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PREFACE

On October 19, 1984 the Departments of Greek, Latin and Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology of Bryn Mawr College held a symposium on the Trojan War as part of the celebrations of the Centennial of Bryn Mawr College, 1885-1985.

The subject of the Trojan War was chosen by the Departments in appreciation of the traditional and creative interest of Bryn Mawr scholars such as Rhys Carpenter, Richmond Lattimore, and Mary Hamilton Swindler in the study of Homer and Aegean prehistory. The Departments thank the President of Bryn Mawr College, Mary Patterson McPherson, for her strong endorsement of the Troy symposium.

The papers presented on that occasion are published in this volume with footnotes and illustrations. The texts have not been basically changed from the spoken versions. References to studies published after the date of the symposium are made in postscripts only.* Of the illustrations, figs. 1-23 and a map of the Troad have been kindly provided by Professor Manfred Korfmann, figs. 24-26 by Professor J. Lawrence Angel.

The organizers owe a debt of gratitude to the speakers, the commentators (led by Professor James D. Muhly and Professor Spyros Iakovidis) as well as the large audience of colleagues, alumnae/i, students and friends which followed the proceedings with lively interest and encouragement. We much appreciated that Dr. Jerome Sperling came from Athens to participate in the symposium and to represent the great Blegen era. Dr. Sperling's remarks about Troy and his reminiscences of Dörpfeld's visits created a vivid link with the history of excavation and excavators.

The editor of this volume wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the advice and assistance in the technical preparation of this publication provided by Dr. Maria deJ. Ellis, Pamela Gerardi, and especially Professor Erle Leichty of the Babylonian Section of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.

The text was typeset by Dorothy A. Slane and Patricia M. Seabolt, graduate students in the Department of Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology of Bryn Mawr College. They deserve admiration for their technical accomplishments in ancient and modern languages and composition of charts.

Warm thanks are due to Professor Brunilde S. Ridgway of Bryn Mawr College, who provided expert editorial advice in the planning, proofreading and production of this volume.
Professor Mabel L. Lang of Bryn Mawr College assisted with the proofreading and editorial checking of several papers, especially those containing quotations in Greek.

Professor Jeanny V. Canby, of Columbia University and the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, deserves special gratitude for her gracious sponsorship of the planning session of the symposium and her generous hospitality to the symposiasts.

Troy and the Trojan War are subjects of continuing relevance to the historical and mythological conscience of modern man. Whether the ancient tradition is based on recoverable facts and identifications will be debated in learned gatherings and writings of many future generations. It is hoped that the following papers offer the reader elements for a rethinking of old questions.

Machteld J. Mellink
Editor

*Not available at the time of the symposium were the following:


Donald Easton, “Has the Trojan War Been Found?” in Antiquity 59 (1985) 188-196.
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THE GEOPOLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF HISARIK ("TROY") AND THE HARBOR PROBLEM

For two millennia Troy — or Ilion — has occupied the minds of many, archaeologically and scientifically as well as emotionally. It is nearly impossible to discuss the subject without presenting hypotheses which others have already — very similarly, if not identically — expressed. I too must admit that some of my arguments have been previously formulated and can be found presented elsewhere. It is by no means my intention to plunge deep into the academic springs of Trojan research and the Homeric sources which have been bubbling steadily and especially profusely since the eighteenth century.

Viewing the facts in all soberness, however, one must admit that there exists no other prehistoric findspot in all of western Anatolia which can compare to Hisarlik — even if one is not willing to equate the excavated site with Homer’s Troy. The prehistoric settlement boasts a continuous stratigraphical sequence of 41 architectural levels, constituting an impressive deposit of more than twenty meters. Especially significant are the fortification systems of the successive settlements with their battered walls interrupted at intervals by bastions and gates. The fortifications are truly massive among prehistoric defenses. Most outstanding are those from the various phases of the Trojan Sixth Settlement. Where else north of Tiryns and Mycenae does one encounter ruins of such monumentality as early as the second half of the second millennium? Such architecture must reflect not only the importance of the settlement itself, but a certain continuous threat as well, felt by the inhabitants because of the critical geographic location of the site. The wealth and power of the settlement are attested over a long span of time, most conspicuously in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. The conquest of such a city would have repaid the efforts of an invader many times over. A surprise attack from the sea, however, would have been impossible, as a threatening force could be recognized from a great distance.

It is not my point, at least at present, to disclaim or to support the
historical authenticity of the Trojan War.¹ My concern here is with the landscape and setting of Hisarhk, as well as with that indisputably significant settlement itself, generally acknowledged as Troy since the excavations of Schliemann in the 1870s and 1880s. As a prehistorian, I should stress that the question of its identity as Troy — or Ilion — remains primarily a philological problem, a question for those studying Homer and historical topography. As was effectively pointed out by Hachmann in 1964, excavation has not yet been able to substantiate the story presented in the epic.²

Because I have had the opportunity to become closely acquainted with the “Trojan landscape,” my text is focused upon this theme. My colleagues and I have been exploring and excavating in the area of Beşik Bay, an embayment lying some 8 km. (as the crow flies) southwest of Hisarhk (map in back pocket).³ Walking from Hisarhk toward Beşik Bay, we reach in about half an hour the nearly dry bed of a channelized stream which over the last two millennia has been repeatedly identified as the Skamander of the Iliad.⁴ After another half-hour’s walk, having crossed the rapidly flowing stream called the Pınarbaşı Suyu, we reach a structure which has long served as an orientation point in the landscape. The building is a rectangular tower, called the beyaz kule, “white tower,” by the Turks in the neighboring villages. The ground plan is 10 m²; the walls rise 11 m. to a flat roof with crenellations. Projecting from the roof at each of the four corners are small round domed look-outs. Entrance to the lower story, generously lighted through large arched windows, was originally gained over a drawbridge (figs. 3-5, 7-10).

It seems that little attention had been paid to the structure before our


4. The Skamander, at best a modest river, is liable to dry up completely in various seasons; see J.B. Lechevalier, Voyage dans la Troade ou Tableau de la Plaine de Troye; German ed., Reise nach Troas, oder Gemälde der Ebene von Troja in ihrem gegenwärtigen Zustande, trans. C.G. Lenz (Altenburg and Erfurt 1800) 179.
arrival in the area, aside from the occasional treasure-seeker.\(^5\) The building is a stylistic anomaly in the region. Its European — Rhodian or perhaps southern Italian — heritage is not difficult to discern. The structure dates to the second half of the eighteenth century; it was built by a certain Jezayirli Gazi Hasan Pasha: Hasan Pasha the Algerian, with the honorary title of Gazi (fig. 1). The man was a high admiral (\textit{Kapudan Paşa}) and is today still highly regarded throughout Turkey. Three times he served as the Grand Vizier of the Ottoman Empire. The location of Hasan Pasha's tower, or \textit{köşk}, corresponds to a group of buildings (a small village or manor house) identified on the early maps as "Yerkessik." Indeed, with a careful survey of the surrounding fields, one can still make out the foundations of subsidiary structures quite obviously laid out in conjunction with the tower (fig. 2).\(^6\)

Facing northward from the tower, one looks out over the Trojan plain (cf. map). The ruins of Hisarlık lie to the right; one sees as well the valley from which the Kara Menderes or Skamander empties into the blue waters of the Dardanelles. Steep cliffs along the Gallipoli peninsula screen any farther sight of the European continent and form a striking backdrop for the scene of ships passing through the straits just 9 km. north of the tower. From here one can recognize each passing ship, even when the weather is relatively poor. Looking westward from the tower of Hasan Pasha, one sees the 13 m. high tumulus Sivritepe some 3 km. away, just at the north edge of the Beşik basin. From the roof of the tower, the whole of Beşik Bay is visible, 2.5 km. north-south and 2 km. east-west. Early residents or visitors to the tower must have observed the sail-driven ships of the period anchored in the bay. From here, view was open both to the Aegean and to the Dardanelles. The close relationship between this tower and seafaring is emphasized by a discovery in the interior of the structure. On the walls of the salon, or reception room, upstairs, as well as on the first floor we found representations of harbor scenes, fish, and numerous ships. These graffiti,

\(^5\) The lack of a local tradition is due to a change of population; the present inhabitants of this area immigrated from the formerly Turkish Balkan countries in the second half of the 19th century; the local Greek population emigrated to Greece.

