) notes that at Qantir, the majority of Mycenaean pottery is dated LH IIIB1 and LH IIIB2, though some material may be dated LH IIIA.
Egypt, as the pottery may have been acquired elsewhere (i.e. Cyprus or the Levant).\textsuperscript{297} We have seen however that in the years preceding the Amarna period, Egypt and Mycenaean Greece had, at least occasionally, direct contact. Therefore, it would \textit{a priori} be rather unlikely that this had not continued in later years. In the pages below, we will take a closer look at the archaeological, iconographical and textual evidence presented above and will come to the conclusion that there is, in fact, a strong case to be made in favour of direct and directed contact between Egypt and the Mycenaean world.

\textsuperscript{297} Cf. Sherratt 1998 on the role of Cyprus in Late Bronze Age economies, see Kemp 1989, 232, esp. 234 ff. for discussion on the nature of the Egyptian economy and the role of the state.
OF OLIVES, POTTERY AND MEN
AN EVALUATION OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL, TEXTUAL AND ICONOGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE

One of the main arguments in favour of direct contact between the Egyptian court at Amarna and the Mycenaean world is the remarkably homogeneity of the corpus of Mycenaean vessels at Amarna. Unlike many of the other corpora of Mycenaean vessels in western Anatolia, the corpus of Amarna has been subject to various studies to determine its origin; this appears to have been the northern Argolid, with especially Berbati as a likely production centre. Berbati with certainty fell under the direct control of Mycenae. In other words; the corpus of Mycenaean pottery at Amarna derives from the Kingdom of Mycenae. We should consider that the significant size and the homogeneous (Argive) origins of the corpus make it highly unlikely that the vessels had been assembled somewhere other than at the place of origin. The shipment therefore is most likely to have come to Egypt in a direct way. Moreover, the Argolid –where the pottery came from- was the heartland of the Kingdom of Tanaju, as reconstructed from the texts (see above), which had been a known to the Egyptians from at least the reign of Thutmoses III onwards. On at least two previous occasions, the King of Tanaju can be demonstrated to have had direct contact with the Egyptian court: the Mycenaean vessels at Amarna thus may well have come as a greeting gift too, from the King of Mycenae to his Egyptian colleague.

Considering this, we are faced with the question why contact between Mycenae and Amarna suddenly involved the exchange of Mycenaean pottery, while earlier Mycenaean–Egyptian contacts did not. The answer, I think, lies in the climatic differences between Egypt and Greece and the Egyptian wish to acquire what Greece is known for even today: olives.

The Egyptian climate is not favourable for growing olives and therefore, olives and olive oil had to be imported. It is likely that olives initially were imported from the Levant, if

---


87
only because the Egyptians used a Semitic loanword to designate the fruit. Considering the limited occurrence of olive stones in strata predating the New Kingdom and the absence of the olive in Egyptian texts or iconography, import before the Amarna period must have been sporadic at best. At Amarna however, olives are omnipresent. Olive stones have been found in the workmen’s village at Amarna, whereas in the Central City, a wreath of olive twigs was found. Olive twigs are also shown on the walls of the Great Aten temple, where they are offered to the sun god by none other than the King himself. Slightly later, four wreaths of olive twigs were buried in Tutankhamen’s tomb in the Valley of the Kings. Olives in the Amarna Age at least, appear to have had a close connection to the King and his court.

The sudden appearance of the olive in the paleobotanical and the iconographical record at Amarna is paralleled by the import of an unprecedented number of Mycenaean closed-shaped vessels. As has been observed, both olives and Mycenaean pottery appear virtually exclusively in an elite context. More to the point, both the pilgrim flask and the stirrup jar are known to have been used as containers of olive oil. A connection between the olives and the Mycenaean pottery at Amarna lies at hand. It now appears very likely that Akhenaten received not only Greek olive oil (perhaps perfumed, as the tablets from Pylos suggest?), but also living olive trees, to be planted in his new capital. The latter would also explain the King’s ability to offer fresh olive-twigs to his God, and to appear, perhaps during religious ceremonies or festivities, while wearing wreaths of olive twigs. At those occasions, while watching the King’s procession, the people of Akhetaten may have smelled an expensive Mycenaean perfume.

299 Egyptian dt for ‘olive’ appears to derive from west Semitic zayt-. Cf. Frankel 1999, 37 for the use of the olive in the Levant; see Hoch 1994, 395; Serpico / White 2000, with references, for ḫḵ as designation for olive oil.
300 The olive has only been attested twice in contexts predating the New Kingdom; in 13th dynasty levels at Kom el Rabi’a and to late Hyskos levels at Avaris. Cf. Murray 2000, 610; Newton / Terral / Ivorra 2006, 407. See for a more intensive study, and a proposal to re-date the introduction of the olive in Egypt, Margaritis / Kelder (in preparation).
301 Renfrew, J. 1985, 188; Pendlebury 1951, 118, PL.LXXVIII.
303 Germer 1989, 90-95.
304 Cf. Haskell 1985, 221-229 with references.
305 Cf. Hepper 1990, 16 for olive importation during the reign of Tutankhamen. See, for Pylian oil production, Shelmerdine 1985.
As far as I can see, this scenario appears to be a better explanation for the presence of Mycenaean pottery at Amarna than any hypothesis presented before. The ‘olive-hypothesis’ does, of course not exclude the possibility that there were other motivations for direct (diplomatic) contact with the Mycenaean Kingdom. Indeed, the Amarna period was not exclusively a period of domestic changes in the Egyptian Empire. Abroad, things were rapidly changing as well—and distinctly not in the way the Pharaoh would have hoped for.

Contemporary diplomatic letters indicate that during the reign of Akhenaten, Mitanni, the age-old ally of Egypt, was swallowed by the resurgent Hittite Empire. Egypt, for one reason or another, appears to have been unable to come to its aid and thus, Mitanni disappeared from the scene. In the process of annihilating Mitanni, the Hittite King Šuppiluliuma annexed several north Syrian states, including Amurru, which had been within the Egyptian sphere of influence. If Akhenaten had not realized the threat posed by the Hittites, the writing now clearly was on the wall.

In the “biography” of Amenhotep III (the father of Akhenaten), Eric Cline devoted a chapter to Egypt’s overseas connections, especially with the Aegean. He proposed that the faience plaques with Amenhotep’s royal cartouche at Mycenae should be seen as evidence for an Egyptian mission, primarily meant to strengthen bonds between Egypt and Mycenae. Moreover, a strategical alliance with Mycenae, Cline continued, would threaten the western flank of the Hittite Kingdom (where Egypt also found an ally in the Kingdom of Arzawa), while the alliance with Mitanni was to keep the Hittites out of Syria.

This military motivation for diplomatic ties with Mycenae may corroborate the papyrus fragments found at Amarna, on which Mycenaean (?) warriors, coming to the aid of a fallen Egyptian, are depicted. It should be pointed out that Egypt had a long tradition of incorporating foreign troops into its army: already during the Old Kingdom, Nubian archers had been a standard component of the royal army and later, during the reign of

306 See also above, 291. The rump-state of Mitanni was incorporated in the Hittite Empire, while Mitanni’s former vassal Assyria gradually assumes a leading position in north-eastern Syria and northern Mesopotamia.
308 In this respect, it should be noted that the first Ahhiyawan incursions in Anatolia that we know of, are roughly contemporary with the reign of Amenhotep III, i.e. the first quarter of the 14th century BC.
309 see above, p. 28.
Ramesses II, there is clear evidence for groups of foreigners (especially early bands of Sea People) serving as an elite in the Imperial military. I will come to that later, but for now, we should ponder at least the possibility that the Egyptian court during the Amarna Age employed groups of Mycenaean warriors and that these warriors came from the befriended King of Mycenae. At any rate, with the collapse of Mitanni, one could see the point of strengthening the ties with the remainder of Cline’s anti-Hittite alliance.

It thus appears likely that from the reign of Thutmose III till the reign of Akhenaten, the Egyptian and Mycenaean courts at least occasionally exchanged messengers. In accordance with contemporary political *mores*, these messengers brought prestigious goods, such as precious metal vessels and faience plaques, while during the reign of Akhenaten these gifts would have also included Mycenaean vessels containing olive oil and possibly living olive plants and elite military forces. But what about the later years? The relationship between Hatti and Egypt would remain strained till well into the 13th century BC and, following Cline’s scenario, there thus would have been good reason to uphold the contact with the Mycenaean Greeks.

Sticking to the evidence, we have seen that Mycenaean pottery was imported to Egypt till the reign of Ramesses II and that it largely remained confined to the Egyptian elite. Some of the pottery following the Amarna period closely resembles the pottery at Akhetaten (such as the flask and the piriform stirrup jar found in the tomb of Horemheb) and might have come from the same source, i.e. the northern Argolid. This certainly is the case for the larger part of the 100 sherds from Pi-ramesse that have been chemically analysed.\(^\text{310}\) The corpus from Pi-ramesse deserves to be mentioned here also because of the diversity of its shapes. I already remarked upon this earlier, as Pi-ramesse –so far at least- really is the only site in Egypt where shapes like kraters, kylikes, and possibly even a rhyton have been found alongside the “usual” stirrup jars and pilgrim flasks. It clearly would go too far to jump to the conclusion that we are dealing with Mycenaean actually living in the city (as we may just as well be dealing with changing patterns of Egyptian appreciation of the Mycenaean pottery), but it raises at least that possibility. To that adds the above

\(^{310}\) Mountjoy / Mommsen 2000, 138 ff. Most of the pottery with certainty comes from the Argolid. Some material may have had its origins on Cyprus, while there also is the suggestion that some pottery may have been locally (i.e. Egyptian) made.
referred to long-standing link between Avaris / Pi-ramesse and the Aegean (with Minoans living in the old city). Moreover, especially Ramesses II is known to have included large groups of foreigners, most notably Sea People\(^{311}\), in his army. Pondering this, and with the Amarna papyrus in mind, the concept of Mycenaean warriors in Pharaoh’s service and settling at Pi-ramesse thus appears to be not too far-fetched. Egyptian interest in the Aegean, at any rate, had not waned since Akhenaten’s days: the earrings of Queen Nefertari are Mycenaean (ill. 3), while the walls of the burial chamber of Ramesses III show Mycenaean amphorae.

The accumulation of data suggesting direct contact between Egypt and Mycenae, taken together with hard textual evidence for direct contact during the reign of Thutmose III, lays the burden of proof with those claiming that direct, diplomatic contact did not occur.

\(^{311}\) Especially the Sherden, a people thought to have come from, or later settled in, Sardinia. Cf. Woudhuizen 2005; Sandars 1978. Note that none of these groups, while we know of their presence within Egypt, have left any trace in the archaeological record that would identify them as being ‘foreign’.
We have seen that during the reign of Thutmoses III, an Aegean Kingdom called Tanaju had direct diplomatic contact, involving the exchange of prestige gifts, with the Egyptian court. The Kom el Hetan text indicates that the heartland of Tanaju was the Argolid, with Mycenae and Nauplion as its principal centres. Both the Kom el Hetan text itself and the presence of faience plaques at Mycenae with the Amenhotep’s royal cartouche argue for continuation of direct contact between the Egyptian court and the King of Tanaju from the reign of Thutmoses III until the reign of Amenhotep III.

As I argued in the pages above, the combination of the sudden import of Mycenaean pottery at Amarna, as well as the presence of olives, olive twigs and the possible depiction of Mycenaean warriors on a papyrus at Amarna, is most plausibly explained as the result of diplomatic contact between Amarna and Mycenae. After the Amarna period, evidence for direct contact between Egypt and the Mycenaean world becomes increasingly flimsy, although—as we shall see below—especially Mycenae has yielded a substantial amount of Aegyptiaca, including objects from the late 19th dynasty (and perhaps even later). In the pages above, I hope to have demonstrated that there is an argument in favour of continuation of direct Egyptian contacts with the Mycenaean world, but even if one is not willing to follow my views in that regard, the point remains that at least between circa 1437 (the 42nd regnal year of Thutmoses III) and circa 1335 BC (the final year of Akhenaten), the Egyptian court had diplomatic ties with the court of Tanaju / Mycenae. This overlaps with the first (bellicose) actions of Ahhiyawans in western Anatolia. In other words; Ahhiyawa and Tanaju must have been contemporaries.

Consequently, we are faced with the question where these Kingdoms, both apparently able to deal with contemporary Great Powers on a par, must be situated. As for Tanaju, the Egyptian textual sources have provided ample proof that its heartland was situated around the centres of Nauplion and Mycenae, as those were the only centres specifically

---

312 The sporadic occurrence of LH IIIB1 pottery in the Amarna corpus argues for a late stage of Akhenaten’s reign as the moment of import.
mentioned in the Kom el Hetan text (as opposed to the other toponyms, which appear to designate regions). Moreover, at least during the reign of Amenhotep III, Tanaju encompassed the larger part of the Peloponnese and, in all likelihood, the Thebaid. The Hittite texts however, do not provide us with such a geographical specification: the Ahhiyawan heartland must be situated “across the sea”, but that is about all.

Yet this is enough. It is clear that Millawanda, Ahhiyawa’s foothold on Anatolian soil, was not itself the principal centre of the Kingdom. That centre must have lain on the isles in the Aegean, or on the Greek mainland itself. We may reasonably assume that the capital of Ahhiyawa must have been one of the Mycenaean palatial centres in the Aegean.

Yet, if we take closer look at these centres, we are left with a –perhaps surprisingly- low number of possibilities. The palace of Pylos can safely be dismissed on the grounds that only very little orientalia have been found, whereas the Menelaion cannot have been the principal centre of the Ahhiyawan Kingdom because of its decline in the 14th century. Admittedly, our knowledge of even the most significant Mycenaean centres remains lacunose, but even those centres can, because of the lack of orientalia or for reasons of size or monumentality, be discarded as capital of Ahhiyawa. Looking for an Ahhiyawan capital in one of the islands in the Aegean appears to be equally fruitless.

---

313 An extensive survey of all major Mycenaean palatial centres can be found in Kelder 2005b.
314 Most notably, the impressive rock-cut tholos tomb at Pellana in Laconia strongly suggests the presence of a nearby important palatial centre, but this has not yet been located. Excavations at Dimini (near Volos) have uncovered an important Mycenaean settlement, including several megaras, one of which appears to have been used for cultic activity. A palatial complex at Dimini has however, not yet been found, although its discovery seems to be a matter of time only. The complex which was hailed as “palatial” during the 2006 excavations at Salamis has still not yielded a Linear B archive or anything else that with certainty proves its dominance over the island (and beyond). For all three sites, good publications are regrettably lacking. The finds at Pellana have essentially only been published on a poster, while the findings at Salamis and Dimini are briefly reviewed in the Archaeological Reports and the Arch. Delt.
315 A site on Crete is an unlikely candidate for a number of reasons. As has been noted, Crete is known in Egyptian sources as k-f-i-tj-w, usually transcribed keftiu, while the name Ṭnḫ was used to refer to the lands beyond Crete (Cf. Edel 1966, 54; Latacz 2001b, 161 ff.). Contact with Crete was quite close until the reign of Thutmoses III, after which Crete seems to have lost its importance to Egypt (Cf. Wachsmann 1987). Despite a subsequent recovery at some sites, destructions at the major Cretan sites around 1450, including Knossos, make a direct association with Ahhiyawa unlikely, as Ahhiyawa for the first time appears in the Hittite records some decades later. Penelope Mountjoy (1998, 51) suggested that the capital of Ahhiyawa might plausibly be looked for at Rhodes, a thought that essentially sprang from her equation of the East Aegean – West Anatolian pottery koinè with the territorial extent of Ahhiyawa. Apart from the apparent methodological flaw, there is the additional problem that the pottery koinè only flourished at a very late stage of Mycenaean culture, during LH III B2 and especially C, which is difficult to relate to the contemporary decline of Ahhiyawa as in the Hittite texts (Mee 1982, 86 notes that during Rhodes’ floruit,
In essence we are left with only two plausible candidates, namely Thebes (in Boeotia) and Mycenae (in the Argolid). In the pages below, we shall discuss the various arguments in favour of or against each centre.

