

---

## On the Anatolian Orientation of Troy

Michael Spencer

*Michael Spencer is a senior history major at Eastern Illinois University. Next fall, he will be pursuing an M.A. in the social sciences at the University of Chicago.*

---

### Introduction

This research project investigates the political orientation of western Anatolia in order to determine the likely nature of the archaeological sites of Troy VI and VII at Hisarlik. In order to do this, I survey the archaeological evidence and review the Hittite sources that comprise the Ahhiyawa corpus. At Troy VI and VII, society was oriented toward the Hittite state in Hattusa and an eastern culture more broadly. The corollary to my thesis is that the orientation of not only the supposed Trojans, but also the Greeks, is toward the east. This is a perspective that is often clouded by a desire to include the ancient Greeks in the long-run narrative of the West. The writings of Herodotus have been used to describe the Greeks as the defenders of the West and all its potential as a region independent of the empires in the East. Greek culture indeed was formative in the ideology of the Romans, who spread Homer alongside their influence throughout Europe. Yet, this theoretical framework that connects the Greeks described by Homer to those European regions most commonly associated with modern western civilization (i.e. Britain, France, and Germany) is a framework that largely ignores the reality that those places were completely off the radar for the ancient Greeks. Furthermore, Romans viewed these regions as being home to uncivilized barbarians. This portrayal was magnified by the writings of Homer, which have been a part of the western literary cannon intermittently since they were penned. For this reason, I will avoid Homer, which will allow the Mycenaeans to be recognized as they likely saw themselves. This method will not only bring clarity to the specifics about Troy VI and VII, but raise broader questions about the traditional view of the cultural lineage of the West.

This first section of this study surveys the archaeological debate that has raged over Hisarlik, particularly in the last three decades. This section also addresses some of the contextual and linguistic evidence that must be established in order to justify the choices made in the primary narrative. My analysis will utilize this understanding of the evidence and attempt to reconcile it with the limited historical material available. Historical sources used here derive primarily from the Ahhiyawa texts, which explicitly further my thesis and its corollary by including the Troad and the Mycenaeans as players in the Hittite sphere of influence. Additionally, I will dive deeper into the arguments advanced by Manfred Korfmann and his excavators in the context provided by the Ahhiyawa texts. On an analytic note, I refer to toponyms and other nouns differently depending on the context in which they are encountered in my analysis. For example, I refer to the Bronze Age site at Hisarlik as Troia or Troy I-VII when discussing it from the perspective of Manfred Korfmann's research. When addressing toponyms and groups of people from the Hittite perspective, I refer to these under the terminology derived from tablets found in the archives of Hatti (i.e. Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, etc.). Naturally, this means that the Greco-Roman levels at Hisarlik are referred to as Ilion/Ilium.

## The Archaeological Evidence at Hisarlik in the Context of the Broader Aegean

Fifty years after Carl Blegen's excavations at Hisarlik, Manfred Korfmann's team of Germans from the University of Tübingen set about digging at the site in 1988. Distinct from all prior archeologists who had worked at the site, Korfmann was interested, not in the relationship between Hisarlik and the Homeric city of Troy, but in a site that had connections to the broader context of the Late Bronze Age Aegean and Anatolian worlds. Furthermore, Korfmann claimed to not be focused on proving or disproving the historicity of Homer's *Illiad*. However, Korfmann was certain that Troia was the city known to the Hittites as Wilusa, which became the Greco-Roman city of Ilion/Ilium. An important find to the analytics of Korfmann's excavations was the distinction between two sub-phases of Troy VII. The archaeologists determined that, at some point in the end of the thirteenth century BCE, Troy VII was subject to massive upheaval involving invasion and/or natural disaster. The period between 1230 BCE to around 1190 BCE was determined to be Troy VIIa, and the period of upheaval that continued for nearly a century and a half was thus called Troy VIIb.<sup>1</sup>

The most significant discovery of the Korfmann excavations involved the existence of a lower city in the area beneath Hisarlik. By making use of magnetometers, remote sensors that are used to map the ground before an excavation, Korfmann's team found a one meter deep ditch carved into the bed rock. The ditch traced an area of 200,000 square meters around the area beneath Hisarlik. Peter Jablonka, the head of the team that found the ditch, said that the find raised the projected population and importance of the site. Furthermore, the lower city meant that Troia “has closer analogues in Anatolia than in the Mycenaean region.”<sup>2</sup> The ditch dated to the Troy VI/VIIa period and encompassed the entire area identified as the lower city. Further attention was paid to methodically placed gaps in the ditch that seemed to indicate the existence of a gate, through which wagons, cattle, and people might pass into the city. Korfmann identified this earthwork as an anti-chariot ditch, a feature that generally indicates the existence of a wall, upon which a battery of archers could have barraged encroaching forces as they navigated the trench.