\(^6\) The tower with its corner turrets, as well as seven other structures, is entered on the map of T. Spratt and P.W. Forchhammer, drawn in 1850; see P.W. Forchhammer, \textit{Beschreibung der Ebene von Troja} (n.p. 1850). Renderings of excellent quality showing the tower, environs, and Hasan Pasha himself, are presented in engravings of 1776, M.C.F.A. Choiseul-Gouffier, \textit{Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II} (Paris 1822).
cut into the penultimate layer of plastering, provide us with an entire fleet
of early ships: a great range of styles and models (figs. 6-7; 11-13).7

Why, however, should this structure — interesting and alluring as it
may be to a Turcologist — so intrigue me as a prehistorian? The riddle lies
in the relationship of the structure to the topography. Here all comes
together: the bay to the west, the Dardanelles to the north, the strong
prevailing winds in the area, the sailing ships. Here Hasan Pasha, in a style
fitting his rank, received his guests, among others, in 1786, the French
“citizen” and man of the cloth J.B. Lechevalier, who provides us with the
following information.8 “One mile west of Udjek Tepe is the village
Erkessighy; when I visited there, the Captain Pasha or high admiral at the
time, the famous Hassan, was himself having the kiosk remodelled, where
he would customarily rest while his fleet, returning from an undertaking
(of the usual sort) in the Aegean, was required to wait for a south wind at
the mouth of the Hellespont.”9 These lines cast a distinct light upon the
sailing conditions, and thus indirectly upon the significance of the terrain in
which Hisarlk lies. There can be no doubt that the ships of Hasan Pasha
whiled away their time in Beşik Bay, an anchoring ground most familiar to
navigators and seafarers. From Lechevalier’s words it becomes clear that,
even in the late eighteenth century, ships wishing to pass through the
Dardanelles into the Sea of Marmara en route to Constantinople or beyond
into the Black Sea were compelled to cast anchor and wait, if there was no
favorable south wind.

In addition to this Ottoman source, those familiar with the history of
navigation will anticipate a reference to Beşik Bay in the works of the well-
known Ottoman cartographer Piri Reis as well. The latter, a fleet admiral
in the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, is best known to us through his “map
of the world,” drawn up in Gallipoli in 1513, as well as for the book Kitab-i
Bahriye (completed there in 1521) in which he described and illustrated the

7. The engravings show an astonishing stylistic and factual resemblance to
representations known from one of the manuscripts of “Bahriye”: P. Kahle, Piri Reis’s
Bahriye. Das Türkische Segelhandbuch für das Mittelländische Meer vom Jahre
1521 I (Berlin and Leipzig 1926).

8. Lechevalier is also the proponent of the identification of Pınarbaşı as the site
of the Homeric Troy, ca. 6.5 km southeast of Hisarlk. He evidently paid no more
than a brief visit to the site, and took less interest in the archaeological remains than
in the geographical situation. Telltale features for him were the “40 springs”
(Turkish Kırk Göz) which he took to be those of the Skamander of the Iliad. The
ensuing debate split the scholarly world of the 19th century in two (or more)
factions until the beginning of Schliemann’s excavations.

9. Lechevalier, Reise (supra n. 4) 179 (author’s trans.).
ports and islands of the Mediterranean from a navigator’s point of view. From Piri Reis we learn that the seven-mile wide passage between Tenedos and the mainland constituted the usual route for ships coming northward from the region of Smyrna and heading for the Dardanelles. He wrote: “One should most decidedly sail through here and into the straits. It should be kept in mind that from this passage to the entrance of the straits, that is, the Yeni-Şehir Burnu (or Cape Yenişehir, the former Sigeion Ridge), the distance is only twelve miles.”10 As to the currents, Piri Reis cautions that if one approaches the Dardanelles from Lemnos, that is, from the south, the current from the straits is strong enough to force the ship onto Tavşan Island (Mavronisi), northwest of Beşik Bay. For this reason, he advises one “to sail as far forward as possible in lee of the current, so that one can enter the straits in a sound condition.” Should one sail northward past Tavşan Island, “because of the strong and irregular current, one must steer a course distant from the island and its surrounding reefs.” Reading further we encounter reference to our Beşik Bay. “As a landmark for this harbor to the seafarer, there is a rounded rise just on the shore, suggestive of an island.” In a different hand is written: “a small rounded very steep promontory.” I should add here that this is one of our excavation sites, Beşik-Yasitepe, which today boasts a lighthouse. “To the south side of this rise,” Piri Reis continues, “is a good anchor ground. To the west there are shallows extending nearly two miles outward into the sea. The appropriate entry into the harbor, consequently, if one comes from Qum Burnu Yüzü, is to sail close to the coast, or simply to approach the rise in such a way [“close” has been added in another hand] that the former is sighted directly to the north. Then one casts anchor. It is a harbor suitable for anchorage on wintry days [or, in another hand, “suitable for wintry days and a good harbor”]. Five miles southward from this harbor lies Qum Burnu. On days with winds from the northeast, there are good anchorages with calm water along the southern side of this ridge.” The second hand specifies: “as far along as the shipbuilding wharf in Eski Istanbulluq.” Here I call to your attention that Eski Istanbulluq, the ancient site of Alexandria (Troas), served with regard to anchorage and embarkation a function fully comparable to that of Beşik Bay.

Attesting the geographical significance of our region, Piri Reis has included in his work a map of the coastal strip from Eski Istanbulluq to the

10. The citations are translated from the German edition by Kahle, Piri Reis’s Bahrıye (supra n. 7) II, 6-8. For a very similar comment, see Choiseul-Gouffier (supra n. 6) 336: “il est obligé d’attendre les vents du sud pour pénétrer dans l’Hellespont.”
Dardanelles, encompassing as well Bozcaada (Tenedos) and the other islands which lie off the coast. Piri Reis labels Beşik Bay as liman-i-çökiertme on his map and describes it in his text as a good harbor. Indeed, as the final anchor ground before the entrance into the Dardanelles, the bay remained of maritime significance even into the last century.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{The Significance of Beşik Bay}

What was then the intrinsic value of this bay? Through Hasan Pasha and his tower we learn of problems with the wind, from Piri Reis we learn of perverse currents. The rivers which flow into the Black Sea — among them the Danube and three large Russian rivers: the Dniester, Dnieper, and Don — produce a freshwater flow via the Bosporus and the Dardanelles into the Aegean. In a year of average rainfall the Danube alone contributes up to 228 billion tons of water. This current runs through the Bosporus at a speed of up to seven knots, and through the wider Dardanelles it can flow as fast as five knots, or 9 km. per hour, with an average speed of two-and-a-half to three knots (or 4.6 to 5.5 km. per hour).\textsuperscript{12} Funneled through the straits in a southwesterly direction, the current is forced outward toward the island of Bozcaada some 10 km. southwest of Beşik Bay. The bay itself, however, remains just in the lee of the current.

In a study on the Greek penetration of the Black Sea, Carpenter suggested that these currents prevented northward passage through the Bosporus before the invention of the Ionic pentekonter, ca. 680 B.C.\textsuperscript{13} A rowing speed of at least five knots was necessary to pass eastward through the Dardanelles. We can assume that this capability — indeed needed in the narrowest part of the straits where a ship cannot count on any helpful reverse currents — was also possessed by the certainly large oar-driven ships of the third and second millennia B.C. Thus we should postulate, I

\textsuperscript{11} It is therefore not surprising that the British and French fleets were often stationed here in the 19th century, e.g., for four or five months in the summer of 1853 shortly before the outbreak of the Crimean war. Prokesch von Osten mentions that at the time of his visit in 1824 three British warships lay at anchor below the "Trojan cape," as Beşik-Yasstepe is occasionally labelled on ancient maps. G. Pfligersdorffer, "Und nur das Wandern ist mein Ziel."\textit{Aus den griechischen Reise- und Zeitbildern des Grafen Prokesch von Osten} (Graz, Vienna, Cologne 1978) 107.

\textsuperscript{12} As reported by Rhys Carpenter, "The Greek Penetration of the Black Sea,"\textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 52 (1948) 1-10, p. 5; data taken from \textit{The Black Sea Pilot} (Hydrographic Department of the British Admiralty, London 1942).

\textsuperscript{13} Carpenter (supra n. 12) 1-7. See also B.W. Labaree, "How the Greeks sailed into the Black Sea,"\textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 61 (1957) 29-33.
believe, that the navigational realm of Troy — or Hisarlık — extended eastward only as far as the Sea of Marmara (the Propontis) and did not reach into the Black Sea. Carpenter was probably justified in speaking of the Black Sea as a *mare clausum*.

As a further complication to the outward-flowing current which represents a constant hindrance to ships entering the Sea of Marmara through the Dardanelles, there are the strong and nearly ceaseless winds which usually blow from the northeast in a southwesterly direction parallel to the current. The daily average speed of these winds is 16.2 km. per hour.\(^\text{14}\) Such northeast winds remain prevalent from spring to early fall, just during those months best suited to navigation in the Aegean and Mediterranean. Southerly winds are more frequent in the late fall and winter months, when ancient man took to the sea only if necessary. The cold winter, with gusty winds, rain, and limited visibility, was unfavorable to early sea travel; the shorter days prevented seafarers from progressing from island to island by daylight.