---

the island actually imported a great deal of Argive pottery; Mee 1998, 143 (without any real argument) proposes an island bases federacy headed by a mainland state like Mycenae). Essentially, it appears wisest to follow Deger-Jalkotzy (1998, 106) in stating that “there is, moreover, no evidence that any island polity could have been on a par with the leading states.”
Thebes has, over the past years, gained in popularity with regard to the Ahhiyawa Question. In the recent update of his original 2001 “Troia und Homer”, Joachim Latacz presents an argument favouring Thebes as the capital of the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa.\textsuperscript{316} Claiming support for his views from established scholars, including Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier\textsuperscript{317}, Latacz presents three major arguments for his equation of Thebes with Ahhiyawa.

The first of these is the apparent Boeotian prominence in Homer’s Catalogue of Ships.\textsuperscript{318} Unlike Latacz and for reasons briefly discussed above, I am not willing to take later legends (even if their backbone may originally date to the Mycenaean Age) into account during this research and I will therefore not deal with Latacz’s first argument.

The second argument produced by Latacz is however of greater relevance to our current research as it deals with a new reading of a Hittite text. The text in question, \textit{KUB XXVI 91} has already been briefly discussed above, in the context of Mycenaean encroachment on the Anatolian west coast and is generally understood as a letter from an unnamed Hittite King to the King of Ahhiyawa. Latacz however refers to a new interpretation of this text, proposed by the Hittitologist Frank Starke, holding that this text was written by an unnamed Ahhiyawan King to his Hittite colleague, providing historical justification for the recent Ahhiyawan seizure of several islands before the Anatolian west coast on the grounds that these islands in the past had belonged to the Ahhiyawan’s forebear, who bore the name Kadmos. It is this name, in later Greek legend closely associated with the city of Thebes, that leads Latacz to the assumption that Thebes must have been the leading centre on the Greek mainland.

There are several problems involved with this new reading and therefore the argument; the most important one being that it simply cannot be upheld (which is why I did not refer to this reading beforehand). Doubtful identifications of cuneiform signs, the

\textsuperscript{316} Latacz 2004; updated translation of Latacz 2001b.
\textsuperscript{317} Cf. Niemeier 2001 (quoted in Latacz 2004, 242-3). Rather than providing any indication why it should be Thebes that assumed a leading role in the Mycenaean world, Niemeier argues against the identification of the south-east Aegean as Ahhiyawa –which was not the problem– as a consequence of which he, apparently, concludes that Thebes is the only plausible option left.
\textsuperscript{318} But see Kelder 2007, for a discussion of those arguments.
improbable reconstruction of the name Kadmos in Hittite n/u-zə Ka-ga-mu-na-aš-za-kân A-BA A-BA A-B[I]-YA and grammatical impossibilities have triggered a flood of criticism, most recently summarized by the American scholar Joshua Katz.\textsuperscript{319} But even if the new reading were true, there still is the leap from the real Bronze Age name Kadmos to the legendary founder of Thebes that has to be explained.

The third argument for Latacz identification of Thebes as the Ahhiyawan capital is the size of the Theban territory, which is reported to have included all of central and eastern Boeotia, and at least parts of Euboea. I have already briefly dealt with this topic above and it should suffice here that especially the inclusion of parts of Euboea in the reconstruction of the Theban Kingdom goes without proper arguments. Also, as we shall see below, even this ‘extended’ reconstruction of the Kingdom of Thebes does not match the territorial extent of the Kingdom of Mycenae, which included, moreover, a number of extremely important citadels (such as Nauplion, Tiryns and Midea).\textsuperscript{320} Latacz’s arguments, in sum, are unconvincing.

If we were to argue for Theban dominance over Mycenaean Greece and that it is the Theban Kingdom that should be identified as Ahhiyawa, it would be better to compare the archaeological remains found at Thebes to those at Mycenae. This, admittedly, is a difficult task, if only because of the extremely lacunose state of research on the Kadmeia hill, even when compared to the state of the investigations at Mycenae.

Unlike Mycenae, which dwindled into insignificance in the Classical era, Thebes has been inhabited till this very day. While it was a significant centre in the Classical era, it appears that especially modern building activities have been extremely harmful to the archaeological record. Indeed, at several spots, modern foundations have been dug to bedrock level, destroying everything ancient in the process. Nonetheless, excavations in the city centre have uncovered a sizable Mycenaean centre, including two structures that have been identified as palatial. Though there may be some overlap, it appears that these structures functioned at different times; the oldest of them commonly known as the “Old Kadmeion” but also referred to as “the House of Kadmos”, was probably destroyed by

\textsuperscript{319} Cf. Katz 2005 forthcoming (but already available on the internet) with references therein.
\textsuperscript{320} Contra Godart / Sacconi 1999, 545.
fire during the early phase of LH IIIA2.\textsuperscript{321} The younger of the two is called the “New Kadmeion” and was built during LH IIIB1.\textsuperscript{322} This complex covered some 2.1 hectares, including what has been interpreted as a large courtyard, resembling those of the Minoan palaces on Crete.\textsuperscript{323}

The New Kadmeion appears to have done without significant demarcation from the rest of the settlement; unlike the major centres in the Argolid and unlike the centre on the acropolis at Athens, there was no cyclopean wall to demarcate (or protect?) the residence of the ruling elite from its surroundings. The settlement as a whole however, may have been fortified with a wall, roughly following the course of the later, Classical fortifications. Though it has been proposed that this wall included seven gates (as in Sophokles’ \textit{Antigone}, 141-3) on the spots of the modern exit roads of the town,\textsuperscript{324} later research suggests a more modest course of the wall.\textsuperscript{325} The wall itself, again unlike the centres in the Argolid, may not have been of cyclopean masonry.\textsuperscript{326}

Despite its defences, Thebes met with violent destructions on at least two occasions during the Mycenaean period: one at the end of the LH IIIB period (like most of the major palatial centres of the Mycenaean world) and one earlier. The exact date of this earlier destruction has been the subject of debate, with some arguing for a LH IIIB2 late date, while others argued that this destruction took place earlier, during LH IIIB1.\textsuperscript{327} It appears that a LH IIIB1 date is now more or less generally accepted,\textsuperscript{328} but the question whether this LH IIIB1 destruction also meant the end of the palatial administration, as Symeonoglou argued, has not yet been resolved.\textsuperscript{329}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{321} Cf. Κεραμόπουλος 1909, 57 ff.; Symeonoglou 1985, 49 for LH IIIA2; Dakouri-Hild, 2001, 101 for LH IIIB1.
\item \textsuperscript{322} Symeonoglou 1973, 75.
\item \textsuperscript{323} See Minoan – Theban contacts Symeonoglou 1973, 74.
\item \textsuperscript{324} See Κεραμόπουλος, supra.
\item \textsuperscript{325} Cf. Demakopoulou/Konsola 1981, 20-22; Symeonoglou 1985, 26-32. The wall would still have a length of approx. 1700 meters, protecting an area of 19.2 hectares.
\item \textsuperscript{326} Cf. Dickinson 2006, 25 with references.
\item \textsuperscript{327} For a LH IIIB2 late date, Snodgrass 1975, 314; Dakouri-Hild 2001, 106-7; for a LH IIIB1 date, see Symeonoglou 1985, 60.
\item \textsuperscript{328} “There are some grounds for believing that part, if not all, of the later so-called ‘New’ Palace at Thebes was destroyed at this [LH IIIB early] time, although not by fire” (Rutter 2004). This means no later than 1230 BC. Shelmerdine (2001) considers the discussion closed in favour of a destruction at the end of LH IIIB1, and a later one at the end of B2.
\item \textsuperscript{329} Symeonoglou supra.
\end{itemize}
This is time for a moment of consideration. As we have seen in the pages above, the Mycenaean settlement on the Kadmeia hill was a sizable town, fortified in its entirety by a wall and dominated by a palace of considerable size. Yet for all its glories, Thebes was destroyed somewhere in the mid-13th century BC.\textsuperscript{330} I have already noted that Thebes was not alone in its misfortune: around the same time the whole of Boeotia suffered a setback, characterized by destructions at Orchomenos and the abandonment of the important centre at Gla / Kastri (ancient Arne?). As a consequence of this, the complex system of waterworks draining the Kopaïs basin fell in disuse, with the subsequent flooding of large stretches of agricultural land and –probably– several major settlements as a result.\textsuperscript{331} Even if the palatial administration at Thebes survived these upheavals (or was revived afterwards), there still is the point that in the rest of Boeotia it clearly did not.\textsuperscript{332} This hardly fits the impression of an Aegean Great Power, operating on a par with the Hittites at exactly the same time. But there is more that argues against the equation of Thebes with the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa than this alone. Troubling for those who wish to see Thebes as the leading centre of Mycenaean Greece must be the lack of monumental architecture, not only in the city (where there is the excuse of extensive building activity in later times) but also in its surroundings.

Although the surroundings of Thebes include various cemeteries from the Mycenaean era, no monumental tombs have so far been found. Various chamber tombs are known, including a tomb with a double \textit{dromos}, two chambers and painted doorjambs.\textsuperscript{333} This tomb is usually described as “royal”, but this appears to be more the result of a lack of truly monumental tombs in the area rather than that there is any evidence for a royal burial in this specific tomb. The excuse that the area has been inhabited ever since Mycenaean times and that therefore, much of the architecture may have been destroyed

\textsuperscript{330} I am aware of the difficulties involving Aegean Bronze Age chronology and absolute dates. In general, I tend to follow the “classical” chronology as proposed in Warren / Hankey 1989. However, even if one is not to follow the data proposed in that volume, LH IIIB1 is, by any standard, unlikely to have lasted later than 1230 BC.

\textsuperscript{331} There is no point to delve deeper into the topography of Mycenaean Boeotia here. German surveys have however located several settlements daring to the Mycenaean period in the Kopaïs basin, including one in the fields surrounding Gla. Cf. Knauss e.a. 1984, 216-9; 1987, 21, esp. ill.6.23; Fossey 1980, 155-162.

\textsuperscript{332} Orchomenos most certainly never recovered from the destruction. Although the centre is only extremely poorly investigated, pottery study suggests a floruit during LH IIIB1, followed by a marked decline in LH IIIB2. Cf. Mountjoy 1983, 11 ff.; see for general observations Bulle 1907, 61; Catling 1984-1985, 31; Iakovidis 2001.

\textsuperscript{333} The tomb originally dated to LH IIIA2 but was extended in LH IIIB. Cf. Leekley / Efstratiou 1980, 37.
is, of course, valid to some extent. But then, one should consider that even at Athens (!) there is evidence for a tholos tomb. In fact, Thebes appears to be the only major Mycenaean centre where no tholos tomb has been found – yet it is precisely this type of tomb that is generally considered to be the royal tomb *par excellence*. This should not be misunderstood: I am not arguing here that there never was any tholos tomb at Thebes. I am arguing that there cannot have been *many* of these royal tombs in the Theban region. This stands in contrast to the abundance of tholos tombs in the Argolid, especially at Mycenae – where there is in fact, as we shall see below, a whole sequence of tholos tombs running from LH IIA to the LH IIIB period.

All this does not mean that the lords of Thebes were without power or prestige. They certainly had in the years preceding the destruction of the New Kadmeion. Finds from the destruction layer of the palace include a variety of rare artefacts, including ivory legs of a throne, smaller ivory carvings, an abundance of jewellery, pottery (a remarkable amount coming from Crete) and testify to Thebes’ contacts with Cyprus and the Levant. Egyptian artefacts are rare, and I know of only one artefact that might be of Anatolian origin. A collection of Babylonian cylinder seals has been taken as evidence for Theban prominence in Greece, but while this assemblage clearly demonstrates the prestige that the Theban lords must have enjoyed whilst their palace was still standing, the fact remains that at the apparent pinnacle of Ahhiyawan power (as indicated by the Tawagalawa letter), Thebes and its Boeotian hinterland experienced a series of setbacks, which makes the equation with Ahhiyawa implausible.

---

334 Cf. Hurwit 1999, 76.
337 Cf. Cline 1994; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990; Kelder 2005b, 151-156. Of special interest are 39 lapis lazuli cylinder seals found together in a room of the palace. Edith Porada devoted a thorough study to these remarkable pieces, a majority of which seems to have been of Kassite origin, and proposed that these had been sent as a greeting gift by the Assyrian King Tukulti-Ninurta I, after his conquest of Babylon, to the King of Thebes (Porada 1981-1982, 69). The fact that these seals in total weigh approximately one *mina*, which appears to have been the standard measure of a greeting gift of lapis lazuli in the Amarna Letters lends some credibility to this proposition, but the late date of Tukulti-Ninurta’s reign (1233-1197 BC) is problematic as the Theban palace by that time would have been but a smoking heap of rubble. The fact that the seals where found in close association with a lapis lazuli workshop (as already pointed out by Porada) suggests the seals were used as raw material. That 10 of these seals appear to have been of Cypriot provenance may suggest that we are dealing here with an assemblage of seals, rather than a single shipment of greeting gifts.
Although one could thus argue that Thebes was a significant regional centre, with contacts to the Levant and Cyprus, there just is too little evidence for more than that. Neither archaeology, nor contemporary texts have produced a single convincing piece of evidence that would allow for the equation with Ahhiyawa.