The other primary claim of Korfmann's excavation centers on the status of Hisarlik as the site of a Late Bronze Age trade hub. This claim is central to the importance of Troia as a Late Bronze Age archaeological site. However, it is also a pivotal element for those who seek Homer's Troy in the Troad. At Hisarlik, there were large quantities of potsherds, which Carl Blegen had called grey Minyan ware. Donald F. Easton, an archeologist with Korfmann's team, determined that these were actually pieces of Anatolian grey pottery. Additionally, Korfmann found evidence of worship and tombs, as well as seventeen stelai, large stone carvings that served as religious idols, which were typical of Anatolian sites. They were largely ignored by everyone else who had excavated at the site before. Furthermore, Troy was probably located much closer to the Aegean at the time of Troy VI/VII. The Bay of Besik once came right up to the citadel and served as a port for Troia. A great deal of this point rests on evidence found at lower levels of Hisarlik that indicate the site's connection to Anatolian trade routes, such as treasure hoards found in the burned-out remains of Troy II.<sup>3</sup> Combined with evidence of steady growth of fortifications and wealth, Korfmann concluded that Troy was a major hub of trade. Troia must have served as a basis for trade between the Levant, Egypt, and the Mycenaean world, as well as the civilizations along the shore of the Black Sea to the north of the Dardanelles. Furthermore, the existence of seals that were used to certify trade agreements, not only indicates Troy as a trade hub, but also as a society oriented toward the Anatolian east. Despite this evidence, there is a notable dearth of writing found at Troy VI/VII.

---

<sup>1</sup> See “Table 2” in Eric Cline, *The Trojan War: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 96.

<sup>2</sup> Joachim Latacz, *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution to an Old Mystery* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

Korfmann's deductions regarding the Anatolian orientation of Troia and its status as a trade hub generated controversy among archeologists and historians. While Korfmann claimed that he was not looking for Homeric Troy, his interviews with the press drew him into debates about the authenticity of a Trojan War at Hisarlik. Frank Kolb emerged as a leading critic of Korfmann's argument. An archaeologist who had once worked with Korfmann at Troia, Kolb had long contended that there was no historical basis for the Trojan War having occurred at Hisarlik. Kolb's primary critique of the Korfmann excavations rests on a dearth of evidence both in the ground and in textual sources. Kolb contends that the character of trade in the Mediterranean world during the late Bronze Age was one of limited trade overseas, minimizing the importance of Troia's past access to the Bay of Besik. Furthermore, Late Bronze Age trade is not significantly attested to in the Troad, despite its possible connections to the Hittites. In its broad sweep, most of the trade in the Aegean, Levant, and Egypt was concentrated elsewhere.<sup>4</sup> Kolb also attempted to discredit the evidence for a lower city, although those claims have largely been refuted by the work of Peter Jablonka and C. Brian Rose, who defend the archaeological work that led Korfmann to expand the size and population of Troy VI/VII. They defend the notion of the ditches as defensive in nature and indicative of a walled lower city. Furthermore, they explain why the gaps in the ditches were the sites of wooden palisades through which carts, animals, and travelers might have passed.<sup>5</sup>

Ultimately, the concerns of Frank Kolb, which emerged in the 1990s, have been thoroughly addressed by scholars from authoritative areas of the field. It is hard to deny the similarities between the Anatolian sites and Troy VI/VII from this analysis, which has now been thoroughly tested, examined, and re-examined. The city that stood at Hisarlik was one within the cultural sphere of the Hittite world. However, Kolb's strongest argument rests on the lack of writing found in the levels that precede the Greco-Roman layers. The preponderance of seals seems to suggest that there should be a great deal of writing at Hisarlik to document the trade that the seals are assumed to have facilitated.