The southerly winds of the wintertime are often gales which make navigation most treacherous; the sea is then churned by conflicting currents of wind and water.

The hazards of sailing in the region of the Dardanelles have been reported by many travellers and navigators,\(^\text{15}\) even as late as the twentieth century. We read in the *Black Sea Pilot* of 1908, for example, that the north wind “lasts sometimes so long that it is not a rare occurrence to see 200 or 300 vessels in Tenedos channel or in the other anchorages, waiting a favourable and enduring breeze. With every slightly southerly air they get underway, but only to shift from one anchorage to another, and they reach the Sea of Marmara after having accomplished the distance by short stages . . .”\(^\text{16}\) Such unfavorable natural phenomena must have presented a still greater peril to prehistoric ships fitted out only with oars and primitive sails. We must remember also that the technique of sailing against the wind had not yet been discovered; indeed it was still not practiced in Homer’s time.

From personal experience while excavating on the cape north of the Beşik embayment, we can attest that the northeasterly winds blow nearly

---


continuously in the summer, becoming from time to time almost intolerable. The winds tend to pick up toward noontime and continue until sunset. The winds are a seemingly regular phenomenon, even on the most beautiful summer days. From the site we can observe how the smaller modern motorboats en route from Bozcaada to Çanakkale on the straits seek shelter in the protection of Beşik Bay or continue to the north close in lee of the cape and the steep coast of the “Sigeion Ridge,” where they are sheltered from the wind and currents. It is a credit to Homer’s geography that he speaks often of “windy Ilion.”

Our study and experience in the Beşik basin and the neighboring area have enabled us to appreciate five additional factors, all of which must have had a real influence on the pattern of early navigation here.

1) After more than five months of drought in the summer of 1981, the six fresh-water sources which are found on the slopes of the Beşik basin and northward as far as Yeniköy were still producing a total of 48 liters of drinking water per minute. Such an abundance of fresh water could certainly have covered the needs of even a large fleet stationed in the area — in the dry summer months as well as in the rainy season. As one approaches the Dardanelles from the south, Beşik Bay is the final coastal source where satisfactory embarkation is available.

2) Northward from here toward the straits the coast is steep and rugged, allowing no passage by land along the edge of the water.

3) Beşik Bay itself is shallow with sandy beaches; entrance to the bay is open and not blocked by reefs. One can easily imagine the seafarers of prehistoric times beaching their ships along the sandy shores of the area.

4) Previous geological surveys within the embayment, in conjunction with 14C datings of shell and plant remains, have indicated that the basin has silted and filled over the centuries. Around six thousand years ago the entire basin was a bay with the sea extending far inland. Thus in earlier times the bay would have offered an even more protective harbor than today.

5) The importance of the bay as an embarkation point is reflected in the military restrictions of both past and recent times. Traces of past military activity are attested by the entrenchments riddling our excavation site.

Thus we have several valid grounds — both natural and historical — which suggest a relationship between the unique embarkation/anchorage facilities of Beşik Bay and the archaeologically important mound of Hisarlık, or Troy.

Although our focus here is not on Hisarlık itself, but rather on the
significance of its landscape and setting, I can anticipate a question concerning the location of the ten-year naval camp of the Achaians, generally considered to have been located at the mouth of the Skamander River (today's Menderes) on the Dardanelles — according to the Iliad, "on the Hellespont."

The broad lower valley of the Menderes, however, could not have offered the oar- or sail-driven ships convenient anchorage and embarkation, because of the strong currents of wind and water. It is these currents which, as mentioned above, would have made the westward trip from the Sea of Marmara — or indeed from the Black Sea — for many, a journey without return. The information which we have, including early maps and engravings, characterizes the lower Menderes as having been extremely swampy. Many familiar with the area, including Schliemann, reported being plagued by the many mosquitoes.\textsuperscript{17} It is only on the neighboring heights, for example on the "Sigeion Ridge" or on the \textit{Pergamos} of "windy Ilion," that one could have held out long, indeed even survived, considering the threat of malaria.\textsuperscript{18}

In addition to the swampy ground and the plague of mosquitoes — as well as the problematic winds and currents discussed above — we can cite the lack of fresh drinking water in the lower catchment of the Menderes River and \textit{Pınarbaşı Suyu} as a further disadvantage to disembarkation or prolonged anchorage there, not to mention a stationing of troops. What grounds have we, then, to support the theory of an Achaian encampment in this vicinity? First of all, there is Homer's recurring phrase that the ships were beached \textit{on the Hellespont}! This argument carries much weight, in that Homer's geographical description, to judge from other details, seems to have been quite accurate. A second argument was seen in the tumuli which lie on the flanks of the plain on either side of the river. By the

\textsuperscript{17.} As a consequence, malaria is known to have prevailed in prehistoric and Ottoman times. On the subject of malaria in the East Mediterranean area in various epochs, see J.L. Angel, \textit{Lerna II. The People} (Princeton and Washington 1971) 77-84, and 110 with a summary of his extensive research. See also Angel, infra 67-68.

\textsuperscript{18.} The modern visitor finds a fertile and rather dry landscape in the Plain of Troy. This is of recent date and a result of the canalization and drainage projects of the years 1956-1965. Two canals dug from the plain toward the Aegean Sea attest past efforts at controlled drainage and irrigation. One of these, from at least the second half of the 18th to the early 20th century led to Beşik Bay, where a mill was functioning, Hamam- or Hamam-Değirmeni. The other canal was planned north of Beşik Bay (north of Yeniköy) and south of Kesik-Tepe. The date of the latter monumental cutting through the Sigeion promontory is not yet determined. The work was evidently not completed.
eighteenth century, these had already been ascribed to the heroes fallen in
the Trojan War. As we know today, however, these tumuli did not belong
to Achilles or Patroklos, but to persons from much later periods, mostly
from Hellenistic times.
Through the geographical identification of Troy and the excavations
there, the location of the Greek naval camp seemed finally clear.
Schliemann and Dörpfeld were convinced that the 1186 ships had been
beached on the Dardanelles (the "Hellespont"), and indeed the recently
exposed "Troy" lay only 5.5 km. south of the straits. Nevertheless, second
thoughts about the Greek encampment were soon expressed, first by one
colleague of the Hisarlik excavations, Alfred Brückner. Basing his
arguments primarily on the text of the Iliad, Brückner spoke out clearly
and rationally against the position on the Dardanelles in a lecture delivered
before the Berlin Archaeological Society in 1912. His hypothesis was that
"the nautical encampment of the Homeric Achaians [must have] lain to
the southwest of Troy at Beşik Bay opposite the island of Tenedos."19
Kommerzienrat Oscar Mey reached a similar conclusion in studying
Homer.20
Then during World War I Oberst W. von Diest with his humanistic
background touched upon the subject in his work Die Dardanellen im
Weltkrieg. In one chapter treating "Earlier Battles on the Dardanelles," he
chose to support Brückner's hypothesis.21 Finally, Schliemann's associate
and successor, Dörpfeld, after long discussions with Brückner and von
Diest, became himself convinced of the westerly location. He published
his new convictions in an article entitled "Das Schiffslager der Griechen
vor Troja," which appeared in the Festschrift for Alfred Götze, another
colleague of the Hisarlik excavations.22 Here Dörpfeld did not hesitate to
favor a literal reading of the lines of Homer himself over the various later
interpretations. There are, in fact, no descriptions in Homer which would
rule out the identification of the encampment to the west rather than to the
north; to the contrary, as long as one is not bothered by the location of the
encampment "on the Hellespont," the lay of the land to the west, that is, in
the Beşik basin, correlates more plausibly with the text. The recurring

19. A. Brückner, "Das Schlachtfeld vor Troja," Archäologischer Anzeiger 1912,
616-633.
20. O. Mey, Das Schlachtfeld vor Troja (Berlin 1926).
22. W. Dörpfeld, "Das Schiffslager der Griechen vor Troja," in H. Mötefindt,
ed., Studien zur vorgeschichtlichen Archäologie (Festschrift A. Götze, Leipzig
1925) 115-121.
phrase “the encampment in the plain on the Hellespont” constituted the principal argument for situating the Greeks on the shores of the Dardanelles near the mouth of the Skamander.

As early as 1898, however, Wilhelm Sieglin had pointed out that the concept of the “Sea of Helle” before the fifth century B.C. was not restricted to the straits, but included as well the Thracian Sea to the west and the Propontis to the east.23 Indeed, as late as the early sixth century A.D., Stephanus of Byzantium referred to the island of Tenedos as lying “in the Hellespont.”24 This clarification of Sieglin removes any necessity of locating the encampment to the north and allows that the Greek ships and camp as described by Homer could indeed have lain opposite Tenedos (Bozcaada) in Beşik Bay — should Homer’s epic truly reflect the historical events. Most interesting, certainly, is the appellation “Achaiion” by which the strip of coast opposite Tenedos came to be known.25 Whether or not a Trojan War actually occurred, pinpointing the location of the harbor used by the prehistoric settlers of Hisarlık remains a valid task.