Since Thebes is unlikely to have been the “capital” of Ahhiyawa, we have to look for another candidate. It is time to direct our attention to Mycenae. Unlike Thebes, Mycenae lost its importance in the last century of the Bronze Age, never to regain it. Although it remained an independent polis until the 5th century BC, habitation seems to have declined significantly from the early 12th century onwards and there consequently has been little later (building) activity. The archaeological record, as a result, has been left relatively intact. Excavations have, over the years, revealed the larger part of the Bronze Age acropolis, as well as the occupation immediately around it. Moreover, more than 200 chamber tombs have so far been identified in the hills surrounding the citadel – a number only surpassed by the supposed number of chamber tombs at Nauplion- and it is generally assumed that these cemeteries mark the limit of the habitation area. The settlement around the citadel would, as a consequence, cover some 32 hectares. For its size alone – unsurpassed in the Mycenaean world- one could already argue that Mycenae was a centre of extraordinary status. Yet it is not only the size of its settlement, but a whole range of unique features that makes Mycenae stand out amongst the palatial centres of Late Bronze Age Greece. Most notable amongst these features is the size of Mycenae’s megaron and the monumental approach to the palace, but other features include, following French:

* The quantity and range of the grave goods and degree of wealth in the Shaft Graves of Grave Circle A
* The nine tholos tombs, forming a sequence of increasing fineness and elaboration and of which six belong to a single period, LH IIA.
* The early construction of Cyclopean walls (with Tiryns)

339 French 2005, 125.
341 See ill. 5.
342 French 2005, 125.
Whereas the wealth displayed in the shaft graves in principle does not decide the argument that Mycenae was Greece’s leading centre during the last centuries of the Mycenaean period, it does testify to the early prosperity –and power- of the lords of Mycenae. As we shall see below, this observation –combined with other archaeological evidence- is of interest when reconstructing the rise of Mycenae to become the leading centre in the Peloponnese.

Mycenae’s continuous prosperity can be deduced from the sheer monumentality of the tombs of its ruling elite in the years following the shaft grave period: the unprecedented number of large tholos tombs, of which the majority is usually considered to have been built in LH IIA, indicate Mycenae’s extraordinary status already in the early Mycenaean period. Moreover, the early fortifications, with the earliest cyclopean walls erected as early as LH IIIA\(^3\), suggest a continuing wish and ability of its leading elite to impress and demonstrate its power and influence, extending from the period of the shaft graves right down to the palatial period.

While we can only guess how the lords of Mycenae acquired such wealth and status, there is reason to suppose that their rule extended not only over the valley around Mycenae and that Mycenae’s realm included the whole of Korinthia already at a very early stage. This hypothesis is mainly informed by survey results, with especially the lack of significant settlements and the absence of monumental tombs suggesting that Korinthia’s seat of power must be sought elsewhere.\(^3\) Considering the close proximity of Mycenae, as well as the presence of a Mycenaean road connecting Mycenae with the isthmus\(^4\), it is difficult to see how it should not have been Mycenae that controlled this

---

\(^3\) Kilian 1988b, 134; Iakovidis 1983, 57.

\(^4\) Cherry / Davis 2001, 154-156. The recent discovery of a tholos near the ancient city of Korinth does not change the point that major settlements and monuments are (with this one exception) notably absent in the Korinthia.

region. In effect, the same goes for Achaea, where I know of no significant centre until
the very late palatial period (with the rise of the centre at Teichos Deimaion).

A similar argument can be made for the inclusion of the Argive plain in the Kingdom of
Mycenae. The whole system of Mycenaean roads attested or reconstructed in the Argive
plain, including the bridge at Kazarma leading to the plain of Epidauros, centres on
Mycenae. Moreover, its settlement’s size, the size of the palace and the monumentality
and number of the tholos tombs make Mycenae stand out amongst the other centres in the
Argolid, including Tiryns. Taking all these facts together, it appears likely that, at least
from LH IIIA onwards, the whole of the Argive plain was part of the Kingdom of
Mycenae. This explains the omitting of Tiryns, Midea and Argos –to name just the major
centres in the area- in the Kom el Hetan list: only Mycenae and Nauplion –the port of
arrival- were of importance to any visiting diplomat.

It is of importance to realize just how substantial this territory really was. None of the
other Mycenaean palatial centres appears to have ruled much more than what could be
considered its “natural territory”; the areas roughly equivalent to modern Greece’s
provinces (i.e. Messenia, Boeotia, Attica), yet Mycenae ruled a territory at least two and
arguably even three times that size. Moreover, and I have stressed this already above, its
territory would have included various major centres, such as Tiryns and Nauplion:
centres that could plausibly be seen as important yet dependent subcentres, ruled by
branches of Mycenae’s royal family. If so, this would be paralleled by the
contemporary and the well-attested Hittite practice of installing members of the royal
family in such centres as Carchemish and Halab, or –closer to the Mycenaean world-
Mira, usually described as Sekundogenitur. If so, the two rather unimpressive tholos
tombs at Tiryns erected during the second half of the 13th century –at the zenith of
Mycenaean power- could be interpreted as the tombs of the local vassals.

Yet there are more arguments why Mycenae must have been the leading centre in Late
Bronze Age Greece. One of these is the scope of its contacts with the east.

---

346 Cf. Crouwel Supra.
347 Kelder 2005b, 164.
348 See Bryce 2003.
Mycenae has yielded an unparalleled array of *Orientalia*, including approximately 40 objects from Egypt.\textsuperscript{349} Apart from these *Aegyptiaca*, some 37 objects of Levantine origin and 6 objects of Cypriot origin (not counting an unspecified number of copper ingots\textsuperscript{350}) testify to Mycenae’s far-flung contacts with the East.\textsuperscript{351} Yet, it is not only the amount of oriental artefacts at Mycenae indicating the centre’s extraordinary position in the Greek world, but it is also the quality of the finds. In this respect I should especially mention the faience plaques with the royal “cartouche” of Amenhotep III. Above, I already noted the importance of these pieces especially because of their distinctly royal connotation.\textsuperscript{352} But perhaps even more striking is the fact that one of these plaques was later used in the “cult centre” of the citadel of Mycenae, i.e. in a context that is rather similar to the Egyptian practice of depositing such plaques in temples or palaces.\textsuperscript{353} Even if one is not willing to follow Helck’s proposition that the plaques at Mycenae once adorned the windowsills of an “Egyptian room” as part of an Egyptian embassy at Mycenae\textsuperscript{354}, this indicates that the rulers of Mycenae were at least aware of the approximate “value” or appreciation of these objects in their original cultural setting (i.e. Egypt). This, in turn, argues for regular contacts between Egypt and Mycenae on a whole different level than, for example, Theban connections with the Levant –where eastern status symbols such as the lapis lazuli cylinder seals were simply considered to be useful raw material (supra).

The obvious problem with equating Mycenae with Ahhiyawa is the conspicuous lack of artefacts from Anatolia. In the pages above, we have seen that the King of Ahhiyawa and the Hittite Great King exchanged messengers at least from the reign of Hattušili III onwards. Considering the apparent familiarity of the Ahhiyawan court with both Hittite and Arzawan nobility, one would expect that the exchange of messengers also involved the exchange of greeting gifts –as was the practice elsewhere in the orient. Indeed, Hattušili’s exclamation that the Ahhiyawan messenger did not bring him any gifts\textsuperscript{355}, suggests that this was not normal practice. There thus is reason to assume that Hittite / Anatolian objects were sent to the Ahhiyawan court, yet Mycenae has only yielded a

\textsuperscript{349} Cf. Lambrou–Phillipson 1990; see also Cline 1994, 145 ff.; Pendlebury 1930, 55.
\textsuperscript{350} Cf. Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 335.
\textsuperscript{351} Lambrou–Phillipson 1990; see also Cline 1994, 145 ff.
\textsuperscript{352} See above, page 54, note 266.
\textsuperscript{353} Cf. Phillips 2007 for extensive discussion.
\textsuperscript{354} Helck 1995, 80. See also Haider 1996.
\textsuperscript{355} *KUB* XIV 3 (supra).
mere three Anatolian objects; all predating the 13th century.\textsuperscript{356} This problem does, however, not affect only Mycenae. Cline listed a total of only 12 Anatolian objects in Aegean Late Bronze Age contexts, whereas elsewhere –even in lands like Egypt, which we know to have been in close contact with the Hittites- Hittite objects are so rare that when one is found, a whole article is devoted to it.\textsuperscript{357} Considering this, we may assume that Anatolian / Hittite objects have either not been recognized as such (which is unlikely) or were of perishable nature. The same may apply to the Ahhiyawan ware which must have been sent to the Hittite court.

A final argument in favour of the equation of the Kingdom of Mycenae with Ahhiyawa is the relative stability of the Kingdom of Mycenae. Although archaeology has demonstrated that parts of the habitation around the citadel, including some of the “Houses” which probably served some kind of administrative purpose, suffered destruction by fire somewhere during the late LH IIIB2 period, there is very little to suggest that the lords of Mycenae experienced troubles or perceived any serious threat until the very end of the 13th century.\textsuperscript{358} Quite the contrary; Mycenae and the other centres in the Argolid seem to have reached their peak of prosperity and population size during the mid 13th century. The same applies to Korinthia, where the Nemea valley was drained so as to provide for more agricultural land.\textsuperscript{359} Nowhere in the Argolid or in Korinthia is there any trace of severe unrest; there are no major destructions, no apparent changes in population. If there was any Kingdom in mainland Greece that would fit the image of a powerful, stable and prosperous Kingdom during the 13th century, it must have been that of the Lords of Mycenae.

\textsuperscript{356} Cline 1994, 271.
\textsuperscript{357} As for example the single (!!) Hittite pendant found in the remains of Akhetaten.
\textsuperscript{358} Wace (1954, 243) postulated that the so-called “House of the Oil Merchant”, was destroyed during LH IIIB2 by human conduct. He suggested that the vases found inside had been used to store olive oil and were deliberately smashed to fuel the flames. Later excavations yielded however evidence for a destruction as a result of an earthquake, of which displaced walls are the clearest testimony (Mylonas 1983, 146). In a paper presented in 1941, Carl Blegen argued for Mycenae as a ‘capital’ on the Mainland, and that the mainland elites “deliberately adopted and absorbed a great many of refinements of Minoan civilization [...] the culmination of the process may be seen in the overthrow of Cretan power and the capture of the Chief Minoan centers” (Blegen 1941, 9). Though Blegen considered the rulers of Mycenae as ‘arbiters’ of a civilization of Minoan and Mainland heritages, he appears not to have considered Mycenae the capital of a veritable unified state.
\textsuperscript{359} Cf. Cherry / Davis 2001, 154-156.
If we are thus arguing for a unified Mycenaean Kingdom, covering the larger part of the Greek mainland and centred upon Mycenae, we must ask the question whether there is any direct archaeological evidence for Mycenaean unity.

This immediately raises a methodological problem. To look for a unified Kingdom, or “Empire” as one is almost inclined to call it, on archaeological grounds is notoriously difficult. The contemporary and nearby example of the Hittites, whose most important sites were known decades before the Hittite script was deciphered, but whose lost Empire was only pieced together after the decipherment of the latter, rings clear.

Moreover, “Empires” may vary in territorial size, composition, ideology and the measure of central authority. The Roman Empire of the 2nd century AD, for example, had a totally different social organization, ideology of rule and military structure than, say, the “Holy Roman Empire” of the German Middle Ages – despite the fact that the latter was essentially built on the memory of the former. Consequently, we must first address the problem of defining the concept of Empire and establish the various ways in which social organization, the degree of control of the central authority on the periphery, and the ideology of imperial rule may have differed over space and time.

Roughly speaking, one can identify two different types of Empire. The first could best be described as a conglomerate of peer polities, bound together by economic or military needs. The cohesion of such an Empire is limited to a degree of cooperation between peer polities, with one of the member states achieving temporal hegemony over the others. Historical parallels for this type of Empire are found in Early Dynastic Sumer, in


361 See for example Sayce 1910, 72 ff. on the reconstruction of the Hittite Empire on the basis of Hittite glyptics, possible only after the realization that various steles found throughout the Near East (at Aleppo, Hamah and Karabel, for example) were inscribed in Hittite hieroglyphic. Here too, we see that the Empire is still reconstructed as Syrian-based, rather than Anatolian – a result of the earliest European knowledge of the Hittites a scatter of Syrian principalities, the Khatte, in the Bible. See Macqueen 1975, 22 ff. for a brief overview of the development of Hittite scholarship.

Classical Greece, or the Holy Roman Empire in Germany during the Middle Ages.\[363\] Although the member states of such Empires could, especially when there was a clearly identifiable “common” foe, organize themselves into a military unity, such cooperation was usually limited to periods of crisis. The concept of Empire in these cases was more a matter of the mind than of reality: an ideology of unity (whether through a common past –real or imagined-, culture, language or religion) shared by various essentially independent and “equal” polities. On the whole, most of these polities operated more or less independently. Needless to say, Empires of this sort are difficult to attest on archaeological grounds alone.\[364\]

By contrast, Empires of a more hierarchical structure, with a Great King governing vassal states through a complex bureaucracy, with one state clearly at the head of the others, should be easier to identify in the archaeological record. The eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age was dominated by Empires of this type, and examples include the Hittite Empire, the Middle Assyrian Empire, Babylon under the Kassites and New Kingdom Egypt. In these cases, there was no mistaking the head of state: in official documents, proclamations and dedications, the central authority was designated as the Great King, or –in Egypt- as “Pharaoh”, whereas the local vassals were referred to simply as King, or chief, or mayor. To express the hierarchy of the participants in intra- and inter-state correspondence, the respective rulers adopted a family metaphor.\[365\] Vassals would address their overlord (and in rare cases, the peers of their overlord) as “my father”, whereas they themselves were addressed as “my son”. Peers would address each other as “brother”. This was a totally different system than the city-state hegemonies; this was a world with a clear stratification between rulers, formalized with treaties and cemented by marriages between ruling houses. Succession too, was secured by treaties, with vassals pledging support not only to their present overlord, but also to his rightful heir. In these power structures, the royal administration was everywhere, affecting even the lives of the common people. Taxes were collected according to a centrally organized

\[363\] For Sumer see Postgate 1994, 1ff.; for Classical Greece see Rhodes 2007; for the Holy Roman Empire Turchin 2006 with references.

\[364\] Note in this respect Voltaire’s famous remark on the Holy Roman Empire: “Ce corps qui s'appelait et qui s'appelle encore le saint empire romain n'était en aucune manière ni saint, ni romain, ni empire.” (Essai sur l'histoire generale et sur les moeurs et l'espirit des nations, 1756).

system (which, in order to fulfil the obligations to the overlord, prompted increased centralization within the vassal Kingdoms themselves), while roads were constructed to connect the various parts of the Empire to the Kingdom at its core.\textsuperscript{366}

Two types of Empire, with –as indicated in contemporary texts- totally different backgrounds, organizations, ideologies, and economies. The question is whether both types might be reconstructed on the basis of a number of archaeological features.

In the pages below, we will propose a number of archaeologically traceable features that appear to be indicative for the existence of an Empire. These features should not be considered as a \textit{sine qua non}; if any or perhaps even all of these features are absent, we should not automatically dismiss the possibility that the area under study was, at some point, subject to one single authority. Conversely, the presence of these features does not automatically prove the existence of an Empire: they should not be misunderstood as \textit{criteria}, but rather as possible \textit{indices}, and only become meaningful in combination with other –textual- evidence.

The various archaeological features of an Empire stem from comparisons between a number of known Empires, including the Empire of Akkad, Ur III, Hammurabi’s Babylon, the Hittite Kingdom, Early Dynastic Egypt, and the Iron Age Empire of Urartu, as well as a number of more “modern” parallels. In order not to obstruct the argument that there are, in fact, archaeological indications for a Mycenaean Empire on the Greek mainland, the respective case studies are presented in small script, with “key-parallels provided at the end of each chapter, in italics.

