The ancient texts that are transliterated, translated, and discussed in this volume have one thing in common: they refer to a country called Ahhiyawa, or they can be used to reconstruct the historical background of the other texts. Virtually all of the texts are Hittite and were found in the Hittite capital of Hattusa. The authors developed the idea of discussing the texts in one volume at the end of a workshop on “Mycenaeans and Anatolians in the Bronze Age: The Ahhiyawa Question” (Montreal, January 2006). The workshop proceedings (ed. A. Teffeteller) have not yet been published, but scholars who want to read the ancient texts can now make use of this book and will also find an up-to-date description of the research on the Mycenaean-Hittite interconnections.

In the introduction (1–8), Eric Cline describes previous scholarly research with regard to the identity of Ahhiyawa and shows that Emil Forrer’s old proposal to identify the Ahhiyawans with the Mycenaean Greeks must be favored over Ferdinand Sommer’s later suggestion that Ahhiyawa was a western Anatolian state. Cline believes that Ahhiyawa proper was an area on the Greek mainland, possibly around Mycenae. Although the Hittite texts refer to a king of Ahhiyawa, he suggests that Ahhiyawa was not a single kingdom but rather a Late Bronze Age confederation of several Mycenaean kingdoms.
Most of the ancient texts in this volume are in Hittite and date from the late fifteenth until the late thirteenth century. They are not presented in chronological order but in the order of *Catalogue des textes hittites* (CTH). In addition to their CTH number, the authors label them with a newly invented designation AhT (Ahhiyawan Text), followed by a number for each individual text. Gary Beckman is responsible for the transliterations and the translations. The following Hittite texts are presented:

AhT 1a (CTH 61.I): The section of Mursili II’s Ten-Year Annals relating to his campaigns in western Anatolia during his third and fourth year. Late fourteenth century.

AhT 1b (CTH 61.II): The more extensive description of Mursili II’s campaigns in western Anatolia in his Extensive Annals. Late fourteenth or early thirteenth century.

AhT 2 (CTH 105): Treaty between Tudhaliya IV of Hatti and Shaushga-muwa of Amurru. Late thirteenth century.

AhT 3 (CTH 147): Indictment of Madduwatta. Early fourteenth century. This text uses the old name Ahhiya instead of Ahhiyawa.


AhT 5 (CTH 182): Letter from a king of Hatti, probably Tudhaliya IV, to a western Anatolian ruler, possibly Tarkasnawa of Mira, known as the “Milawata letter.” The preserved part of the text does not mention Ahhiyawa, but it does refer to individuals and political entities with connections with Ahhiyawa. One of the individuals is Piyamaradu, a rebel who enjoyed the support of Ahhiyawa in his anti-Hittite enterprises. Late thirteenth century.

AhT 6 (CTH 183): Hittite letter from a king of Ahhiyawa to a king of Hatti, probably Muwattalli II. Early to mid-thirteenth century.

AhT 7 (CTH 191): Letter from Manapa-Tarhunta of the Seha River Land to a Hittite king, probably Muwattalli II. Ahhiyawa is not mentioned in the preserved lines, but there are references to Piyamaradu. Early thirteenth century.

AhT 8 (CTH 209.12): Letter from a Hittite official to the king, possibly Hattusili III. Thirteenth century.

AhT 9 (CTH 209.16): Fragment of a letter, possibly from a Hittite king to a king of Ahhiyawa.
AhT 10 (CTH 209.17): Small fragment of a letter, with a damaged reference to a king of Ahhiyawa.

AhT 11 (CTH 211.4): Description of offenses of the Seha River Land, possibly an edict of Tudhaliya IV. Late thirteenth century.


AhT 19 (CTH 243.6): Inventory of the contents of a storeroom mentioning a copper vessel from Ahhiyawa. Thirteenth century.

AhT 20 (CTH 570.1), AhT 21 (CTH 570.2), AhT 22 (CTH 571.2), AhT 23 (CTH 572.1), and AtH 24 (CTH 572.2): Oracle reports from different periods referring to Ahhiyawa, for instance, to its deity or its ruler. AhT 22 is the oldest of these oracle reports and uses the old name Ahhiya instead of Ahhiyawa.

AhT 25 (CTH 581*): Letter referring to a journey to Ahhiyawa. Thirteenth century.

AhT 26 (CTH 590): Possibly a votive prayer of Puduhepa, wife of Hattusili III, without reference to Ahhiyawa in the surviving part of the document but with references to Piyamaradu. Thirteenth century.

In addition to these Hittite texts, three texts are included that were discovered more recently. They use the name Hiyawa instead of Ahhiyawa.

AhT 27a: Akkadian letter from the Hittite king Suppiluliuma II to king Ammurapi of Ugarit referring to people of Hiyawa, found in the “house of Urtenu” in Ugarit. Late thirteenth century.
AhT 27b: Akkadian letter from Penti-Sharruma, a Hittite official, to king Ammurapi of Ugarit referring to a man of Hiyawa, found in the “house of Urtenu” in Ugarit. Late thirteenth century.