It was a search for both the harbor used by the Achaians and the tombs of the Homeric heroes, especially those of the comrades Achilles and Patroklos, which instigated a German expedition in the Beşik basin in 1924.26 Dörpfeld from the Hisarlık excavations took part, as did Martin Schede, later director of the German Archaeological Institute in Istanbul. These earlier investigations were of a geological nature and revealed, as have our excavations, the maritime character of the basin.

As to the burial tumuli (both briefly investigated earlier by Schliemann in 1879), the one near Üvecik köyü proved to be apparently from Roman times, although upon earlier foundations — in any case, not to be ascribed to the end of the second millennium B.C.27 The second tumulus is our Beşik-Sivritepe. Here, the excavations of 1924 were cut short. As Schede explained, “The hopes of the participants that a second complementary campaign might be possible, were not fulfilled, as the

25. Strabo, Geographica 13, 1.32.
26. See Dörpfeld (supra n. 22) and Mey (supra n. 20).
27. It may be the funeral mound raised by Caracalla for his favorite Festus; see J.M. Cook, The Troad (Oxford 1973) 172-173.
Turkish government on military grounds was no longer granting foreigners permission to excavate along the coasts.\textsuperscript{28}

Despite the fact that the tumuli cannot be connected with the heroes of the Trojan War, there are other, stronger arguments for locating the harbor of Hisarlik in Beşik Bay.

It has proved a great advantage for our work in the Beşik basin that Turkish and American geologists recently undertook investigations in the area, including drillings in the plain of the Skamander (Menderes). Their work has been published in a supplementary monograph of the University of Cincinnati \textit{Troy} series.\textsuperscript{29} In regard to the coastal morphology, the study concluded that in this area the sea extended farthest inland around 5000 B.C. In that period, today's plain must have been entirely submerged; the sea reached 12 km. inland from the present shoreline, and the rise of Hisarlik would have been nearly a peninsula, surrounded by water on three sides. Over the many centuries since 5000 B.C., a gradual sedimentation of the plain through the rivers Menderes and Dumbrek (the Simoeis) has taken place, accompanied by a slight lowering of the sea level. Thus the First and Second Trojan Settlements of the third millennium B.C. would have been situated on a nearly level beach just at the water edge. As the sea gradually retreated northward toward the Dardanelles, the swampy lower valley of the Skamander and the Simoeis moved likewise to the north. By the thirteenth or twelfth century B.C. — the setting of the \textit{Iliad} — the coastal configuration must already have been similar to what it is today, although the sea lay much nearer to Hisarlik. In these centuries the plain between Hisarlik and the Dardanelles would still have been much too cramped to allow for the advances and retreats of a battle. "Descriptions of the plain of Troy in the \textit{Iliad} fit these new models. If the Trojan War did occur, then the axis of the battlefield was to the southwest across the Skamander plain toward the Besika embayment ..."\textsuperscript{30}

This brings us to the central point of my paper, that Homer's geographical description, despite meter and poetic license, not only conveys a remarkably accurate impression of the Troad in general, but also

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{28} M. Schede, "Anatolien. I," \textit{Archäologischer Anzeiger} 1929, 359.
  \item \textsuperscript{30} J.C. Kraft, I. Kayan and O. Erol, "Reconstructions of Ancient Landscapes at Troy (Hissarlik) in the Troad: The Past 10,000 Years," Abstract, \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 84 (1980) 218.
\end{itemize}
provides a concrete description of Beşik Bay as the harbor and encampment of the Greek troops.

As philology is not my specialty, for further details I must refer you to philologists and students of Homer; I can only say that a substantial number of scholars supports this viewpoint, even if it has not yet become generally accepted in the scholarly and popular literature.

I hope I have thus far been able to convey, not only that our area — the harbor of Hisarlık and the site itself — occupies a most significant position near the straits between Europe and Asia, but furthermore that a secure interrelationship can be established between Beşik Bay and this settlement. Whoever sailed through these straits was obliged (whether by choice or necessity) either to remain on good terms with the inhabitants of Hisarlık or to force them into submission. This situation at the Dardanelles continued throughout history, even into the present century, as the records impressively show. The inhabitants of Hisarlık must have proved troublesome to many seafarers and thereby must have feared retaliation; the settlement has revealed a fortification system remarkable for early prehistoric times. Finds from the consecutive settlements, especially those of precious metals, attest to broad overseas communications. The site itself, even without the name Troy, represents a most powerful and important center of trade during the third and second millennia B.C.

To draw a line of differentiation between maritime trade and piracy is difficult in any period. I might not be far wrong should I describe Troy as a pirate fortress which exercised control over the straits (a theory already expressed by Spengler), although I use the term here without moral implication.

That in later times a toll was charged for passing through the Dardanelles we can read upon a stone now in the Çanakkale Museum. This inscription, chiselled in marble, had been set up at the straits to fix the price for passage: a higher toll for the difficult entry into the Sea of Marmara than for exit westward. One of several such examples, this particular inscription dates to the reign of Anastasius I, between A.D. 491 and 518.

When we consider how much the settlement of Hisarlık seems to have benefited from its geographical position as early as the third and second millennia B.C., we must consequently ask ourselves how it must have been in the succeeding first millennium. With the expansion of Greek colonization, the Black Sea itself became practically an “internal” sea. Carpenter cited the introduction of the newer and faster pentekonters as

31. O. Spengler, Reden und Aufsätze (Munich 1951) 192, 225.
the necessary impetus for this development. As an example of colonization in the Troad, we can name Sigeion. This city as well must have been founded here, in an area of limited agricultural resources, for the sake of the intrinsic commercial and strategic advantages offered by the natural geography of the region. Not without reason did the Greeks continue to found colonies along the Dardanelles.

At Hisarlik as well, a contemporary settlement has been attested through excavation. This, the Trojan Eighth Settlement, dates to the period of Homer, the eighth century B.C. From this time on at least, the site must have carried the name of Troy or Ilion; it is clear that Homer’s epic deals with this settlement.

The question of whether a hiatus really exists between Troy VIIb 2 and Troy VIII has recently come again under discussion. If indeed no break had occurred, it would mean that we could trace the tradition established for the Eighth Settlement back over centuries of archaeological continuity into the hazy period described in the *Iliad*. This remains today an open question, but one which will certainly receive much attention. The “Greek colonists” of the Trojan Eighth Settlement not only reinforced the city gates of the preceding Sixth and Seventh Settlements, but also built rounded bastions at critical points in the fortification walls, which means that they continued the defenses in a nearly unbroken tradition.

Later, in the second half of the first millennium B.C., Troy’s heritage was most obviously usurped by the city of Alexandria Troas, 15 km. south of Beşik Bay just across from the southern tip of the island of Tenedos. The construction of a large artificial harbor there elevated the status of Alexandria to that of one of the most important cities of the period. This

32. C. Podzuweit, “Die mykenische Welt und Troja,” in B. Hänsel, ed., *Sudosteuropa zwischen 1600 und 1000 vor Chr.* (Prähistorische Archäologie in Sudosteuropa 1, Berlin 1982) 82. In this context Podzuweit cites a statement by C. Blegen concerning the hiatus problem: “it has been argued that Troy VIIb came to its end about 1100 B.C. Generally considered, our evidence leads us to believe that a gap of 400 years exists between the end of Troy VIIib and the beginning of VIII, but the possibility of a contrary view is established by the existence of the several successive floors of House 814, and also by the presence of Geometric sherds in a context of Troy VIIib.” C. Blegen, *Troy IV* (Princeton 1958) 250.

33. Podzuweit, (supra n. 32) 82, states that an analogy for Geometric finds in Mycenaean context at Troy occurs in the sequence at Kastanas, where locally manufactured Mycenaean ware probably existed into the 8th century B.C. He assumes a similar situation at Sardis.

point too clearly demonstrates the economic significance of a good harbor in this part of the eastern Mediterranean.

The fact that Alexandria's man-made port (necessary for the deeper-hulled ships of the historical period) gained importance while the sandy harbor of Beşik Bay lost significance, probably reflects as well the technique of sailing against the wind, which had been introduced toward the end of the first millennium B.C.