\textbf{Intrusive architecture:} one of the clearest markers of an overarching authority is its architectural tradition, often markedly different from local traditions. Even in regions of general cultural uniformity, “imperial” building can normally be singled out on the basis of their standardized plans and uniformity. Good examples in this respect are Naram-Sin’s fort at Tell Brak, or the Assyrian governor’s palace at Til-Barsip.\textsuperscript{367} Similarly, in proto-dynastic Egypt, the erection of mudbrick structures replacing earlier buildings appears to have been directly related to state formation. As such, the construction of

\textsuperscript{367} Postgate 1994, 10; Mallowan 1947, 63-68 (non vidi).
mudbrick buildings throughout Egypt, although perhaps not directly a result of the unification of Egypt, seems to have been closely related to the rise of a unified Egyptian state.\textsuperscript{368} Likewise, the erection of a 1st dynasty royal fortress on lands that had hitherto belonged to a local shrine at Elephantine indicates the rise of a central authority with its own agenda—sometimes conflicting with local interests.\textsuperscript{369} Imperial structures, such as barracks, fortresses or palaces, apart from being a monumental sign of the power of the overlord, are usually built for administrative or military purposes. Precisely because they are meant to impress the local, subjugated, population they represent a different, intrusive type of architecture.

\textit{Examples: Mesopotamia (Akkad, Ur III, Hammurabi), Egypt, Urartu, Hittites.}

**Uniformity of administrative tools:** depending on the measure of control of the central authority on the periphery, local systems of measures and weights, as well as calendars, will be changed / adjusted to one, imperial system. An example of recent date is the use of our metric system—imposed by Napoleon Bonaparte. As such, the change to “imperial measures” can also be discernible in basic construction materials, such as the shapes and sizes of mudbricks or stones. The same applies to the sizes and shapes of clay tablets used for the administration. As a rule, in Mesopotamia at least, each political entity used its own types of clay tablets.\textsuperscript{370} Absorption into a larger Empire meant conforming to the shapes and sizes of that Empire.

\textit{Examples: Mesopotamia (Akkad, Ur III, Hammurabi), Hittites.}

**Imperial language:** Although the language of the imperial administration does not necessarily reflect the ethnic or cultural composition of the respective Empire, imperial administration was usually recorded in a single language—the language of the triumphant entity. In Sumer, the rise of Sargon of Akkad meant that Sumerian was no longer used for the administration, whereas the collapse of the Akkadian Empire and the rise of the third dynasty of Ur meant a return to Sumerian as imperial language. In Urartu, the imperial language appears to have been used virtually exclusively for the Empires administration.

\textsuperscript{368} Wilkinson 1999, 36.
\textsuperscript{369} Wilkinson 1999, 308, 329.
\textsuperscript{370} Postgate 2001,
and monuments: the population, and probably a number of Kings, spoke different –local-
tongues.

Examples: Mesopotamia (Akkad, Ur III, Hammurabi), Egypt, Urartu.

**Intrusive uniformity in material culture:** Since it can be changed by a single historical event, the political order is invariably less stable than the cultural, in time and space. However, if successful for some time, imperial rule almost without exception influences and changes local customs. Cultural changes as a result of the expansion of royal power are usually most evident with local elites, as a result of the central authority’s attempts to limit the elites’ display of power and the local elites’ desire to associate with the court and its culture. Proto-dynastic Egypt offers a good example, where an increase in uniformity in Southern Egyptian pottery styles (Naqada I to II) as a result of mass production and increased specialisation (which in turn led to the advent of a more complex pottery technology, with vessels of a new and distinctive type) appears to have been directly related to the rise of powerful elites at such centres as Hierakonpolis and This. In the case of Egypt, the new style of pottery was eventually adopted in all social strata. Elsewhere, for example in Urartu, Toprakkale pottery, while closely associated with Imperial fortresses, temples and palaces and usually considered a marker of Urartian rule, was not adopted by local potters—who continued producing a local, greyish type of pottery. With the collapse of the Urartian state, the local pottery styles survived, whereas Toprakkale pottery vanished.

Examples: Egypt, Urartu.

**Religious uniformity:** Along with the royal drive towards uniformity of material culture comes the move towards uniformity in religion. The nature of this drive is closely

---

371 Wilkinson 1999, 34 ff. The subsequent expansion of these centres correlated with the replacement of local pottery styles in Northern Egypt by these new types of Southern imports. Whether the north was gradually absorbed by (one of the) southern states or not, there are clear indications for profound changes in the social organisation of northern Egyptian communities, especially marked by increased hierarchy and changing burial customs, eventually leading to a socio-cultural koinè throughout Egypt by the beginning of the Naqada III period. Although the eclipse of northern culture may have been primarily the result of exchange processes, there is at least the suggestion of southern expansion towards the north, including the foundation of (trading) colonies in the eastern delta Cf. von der Way 1991; Kemp 1995, 687.

372 Zimansky 1995, 107. A case can be made to consider Urartu as a so-called “mirror Empire”, emerging in direct response to imperial state formation of the neighbours (Assyria); see Barfield 2001, 34 for comparisons.
connected to the status of the ruler. In early dynastic Egypt, local shrines (typically of a very open nature, without enclosure walls) that apparently did not fit into the state’s concept of religion were treated with notable contempt; we already noted that, in southern Elephantine, the entrance to a shrine of the local deity was blocked by the erection of a royal fortress.\(^{373}\) Interestingly, the state did not partake in any way in the embellishment or sustainment of local shrines. In contrast, those temples that were deemed fitting for state-interest, were either completely rebuilt (in stone), or adorned with stone reliefs. In those cases, access to the temples became restricted (by means of an enclosure wall): state religion was in the hands of the court and did not actively involve the local populations.\(^{374}\) In sum, there is a clear case of the state *versus* local religious traditions (even if some local religious traditions may become incorporated in “state” protocol). Needless to say, Egypt, where the drive to religious uniformity went hand in hand with the erection of a number of monuments to royal power –in the shape of miniature step pyramids!\(^{375}\)- throughout the realm, is an extreme example of unified statehood, but even in those cases where an Empire appears to have been a relatively “loose” construct, such as the city state leagues of early dynastic Sumer, there usually was a central shrine (whether this is conceptual or spatial is irrelevant), where the (most powerful) ruler(s) made his / their offering.\(^{376}\)

*Examples: Egypt, Mesopotamia (Early dynastic, Akkad, Ur III, Hammurabi), Hittites, Urartu.*

**Large-scale infrastructural projects:** In order to be able to effectively govern even the remote parts of the Empire, roads were needed to provide safe passage for troops, messengers and merchants throughout the realm.\(^{377}\) In case of troublesome terrain (mountains, rivers), the construction of bridges or passes would not only further transport throughout the region, but also provide for a visible marker of royal power. In Hittite Anatolia for instance, important mountain passes, including the Karabel Pass, were embellished with signs of royal power: a relief of the King, his patron deity, or simply the name of the King. In some cases, these landmarks also served as polity boundaries, in

\(^{373}\) Wilkinson 1999, 308, 329: see also above.
\(^{374}\) Wilkinson 1999, 272.
\(^{376}\) Postgate 1994.
which case (such as at Karabel) this was specified in the respective rock carving. The more centralized an Empire was, the more static its territorial concepts. Roads as a result were not only of practical use, for the transport of goods and men, but also of symbolic value, linking the various polities within the realm to the Empire’s heartland.

Examples: Hittites, Mesopotamia (Akkad, Ur III Hammurabi), Urartu, Etruscans, Roman Empire, Incas.

**Large-scale agricultural / economic projects:** Along with the desire to link the various parts of the Empire to the heartland by roads, comes the drive towards consolidation of royal economic power. In early dynastic Egypt, the installation of large “royal domains” and “royal estates” throughout the provinces, producing directly for the crown (for royal cult, for palace life, for distribution amongst followers) ensured economic power over the realm –and over the provincial elites.\(^{378}\) This custom prevailed throughout Pharaonic history, although the scale of the estates increased. During the Middle Kingdom, Amenhat III embarked on a project to drain the Fayum depression by directing superfluous water to a large canal –therewith furthering the region’s agricultural potential. Part of the Fayum subsequently was allocated to the crown.\(^{379}\) Centuries later, the Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt restored Amenhat’s canal and embarked on a project of land reclaiming in the same area, while under Roman rule, the whole of Egypt was essentially a royal estate (it did not fall under the senate’s administration). Similar practice is attested in Inca Peru, where the expansion of the Inca Kingdom went hand in hand with the installation of an increasing number of royal estates throughout the realm.\(^{380}\)

Examples: Egypt (all periods), Babylonia, Assyria, Roman Empire, Incas.

---

\(^{378}\) Wilkinson 1999, 117 ff. Domains (pr-nswt) were established by a particular King, above all to guarantee the maintenance of the royal mortuary cult and were substantial, though not necessarily contiguous, areas of farming land in the Delta. By contrast, Estates (hwt) seem to have been a more specific institution, either a particular locality or a foundation supplying a particular commodity.

\(^{379}\) Especially the huge complex later known as the “Labyrinth”, actually the mortuary temple of Amenhat III, was –as a royal estate- the important economic factor in the region.

\(^{380}\) D’Altroy 2001, 218 ff.
The features listed above share one characteristic: the suppression of local identity and the promotion of a state ideology. We have established in the previous pages that both the Hittite and the Egyptian textual records suggest the presence of a unified state in the Aegean, and our evaluation of the archaeology suggests that Mycenae is the most plausible candidate as a capital of Tanaju / Ahhiyawa. We now need to establish whether archaeological data corroborate that concept: is there indeed evidence for an “intrusive” culture on the Greek mainland in the Late Bronze Age? Can we indeed see a conscious drive towards uniformity, towards standardization and can we contribute this to the developments in the Mycenaean heartland? We will follow the order of the indices established above, starting with intrusive architecture.

**Architectural uniformity in the Mycenaean world:** A true typology of Mycenaean domestic architecture is difficult to establish, and though Pascal Darcque, in his important 2005 monograph “L’Habitat Mycénien”, distinguished a “simple” and a “complex” type of domestic architecture, many buildings appear to have been modified rigorously over time, radically changing the character of the structures.\(^{381}\) On the whole, Mycenaean houses appear to have consisted of a number of rather generic spaces, without a specific purpose and used for various domestic tasks.\(^{382}\) There appears to have been remarkably little development in domestic architecture throughout the Mycenaean era; shapes and building techniques are largely the same throughout the Late Helladic Period.\(^{383}\) Mycenaean domestic architecture stems largely from preceding Middle Helladic traditions\(^{384}\); both in shapes and location of settlement, and we probably should see the uniformity of domestic architectural traditions throughout the Greek mainland as the result of a shared past, rather than Mycenaean (cultural) expansion.\(^{385}\) Moreover, the

---

\(^{381}\) Darcque 2005, 353; for substantial alterations of the architecture over time (including additional rooms, with a different alignment) see for example unit IV-6 at Nichoria (Darcque 2005, 350 with references, and Plan 107).

\(^{382}\) Darcque 2005, 353.

\(^{383}\) Darcque 2005, 355.

\(^{384}\) Darcque 2005, 354.

\(^{385}\) Although the use of mudbricks in Late Bronze Age Macedonia might be considered to have been the result of Mycenaean influence; Darcque 2005, 396. Note that while in Thessaly and regions north of
varying sizes of mudbricks used in the construction of (domestic?) structures at various sites strike us with a sense of “randomness”; there certainly is no evidence for a uniform measurement-system.  

In contrast to domestic architecture, Mycenaean palatial architecture was prone to a number of innovations and developments. Although there may be some argument for continuity from Early Helladic architectural traditions (corridor houses, such as the House of Tiles at Lerna) in the construction of the Mycenaean palaces, the scanty remains of a number of pre-palatial structures at various sites throughout Greece indicate that the “architectural evolution” of the Mycenaean palace was –initially at least- by no means a clear-cut path, but rather a wide array of local attempts to aggrandize the focus of the settlement. Minoan aspects, local traditions and innovations were mixed in various ways and to various degrees. In a way, the early Mycenaean period can, from an architect’s viewpoint, be considered a truly experimental phase with various results, some of which, such as the Menelaion at Sparta, “représenterait une sorte de prototype qui ne donnerait naissance à aucune véritable série”. With the wide variety of architectural traditions, innovations and failures in mind, the sudden rise of the “true” Mycenaean palace –the structure as we know it from LH IIIB, focussed around a single large megaron- and its implementation throughout the Greek mainland (the exact layout of the palaces at Thebes and Orchomenos is unclear but Dimini in Thessaly seems to have a clear focus on a megaron) is notable, and difficult to explain in terms of cultural interaction only.

It is generally acknowledged that the palaces of Pylos, Mycenae, and Tiryns, in architectural respect, essentially are the same. The newly discovered megara at Dimini

---

386 Darque 2005, 75, fig.8; Guest-Papamanoli 1978, 14-15 (including data from Crete).
387 Darque (2005, 376) rather unconvincingly suggests that the overall layout of the palace of Pylos (as a whole) resembles the layout of corridor houses, but fails to explain the gap in (monumental) architecture and notable change in material culture separating EH II from MH (or even EH III) and LH.
388 A large building built in LH IIIA Tiryns, might, on the grounds of similarities (orientation, structure) with the later palace be considered a veritable early Mycenaean palace (Cf. Kilian 1987b, 212, fig. 7), while a number of relatively large structures at various other sites (including Mycenae [remains of wall-paintings; Immerwahr 1990, Pl. XVI.], the Menelaion [a well-planned megaron complex; Hope Simpson / Diskinson 1979, 108], Pylos [a large structure with Cretan palatial features? Cf. Kilian 1987b, 213-17], and Thebes [the Old Kadmeion; see above]) seem to indicate a similar drive towards increased monumentality of the centres of the respective local administrations, though in a different execution.
389 Darque 2005, 374.
may be interpreted as (part of) a palatial unit and could, perhaps, be added to the list. These palaces all share a number of distinctive features, such as:

- The focus on one central megaron, alongside which relatively narrow corridors provide access to storage-rooms.

- Access to the megaron unit is provided through a court, partly surrounded by colonnades.

- The court is reached via a propylon, set at a different axis as the rest of the palace-unit. In the case of Tiryns, there is a second propylon and a second court, while at Mycenae, the propylon (sometimes designated with the misnomer “west porch”) is built downhill, northwest of the palace and granting access to a path running uphill (which in turn, via a corridor, ends into the court).

A number of features have only been attested at some of the palaces. Most notable is the presence of a second, but smaller, megaron at the palaces of Pylos, Tiryns and Mycenae. This particular structure in all three cases appears to have been a completely integrated element in Mycenaean palatial architecture, to the point that Kilian described the typical Mycenaean palace as a “bipartite unit which consists of a main palace (megaron or great hall) and a secondary one, each with its own independent functional units”.