AhT 28: Luwian/Phoenician inscription of Warika, king of Hiyawa, discovered in 1997 in Çineköy, thirty kilometers south of Adana. By far the youngest text discussed in this volume: eighth century B.C.E.

The transliteration and translation of most texts are followed by a commentary by Trevor Bryce in which he elucidates what the text reveals with regard to Ahhiyawa. In his commentary to AhT 3, Bryce shows that already in the early fourteenth century Ahhiyawa sought to expand its influence in western Anatolia and that it was difficult for the Hittite kings to enforce the loyalty of the kingdoms in that area. The annals of Mursili II (AhT 1a, AhT 1b) recount that during the first years of this king the western Anatolian kingdoms of Millawanda (Miletus) and Arzawa (capital: Apasa/Ephesus) were disloyal to the Hittite Empire and allied themselves with the Ahhiyawan king. Mursili reports with satisfaction that his army was able to subdue the uprising in his third and fourth years. However, AhT 4 shows that a few decades later there was again uprising in western Anatolia and that several Hittite campaigns ended in a failure. Millawanda appears to have come under Ahhiyawan control. It is significant that the Hittite king addresses his Ahhiyawan counterpart as his equal: “Great King,” “my brother,” “my peer.”

In his commentary to the somewhat younger text AhT 2, Bryce discusses an interesting phenomenon. The scribe first wrote: “And the Kings who are my (i.e., Tudhaliya’s) equals in rank are the King of Egypt, the King of Babylon, the King of Assyria, and the King of Ahhiyawa.” However, the scribe erased the phrase “and the King of Ahhiyawa” when the clay was still wet. The initial mistake was probably due to the Ahhiyawan king’s higher status in the past, a status that he had recently lost. Text AhT 5 indicates that in the late thirteenth century Ahhiyawa had lost most of its influence in western Anatolia.

In the epilogue (267–83) Eric Cline discusses not only the textual but also the archaeological evidence. The involvement of Ahhiyawa in western Anatolia is confirmed by the occurrence of Mycenaean artifacts, especially in areas near the coast. Mycenaean must have been active on the Anatolian mainland probably already during the late fifteenth and certainly during the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries. The relationship between the Mycenaean and the Hittites seems to have become more peaceful after Mursili II conquered the land of Arzawa. The situation worsened again in the thirteenth century, when Ahhiyawa supported the anti-Hittite activities of Piyamaradu and others. The Hittite texts suggest that the Hittites failed to curtail the uprising. Archaeological evidence indicates that there was a strong Mycenaean presence in Miletus during this...
period, which came to an end when Tudhaliya IV conquered the city. Not only the texts but also the archaeological data suggest that Ahhiyawa weakened considerably during the last decades of the thirteenth century. The (Ah)hiyawans that the two Akkadian letters from Ugarit (AhT 27a, AhT 27b) refer to seem to be freebooters or mercenaries, not representatives of a Mycenaean kingdom.

Much later, in the eighth century, Warika refers to his kingdom in Cilicia as “Hiyaw” (Luwian) and to his people as $dnnym$ (Phoenician). The name “Hiyaw” may be due to a migration of descendants of the Ahhiyawans to this area after the collapse of the Late Bronze Age kingdoms. Remarkably, Mycenaean pottery dating from the last decades of the Late Bronze Age has been found primarily in the area of Cilicia. Despite the possibility of connecting the $dnnym$ in the Phoenician version of the text with the Sea People of Danuna or Denyen, neither Bryce nor Cline tries to identify Sea Peoples with groups of Mycenaens.

My first critical remark relates to the title of the volume and to the new label “AhT.” There is insufficient reason to label the significantly different texts discussed in this volume as a “definitive corpus” (xiv) of “Ahhiyawa Texts.” In some of the texts, the references to Ahhiyawa are only marginal, and in some of them references are even lacking entirely. Actually, “AhT 6” is the only text for which the new label “AhT” is appropriate. All the other texts were not written by Ahhiyawans. The texts are certainly not a collection with a strong mutual relationship, like the documents discussed in other volumes of the WAW series, but compositions of completely different origins and genres. Also, for the long texts with only marginal references to Ahhiyawa, such as the oracle reports, it would have sufficed to display the short passages where these references occur.

For the intended scholarly readership, it would have been useful to discuss the different Hittite spellings of Ahhiyawa ($ah-hi-ya-wa$, but also $ah-hi-ya-u-wa$, $ah-hi-ú-wa-a$, etc.) and the possibility of connecting the name with the Achaeans. The list of signs and symbols (viii) does not contain an explanation of the half brackets ↷ and ↷ that occur often in the transliterations.

Despite these minor shortcomings, there is ample reason to congratulate the authors with the publication of this readable book. Thanks to their initiative, scholars interested in the identity and history of Ahhiyawa can access improved translations and transliterations of the most relevant texts. The clear introduction, commentaries, and epilogue provide useful information with regard to the problems connected with the identification of the Ahhiyawans and the reconstruction of their history.