In his study on the geography of Homer,\(^{35}\) W. Leaf posed once again a question earlier pondered by M. V. Bérard: is it not likely that the wealth of the Trojan Second and Sixth Settlements derived from the overland transportation of goods between the harbors of Beşik Bay, Cape Sigeion, and the entrance to the Dardanelles? To approach the Dardanelles by sea from the west was indeed a difficult undertaking in early times. Although Leaf chose to reject this hypothesis, he emphasized that the inhabitants of Hisarlık could easily have controlled access to the fresh-water sources: not only those along the Skamander but also those in the Beşik basin, the latter most significant for maritime travel. As to the Dardanelles, Leaf believed that they too could have been relatively easily dominated by Troy. Reefs along the European side which prohibited disembarkation along the northern coast, as well as the strong currents and stubborn winds, would have proved of benefit to the controller, Troy. Thus Hisarlık was destined to become the meeting point for the commerce from the Black Sea and that from the Aegean and the Mediterranean.

I hope that my comments thus far on the geographical situation of Hisarlık and its harbor on the Aegean (on the "Hellespont," as this part of the Aegean Sea too was termed in antiquity) have emphasized that the prehistoric fortified settlement of Hisarlık was a bulwark which effectively hindered passage. The situation remained unchanged into the second millennium, at a time when Mycenaean culture was spread from Sardinia in the west to the Phoenician coast in the southeast, in the Aegean northward to the Macedonian coast and along the west coast of Asia Minor as far as Miletos. The plentiful finds which attest to Mycenaean contacts along the coastal regions imply a flourishing maritime trade and suggest moreover a Mycenaean dominance at sea. There can be no doubt that the Mycenaeans were familiar with our settlement near the straits; the substantial amount of Mycenaean pottery found here (more than at any other location so far to the north) attest it. Hisarlık could indeed have been

of special strategic importance for Mycenae, and perhaps enjoyed a relationship as trade partner or ally, a sort of counterbalance against Thrace and the Propontis.

At the same time it is hard to imagine that the region of Hisarlık was unknown to the great contemporary power of inland Anatolia, the Hittites. Philological studies, among them a recent article by H.G. Güterbock, have revealed that Hittite interests did reach as far westward as the Aegean coast, especially during the thirteenth century B.C. Reconsideration of the Ahhiyawa question in a new light suggests that the land of Ahhiyawa might be synonymous with Mycenae. It is, however, not my intention to imply any direct confrontation of these two great powers at the Dardanelles. The sources we have fail to support this theory, and we have no archaeological proof of direct Hittite influence in the area.

Now that we have emphasized the role which the settlement of Hisarlık played in trade relations, we must also assume that the inhabitants here, who relied upon this maritime contact for their livelihood, must have suffered as well from certain corresponding tensions, if only indirectly. We need only to consider, for example, how close to the Dardanelles the Mycenaean settlements at Ephesos and on the islands of Samos and Chios lay, to realize that such tensions must have existed. We can only guess, however, what concrete form the outcome of these problems took here, at the entrance to the Dardanelles.

Institut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte
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Addendum: Professor Peter Ian Kuniholm of the Aegean Dendrochronology Project, Cornell University, reports the following: "On 27 July 1985 we collected eleven wood samples, nine oak and two conifer, from Jezayrîli Hasan Pasha's Tower: from headers and stretchers on the first and second levels in the east, north, and west walls, also from a niche or cupboard on the second level of the east wall.

Eight of the oak samples crossdate with one another, forming a 156-year master site chronology with the earliest ring at 1627 and the last complete ring at 1782. A few cells of the springwood of 1783 are present inside the bark. Thus the wood was cut in April or very early May of 1783 and was used in the primary construction of the building shortly thereafter. The remarkably good cross dating among samples suggests that the wood came from a single forest stand."

II

BEȘİK TEPE: NEW EVIDENCE FOR THE PERIOD OF THE TROJAN SIXTH AND SEVENTH SETTLEMENTS

Manfred Korfmann
(Figs. 14-23)

In my previous paper I discussed the significance of the winds and currents in the area of the Dardanelles, and how great a role they played in shaping the history of this region.

It is my conviction that Troy’s wealth derived basically from its geographical situation and, of course, the readiness of the inhabitants to take advantage of the lay of the land. Ships, compelled to bide their time in Beşik Bay, awaiting weather conditions favorable for the eastward journey through the Dardanelles, for example, must have been laden with foreign goods and merchandise which could have been sold or traded in return for drinking water and provisions, or indeed even surrendered as toll for passage through the straits.

The significance of the bay in historical times is well attested; in my first paper I quoted selected references. The condition and appearance of the embayment in prehistoric times — some three to five thousand years ago — is now being clarified. We too have made sondages within the basin; the shells and seaweed recovered clearly demonstrate that the area was once submerged and lay indeed under salt water. It was only a few weeks ago that we received the first 14C dates for our samples. These serve to substantiate the geological studies. It is evident that in the fourth and third millennia B.C. the sea reached far inland beyond the present shoreline. Toward the end of the second millennium, then — or we could say, about the time of the traditional Trojan War — the sea had already retreated as far as a series of dunes marked today by a line of trees curving across the landscape. A still more recent shoreline, easily recognizable in the aerial

photographs, can be traced as well across the basin. This second line is provisionally estimated to have represented the beach as it was in Augustan times and probably remained at least until the sixteenth century after Christ, when the navigator and cartographer Piri Reis described Beşik-Yassitepe as a promontory which jutted two miles out into the sea.

The details of the gradual filling of the basin, however, fall outside our discussion here. The geologists themselves are not yet fully in agreement on the cause of this phenomenon — whether, for example, a tectonic movement was principally responsible, or whether a more significant role was played by alluvial deposit and fluctuation in the sea level. Scientific investigation continues; colleagues from Ankara are presently still at work. What is critical for us here is that Beşik Bay was formerly an even better harbor for anchorage and embarkation than it is today.

After our first survey of the area in October 1981, there was a certain doubt in the back of our minds whether or not our excavations on the windy cape would reveal much of anything. As uncomfortable as the continuous winds are to an excavator, so must they have been to any earlier inhabitants of the promontory, especially in the cold and rainy winter months. Who would have chosen to settle here?

Excavation has shown, nevertheless, that the cape was settled\(^2\) — and not only in Hellenistic and Byzantine, but also in prehistoric times.

A) From Byzantine times we have an architectural complex with a fortification system dating to the period of the Latin occupation of Istanbul, the first half of the thirteenth century.

B) From Hellenistic times we found two consecutive building levels from the third century B.C. Like the late Byzantine structures, the Hellenistic remains also seem to represent fortified stores or a warehouse complex.

C) The next earlier human activity on the promontory is represented by pits and stray finds either of the early Troy VII or — and this is more likely — of the late Troy VI period. Here we encounter a terminological hurdle, to which I shall later return. Further remnants from this period were found on the terrace of the eastern slope of Yassitepe, immediately under the Hellenistic structures.

D) Aside from a very few stray finds which reflect the ceramic repertory of the Trojan Second Settlement (that is, the second half of the third millennium B.C.), earlier habitation on the promontory proved, much to our satisfaction, to represent a settlement with sequential

architectural levels all contemporary with the early phase of the Trojan First Settlement (ca. 3000 B.C.). This settlement on the cape at Yassistepe seems to correspond with the earliest three levels (Ia through Ic) of the eleven recognized within the Trojan First Settlement itself.

Whereas this early phase at Troy could not be widely exposed because of the large overlying megara of Level IIa at Beşik-Yassistepe we have no similar hindrance. After our newly-ended third campaign we have a plan which clearly demonstrates that the architecture of this period on the cape consisted by no means of “small fishermen’s huts,” but rather of a row of substantial edifices measuring over 15 m. in length by 5 to 6 m. in width, protected moreover by a fortification. Thus our investigations on Yassistepe are considerably altering our impression of the early Troy I culture. Of additional significance is the fact that we can distinguish at least five consecutive building levels within this phase, represented by an accumulation of deposit of more than 2 m.

E) The earliest material from our campaigns resulted from our two seasons’ work at Beşik-Sivritepe. Our sondages here, thanks also to S. Hood’s recent publication of Emporio, are enabling us to establish a firm relationship between the pattern-burnished ware found here — “late Neolithic” according to the chronology of mainland Greece — and the pottery of the early Troy I period.

Because this pattern-burnished ware is widespread in the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean and appears as far south as Crete, we may consequently be better able to correlate the beginnings of Early Minoan I within the relative chronology. The present correlation of EM I hangs — rather tenuously, as I, among others, hold — upon Egyptian stone vessels stylistically attributed to the First Dynasty. Furthermore, we have an idol of the so-called Kilya type which gives a good link with prehistoric levels at Aphrodisias.

After this brief overview of our first three excavation campaigns in the Beşik basin, let us approach more closely our theme here: the evidence for habitation, or events, toward the close of the second millennium B.C. The existence of pits and stray finds from this period on the terrace on the eastern slope of Yassistepe has been mentioned above.

My subject is rather risky; we are treading upon thin ice in this symposium, and I should not wish to draw any conclusions which I cannot support. We have not found any remnants of the ships of the Achaians in Beşik Bay, and I should make it clear that this is not what we are searching for.