In the chapter on the status of the wanax and the lawagetas (p.17), I have already noted that, despite the fact that the position of both officials in Mycenaean society is quite unclear, the wanax is usually considered to have been the person residing in the “great” megaron, whereas the smaller megaron unit is considered to have been the “office” of the lawagetas. In the context of a greater, unified Mycenaean Kingdom, this is an interesting hypothesis –especially if one (and there seems to be space [though –it cannot be stressed enough- no conclusive evidence!] for such a concept in the Linear B texts)

---

390 But see Younger 2005, who argues for the presence of a bathroom and a secondary megaron at Mycenae, and postulates a standardized plan, reflecting standardized concepts and functions, of the Mycenaean palaces.

391 Kilian1988, 293; for a comparison of the various Mycenaean palaces and their reflection of typical Mycenaean political structures, see Kilian 1987a, 21-38.

392 With “residing” I mean, of course, the official duties of the wanax (whatever the nature), and do not imply that the wanax actually lived in the megaron (he may have lived on the first floor).
considers the wanax to have been the overlord and the lawagetas as the local lord, in which case Kilian’s “bipartite unit” may be the architectural reflection of the Mycenaean Kingdom’s hierarchical structure of power.

There is no point in dealing with the endless list of publications on the iconography of palace frescoes here, since essentially all of these publications argue from the basic assumption that the wanax, as a local, autonomous monarch, resided in the central megaron, and that the iconography therefore was focused on his position in the local society. Proof for that assumption is, however, lacking. Suffice to note that even the iconography, for example the notable focus on marine motives (octopi, fish, and dolphins) at Pylos and Tiryns, is remarkably uniform throughout Greece. The uniformity of palace architecture throughout Greece stands in contrast to domestic architecture, which continues to be diverse and highly “individual” throughout the palatial period (and, indeed thereafter). It is questionable, especially with the diversity in proto-palatial architecture in mind, whether this uniformity can be considered to have been the result of cultural interaction solely –the Near Eastern parallels provided above would, at any rate, certainly allow for an imposition of uniform palatial architecture.

Uniformity of administrative tools in the Mycenaean world: It has already been noted that the uniformity of the palatial administrative system throughout Mycenaean Greece would, to a Near Eastern archaeologist at least, suggests that the various palaces were subject to a single authority. The shapes, the sizes and the way the administration was kept (tax collection, distribution of goods etc.) are virtually identical at every palace. Similarly, the numerals and methods of measurement appear to have been the same throughout the entire Mycenaean palatial world. Whether the Mycenaean calendar was equally uniform all over Greece remains unclear, because of the limited number of relevant Linear B texts. On the whole, there is no evidence for overlap in calendrical terms between the various palaces, although the fact that a number of month-names known from Cnossos have Classical parallels might indicate a widespread terminology. In sum, when it comes to uniformity of administrative tools throughout Greece, the Mycenaean palatial world conforms rather well to a highly organized Empire.

393 Vermeule 1957, 200; See also Ventris / Chadwick 1956, 199; Palmer 1955.
Imperial language in Mycenaean Greece: In the pages above, I have noted that the Linear B texts only deal with administrative matters. As a result, there is little variation in the formulas or the structures of the texts: the texts mainly consist of simple list of material and people. Despite the highly uniform nature of the texts, occasional mistakes, or “slips of the pen” seem to indicate that the language used for the palatial administration was not the language normally spoken by those that wrote it. Underneath the layer of the administrative language, there may have been a wide variety of local dialects. Assessing the various layers beneath Mycenaean Greek has proven to be a difficult exercise, and a variety of models has been proposed. There is no point in dealing with those varying models here; suffice to state that, since Mycenaean Greek appears to have been a language used primarily for the palatial administration while a significant part of the population of the palatial world would have spoken different dialects of Greek, Mycenaean Greeks may very well be considered an “Imperial language” or at least an elite language. As such, it may be considered as yet another argument in favour of a unified Mycenaean state.

Intrusive uniformity in Mycenaean material culture: Mycenaean material culture is widely believed to largely derive from the preceding Middle Helladic culture. This is especially evident in the pottery corpus, where the adoption of Minoan shapes (and decorations) essentially marks the shift from the Middle Helladic period to the Late Helladic, Mycenaean era. The adoption of Minoan examples cannot be explained from a purely technological viewpoint, since late Middle Helladic pottery was, at least in a

---

394 Cf. Chadwick 1976b, 103-117. Rupert Thompson (1996-1997, 303-333, esp. 330) argued that there is some variety in the language used by the various palatial administrations, and that linguistic changes in the various administrations seem to differ per administration. This might be taken as evidence that Mycenaean was not an “accounting artifice” but a veritable language, with regional differences / accents. However, as Thompson himself admits, “the level of differentiation between the language at different sites is surprisingly low” (although he suggests that this might be the result of the inadequacies of the Linear B script).

395 John Chadwick proposed that Doric, the dialect often thought to have arrived in the Greek world with the legendary invasion of the Dorians at the end of the palatial period, was already spoken by at least part of the population –possibly as a sort of lower class dialect opposed to the “imperial” administrative tongue. Cf. Chadwick 1976b, 103-117; see Drews 1988 (with references) for critiques and, most recently, Finkelberg 2005. Regardless of such details, the point remains that the diversity of dialects throughout the palatial world strongly suggests that Mycenaean Greek was an imperial veneer; a language for the administration, not for the people.
number of cases, of such a high quality that it was as good as the later Mycenaean pottery.\footnote{396} Interestingly, the “new” LH I style of pottery, including a number of shapes that are “patently of Cretan ancestry”, is thought to have been developed at a single specific centre, by a specific school, most likely to be situated in the north-east of the Peloponnese (i.e. the Argolid).\footnote{397} The new “Mycenaean” style developed rapidly and eclipsed local pottery traditions throughout the Greek mainland within a few generations, while Minoan influence became increasingly prominent.\footnote{398} It is, as a result, likely that the emerging Mycenaean elites adopted Minoan shapes and decorations for considerations of style, distinguishing them from the “commoners” –who continued, in part, to produce pottery in the old MH tradition.

Throughout palatial Greece, Mycenaean pottery was notably similar –pots at Pylos were essentially made and decorated in the same way as pots at Mycenae or Thebes.\footnote{399} This koinè persisted until the very end of the palatial period, and it was only during LH IIIB2 that local traditions began to emerge.\footnote{400} It is notable that “Mycenaean” pottery shapes, such as the stirrup jar or the kylix, did not survive the collapse of the palatial system for

\footnote{396} Dickinson (1974, 112) noted that some decorated pottery from Nichoria and Ay. Stephanos “are hard to distinguish from Mycenaean in appearance, while on a rather rare ware that seems to have been manufactured in the north-east Peloponnese, coated with red or black and decorated with dull cream-yellow or white, the paint is as lustrous as the best Mycenaean. The clay of this particular ware, as of some other Late Phase wares, such as the later bichrome types, is quite as well prepared as that of Mycenaean vases, and the vases themselves were probably wheel-made; in terms of technique Blegen was fully justified in classing it with LH I.”

\footnote{397} Dickinson 1974, 113, although Jeremy and Sarah Rutter (1976, non vidi) argue for a Laconian origin under Kythera influence (But see Coldstream 1979).

\footnote{398} For example, LH I pottery was found together with Late MH pottery in the shaft graves at Mycenae (see Dickinson 1974), whereas at Aegina, the earliest Mycenaean Phase (Ceramic Phase K) is characterized by the introduction of a few pieces of imported mainland pottery, mainly Vapheio cups and tea cups (Gauß / Smetana 2007, 66; see also Wohlmayr 2007 [although to me, his fragment 6, I think correctly identified as an alabastron, appears to be LH I, i.e. Mycenaean, rather than Late Middle Helladic]). LH II saw a significant increase of Minoan influence with the adoption of Minoan palatial style pottery. The LH IIA corpus of shapes was mostly of Cretan derivation, though Mycenaean potters continued to adapt the shapes to their own changing tastes/needs. After LH IIB, new shapes are mainly the result of these “Mycenaean” innovations (Cf. Mountjoy 1993, 31), although the introduction of the stirrup jar, probably in LH IIIA2, should probably be ascribed to Cretan influence (although Crete itself by this time was under Mycenaean control: the earliest (inscribed) stirrup jars on the Mainland appear to have been imports from Ghania, followed by a few vases from Mycenae; Mountjoy 1993, 74; Catling/Cherry/Jones/Killen 1980, 100).

\footnote{399} Although preferences in pottery shapes appear to have varied somewhat per region (although the shapes themselves are perfectly koinè Mycenaean) during the LH IIIA period. One may, perhaps, ascribe these differences to varying needs per region. During LH IIIB1 even these local preferences appear to have been minimal. Cf. Mountjoy 1999, 27-34.

\footnote{400} The most notable example is the above-mentioned “East Aegean – West Anatolian Interface” pottery, which emerged in LH IIIB, but only flourished during the post-palatial (LH IIIC) period. See Mountjoy 1999, 36 ff. for regional differences on the Mainland.
long—they become increasingly rare throughout LH IIIC and disappear from the record in the Sub-Mycenaean period. In contrast, shapes following the Middle Helladic tradition and which had enjoyed only minimal interest during the palatial era, survived the collapse of the Mycenaean world and became, in a number of cases (such as the kantharos) increasingly popular over the course of the Iron Age.

In effect, the change from the Middle Helladic pottery traditions to Mycenaean pottery during the first two centuries of the Late Helladic period appears to have been so distinct and so widespread, while the ensuing two centuries saw such an extraordinarily homogeneity in pottery production throughout the Aegean, that this is difficult to explain as a result of cultural exchange. Moreover, the prominence of Argive workshops—both in the early phases of the Late Helladic period and in the palatial period—as the “leaders in style” is, perhaps, best understood as a result of Argive political dominance over the Greek mainland, and a drive towards “cultural unification”—much like the principles we have observed in early Egypt or, especially, Urartu. With the collapse of royal authority, this cultural unity gradually disintegrated.

Religious uniformity in Mycenaean Greece: Archaeologically speaking, the Mycenaean would appear to have been a remarkably secular society. Shrines and temples are virtually absent in the archaeological record, whereas Mycenaean figurines are mostly small and unremarkable. However, the Linear B texts inform us that, at least in the Kingdoms of Pylos and Knossos, there must have been a variety of sanctuaries dedicated to a range of deities. Moreover, they indicate that there were religious festivities, with offerings to one or several Gods. The offerings differed, but usually included libations (of wine), the offering of meat and—most of all—the donation of quantities of olive oil. Indeed, the overall quantities of oil dedicated to the Gods are such that any practical use appears unlikely. In contemporary Egypt, texts indicate that (olive)

---

401 On the mainland, the only clear archaeological evidence for cult evidence during the palatial period comes from the Cult Centre at Mycenae, although a case may be made for cult activity at one of the megara found at Dimini (Thessaly). The shrines found at Tiryns all appear to belong to the post-palatial (LH IIIC) period. Excavations by W-D. Niemeier at Kalopodi in Boeotia may suggest that there may have been a late Mycenaean sanctuary there (lectures at the Archaeological Service, Athens, February 2008), while shrines are known at Ayia Irini on Kea, and at Philakopi on Melos.
oil was used “to keep the lamps of the temples burning”\footnote{Great Harris (I) papyrus; Cf. Breasted 1906 (A.R. III §239, 241; A.R. IV §236).} and we may, perhaps, think of similar principles in Greece.

The recurrence of a number of deities in texts from various palatial palaces indicates that the same Gods were worshipped throughout the entire Mycenaean palatial world, although the Cretan pantheon appears to have known a number of distinctly local divinities. Similarly, there may be some indications for local deities at various Mainland sites. At Tiryns, there is a notable preference for bovine figurines, whereas these hardly appear at Mycenae. At the same time, the snake figurines found at Mycenae appear to have been “site specific” and have not been found elsewhere. \footnote{Unpublished lecture (“Was dem Volke frommt…”) by Melissa Vetters at the DAI Athen, 15\textsuperscript{th} May 2007.} There thus is the suggestion that, much like in the Classical world, the Hittite Empire or Egypt, each centre had its own patron God or Goddess. On the whole, however, religion seems to have been rather uniform, although this of course does not mean that there were no regional differences or variations in the pantheon. This sense of general uniformity is also reflected in the archaeological record: at all palatial sites, the typical Mycenaean phi- and psi-figurines have been found.

It has been noted above that temples and shrines are conspicuously rare in the Mycenaean archaeological record. Monumental cultic buildings have not been found at any of the palatial centres, with the exception of the Cult Centre at Mycenae. The construction of that complex seems to have been a rather late development (of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century) and is difficult to interpret. We might speculate and view its construction, within the newly built cyclopean walls of the Mycenaean citadel, in the light of increased royal control over hitherto relatively “public” religious practice, or as a central sanctuary for the worship of all the Gods in the realm, but evidence for either interpretation is lacking.

The problem is to establish whether the sense of religious homogeneity throughout Greece is the result of an “imperial drive”, or rather the outcome of cultural interaction within the Mycenaean world. The presence of “local” Gods at Knossos, as well as a number of Knossos-specific epithets for the goddess potnia, while the majority of attested
deities in the Linear B texts are “Greek”, might indicate an overlay of new (Greek) deities over the native, Cretan set of beliefs. However, without a clear insight into the religious beliefs of the Middle Bronze Age society on the Greek mainland, it appears difficult to state anything with certainty about the development of Mycenaean religion on the mainland.