The last bit of framework evidence that should be surveyed before moving forward is the nature of Hisarlik's connection to Troy, Wilusa, Ilion, and Ilium. There is no map of the Hatti Empire that comes down through history and thus most of the cartography has to be deciphered from the evidence available in official imperial documents. The first element in deciphering the linguistic roots of the term means acknowledging that Homer uses the terms Ilios and Troy interchangeably throughout *The Iliad*. Joachim Latacz's exhaustive analysis of the historical, archaeological, and linguistic evidence in his book *Troy and Homer* presents sufficient linguistic evidence that these two terms refer to the same place. The phonetic laws of Indo-European languages have been relatively apparent as far back as 1924. It was "well known and beyond dispute that that original toponym in an earlier period, before Homer, was 'Wilios,' with an initial 'w,'" explains Latacz.<sup>6</sup>

With the veracity of equating Ilios with Wilios established, one can ask: what is the relationship of those words to the Hittite toponym Wilusa? It took over seventy years to reach a definitive answer to that question. In 1996, Frank Starke proved "convincingly that the pile of ruins on the Dardanelles, whose once-proud predecessor Homer calls by turns 'Troy' and 'Ilios,' really was the remains of that center of power in northwestern Asia Minor." With the recovery of a treaty made between a thirteenth century Hittite king and a vassal, which described just enough about the geography of Anatolia to provide clarity at the western edges of Asia Minor, the map was completed

---

<sup>4</sup> Frank Kolb, "Troy VI: A Trading Center and Commercial City?" *American Journal of Archaeology* 108, no. 4 (October 2004): 582-3.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Jablonka and C. Brian Rose, "Late Bronze Age Troy: A Response to Frank Kolb," *American Journal of Archaeology* 108, no. 4 (October 2004): 616-620.

<sup>6</sup> Latacz, 75.

at last. We can now move forward, relatively comfortably, with the argument that Hisarlik is the site of Late Bronze Age Wilusa, which is known to have become the Greco-Roman city of Ilios/Ilium.<sup>7</sup> Evidence of this treaty is found in the Milawata Letter, which will be dealt with more directly later.

## The Ahhiyawans

It is challenging to piece together a historical narrative of a region on the western fringes of the Hittite kingdom at the end of the second millennium BCE. Using just the archaeological evidence, the Troad remains shrouded in mystery at the end of the Bronze Age. There is far too little left at Hisarlik after the intervening three millennia. However, there is significantly more information available about the social, cultural, and political developments in the region when the issue is approached from the perspective of the Hittite sources. A specific set of Hittite texts concerns the potential historicity of the Trojan War. Known now as the Ahhiyawa texts, Hugo Winckler discovered these documents in 1906 by the site of Hattusa; the ancient Hittite capital.

In 1924, Swiss scholar Emil Forrer was the first to connect the Ahhiyawans with the Achaeans, the primary name for those whom Homer refers to as the force that opposed the Trojans in the *Illiad*. The issue has been thoroughly picked over across the last ninety years. A great deal of this argument has centered on navigating from one ancient Indo-European language to another—Hittite and ancient Greek—in order to determine the linguistic relationship between the terminology in Homer and the Hittite texts. Turning once more to Latacz for the linguistic analysis, it becomes apparent that these terms are also closely connected. Homer's use of several different names seems to demonstrate some historicity, as “there was no conceivable motive for inventing a name.”<sup>8</sup>

Finally, there is substantial textual evidence for contact between the Hittites and the Ahhiyawans. It is worth noting that, while the Ahhiyawans might not have literally been a detachment from the city of Mycenae and other prominent cities on the Greek mainland (though they may have been), they were a group within the Greek world that had spread around the shores of the Aegean. Beyond the linguistic argument, it is largely “by default” that scholars have been led to posit that the Ahhiyawans and the Mycenaeans are the same people because, “[o]therwise, we would have, on the one hand, an important Late Bronze Age culture not mentioned elsewhere in the Hittite texts (the Mycenaeans) and, on the other hand, an important textually attested Late Bronze Age 'state' without archaeological remains (Ahhiyawa).”<sup>9</sup>

## The Narrative of the Ahhiyawans and the Hittites in Western Anatolia

This section will outline the broader Late Bronze Age narrative of the Mediterranean region, specifically the Late Helladic I period (1600 BCE) through the Late Helladic III period (1050 BCE). This will be interwoven with a historical narrative that utilizes those sources described in the previous section, which detail the interactions between Hattusa and the Ahhiyawans. There are some primary themes worth noting in this analysis. First, the Hittites and the Ahhiyawans appear, at different times, to have been both aligned and at odds with each other in Western Anatolia. Second, the identity of one Pijamaradu is central to this narrative. Whether he is an Ahhiyawan, a Hittite, or someone else entirely, his effort to carve out a space on the Hittite frontiers is the primary reason that the Ahhiyawans have appeared at all to modern historians. As established in a prior section, this narrative will start by accepting the scholarly consensus that the Ahhiyawans represent a major state on or associated with the Greek mainland.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 75-82.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 121-8.