Because I have come here almost directly from the excavation
of the slides used in this presentation I saw myself for the first time only a few days ago), I am in no position to present a precise and detailed analysis of our latest and most intriguing finds. The situation is unavoidable; nevertheless it is perhaps welcome to you and fortunate for the symposium that we can thus pool our thoughts and consider these newest findings together.

This past season we opted to open a sondage within the basin below Yassitepe in a spot where very few clues of any sort were visible. Our familiarity with the embayment had led us to anticipate the existence of a cemetery hereabouts. It seemed at least worth a try.

Our first trench, opened at the beginning of August, was a disappointment. Our second trench, however, hit the nail on the head. The entire 10 m² area was dotted with pithos burials lying just under the surface (figs. 14, 16), and thus unfortunately somewhat disturbed by plowing. Stones placed around and at the mouths of the pithoi, however, had proved enough of a hindrance to the plow that the immediate area had been left uncultivated over the last several years.

In addition, we were able to expose the earlier seacoast and thus determine the sea level of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B.C. The sea level must have been 1.10 m. higher than at present, as least at high tide. The beach sloped gradually upward ca. 2 m. to a steeper rise about 2 m. distant from the water's edge. Above this, the ground continued to slope gradually upward another 1.70 m. over the remaining 13 m. to where the burials lie. Thus the cemetery itself lay only 15 m. away from its contemporary coastline, about 4 m. above the sea level of that time.

We should stress again that at the sea level we found sherds typical of the cemetery period (i.e., probably of the Troy VIla phase), rolled and washed by the water. Furthermore, just on the sloping beach lay a stone slab like those from the cemetery, one which remained there unused, or which slid down. A close connection between this shore and the cemetery is underlined by the fact that we uncovered three steps leading up the steep ascent between the beach and the cemetery.

Slightly higher in the sand, beside the remains of a bonfire, we recovered a carbonized piece of wood which had obviously been worked — pierced through.

All that we have uncovered here provides interesting historical as well as geological information. There is a nearly pure white, extremely clean sand deposited upon this earlier coastline. Toward the top of this white sand deposit some Hellenistic sherds occur. That this sand came obviously from a beach demonstrates that in Hellenistic times as well the coast was
not so far away. Above this white sand, however, we encounter the typical sand which today covers the beaches, remarkable for its fine black inclusions stemming clearly from volcanic activities.

The cemetery lies directly opposite the lower terrace to the southeast of Beşik-Yassitepe, separated from it by a gully. In the three weeks we worked at the cemetery, we employed an average of seven workmen and were able to open six trenches with a total area of 326 m².

The graves appeared most densely in the south and west of the trenches opened, just under the surface and badly destroyed through plowing. To the north, however, we were able to clear some quite solid and seemingly undisturbed graves, still buried in the sandy soil at a depth of up to 1 m. These tombs, too, were partially destroyed, partly by an entrenchment (dating to World War I?), and partly by tomb robbers who must have been active quite soon after the cemetery was abandoned. The cemetery had been obviously very rich, and the robbers, who seem to have had no use whatever for the many stones so practical as building material, were probably thus not residents of the immediate area.

In 1984 we were able to clear a total of 56 structures in the area of the cemetery. There were five basic types of “structures.”

1) **Pithos burials and other smaller vessels or urns closed with small stones** (*the most frequent type of “structure”*). Burials occurred in two different vessel types. One is the narrow-necked pithos with an outcurving rim and a narrow, sometimes pointed base. Such pithoi are generally of large size, measuring up to 1.80 m. in height. The smallest was 0.70 m. high. All these pithoi originally contained interments.

The other vessels in the cemetery are smaller in dimension and varied in form; they usually have small, flat bases. In some instances vertical handles join the rim to the shoulder; other vessels have symmetrical handles on the shoulders.

The mouths of the pithoi and the smaller vessels were found supported and protected by stones on all sides. They lay in the earth with the openings tilted slightly upwards and closed by flat stones set vertically. That the upper part of each vessel had originally also been surrounded by flat stones became obvious from the better preserved graves.

2) **Clay-lined structures.** We found one structure consisting of fired clay. Although disturbed, it still contained a partial skeleton and half of a small vessel, probably an offering. We assume that perhaps no pithos was available at the time of the interment.

3) **Stone circles.** Two stone circles appeared within the cemetery.
The roughly rectangular stones seem to have been placed radially, with any pointed ends oriented toward the center of the circle. The purpose of these round structures remains unclear. Within one circle (no. 24) some large sherds of a Mycenaean vessel may represent a burial gift. Perhaps a pithos had lain within the stone circle.

4) Cist graves. Only one example of a cist grave was found. Made of well-cut stone, it is rectangular in form. Parts of a skeleton were bordered by rows of small stones on either side. The legs extended outside the cist to the south; apparently the cist had been originally longer (and probably closed on the fourth side) and was later damaged. Of the skeleton itself only pieces of the skull, including the fragmentary lower jaw, and of both legs remained. The main part of the body is missing.

5) One pithos burial within a chamber tomb (Tomb 15). The chamber tomb is obviously an imitation of a house with two rooms, a megaron (figs. 15, 17-18). Just inside the front entry, which was blocked by a secondary line of stones, was situated a large burial pithos. The two rooms were paved with small stones. In the rear room, a remarkable pedestal krater (fig. 20b) was found, partially destroyed (see Addendum, p. 28 infra).

In the trench to the north (Z, 29), fallen stones lay around the structure at the level of the second course of stones. The first row, therefore, must represent a foundation. The second and upper courses would have stood above the surface as a monument. It was most likely grave robbers who destroyed and levelled it.

Orientation of the graves

The mouths of the pithoi and the smaller vessels were oriented generally to the southeast, but in three instances the openings faced northwest and in three more, south. The head of the skeleton in the cist grave pointed northeast; the chamber tomb and its pithos were oriented, as usual, to the southeast.

The soil

In the scarps one sees three distinct layers above the virgin soil. The first, immediately upon virgin soil, is mixed with a minimal amount of sand. The graves were dug into this level. The second layer is pure sand, which might have been brought from the nearby beach in order to cover the burials. The line between these two levels is most irregular. This may, of course, reflect only the later disturbances in the area. The third layer, the
surface, consists of light-colored sand which was apparently deposited by the wind over the course of more than three millennia.

It is possible that the flat stones closing the pithoi (or another vertical stone as a grave marker on top, for which we have not yet found evidence) might have been visible above the surface. The chamber tomb could definitely be seen, as we have noted, standing mainly above ground.

Most of the pithoi as exposed had not collapsed — or only very slightly — which suggests that the vessels were intentionally filled with sand at the time of burial. In one pithos, stones were found inside the vessel, covering the burial. These, however, might possibly have been inserted by the robbers.

**Burial gifts (figs. 19-23).**

Because of the robberies, we have at present relatively few burial gifts from the tombs. The single burial jar found intact with its offerings contained the skeletal remains of two children (Tomb 21, fig. 22).

We also found urn-like vessels intact, but with neither skeleton nor ash in them. Such vessels, usually of cooking ware, might have contained organic matter without skeletal parts. Only one of these contained a possible offering, a finger ring of bronze or copper.

Burials in the pithoi were often accompanied by bronze or copper earrings, all retrieved in fragmentary condition.

Vessels placed with the burials as grave offerings fall into two basic groups: gray ware, and Mycenaean ware, partly of local production. Such vessels were usually recovered in fragments, some within the graves and some scattered around, probably because of the disturbances. Because there seems to have been no settlement activity in the immediate neighborhood of the cemetery, the finds must be connected with the burials. It might be mentioned in this connection that no animal bones have been recovered within the area, and surface stray finds are minimal; when they occur, they are usually Hellenistic.

In addition to the pottery and the earrings, the head of a toggle pin and a knife, both of bronze or copper, were unearthed amidst the tombs.

Most common among the burial gifts were beads. Some were of frit, bluish in color; others were of red-orange stone (probably carnelian); still others of dark or pale clay. In some graves only a few such beads were recovered, whereas in the single intact children’s burial mentioned above (Tomb 21), over three hundred such beads came to light (fig. 22b, d, e), together with four most interesting flat rectangular beads of frit, each with five parallel perforations (fig. 22c), and a long articulated bead made of
gold sheet (fig. 22a). One complete Mycenaean alabastron accompanied this burial (fig. 22g-h). The vessel finds a parallel in alabastron 34.281 from the cemetery at Troy, which has been assigned to the period of Troy VIh, as has that cemetery in general.

Our most interesting find of the season is a lentoid seal of black stone with the representation of a “human” face (fig. 19a-b). This pierced stone comes from the large pithos in the chamber tomb (Tomb 15). This pithos, although relatively well preserved, had a small fragment missing from the top surface and thus may also have been robbed.