**Large-scale infrastructural and agricultural works in Mycenaean Greece:** One of the most remarkable features of Mycenaean society was its ability to gather resources and manpower to undertake large-scale infrastructural and agricultural projects. The sheer magnitude of a number of these projects alone makes one wonder whether any or even two or three of the “provincial centres” could be held accountable for their undertaking. Most notable in this respect are the drainage, colonization (to put it like that) and administration of the Kopaïs basin in Boeotia, the construction of a large dam near Tiryns (to prevent the flooding of the Tirynthian lower town), the drainage of the Nemea valley (originally a swamp) and, perhaps most notable, the construction of a harbour at Pylos. In case of the construction, probably sometime in LH III, of the port of Pylos, it has been stated that “the Kingdom at that time had sufficient economic incentive, manpower, know-how and political authority to justify and realize such a project”\(^\text{404}\) but the calculations behind this observation are nowhere explained. Indeed, the numbers of the Pylian workforce as evidenced in the Linear B texts seem rather small for such an undertaking. On the other hand, such a project would be more easily manageable if organized by a higher authority, able to draw manpower and resources from all of Greece.\(^\text{405}\)

Apart from furthering trade with the construction of ports capable of accommodating ships like the one excavated at Ulu Burun (which needed a quay for loading and offloading), and projects meant to increase agricultural capacity (such as the drainage of the Nemea valley and the Kopaïs basin), arguably the most famous infrastructural work from the Mycenaean era is the system of roads. Although it has been proposed that the Mycenaean roads were constructed to facilitate the transportation of bulk goods, loaded

\(^{405}\) And potentially add the numbers of the workforce with imported labourers from Anatolia. See the Tawagalawa letter, and comments in Bryce 2003b, 203.
on heavy vehicles, the general perception is that transport of large quantities of bulk goods, such as grain or olives, was rare.\textsuperscript{406} Rather, roads served to allow the speedy passage of chariots. Linear B texts from especially Pylos indicate that the palaces had a significant number of chariots at their disposal, and it appears likely that a number of these were used by the \textit{e-\textit{qe-ta}}, the “followers” often referred to in the same texts. These and other officials may have served as liaison officers, reporting to the King, conveying orders to local commanders, or –in case of emergencies- may have acted as heavy infantry, brought to the battlefield by chariot.\textsuperscript{407} Indeed, it appears likely that the Mycenaean system of roads served (perhaps not primarily, but at least prominently) a military role, facilitating the speedy deployment of troops and the monitoring of troublesome or border-regions.\textsuperscript{408} To this impression add the remains of a Mycenaean road in combination with what is thought to have been a Mycenaean fortification wall, spanning the isthmus near Corinth.\textsuperscript{409}

I have already noted above that the Mycenaean road connecting Mycenae with the isthmus is one of the reasons to consider the Korinthia as part of the Mycenaean heartland. As such, this road was part of a larger system of roads, which connected the various centres in the Argolid and focussed on Mycenae.\textsuperscript{410} Although only part of this system has survived, it seems clear that in terms of infrastructure, the Mycenaean era saw the zenith of Greek engineering. This appears not to have been restricted to the Argive plain: remains of Mycenaean roads have been found in Korinthia (where a highway linked Mycenae to the isthmus), Arcadia\textsuperscript{411}, Messenia (where there is the suggestion of a road connecting Pylos to Kalamata)\textsuperscript{412}, and Boeotia (especially in the Kopaïs basin).\textsuperscript{413} As Mc Donald argued: “there are several considerations –political, economic, military-which indicate that traffic overland was much better developed in the later second millennium BC than in the Classical period”,\textsuperscript{414} and although no remains of Mycenaean
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roads have (yet) been found that are unequivocally crossing the borders of the respective provincial principalities, there thus seems to be the suggestion of an overarching authority, asserting and consolidating its influence over even remote regions in a very practical (yet visible) way.

The archaeological evidence for a unified Mycenaean state

If we thus compare a number of archaeologically attested features for Empires with the archaeological evidence from Mycenaean Greece, we must conclude the following:

Archaeologically speaking, the Greek mainland in the Late Bronze is remarkably uniform. To some extent, this appears to have been the natural result of developments of the rather uniform material culture of the Greek Middle Bronze Age. At the same time, various local traditions (i.e. traditions that were not the same all over Greece during the Middle Bronze Age and the early phase of the Late Bronze Age), most notably monumental architecture and pottery traditions, dwindle in significance or die out, eclipsed by a new pan-Mycenaean tradition. In case of palace architecture, it is difficult to establish the source of this “Mycenaean palatial” style, but in the case of pottery production, the Argolid appears to have provided the example for the rest of the mainland.

As has been noted above, throughout the 14th and 13th century BC, Mycenaean pottery was made in essentially the same way throughout palatial Greece –in the Argive way. This immediately demonstrates the weakness of archaeology as a tool for establishing the territorial extent of a prehistoric state: the Mycenaean pottery koinè extends beyond the borders of the reconstructed territory of Ahhiyawa – Tanaju – Mycenae. Iolkos (Dimini) and Crete (Knossos and Ghania) are, archaeologically speaking, virtually indistinguishable from those centres and regions within the reconstructed Ahhiyawan realm. As a result, one can either include these regions in that reconstruction –but additional evidence for that is lacking- or one is to reject archaeology as a reliable means to reconstruct ancient states.

Rejecting archaeology as a reliable tool appears to be most prudent. The important observation is, in sum, that the archaeological data are compatible with the Hittite and
Egyptian texts, but do not prove the existence of a larger territorial state in Late Bronze Age Greece.
SYNTHESIS: THE RECONSTRUCTION OF A GREAT KINGDOM

We have now come to the final words of this research: we have seen that the “traditional” view of the Mycenaean palatial world, a world of several similar yet independent Kingdoms, can no longer be upheld. There are too many inconsistencies with contemporary texts and a general lack of conclusive evidence for that remarkably “Classical” view on the Mycenaean world, with competing Kingdoms bound together only by language and culture -as was the case with the later Greek poleis of the 6th to 3rd century BC.

The Linear B texts, which have long been the “fuel” for this view are unreliable when it comes to reconstructing any political entity, if only because of their extremely limited scope in time (last years of the palatial administration) and ambition (meant only to record the flow of men and goods in each respective territory).

It has been demonstrated that the archaeological data in no way provide any evidence for the popular scenario of a Mycenaean Greece consisting of various independent polities. By contrast, a number of archaeological features, especially the cultural uniformity, the uniformity of the palatial administrations, and the ability to embark on large-scale projects, would allow for some sort of an overarching authority. However, conclusive archaeological evidence for such a scenario is lacking.

Contemporary Hittite texts indicate the presence of an Aegean Kingdom called Ahhiyawa, which is strengthening its hold on western Anatolia from circa 1400 till 1220 BC. During this period, the Kings of Ahhiyawa are clearly able to deal with the Hittite Kings both in a military and diplomatic way and are of such stature that they are called “Great King” from the mid 13th century onwards. The major Ahhiyawan foothold in Anatolia was Miletus; a sizable, prosperous Mycenaean settlement for most of the Late Bronze Age. Yet it was only a foothold: Ahhiyawa’s political centre was situated elsewhere: it has been demonstrated that Mycenae is the most plausible candidate in this respect.

On the other hand, Egyptian texts indicate that from the reign of Thutmose III till at least the reign of Amenhotep III, the Egyptians were aware of an Aegean Kingdom called Tanaju, which centred upon Mycenae (and its harbour Nauplion). Other parts of this
Kingdom are only named as regions and include Kythera, Messenia, the Thebaid and possibly Elis (see map 2).

Because of the Kom el Hetan list, the geographical extent of Tanaju is roughly known, although some of the identifications are open to debate. With Tanaju covering most of the Peloponnese and probably the Thebaid, there is only very little room left for independent entities in the Aegean. As Ahhiyawa was an important state, capable in pursuing its aims in Anatolia both politically and militarily, it is very doubtful whether this entity would fit in the space left in the Aegean. It also implies an unlikely gap in both Hittite and Egyptian intelligence, as both of these Kingdoms apparently were unaware of an important entity in the Aegean. Pondering these matters, it is compelling to consider Ahhiyawa to be the same as the Tanaju land known from the Kom el Hetan list. In other words: Tanaju = Ahhiyawa = the (larger part of the) Peloponnese, the Thebaid, various islands in the Aegean and Miletus on the Anatolian west coast, with Mycenae as its capital.
Het Koninkrijk van Mycene
Een Groot Koninkrijk in het Egeïsche gebied
Inleiding

De wereld van de Late Bronstijd werd gedomineerd door verschillende grote rijken, zoals het koninkrijk der Hettieten, en Egypte. Ook Cyprus was een belangrijk gebied, vooral vanwege de gunstige ligging voor de handel en de koperreserves van het eiland. Men heeft altijd de neiging gehad om de wereld van de Late Bronstijd ruwweg gelijk te stellen met de “Hochkulturen” van de zogenaamde vruchtbare halve maan. Europa daar tegen werd lange tijd als een min of meer onafhankelijk en onbekend gebied gezien dat alleen via onduidelijke handelsroutes contact onderhield met de grote oosterse culturen. Het is intussen duidelijk geworden dat Kreta en Griekenland wel degelijk een belangrijke rol speelden in de internationale handel en politiek van de Late Bronstijd en dat de gebieden nauwe contacten onderhielden met de oriënt. Dat de contacten tussen deze gebieden en het oosten niet altijd van vredzame aard waren blijkt steeds meer uit Hettitische teksten en nieuwe archeologische gegevens. Bovendien wekken de Hettitische teksten de indruk dat er in Griekenland sprake was van een groot koninkrijk, genaamd Ahhijawa. In dit artikel zal dieper in worden gegaan op de politieke opbouw van Griekenland in deze tijd, wat de plaats van Ahhijawa was en wat voor rol dit gebied speelde op het internationale vlak.

De belangrijkste centra

Hoewel dit niet noodzakelijk op een politieke eenheid wijst, kan men vanuit archeologisch perspectief zonder meer spreken van een culturele eenheid in Griekenland gedurende de Late Bronstijd. De cultuur wordt de Mykeense genoemd, naar de beroemde site in de Argolis. Het leidt geen twijfel dat Kreta en het vasteland tijdens de 14e en 13e eeuw gedomineerd werden door verschillende grote centra, die men in de regel als palatiaal betitelt. Belangrijke voorbeelden zijn te vinden op de Peloponnesos, zoals Mykene, Tiryns, Midea en –in Messenië- Pylos. Lakonië kende een belangrijk centrum op de plek van het latere Menelaion, maar deze site lijkt in de 14e en 13e eeuw over haar hoogtepunt heen. Buiten de Peloponnesos werd Attika in de 13e eeuw gedomineerd door het centrum op de Atheense akropolis; daarvoor lijkt het gebied politiek versnipperd te zijn geweest en was er geen sprake van één dominant centrum. Boeotië telde ten minste twee grote palatiale centra. Thebe domineerde het zuidoosten, terwijl Orchomenos het belangrijkste centrum in het noordwesten was. Verwoestingslagen in deze twee centra, alsmede enkele kleinere, naburige centra geven de indruk dat het gebied betrekkelijk onrustig was gedurende de 13e eeuw. Ten noorden van Boeotië ligt Thessalië: tot voor kort een terra incognita voor de archeologen van de Late Bronstijd. Onlangs werd bij de neolithische “tell” van Dimini
een groot centrum ontdekt, en het heeft er alle schijn van dat hier –zo men legenden met archeologie wil combineren- het legendarische Iolkos gelegen was.

Politieke eenheid of niet?

Hoewel deze centra ontegenzeglijk tot dezelfde cultuur behoord, leidde een gebrek aan duidelijke bewijzen vóór grotere politieke verbanden, zoals een verenigd Mykeens rijk uit de Ilias, bij de meeste archeologen tot het idee dat Griekenland, net als in de Klassieke Tijd, politiek gefragmenteerd was. De verschillende Mykeense vorstendommen zouden onafhankelijk van elkaar hebben bestaan, zoals de “poleis” dat in het klassieke Griekenland deden. Dat er wel degelijk aanwijzingen voor grotere verbanden waren, met name in de Hettitische teksten en Lineair B tabletten, werd nauwelijks opgemerkt. Zo blonk de overigens interessante bundel *Rethinking Mycenaean Palaces* die in 1999 het licht zag, uit in archeologische beschouwingen van de paleizen, waarbij woorden als “marginaliteit” en “regionaal” de boventoon voerden. De oude teksten, zowel Hettitische als Lineair B, werden grotendeels buiten beschouwing gelaten. Het artikel van Bennet –het enige artikel dat juist wel de teksten behandelde- had een heel andere toon. Uit de teksten blijkt juist dat de Mykeense paleizen in nauw contact met elkaar moeten hebben gestaan. Bennet merkte op dat bepaalde namen van hoge functionarissen voorkwamen in archieven van Pylos, Knossos, Thebe en Tiryns en schreef: “*several names [...] appear in more than one archive, suggesting at least the possibility that all of these persons were members of a single ruling dynasty.*” Niet alleen de teksten spreken voor een zekere mate van overkoepelend bestuur in grote delen van Griekenland, gedurende in elk geval de 13e eeuw. Ook de aanleg van wegen tussen de grote centra, de bouw van grensfortificaties en grote projecten zoals de inpoldering van hele meren, wijzen op meer dan lokale politiek. Daar komt nog bij dat contemporaine Hettitische teksten gewag maken van een (Groot) Koning van Ahhijawa.

Groot koning in Griekenland

Nu recentelijk de geografie van Hetietisch Anatolië vast is komen te staan, wordt algemeen aanvaard dat Ahhijawa ten westen van Hetietisch territorium moet hebben gelegen, dat wil zeggen in Grieks gebied. Rest de vraag of Ahhijawa dan een deel van dit gebied besloeg, of geheel Griekenland. Sommigen, zoals Mountjoy, situeren Ahhijawa op de eilanden, bij Rhodos. Afgezien van het feit dat Mountjoy’s theorie vrijwel volledig gefundeerd is op de zogenaamde Oost Aegeïsche koine –een bepaalde wijze van aardewerkdecoratie die slechts op de eilanden in zwang was en naar Mountjoy’s idee wijst op een culturele en dus (?!?) politieke eenheid – houdt dit geen rekening met de implicaties van de titel Groot Koning. Deze titel, die door de Hettitische
vorst Hattušili III (1267-1237 v. Chr.) aan zijn Griekse collega werd toegekend in een brief vol klachten over Griekse activiteit op de Anatolische westkust, impliceert dat de Griekse vorst gelijk in rang werd geacht met de Hettitische koning. De precieze lading van de titel Groot Koning is niet echt duidelijk en het lijkt er op dat deze verschilde per regio / cultuur. Duidelijk is in elk geval wel dat het een aanduiding was voor een vorst die verschillende andere heersers had onderworpen en schatplichtig had gemaakt en bovendien in staat was een aanzienlijke strijdmacht in het veld te brengen. Het feit dat de titel in de regel voorbehouden was aan de heersers van Egypte, Babylon, Assyrië en Hatti geeft al aan dat het de Bronstijd equivalent van de moderne term “supermacht” was. Men mag daarom verwachten dat de hoofdstad van de Griekse Groot Koning een centrum van formaat was en dat diens territorium van aanzienlijke omvang moet zijn geweest. Een site die met enige waarschijnlijkheid de hoofdstad van zo’n Bronstijd supermacht zou zijn geweest ontbreekt te enen male op de Griekse eilanden. Bovendien lijken de eilanden – zelfs al zouden zij verenigd zijn onder één heerser – wat betreft territoriale omvang en wat betreft bevolkingsomvang - nauwelijks voldoende om een term als Groot Koning te rechtvaardigen. Daar komt nog bij dat de 13e eeuw, de periode waarin Hattušili zijn brief schreef, een periode van achteruitgang en betrekkelijke armoede is op Rhodos; iets wat moeilijk te rijmen valt met de expansionistische supermacht die uit de Hettitische brief naar voren komt.