<sup>9</sup> Gary M. Beckman, Trevor R. Bryce, and Eric H. Cline, eds., *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 3.

The Hittites and the Greeks are both Indo-European peoples who spread out across the Eurasian continent, arrived in Asia Minor, and spread to the Balkans as early as 2200 BCE. In the Balkans, an undeveloped agricultural economy defined the region, with the exception of the Minoans who were neither Indo-European, nor Semitic, nor Egyptian. For up to 600 years after the arrival of the Indo-Europeans on the Greek mainland, the Minoans lived in palatial societies defined by centrally planned economies. For some time, scholars imagined that the Minoans were actually the progenitor of Mycenaean society. However, it is now understood that, at some point in the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries BC, Indo-Europeans on the mainland began to accrue wealth, build architecture, and stratify society without military coercion from Crete. Obviously, the Mycenaeans did not develop completely independent of the Minoans. In fact, trade relations probably began around 2000 BCE, and at that point “the Greeks did not just borrow single elements from the Minoan cultural repertoire; they adopted wholesale the model of the Minoan state, right down to the writing system.”<sup>10</sup> The similarity between Linear A, which was the written language of the Minoans, and Linear B, which was an early Greek script used by the Mycenaeans, was what led scholars to confuse the origins of these two groups until Michael Ventris deciphered Linear B between 1951 and 1953. The reality was that, starting in 1450 BCE, the Mycenaeans invaded the Minoan society on Crete and, by the middle of the fourteenth century, the Mycenaeans controlled all of Crete. This translated into the development of the apex of Mycenaean society until a Dark Age ensued around 1050 BCE. Mycenaean civilization was so grand, and its fall so complete, that the era was eventually thought of by Homer as a time of heroes and monsters. It was the only explanation for what still remained of the ruins of the Mycenaean civilization by the middle of the Dark Age in Greece.

Concurrent with the development of Mycenaean civilization was the Hittite conquest of Mesopotamia during the Old Hittite Kingdom in 1595 BCE. Before this time, there is little historical information on Anatolia. What is known comes from an Assyrian merchant colony in Anatolia, which described the rapid centralization of several kingdoms in the region under Hittite rule. Most of the information that exists about the Hittites comes from annals on clay tablets written generations after the fact, which were preserved by a fire at the palace in Hattusa. These are some of the oldest historical records found in the East. Scholars know that the Hittites were heavily influenced by Babylonian culture, which was where they derived their language and religion. The earliest known Hittite king was Hattusili, whose annals describe his creation and reign over the empire he called Hatti during the early seventeenth century. Hattusili launched a campaign in Yamkhad (modern day Syria) as a part of an effort to obtain more farmland. This policy of southern expansion was extended by Hattusili's grandson, Mursili, who came to power near the end of the seventeenth century after Hattusili's sons rebelled or at least disqualified themselves in some way. It was under Mursili that, in 1595, the Hittites destroyed Aleppo and Babylon. “The situation that had characterized Mesopotamia and Syria for two centuries was thus totally reversed,” writes Marc Van De Mieroop.<sup>11</sup> The region plunged into darkness by a power vacuum that opened up beneath one of the oldest civilizations in the world. For over a century, the region turned over on itself. Babylon was overrun; Egypt reasserted control in the Levant under Thutmose III; urban development fell to a level that had not been seen since at least 3000 BCE. This was the context of the Middle Hittite Kingdom, a low-point, which stretched from 1500 to 1430 BCE.

Hatti reemerged in the late fifteenth century as a force in regional affairs under the leadership of Tudhaliya. In a move corroborated by Egyptian sources, Tudhaliya I/II campaigned in

---

<sup>10</sup> Sarah B. Pomeroy, et. al., *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 31.