**Skeletons in the graves**

The skeletons in the graves are all very poorly preserved, in part because of the deleterious sandy soil in which they lay. Some of the graves contained multiple burials. Some bodies had been partially cremated. In one instance a complete cremation had been deposited in a beaked jug which in turn had been placed inside a burial pithos. The pithos had its own skeletal burial, and contained also one Mycenaean vessel, which may, however, have entered the pithos through a disturbance. The cremated bones were clean and had obviously been most carefully separated from the ash and charcoal of the pyre.

It may seem as surprising to you as it does to me that we have not encountered a continuous sequence of settlement in the trenches we have opened on Sivritepe and Yasstepe, but rather distinct periods of habitation with interruptions of considerable duration. There is, of course, the possibility that the sporadic habitation here is a result of the varying configuration of the basin, that is, of fluctuation in the shape and depth of the bay itself. Such periodic settlement could reflect the history of the sedimentation of the basin and the fluctuating patterns of the shoreline.

It is even more surprising that we have come upon a cemetery of exactly that phase which is the most poorly represented upon the promontory of Yasstepe itself: Troy VI/II (here most probably late Troy VI).

Although we do not yet know the full extent of the cemetery, what we have thus far excavated is most impressive. The vineyard which lies next to the burials uncovered this year (fig. 16) is for us both problematic and promising. If further burials lie there, it is little wonder that the landowner has chosen to plant grapes rather than a crop which requires plowing!

Finally, I must admit I should not like to wager whether or not we shall find the habitation site corresponding to the cemetery.
Let us turn now to Hisarlık itself and the subject of the Trojan War. It has often been remarked how incredibly well Homer described the landscape which meets the eye today at the Dardanelles. Just as frequently has the *Iliad* been credited with historical authenticity. Even if actual existence is denied the heroes of the war and their well-known deeds and confrontations, an historical framework for the epic has been accepted by many notable scholars up to the present day. Others remain strongly skeptical on the grounds of missing archaeological confirmation.  

K. Bittel, who as a guest closely followed Blegen’s excavations at the site, was always skeptical of the premise that the Trojan Sixth Settlement came to its end through an earthquake. “The total absence of animal and human skeletons, as well as of the burned layer which characteristically accompanies an earthquake, serves to strengthen the doubt.” F. Schachermeyr, on the other hand, went so far as to suggest that it was the earthquake itself which gave rise to the legend and can lead us “to the horse-god Poseidon and the Trojan horse.” In a recent treatment of the subject, natural scientists have confirmed the high probability of earthquakes in this region and have thus strengthened the archaeological arguments of Blegen.

The fact that Troy VIh seems to have been destroyed through natural causes left Blegen with the fiery destruction of the succeeding Level VIia as the sole remaining candidate to represent the city destroyed in the Trojan War. One has the impression that he made the proposal with a certain degree of hesitance. Aside from a handful of skeletons from this level, there was no further evidence of a military assault.

It would now appear, however, after careful weighing of the arguments and taking into consideration especially the Mycenaean material from the recent excavations at Tiryns and Kastanas, that Blegen’s Level VIia should be contemporary “only with the end-phase of LH IIIC and perhaps even with the early Geometric period.” Thus C. Podzuweit concludes that Level VIia “does not come into consideration as the

---

Homeric Troy, because it is practically beyond the realm of imagination that the Mycenaeans would still have been able to rally to such a full-scale undertaking at this time when their own cities were clearly in decline." In Podzuweit's opinion, the end phase of Troy VI as well must be later than presently accepted. He would correlate the end of the Sixth Settlement with the developed LH IIIC period on the Greek mainland. Despite the consequences implied by his argument, we cannot here treat his theories at length. Suffice it to say that they are based principally on the material from the poorly preserved cemetery south of Troy, which is considered contemporary with the final phase of the Trojan Sixth Settlement, Level VIh.

It is certainly clear to those who have dealt intensively with the chronological problems of the Trojan Sixth Settlement and Level VIIa, that one should, as much as possible, forego assigning particular finds to individual levels within the Sixth Settlement, and should rely upon such assignments only with some reluctance. Deposits of the Troy VI period in the area of the fortifications too often consist of poorly stratified dumps; and the grand scale of the edifices, on the other hand, invited a constant clearing and reuse (which continued in some cases even into the Protogeometric period), so that one must always allow for the possibility that some phases may no longer be represented — outside the structures as well as inside them. Stratigraphical hair-splitting is here of questionable value.

The cremation cemetery south of Troy has generally been ascribed to the end of the Troy VI period, or perhaps it is more apt to say that the late Sixth Settlement has been ascribed to the period of the graves. Almost all the graves in this cemetery, disturbed in the course of Hellenistic and Roman construction as well as through relatively recent tampering, lay just under the surface and could be located only through concentrations of ash accompanied by fragments of burial urns or concentrations of sherd material. Only nineteen graves identified by urns were excavated, all more or less disturbed. Such burials, especially considering the scarcity of grave offerings, hardly represent a firm basis for chronology. The American excavators, however, were able to emphasize the homogeneous character

9. Blegen (supra n. 8) 371.
of the finds. They described the local pottery as practically identical with that of the terminal level of the Trojan Sixth Settlement, i.e., Troy VIh, the level destroyed by earthquake. Comparable pottery was said to come also from the so-called "Pillar House." 

It was G. Karo who analyzed the relatively plentiful Mycenaean pottery from the cemetery, including the stray finds from the area — a total of three small vessels and 126 fragments. In summing up it was stated "that we are dealing with material in the main characteristic of late Helladic IIIA, but containing some elements that seem to fall into IIIIB." According to the established chronology, the cemetery would thus date within the fourteenth century, extending at the latest into the first decade of the thirteenth. Podzuweit's recently formulated dating of the cemetery, I wish to note here, stems from his later dating of the well known stirrup jar from the cemetery of VIh, which he views as belonging to the developed LH IIIC period. His argument here is problematic. A similar stirrup jar from Maşat in northern Anatolia supposedly comes from a burned level dated through inscriptions to the second half of the thirteenth century at the very latest. It is fully plausible that vessels of this type and decoration come from an earlier period, or perhaps are even indicative of such a date.

From current discussion, it is clear that basic uncertainties remain in the dating of Levels VIh and VIIa at Troy itself as well as in the cemetery. We hope that our excavation of the newly discovered cemetery in the Beşik basin can help clarify some of these uncertainties. We will have in future more material to rely upon than just a few vessels found scattered among a small number of graves; what we have thus far uncovered is most promising. The question of what Trojan material actually belongs to the end of the Sixth Settlement — and what to the beginning of the Seventh — can and should be reconsidered and discussed.

If it were not for the name Troy and the epic Iliad, Hisarlık would doubtless have been pronounced a Mycenaean trading colony, on the basis of the substantial amount of Mycenaean pottery recovered there. Certainly there is no more material evidence of the Mycenaeans at other western Anatolian sites such as Ephesos, than what we have from Troy — or even from the Beşik basin. In addition to the impressive quantity of Mycenaean finds as far from the Greek mainland as the Troad, we hear of the discovery of a hoard of metal objects — including both sickles and swords — in Thracian Şarköy on the northern coast of the Sea of Marmara.

10. Blegen (supra n. 8) 377.
11. Blegen (supra n. 8) 386-388.
12. Tahsin Özgüç, Excavations at Maşat Höyük and Investigations in its Vicinity (Ankara 1978) 66, pl. 84.
This hoard, as yet unpublished, was reported by Mehmet Özdoğan in a recent lecture in Tübingen. Finally, the geopolitical significance of the settlement at Hisarhk would have offered Mycenae a solid economic interest. All these considerations — and not least those which I have formulated here today — lead me to side with those who hesitate in discrediting an historical basis for the Trojan War.

The date of the Trojan War was a subject of frequent discussion in antiquity as well as today. As is to be expected, opinions were and are not altogether unanimous. Thus one feels justified in propounding his own opinion. Should we follow Herodotus, for example, the source chronologically nearest Homer, we arrive at a date in the LH IIIB period: Herodotus calculated that Homer lived 400 years before the time of his own writing, and that the War occurred another 400 years before Homer’s time. Thus we go back 800 years from the date of Herodotus’ composition and reach a date ca. 1250 B.C. This is only one example among several possible calculations, all rather insecure to say the least. The chroniclers, Eratosthenes, Douris of Samos, and the Marmor Parium (among other sources) suggest various dates ranging from 1334 to 1150 B.C.

Should you ask me now for a personal opinion, I can only express an intuitive impression, a feeling I have that the cemetery which we have just laid bare at the harbor of Troy should belong to the very time when the Trojan War ought to have occurred. The cemetery lies, moreover, only a few meters away from the ancient coastline!