De hoofdstad van Ahhijawa

De vraag of de attributie van de titel Groot Koning aan de vorst van Ahhijawa geheel terecht was of meer voortkwam uit “realpolitik” van Hettitische zijde blijft problematisch. Voorlopig volstaat te constateren dat gedurende de 13e eeuw Ahhijawa een mogendheid was waar de Hettieten rekening mee moesten houden. De heerser van dit land zetelde in een paleis, in een grote hoofdstad en ongetwijfeld werden daar de buitenlandse gezanten ontvangen. Het zou zich dus lonen deze hoofdstad te zoeken alvorens verdere uitspraken te doen over de status van Ahhijawa. Eerder heb ik al vermeld dat Ahhijawa waarschijnlijk in Griekenland te zoeken is – de hoofdstad daarom ook. Een probleem is echter dat geen enkele tot dusverre bekende site Hettitische teksten
heeft opgeleverd. De hoofdstad van Ahhijawa zou op andere gronden moeten worden geïdentificeerd. Redelijke criteria daarvoor zijn formaat, monumentaliteit, rijkdom en de hoeveelheid buitenlandse import. Indien men met deze criteria naar de sites kijkt, blijven in feite alleen Thebe in Boeotië en Mykene in de Argolis over als mogelijke hoofdstad. Aangezien opgravingen te Thebe betrekkelijk beperkt zijn gebleven al gevolg van moderne bewoning over de oude nederzetting, terwijl de citadel van Mykene vrijwel volledig is onderzocht, is een vergelijking tussen de twee sites wellicht niet helemaal fair, maar mijns inziens is ook over Thebe voldoende bekend om een reële afweging te maken.

Al op het eerste gezicht kan worden gesteld dat Mykene beduidend monumentaler is dan enig andere site in het Griekeland van de Late Bronstijd. De cyclopische muren en de enorme tholos graven nabij de citadel getuigen van de status die Mykene moet hebben gehad. De Leeuwenpoort wordt beschouwd als het summum van de sculptuur in Bronstijd Griekenland, en het is waarschijnlijk dat het reliëf ook indertijd al uniek was. De bouwwijze van de omliggende bastions en de uitvoering van het monument zelf zijn vaak gezien als voorbeelden van Anatolische invloed in Griekenland, en inderdaad zijn er overeenkomsten aan te wijzen tussen de verdedigingswerken te Mykene en die van Hattuša. Een interessante verhandeling hierover levert Bryce 2003. De monumentaliteit van Mykene steekt af tegen de vrijwel volledige afwezigheid van grote muren, poorten en torens te Thebe. Het is aannemelijk dat Thebe een vestingmuur heeft gehad –enkelen menen zelfs dat deze muur de gehele nederzetting, en dus niet slechts de citadel, omringde- maar hier is niets van over. Er wordt wel gesteld dat de Mykeense muren het verloop van de latere, Klassieke muren hadden. Het is evident dat veel van de Bronstijd architectuur in Thebe is verdwenen als gevolg van latere bebouwing. Desalniettemin is het onwaarschijnlijk dat een monument vergelijkbaar met de Leeuwenpoort ook te Thebe heeft bestaan. Men zou hier ten minste enige overblijfselen van verwachten. De muren van Thebe waren eenvoudigweg minder groots dan die van Mykene. Ook de grafvelden van Thebe stralen minder allure uit dan die van Mykene. Koepelgraven ontbreken, hoewel er wel enkele kamergraven zijn aangetroffen die men als koninklijk betitelt.

Ondanks een gebrek aan grootse architectuur, heeft Thebe de afgelopen jaren gewonnen aan populariteit onder archeologen als kandidaat voor de hoofdstad van Ahhijawa. In de regel lijkt dit voort te komen uit drie overwegingen. De eerste behelst de naam Ahhijawa, die wel wordt gezien als de Hettitische variant van het homerische “Achaea”. In de Ilias wordt deze naam aanvankelijk gebruikt om troepen uit centraal Griekenland, vooral die van Achilles, aan te duiden. Aangezien Thebe zonder twijfel het dominante centrum in centraal Griekenland was, is de stap om het centrum dan ook als hoofdstad van het land dat de Hettieten als Ahhijawa kenden, te begrijpen.
Er kleven echter enkele bezwaren aan deze gelijkstelling. Het bovenstaande is volledig gebaseerd op een interpretatie van de Griekse legenden, met name de Ilias. In dezelfde Ilias staat echter ook duidelijk dat Agamemnon, heerser van Mykene, opperbevelhebber van alle Grieken was. Bovendien wordt de naam Achaeërs uiteindelijk ook gebruikt als aanduiding voor de gehele Griekse troepenmacht voor de muren van Troje. In feite lijkt de homerische overlevering dus vrij weinig vóór Thebaanse suprematie te spreken.

Zonder meer het belangrijkste argument dat spreekt voor Thebe als hoofdstad van Ahhijawa is de vondst van een dertigtal lapis lazuli zegels in het paleis van Thebe. Deze zegels waren afkomstig uit Mesopotamië, hoewel uit verschillende regio’s en uit verschillende perioden. Deze vondst maakt duidelijk dat Thebe verre betrekkingen onderhield. Het is voorgesteld dat deze zegels ooit als diplomatieke gift door een Assyrische koning naar Thebe zijn gestuurd, mogelijk in de hoop een alliantie te sluiten tegen de Hettieten. Het is evenwel ook mogelijk, mijns inziens waarschijnlijker, dat de lapis zegels vanuit de Levant naar Thebe zijn gezonden als “grondstoffen”. De recentste zegels uit het Thebaanse corpus zijn gedateerd in de tweede helft van de 13e eeuw en aangenomen werd dat de zegels dus niet voor die tijd in Thebe zijn beland. De datering van de zegels is echter nogal onzeker en het is goed voorstelbaar dat de zegels in feite vroeger, bijvoorbeeld in de eerste helft van de 13e eeuw, moeten worden gedateerd. Wat hiervoor spreekt is dat de brandlaag die op vele plekken in Thebe is aangetroffen waarschijnlijk gedateerd moet worden rond 1250 voor Christus. Het is moeilijk voorstelbaar dat een Assyrische koning giften zond naar een afgebrand Grieks paleis. Hoewel het onduidelijk is hoe groot de verwoesting was die Thebe halverwege de 13e eeuw trof, duiden verwoestingen in de nabije omgeving, zoals te Orchomenos en het enorme fort Gla, op een chronisch onrustige tijd. Dit valt moeilijk te rijmen met het kerngebied van een expansionistische supermacht.

Hoewel duidelijk is dat Thebe verre contacten onderhield voor 1250 v. Chr. lijken overzeese betrekkingen vooral beperkt te zijn geweest tot de Levant en Cyprus. Er zijn nauwelijks objecten uit andere gebieden, zoals Egypte, gevonden. Dit is duidelijk wel het geval te Mykene. Te Mykene is de grootste hoeveelheid orientalia gevonden in het Griekenland van de Late Bronstijd. Bovendien is de origine van deze oosterse import meer divers dan dat het geval is in Thebe: goederen uit de Levant, Cyprus, maar ook veel uit Egypte zijn aangetroffen. Materiaal uit Anatolië is bijzonder zeldzaam, zowel in Mykene als te Thebe. Mogelijk werden er vanuit Anatolië vooral grondstoffen of vergankelijke materialen geïmporteerd. Als men afgaat op de hoeveelheid importgoederen, is duidelijk dat Mykene meer overzeese contacten had dan Thebe.

**Contacten met andere gebieden**
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Ook de aard van de import doet vermoeden dat Mykene in dit opzicht van groter belang was dan Thebe. Te Mykene zijn verschillende objecten van Egyptische herkomst aangetroffen. Vooral faience plaquettes met daarop de cartouche van koning Amenophis III zijn hier interessant, omdat deze objecten –gevonden in het cultusgebied van de akropolis - als bewijs voor directe contacten tussen Mykene en het Egyptische hof worden gezien. Er wordt zelfs gedacht aan een “Egyptische ambassade” in Mykene. Wat hier voor spreekt, is dat gedurende de regering van Amenophis III een overzicht werd opgetekend van alle gebieden waar de Egyptenaren belangen hadden. Dit overzicht werd in de sokkels van beelden van de koning gebeiteld, die werden opgesteld bij diens tempel te Kom el Hetan. Aan het begin van één van deze lijsten van plaatsnamen die –volgens de tekst- in Tanaju land gelegen waren, staat Mykene. Verdere namen lijken te refereren naar het eiland Kythara en de landstreek –of ooit een plaats?- Messenië. Tanaju wordt wel gezien als een Egyptische verbastering van wat later, in Klassieke tijd, bekend stond als de Danaoi; de aanduiding voor bewoners van de Argolis en Lakonië. Het is opmerkelijk dat Messenië hier, althans in Egyptische ogen, in de Bronstijd ook onder viel.

Messenië werd in Mykeense tijd gedomineerd door het paleis van Pylos. Dit paleis, niet ver verwijderd van het moderne plaatsje Pylos, is in de jaren 50 opgegraven door een team van de universiteit van Cincinatti, onder leiding van de bekende archeoloog Carl Blegen. Tijdens deze opgravingen werd een groot archief ontdekt, met honderden fragmenten van kleitablaten beschreven met Lineair B. Juist rond deze tijd werd dit schrift ontcijferd, en het is dan ook niet verwonderlijk dat tijdens de opgraving de tabletten bijzonder veel aandacht kregen. In feite vormen de Pylos tabletten een belangrijk deel van het grote standaardwerk van Ventris en Chadwick over de Mykeense wereld volgens de teksten. Uit deze tabletten bleek dat het koninkrijk Pylos actief betrokken was met troepenverschuivingen buiten haar eigen rijksgrenzen.

Nu zou dit kunnen duiden op oorlog met andere gebieden, maar de verschuivingen betreffen meestal slechts enkele tientallen manschappen. Men zou kunnen denken dat het hier dan “toevoegingen” betreft aan een groter leger dat al ter plaatse is, maar van een dergelijke expeditie blijkt verder niets uit de teksten. Veeleer lijkt het er op dat Pylische troepen actief waren in andere gebieden in het kader van een soort samenwerking met deze regio’s. Het betreft vooral de regio rond Olympia en West-Akkadië, maar mogelijk zelfs gebieden ten noorden van de golf van Korinthi.

Samenwerking tussen verschillende Mykeense staten blijkt ook uit andere teksten: goederen werden van Mykene naar Thebe verzonden, mensen uit Lakonië worden genoemd in tabletten uit Thebe en in Pylos zijn verschillende verwijzingen naar mensen uit Mykeense centra aan de westkust van Anatolië. Dat de relaties tussen de Mykeense rijken meer zouden kunnen zijn
geweest blijkt uit een tekst uit het archief van Pylos, waarin spraken is van “land van Atreus” binnen Pylische rijksborders. Hoewel er ongetwijfeld meer personen de naam Atreus hebben gedragen dan de legendarische stamvader van het koningshuis van Mykene, wekt de bewuste tekst toch de indruk dat de Mykeense wereld tot op zekere hoogte feodaal was –vergelijkbaar met leengebieden uit de Europese Middeleeuwen. Bennett ging in zijn artikel nog niet zo ver, maar zijn hierboven genoemde stelling van familiebetrekkingen tussen de heersershuizen in Mykeens Griekenland impliceert een zekere mate van samenwerking tussen de gebieden, ja zelfs een mate van overkoepelend gezag.

**GRIEKSE EENHEID**

Dat de plek waar dit overkoepelende gezag zetelde waarschijnlijk in Mykene te zoeken valt en niet zozeer in Thebe, blijkt uit het bovenstaande. Als we er op grond van de Kom el Hetan tekst, de hoeveelheid orientalia, de monumentaliteit en de architectonische overeenkomsten tussen de defensiewerken van Mykene en Hattuša, vanuit gaan dat Mykene dan dus ook het centrum moet zijn waar Hattusili III zijn brief naar stuurde en dat de heerser van dit paleis in de ogen van de Hettieten kwalificeerde voor de titel “Groot Koning”, dan blijft de vraag over hoe de macht van de vorst van Mykene zich verhield tot die van de lokale koningen. Liever gezegd: in hoeverre was er sprake van een verenigd rijk en hoe groot zou dit zijn geweest. Uit bovenstaande bleek al dat er gerede grond is aan te nemen dat Messenië, ofwel het koninkrijk Pylos, in zekere mate moet hebben samengewerkt met omliggende gebieden. Uit de Kom el Hetan tekst bleek dat de Egyptenaren de regio beschouwden als behorend bij Mykene. Men krijgt hierbij de indruk dat voor het tussenliggende gebied, Lakonië, hoewel niet geïdentificeerd in de Egyptische tekst, hetzelfde moet hebben gegooid. Archeologische bewijzen hiervoor ontbreken en ook uit contemporaine bronnen is er geen duidelijke aanwijzing voor een zekere mate van unificatie van Messenië, Lakonië en de Argolis.

In de Ilias wordt echter wel naar een dergelijke unificatie verwijzen. Het duidelijkst blijkt dat uit het feit dat Agamemnon, koning van Mykene, tevens de aanvoerder van alle Griezen is die voor Troje liggen. Niet slechts Agamemnon’s functie als opperbevelhebber verwijst naar de Griekse unificatie. Zo wordt in de Odyssee bezongen hoe Telemachos, de zoon van Odysseus, in een strijdwagen van Pylos naar Sparta wordt gereden. Nu zijn de Homerische epen wel vaker als een argument aangevoerd om grotere politieke verbanden aan te tonen in Griekenland gedurende de Late Bronstijd, en deze argumenten zijn even vaak afgedaan vanwege de late codificatie van de Ilias en de Odyssee –waarschijnlijk in de late 9e eeuw voor Christus. De Homerische wereld lijkt evenwel verbaasd veel op datgene wat uit archeologisch onderzoek naar voren komt –kleine
afwijkingen daar gelaten. Zo is de weg tussen Pylos en Sparta, die Homeros impliceert, beslist voorstelbaar. Hoewel velen het lange tijd niet voor mogelijk hielden dat de Mykeners in staat waren een weg door het Taygetos gebergte aan te leggen, is intussen wel een weg aangetoond tussen Pylos en het huidige Kalamata, dat wil zeggen: het eerste deel van Telemachos’ route. Trekt men deze lijn door, dan belandt men in de vlakte van Sparta. Dat men wel degelijk in staat was ook in moeilijke gebieden wegen aan te leggen, blijkt uit de bruggen in de Argolis, en het wegennet in Messenië.

De aanleg van wegen wordt in de regel geassocieerd met een (vroeg) staat. Verdere kenmerken van zo’n staat in het archeologische bestand zijn onder andere de constructie van grensfortificaties, grote centrale paleizen en heiligdommen. Kijkt men naar de Mykeense wereld, met name naar de Peloponnesos, dan treft men inderdaad deze kenmerken aan. Belangrijke voorbeelden hiervan zijn bijvoorbeeld de grensfortificatie die de Isthmus afsluit (bij Korinthe), en het uitgebreide wegennet in de Argolis en Messenië. In dit verband is het opmerkelijk vast te stellen dat Mykene door een weg verbonden werd met Korinthië, hetgeen er op wijst dat ook dat gebied behoorde tot het grotere Mykeense territorium —zoals ook in de Ilias wordt gemeld. Ruwweg zou men op grond van deze gegevens kunnen stellen dat het koninkrijk Mykene ten minste de Argolis, Korinthië, Lakonië en Messenië moet hebben omvat. Het is zeer wel voorstelbaar dat in feite de gehele Peloponnesos verenigd was onder de leiding van Mykene. Daar buiten is een groter verband rond 1250 moeilijker te reconstrueren.