<sup>11</sup> Marc Van De Mieroop, *A History of the Ancient Near East: ca. 3000-323 BC* (London: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 130.

western Anatolia primarily to keep the region under control.<sup>12</sup> While the Tudhaliyas and Arnuwanda I/II were in power between 1430 and 1344, a vassal for the Hittites named Madduwata ultimately brought most of the western region under his control. However, he failed to cope with a person called Attarissya, who Arnuwanda II calls “the ruler of Ahhiya” in his letter to Madduwata. The letter chastised the vassal for costly military mistakes and questionable loyalty. On two separate occasions, Attarissya invaded the region. The first time, Attarissya “chased [you], Madduwata, out of your land.” At this point, Tudhaliya had conveyed vassal status on Madduwata and restored him to the region. Yet, Madduwata had continuously failed to fulfill his obligation, conspiring against Arnuwanda II, waging war on other vassals, and failing to respond appropriately to a second invasion by Attarissya.<sup>13</sup> This is the earliest acknowledgement of the Ahhiyawans playing a role in the region to the west of Hatti. Much like the Romans did in Asia Minor twelve centuries later, Suppiluliuma restored regional dominance starting in Anatolia through a series of diplomatic and military efforts.

Returning from the east and suffering from the plague that likely killed both him and his chosen successor, Suppiluliuma was replaced by Mursili II around 1321 BCE. The new leader dealt successfully with an Assyrian incursion in Mittani, Egypt in the Levant, and an effort to destabilize Millawanda (Miletus) in the west. According to the annals found at Hattusa, Millawanda had fallen to Ahhiyawa with the help of the vassals in the region, particularly one called Uhha-ziti. “He supported [the King of Ahhiyawa] and became hostile to me. (Now) you must become mine [again], and [no longer support] Uhha-ziti.”<sup>14</sup> Muwatalli II succeeded Mursili II and focused on further consolidation of power by moving the capital at Hattusa south to Tarhuntasa after the Kaskeans, a group of people from the steppe who had raided the city repeatedly, sacked Hattusa at its exposed location in northeastern Anatolia. It appears that, under Muwatalli II's reign (c. 1295-72 BCE), Pijamaradu actively opposed the Hittites in Wilusa, possibly with the support of the Ahhiyawans. In a letter from Manapa-Tarhunta, one of the vassals to the west, to Muwatalli II, historians gain insight into events occurring at Wilusa. Though the letter is focused on a group of skilled laborers that had defected to the Seha River Valley south of the Troad, it introduces Pijamaradu and contextualizes the political dynamic around Wilusa. The result of this appears to be a treaty signed between the Hittites and a person named Aleksandu, a name that is tantalizingly consistent with Homer's account of the son of the Trojan King Priam—Alexander or Paris “on account of whom this war began” (Hom. *Il.* 3.90). Shortly before the end of his reign, in 1274 BCE, Muwatalli II defeated Ramses II at Qadesh in Syria. While evidence in Egypt contradicts the notion of this battle as a Hittite victory, there is also evidence that Hittite control in the Levant expanded after this battle.

In a letter that was translated into Hittite from Greek, an unknown King of Ahhiyawa wrote to Muwatalli II to discuss the ownership of a group of islands. What makes the letter fascinating is that the islands were a part of a dowry, which suggests that there was some sort of an elite marriage between an Ahhiyawan and a Hittite. Furthermore, it appears to be a reference to marriage from several generations prior. The King of Ahhiyawa writes that Muwatalli II's great grandfather, Tudhaliya, had subjugated the Assuwan confederacy as much as a century earlier. The language of the letter fits with an inscription on a sword that was uncovered at Hattusa. Both the letter and that sword credit a “Storm-God” with the subjugation of Assuwa. The figure appears once more in the Tawagalawa letter, which means that historians can account for a consistent and common, if not shared, ideology between Mycenaean and Hittite elites that stretched back to the late fifteenth century and into the middle of the thirteenth century.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, 164-5.

<sup>13</sup> Gary M. Beckman, et. al., *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 71, 81.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, 39.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, 138. See 105 for mention of the Storm-God in the Tawagalawa letter.

Meanwhile, Hattusili III had retaken the northern region of Anatolia, likely laying claim to Hattusa. However, a young Mursili III came to the Hatti throne in 1272. In 1267, Hattusili III swept to the throne and sent Mursili III fleeing for Egypt. As Ramses II and Hattusili III came to blows over the asylum offered to Mursili III, Assyria invaded the region of Mittani. In 1259, Ramses II and Hattusili III entered into a treaty that ended the threat in Mesopotamia. At some point, Pijamaradu comes back onto the scene in the west. This is what prompts Hattusili III to write the Tawagalawa letter to a second unknown King of Ahhiyawa. He asked for solidarity from the Ahhiyawans, whom he suspected of having aided and tacitly supported the incursion of Pijamaradu. There is a reference to an instance when Hattusili III and the King of Ahhiyawa had found common ground previously. The Hittite king wrote, “And concerning the matter [of Wilusa] about which we were hostile-- [because we have made peace], what then?”<sup>16</sup> Instead of merely another conflict between states and individuals in proximity to one another in western Anatolia, this reference appears to be about a direct conflict between Hatti and Ahhiyawa. This is, undoubtedly, the best historical evidence that a proverbial “Trojan War” might have occurred at Wilusa.

It was not until 1237 BCE, thirty years after deposing Mursili III, that Hattusili III was replaced by Tudhaliya IV. After he regained control of Milawata from the Ahhiyawans, Tudhaliya IV signed a treaty with the local leader of Amurru. The settlement was with Tarkasnawa, the King of Mira, whose father had rebelled against Tudhaliya IV. Mira was likely located just south of the Seha River Lands, adjacent to the Troad. Called the Milawata Letter, this piece of correspondence demonstrates the weakening grip of the Hittites on western Anatolia and provides insight into the status of Wilusa. It seems that Tudhaliya IV needed Tarkasnawa to turn over Walmu, a vassal, so that he could put him in charge of Wilusa.<sup>17</sup> A similar deterioration may have been occurring across the Aegean as well, as a treaty between Tudhaliya IV and Amurru (Syria) initially named the Ahhiyawans among the great powers like Egypt and Assyria; but, that mark was intentionally removed from the tablet, suggesting that something occurred after the treaty was written to change the actual or perceived strength of the Ahhiyawans. It is worth pointing out that the Milawata Letter is the same document that, after the discovery of a missing join in the tablet, set in motion the scholarship that brought clarity to the location of Wilusa and other important Hittite cities and states in 1996. Harry Hoffner, an archaeologist, helped bring this narrative to light in 1981 when he found a new fragment of this so-called Milawata Letter. Hans Guterbock, another archaeologist, contextualized these findings, noting that “instead of Milawata/Millawanda as a Hittite dependency, we now have a city from whose territory both the Hittite king and Tarkasnawa enlarge their own realms.”<sup>18</sup> It revealed the nature of the relationship between this New Hittite Kingdom and its subsidiary rulers. This is useful for analyzing the diplomatic relationship of other rulers and vassals.

Past this point, there is no record of the Ahhiyawans in the Hittite sources from Hattusa. There is only one known king of Hatti in the Anatolian heartland after Tudhaliya IV. Facing incursions once more from the steppe, the Hittites fell from the pages of history under Suppiluliuma II, sometime soon after he came to power in 1207 BCE. However, in the ruins of the ancient Syrian city Ugarit, archaeologists unearthed a correspondence between Suppiluliuma II and the last known king of Ugarit, Ammurapi. At the same site, a letter from a Hittite official to the same Ugarit king came to light. Likely dated to the very end of the thirteenth or the first part of the twelfth century BCE, both letters addressed the funding of Ahhiyawan mercenaries deployed for the Hittite empire over the edge of its already receding southwestern frontier. Though, “the (Ah)hiyawan is tarrying in

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, 117.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, 129.

<sup>18</sup> Hans G. Guterbock, “The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 1. The Ahhiyawa Problem Reconsidered,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 87, no. 2 (April 1983): 137.

[the land] of Lukka... there are no (copper) ingots for him.”<sup>19</sup> This seems to indicate the deterioration of both the sovereignty of the Ahhiyawan state and the ability of the Hittite state to fund the security of its border in the west. Ultimately, the Hittites and the Mycenaeans were swept away around the close of the thirteenth century BCE, as their empire was gradually broken off into its constituent parts.