CONCLUSIE

Het Mykeense koninkrijk, bij de Hettieten bekend onder de naam Ahhijawa / Achaea, bestond primair uit Mykene met haar directe omgeving (Korinthië en de Argolis). In elk geval op het gebied van militaire zaken en buitenlandse activiteit, maar mogelijk ook als het grotere bouwprojecten betrof, had de vorst van Mykene gezag over kleinere, lokale koningen. Men dient zich hierbij te realiseren hoe goed een dergelijk beeld overeenkomt met het beeld dat de Hettieten van een Groot Koning hadden. Binnen het Hettitische rijk behielden de lokale heersers veel van hun autonomie, maar waren gebonden hun vorst bij te staan — in persoon en met troepen — in geval van oorlog. Verder was het hen niet toegestaan zelf contact te onderhouden met buitenlandse mogendheden. Dit lijkt ook in de Peloponnesos het geval te zijn geweest.

Uit de Hettitische teksten blijkt dat de Groot Koning van Ahhijawa rond 1250 tevens heerste over Millawanda / Milete. In de Ilias wordt gemeld dat Agamemnon “koning over alle eilanden” was. Mykeense heerschappij over de eilanden is moeilijk archeologisch vast te stellen. Het is wellicht een teken dat op Rhodos en omliggende eilanden het merendeel van het aardewerk uit de Argolis
lijkt te zijn geïmporteerd. Verder blijkt uit Hettitische teksten dat de Koning van Ahhijawa enkele eilanden, onder andere Lesbos, op de Hettitische Koning heeft veroverd. Er blijft dus genoeg om te speculeren. Hoe het ook zij; het lijkt aannemelijk dat in Griekenland, met name op de Pelopponnesos gedurende de Late Bronstijd een verenigd Mykeens rijk heeft bestaan, dat contacten onderhield met Hatti en Egypte, en van een dusdanig belang was dat de heerser ervan werd als een gelijke werd gerekend in het selecte groepje van “supermachten” van die tijd.
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<td>Amenhotep II</td>
<td>1427-1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose IV</td>
<td>1400-1390</td>
<td>LH III A1</td>
<td>Attariššija in Anatolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1390-1352</td>
<td>LH III A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhenaten</td>
<td>1352-1336</td>
<td>Suppiluliuma I</td>
<td>Olives and Mycenaean pottery at Amarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhare</td>
<td>1338-1336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamen</td>
<td>1336-1327</td>
<td>LH III B1</td>
<td>Mycenaean pottery at Deir el-Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>1327-1323</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mycenaean pottery at Saqqarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemheb</td>
<td>1323-1295</td>
<td>Arnuwanda II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muršili II</td>
<td>Collapse of Arzawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I</td>
<td>1295-1294</td>
<td>Muwatalli II</td>
<td>Queen Nefertari wears Aegean jewellery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1294-1279</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Battle of Kadesh (1274 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td>1279-1213</td>
<td>Urhi-Tešub</td>
<td>Mycenaean pottery at Pi-ramesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hattušili III</td>
<td>The Tawagalawa letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peace between Egypt and Hatti (1258 BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destructions in Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tudhaliya IV</td>
<td>Sasilgamuwa Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LH III B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1230-1190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kurunta</td>
<td>Usurper on the throne of Hatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1228-1227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tudhaliya IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1227-1209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merenptah</td>
<td>1213-1203</td>
<td>Arnuwanda III</td>
<td>Libyan invasions with Sea Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1209-1207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenmesse</td>
<td>1203-1200</td>
<td>Suppiluliuma II</td>
<td>Destructions throughout Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti II</td>
<td>1200-1194</td>
<td>LH III C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sethnacht</td>
<td>1186-1184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses III</td>
<td>1184-1153</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sea People invasions over land and sea. Mycenaean stirrup jars on the walls of the tomb of Ramesses III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Chronological overview
Table 2: Trojan Chronology (after Korfmann/Mannsperger 1998).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE NAME</th>
<th>LH II</th>
<th>LH IIIA1</th>
<th>LH IIIA2</th>
<th>LH IIIB1</th>
<th>LH IIIB2</th>
<th>LH IIIC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TROY - HISSARLIK</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESIK TEPE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITANE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAZTEPE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOCAEA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇERKES</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRIKÖY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARISA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYRAKLI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAZOMENAE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REISDERE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORBALI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPHESUS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARDIS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVURTEPE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEYESULTAN</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARAKÖY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILETUS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKBÜK</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASOS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYLASA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATONICAEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MÜSGEBI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNIDOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DÜVER</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELMESSOS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEREKÖY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEYLERBEGY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Sites in western Anatolia with Mycenaean pottery. The total numbers of finds have been divided in groups; 1=1-10; 2=10-50; 3=50-100; 4=100-500; 5=500 and more. The sites are (following the text) listed from north to south. Note that the earliest concentrations of Mycenaean pottery appear in the same regions known to have been subject to Ahhiyawan activity (i.e. the Troad, the area around Miletus and Ephesus).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>pilgrim flask</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential (house of the mycenaean greek)</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>stem of a goblet</td>
<td>eating / drinking</td>
<td>residential (house of the mycenaean greek)</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, 26: 30/207;225</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, 61: 30/257</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.64: 30/279</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.69: 30/296</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment of a stirrup jar</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, T.36.78: 30/379</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment of a pilgrim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>flasks of Rhodian fabric</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, T.36.58: 30/196</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.84: 30/420</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>handle of a stirrup jar</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, T.36.44: 30/46</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.76: 30/257</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.79: 30/232</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.15: 30/330 (public well)</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>bead-spacer of white paste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.75: 30/364</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.34.3: 30/480</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>base of an amphora</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, S.33.1: 30/464</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>no fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>(top of a shaft) burial?, T.35.6: 29/353</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>pair of small pottery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, V.37.8: 26/216</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>vase, 11 cm</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, U.36.29: 29/36 (slums)</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, T.36.2 (larger estates)</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1933, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>no fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mycenaean ware in the North Suburb of Akhetaten**

**Central - Western Quarter**

**South - Western Quarter**

**South - Central Quarter**

**Eastern Quarter**

**North - Western Quarter**

**Mycenaean ware in the South Suburb of Akhetaten**

**Eastern Quarter**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LH IIIa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>neck of a stirrup jar</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, N.49.10: 21/33</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 20,XIII, fig.5, t.l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, N.49.12: 21/163</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, N.49.35: 21/496</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, O.47.16: 22/517, 532</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, P.46.7: 22/544</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, P.46.8: 22/542</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, P.46.10: 22/547</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, P.46.15: 22/565</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, P.47.30: 22/531</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>mouth of a vase</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, P.47.31: no number</td>
<td>Peet, 1923, 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>residential, Petrie’s House 11</td>
<td>Petrie, 1894, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mycenaean ware in the Central City of Akhetaten*

Mycenaean ware found by Carter, precise context within the central city unknown, now in the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | LH IIIa2 | sherds, small piriform jar | storage | APM 3226/D en /4 |
| 2 | LH IIIa2 | sherds, vertical flask | storage | APM 3226/B, F, H, 1,3,5,6,7 |
| 3 | LH IIIa2 | sherd | storage | APM 3226/8 |
| 4 | LH IIIa2 | sherd, alabastron | storage | APM 3226/G |
| 5 | LH IIIa2 | sherd, stirrup jar? | storage | APM 3226/A |
| 6 | LH IIIa2 | sherds | storage | APM 3226/2,9 |

The Great Temple

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | no fragments |   |   |   |   |

The dependencies of the great temple

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | no fragments |   |   |   |   |

The Great Palace: magazines

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | LH IIIa | a pilgrim flask | storage | official, 34/41 | Pendlebury, 1951, 38 |
| 2 | LH IIIa | 2 | storage | official, 34/45 | Pendlebury, 1951, 38 |
| 3 | LH IIIa | cm | storage | official, 35/137 | Pendlebury, 1951, 49 |
| 4 | LH IIIa | flask, 5.8 cm | storage | official, 35/150 | Pendlebury, 1951, 49 |
| 5 | LH IIIa | flask, 4 | storage | official, 35/190 | Pendlebury, 1951, 49 |
| 6 | LH IIIa | of a pilgrim flask | storage | official, 35/180 | Pendlebury, 1951, 49 |
| 7 | LH IIIa | cm | storage | official, 35/196 | Pendlebury, 1951, 49 |
| 8 | LH IIIa | flask, 4 cm | storage | official, 35/221 | Pendlebury, 1951, 49 |
| 9 | LH IIIa | fragment (rough ware) | storage | official, 35/222 | Pendlebury, 1951, 49 |
|10 | LH IIIa | fragments of vases, 4 | storage | official, 35/239 | Pendlebury, 1951, 50 |
|11 | LH IIIa | fragments, 4 | storage | official, 35/273 | Pendlebury, 1951, 50 |
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The Great Palace: state appartment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Finding Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment of a pilgrim</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 34/182</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>flask</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 35/382</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 68,CIX.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments of 2 small amphoras</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 35/373</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 69,CIX.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment, 7.6 cm</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 35/492</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 70,CIX.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, 35/415</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 72,CIX.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment, 2</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 35/289</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 7</td>
<td>official, 35/305</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td>official, 35/315</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 6 (3 from pilgrim flasks)</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 35/310</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 6</td>
<td>official, 35/324</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 3</td>
<td>official, 35/349</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td>official, 35/359</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 9</td>
<td>official, no specification</td>
<td>Petrie, 1894, 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Royal Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Finding Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment of an amphora</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 31/622</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment, 4.8 cm</td>
<td>official, 31/532</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 91,CIX.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td>official, 31/547</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 91,CIX.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment of a pilgrim</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, 31/553</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 91,CIX.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment of a bowl</td>
<td>eating / drinking</td>
<td>official, 31/560</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 91,CIX.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, 31/564</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 91,CIX.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Magazines between the Royal Estate and the Temple

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Finding Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, P.41.1&amp;3: 31/609</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 107,CIX.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>top of a stirrup jar</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, Q.41.7: 31/605</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 107,CIX.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments of a stirrup jar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, Q.41.7: 31/606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment, 2</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, Q.41.7: 31/607</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 107,CIX.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td>official, Q.41.2: 32/260</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment of an amphora</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>official, Q.41.4: 32/248</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, Q.41.10: 32/283</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 109,CIX.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>residential, R.41.1: 32.263</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 210,CIX.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Record Office and its Surroundings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Finding Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, Q.42.1: 33/39</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>residential, Q.42.15: 33/96</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, Q.42.21: 33/142</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>residential, Q.42.28: 33/200</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 5</td>
<td>official, Q.42.30: 33/211</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, Q.42.31: 33/215</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>fragments, 2</td>
<td>residential, no.1:33/223</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>LH IIIa</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>top of a stirrup jar</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, no.2&amp;3:33/199</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>top of a stirrup jar</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, no.2&amp;3:33/190</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>flasks, 4</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, no.15&amp;16:33/243</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 123,CIX.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, no.36:33/255</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 124,CIX.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, no.43:33/252</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 124,CIX.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, no.58:33/263</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 125,CIX.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>storage</td>
<td>residential, no.69:33/284</td>
<td>Pendlebury, 1951, 125,CIX.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>fragments, 1329</td>
<td>official, waste heaps</td>
<td>Petrie, 1894, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>official, waste heaps</td>
<td>Kemp, 1987, 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Military and Police Quarters

1 | LH IIIa | fragment of a pilgrim flask, 7.3 cm | official, R.42.9.B: 36/112 | Pendlebury, 1951, 135,CIX.6 |
| 2 | LH IIIa | fragments of an amphora, 2 | official, R.43.1.B: 36/151 | Pendlebury, 1951, 140,CIX.6 |

The South - East Quarter

1 | LH IIIa | fragment of an amphora, 12 cm | storage | residential, R.43.2: 36/164 | Pendlebury, 1951, 141,LXXVIII.9 |

Table 4: Mycenaean pottery at the site of El Amarna / Ahketaten, Egypt (after Kelder 2002-3).
Map 1: The major states in the Late Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean
Map 2: Mycenaean palatial states. Dots represent those areas where Mycenaean culture is dominant; densely packed dots represent areas where a Mycenaean palatial state is suspected; Black represent attested Mycenaean palatial states or palatial territories. 1= Iolkos (Dimini); 2= Orchomenos; 3= Thebes; 4= Athens; 5= Salamis; 6= Mycenae; 7= Lacedaemon (Pellana); 8= Pylos; 9= Miletus; 10= Lazpa (Lesbos); 11= Elis; 12= Kythera; 13= Knossos.
Map 3: One interpretation of the Pylian Kingdom according to the Linear B texts (from Bennet 1998).
Map 4: Western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age
Map 5: New Kingdom Egypt: big black blocks stand for capital centres, whereas small blocks stand for significant provincial centres. Black dots represent sites where textual evidence referred to in the text has been found. Text between quotation marks designates geographical areas.
Map 6: Ahhiyawan activity in western Anatolia. Dots, hatches and crosses stand for various incursions attested in Hittite texts or delivered in later Greek legend. Underscored names refer to the leading persons of Ahhiyawan activity in those areas.
Map 7: Mycenaean finds in Western Anatolia (after Mee 1978)
Map 8: The eastern Mediterranean. The grey areas represent the regions where Mycenaean pottery has been found. The black squares represent the sites specifically investigated in the text; i.e. Troy, Ephesus, Miletus, Pi-ramesse and Memphis.
Map 9: The site of El-Amarna. City boundaries were marked with boundary steles. The City itself fell apart in several quarters, connected by the ‘Royal Road’. By far the largest structure in the capital was the great Aten Temple, roughly opposite the remains of the royal palace.
Illustration 1: A Mycenaean warrior incised on a vessel from the Hittite capital Hattuša

Illustration 2: Detail of a papyrus fragment from Amarna, possibly showing Mycenaean warriors. The helmets find their closest parallel in the boar’s tusk helmet from a tomb at Dendra (near Midea), but also compare to the helmet shown in illustration 1.
Illustration 3: Queen Nefertari as depicted on the walls of her tomb. She wears Aegean style earrings, parallels of which are found at several sites on the Greek mainland, especially at Mycenae. The earrings are coloured white, indicating silver. The queen is shown four times with this type of earrings.
Illustration 4: The Mycenaean social pyramid (adapted from Kilian 1988a). In essence, various similar Kingdoms function with their own administration, yet are subject to one Great King (himself ruling his own “core” Kingdom in the same way as his vassal rulers). This Great King may have exercised control via “collectors”; high officials collecting tribute and, probably, dividing prestige gifts amongst the King’s followers.

Illustration 5: The size of Mycenaean palatial centres. Note that for Thebes, the whole of the Kadmeia hill is taken as the “citadel”, though this includes the larger part of the Theban settlement (i.e. also the dwellings of the populace). For Tiryns, the LH IIIC size has been taken, as the extent of the settlement in earlier periods is not well established (although almost certainly lesser).
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