### **Reconciling the Historical Narrative and the Archaeological Evidence**

The most striking syllogism between the development of the archaeological evidence under Manfred Korfmann and the corpus of Hittite texts referencing the Ahhiyawans is the corroboration of a period of turmoil in the region around Hisarlik across the Troy VI and VII levels. After Suppiluliuma brought Hatti to its last great height between 1344 and 1322 BCE, the empire was thereafter beset with problems stabilizing its frontiers, particularly in the Troad. Compare the severity of control exercised by Arnuwanda II over Madduwata in the first half of the thirteenth century with the policy of Tudhaliya IV. Whereas the emperor dressed down Madduwata for not contributing troops to the Hittite cause in the West, Tudhaliya IV attempted to consolidate his rule in Milawata with the aid of Tarkasnawa, whose father had openly rebelled against the Hittites. Crucially, in both instances, it was the Ahhiyawans who were the antagonizing force that faced the vassals of the Hittite state in the west.

This transition across the middle of the fourteenth century and the end of the twelfth century corresponds with the major destructions that divide the sixth and seventh levels at Hisarlik. The earthquake, which the Korfmann expedition posits as the cause of the conclusion of the Troy VI society around 1300 BCE, corresponds with the beginning of the Ahhiyawan incursions, particularly those by Pijamaradu, under Mursili II, Muwatalli II, and Hattusili III between 1321 and 1272 BCE. The synthesis of these two pieces of evidence indicates an earthquake in the region of Hisarlik that destabilized the region, possibly opening the door to outside powers to exploit a recovering society. The continuity and rebuilding efforts that Korfmann's excavation indicates between 1300 and 1150 BCE appear to be consistent with the historical evidence as well. However, it seems that Hatti's deteriorating hegemony left the door open for an increasing number of Ahhiyawan invasions. Notably, these invasions do not seem to be the product of a perpetual enmity between the Hatti and Ahhiyawan leadership. Yet, the Tawagalawa Letter does imply a direct conflict between the two states. However, that conflict is referenced in contrast to otherwise amenable relations. Additionally, the letter from the King of Ahhiyawa to Muwatalli II indicates that some sort of positive relationship had existed as far back as the middle-to-early thirteenth century BCE.

### **Conclusions**

It appears that the incursions of Ahhiyawans in western Anatolia were outside the interests of both the kings of Ahhiyawa and the Hatti Empire. Therefore, the turmoil in and around Wilusa was likely the product of two states in decline. Notably, decline is consistent with the broader historical and archaeological context of the end of the Late Bronze Age. Mycenaean cities were abandoned en masse by their populations during the twelfth and eleventh centuries, suggesting a migration that corresponded with the start of the Dark Age in Greece. Hatti experienced a general collapse defined by famine and violence at the start of the twelfth century. Indeed, if the explanation for the destabilization of western Anatolia is the decline of the two adjacent powers, then that

---

<sup>19</sup> Beckman, 257. Note also the loss of the first syllable, a phenomenon already referenced in the linguistic analysis of the Hittite toponym “Wilusa,” which translated and developed into Ilium in Greek.



meshes with Korfmann's analysis of the Troy VIIb level. Korfmann contends that the combination of invasion and migration appears to have completely supplanted the population at Hisarlik around the middle of the twelfth century. If the inhabitants of Troy VI and VIIa were replaced around the same time as the end of Hittite influence in the region, then it can be said, with some certainty, that the Late Bronze Age site at Hisarlik was fundamentally oriented toward the Hittite state.

This narrative reveals several central facts that aid in understanding the cultural orientation of not only the Late Bronze Age levels at Hisarlik, but the relationship of the Mycenaeans with the civilizations to the east as well. First, it is clear that the Troad was in a transition zone between the Hittites and the Ahhiyawans. Neither state appears to be capable of exerting its full force in western Anatolia. Second, it demonstrates how the political structures used by the Hatti state were present in the Troad during the period that Homer and Herodotus have suggested the Trojan War occurred. If there is any truth to the *Iliad*, then it is likely the product of a telescopic representation of conflicts in western Anatolia, particularly in the century before Greece plunged into its Dark Age. Indeed, the Hittite state was not only influential here, but it demanded obedience from its vassals along the Aegean. Third, this narrative demonstrates that, despite the antagonistic relationship that often appears to have defined these diplomatic relationships, the Ahhiyawan elite found common ground with the Hatti elite and even counted some of them among members of their family as early as late fifteenth century. Finally, this analysis allows the Tawagalawa Letter to stand as the strongest piece of evidence for the historicity of the Trojan War. While this is not a primary objective of this paper, this fact reveals itself, with some irony, once one dispenses with a western-centric view of the story.