Our present task, however, is excavation and study of the finds. Should some among our finds cast a significant light upon the historical question of the Trojan War, that would indeed be a most felicitous by-product of our efforts, and one which would doubtless be welcomed by you, my colleagues, as well.
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* * *

Addendum: The baulk left in 1984 across the north corner of the small megaron was removed in 1985. The main burial came to light in the back room; it was a cremation with gifts of pottery and a sword, partly melted in the heat of the pyre.

* * *

13. Herodotus 2.53 and 145.
REMINISCENCES OF TROY

Jerome Sperling

The archaeological study of Troy and the question of the Trojan War are by no means closed subjects. Objectives and perspectives have changed with the passing of time. This we see not only in the early excavations conducted by Heinrich Schliemann but also in Wilhelm Dörpfeld's campaigns of 1893 and 1894, and again in Carl Blegen's excavations on behalf of the University of Cincinnati in 1932-1938. As we are learning at this Symposium, the discussion of these matters is still very lively.

Looking back at the nineteenth century, we see that Heinrich Schliemann was above all a romantic figure. It was his life-long dream to discover the walls of Homeric Troy. He visited the region for the first time in 1868, at the age of 46, after an adventuresome career in commerce that gave him the means to pursue his dream. He conducted one short and seven major campaigns of excavation at Troy, at intervals from 1870 until shortly before his death in 1890.

At an early stage of his digging, he expected to find the remains of the Homeric citadel at the bottom of the mound. He changed his mind, however, when he saw that the relics of the First Settlement, which lay upon bedrock, were more primitive than he had expected.

Subsequently he long held the view that Homeric Troy was represented by a somewhat higher stratum, which contained signs of a general conflagration, and which we now date to the end of the Second Settlement, in the latter part of the third millennium B.C. In Schliemann's mind, the conflagration marked the end of the Trojan War.

A change in Schliemann's view of this matter was inevitable after he became aware in 1890 that the stratum he had had in mind was too early to represent what he had thought, for the stratum of the Sixth Settlement now yielded fragments of Mycenaean decorated pottery (such as he had found in great plenty when he excavated in the citadels of Mycenae and Tiryns).

We know part of the story through a revealing anecdote that Wilhelm Dörpfeld told us 45 years later, during one of his periodic visits to the Cincinnati excavations. (Besides having directed the 1893 and 1894 excavations himself, as I have mentioned, Dörpfeld had assisted...
One evening Carl Blegen asked Dörpfeld how Schliemann reacted upon realizing his mistake in trying to equate the much earlier remains with Homeric Troy. Dörpfeld replied with a characteristic twinkle in his eyes: He had discussed the matter with Schliemann, who listened carefully without saying much. Schliemann then retired to his own tent, and remained incommunicado for four days. When he finally came out, he quietly said to Dörpfeld, "I think you are right."

Under the circumstances, Schliemann would naturally have tried to carry out at least one additional season of excavation, for a definitive investigation of Troy VI. Unfortunately he died in December 1890, before new plans could materialize.

Some time later, Sophia Schliemann took it upon herself to pay the expenses of one more full campaign, with Dörpfeld directing. This campaign was carried out in 1893. Large portions of the Sixth Settlement were unearthed, but at the end of the season, there was still much to be done, and the money had run out. At this point, Dörpfeld brought the problem to the attention of the German Kaiser, who promptly arranged a grant to cover one more season of excavation in 1894.

Dörpfeld's greatest accomplishment in the 1893-1894 campaigns was that of giving the world a glimpse of Troy VI as a whole. More than 300 meters of the fortification wall of that period were uncovered, along with towers, gates, and some houses. In addition, very useful observations were made about developments during later periods.

In 1932, the University of Cincinnati expedition under the direction of Carl Blegen began its work at Troy. The scene had greatly changed during the Schliemann and Dörpfeld years, more than half the mound having been dug away, to different depths in different areas.

Before coming to Troy, Blegen had already had a distinguished career in prehistoric archaeology. He was a leader in developing the techniques of stratigraphy and relative chronology.

His primary objective at Troy was a more detailed stratigraphic examination of surviving portions of the ancient mound, for a better understanding of each phase in the life of the settlement and its external relations. (He was able to identify a sequence of no less than forty-six phases of habitation in the nine major periods of Troy.) Readers of the voluminous final publication on his excavations at Troy can attest to the thoroughness of his work.

The most exciting conclusions resulting from Blegen's very careful stratigraphic work were that Troy VI came to an end in a severe
earthquake, whereas VIIa ended in a general fire. Blegen took this to have been the fire that marked the close of the Trojan War.

The Cincinnati expedition also conducted a search for prehistoric burials in the immediate vicinity of the ancient mound. Only one cemetery was found. It lay south of the citadel, in a much disturbed area where the soil resting on bedrock scarcely covered the 19 surviving cinerary urn burials. They were all of the last phase of Troy VI. Once there were probably many more such burials, as is shown by the great number of scattered pottery fragments of the same types and date in the nearby areas. At one side lay the bottoms of four large pithoi of the same period, two of which still contained a few bones. This cemetery of Troy VIh now takes on new interest, with Manfred Korfmann’s report on the newly discovered cemetery near Beşik Bay, which dates to the time of Late Troy VI and includes numerous pithos burials, apparently in better condition.

May I end by adding a thought about something that has not really been touched on at this Symposium? Let me put it as a question relating to the Trojan War: While trying to achieve a better understanding of the nature of the war, are we giving adequate consideration to Milman Parry and Albert Lord’s thinking about the creativity of the epic poet?
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TROY IN HITTITE TEXTS?
WILUSA, AHHIYAWA, AND HITTITE HISTORY

Hans G. Güterbock

Among the Hittite tablets excavated in 1906-1907 at Hattusa, the Hittite capital at Boğazköy in central Turkey, there is a vassal treaty concluded between the Hittite Great King Muwatallis and Alaksandus, ruler of Wilusa. Already in 1924, Paul Kretschmer had pointed to the similarity between Alaksandus, king of Wilusa, and Alexandros, prince of (W)Iljios. In addition, he mentioned the note of Stephanus Byzantius according to which a certain Motylos, founder of the city of Samylia in Caria, was host to Paris and Helen (presumably on their way from Sparta to Troy); he took Motylos as an echo of Muwatallis, the name of the overlord of Alaksandus. In a postscript Kretschmer commented on Emil Forrer's equation of the place name Taruisas with Troy, which he accepted.1

It must be because of these names that you have invited a Hittitologist to participate in this discussion of the Trojan War. In a wider sense, the Trojan War, whatever its date, is so close to the time of the Hittites and the Mycenaeans that it is legitimate to ask whether the so-called Ahhiyawa problem — the question of whether the name Ahhiyawa of the Hittite documents refers to the land of the Achaians — has a bearing on the historical background of the Trojan War.

The Ahhiyawa problem is still a matter of faith: there is no strict proof possible either pro or contra. In recent years I have publicly stated why I belong to the believers, and have offered new interpretations of a few passages in support of my opinion. In a paper read before the

Archaeological Institute of America\textsuperscript{2} and repeated, with the relevant documents, in a seminar at Bryn Mawr College, I left out the Alaksandus issue because it has no direct bearing on the Ahhiyawa problem. In a later paper, read before the American Philosophical Society,\textsuperscript{3} I briefly mentioned it without taking a stand. Here now is the occasion to face this question.

I shall discuss the various aspects of the problem in the following sections:

1. The names Alaksandus and Kukkunnis;
2. The date of Alaksandus;
3. The names Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa;
4. The history of Wilusa (which will be the longest section);
5. The relation of Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa to one another;
6. The location of Wilusa;
7. The gods of Wilusa.

1. The names Alaksandus and Kukkunnis. In the onomastic of the Hittite period the name Alaksandus is rather isolated; it has no recognizable meaning in Hittite or Luvian and no similarity to other names. Therefore it is conceivable that it is foreign. On the Greek side, Ferdinand Sommer’s objection to the antiquity of the name Alexandros on the grounds that older compounds with the word for “man” used the form ênôr — is now removed by the occurrence of the name Alexandra (a-re-ka-sa-da-ra) in a tablet found at Mycenae.\textsuperscript{4} Thus, Alaksandus may be the Greek name Alexandros. But here we must immediately add that Alaksandus is nowhere characterized as an Ahhiyawa man. He is called one of the four kings in the Arzawa countries.

According to the treaty, a predecessor of Alaksandus, contemporary with Muwatallis’ grandfather Suppiluliumas (ca. 1352-1322), bears the name Kukkunnis, which may well be Anatolian, since it resembles such names as Kukkulis, Pupullis, Zuzullis, etc. Kretschmer compared it with the name Kyknos (Kükvoç) of a hero somehow connected with Troy, but he thought that Kyknos was a “Gräzisierung” (Hellenization) of a foreign, i.e., Anatolian name, since he felt that the reasons given in the Greek tradition for a hero being called “Swan” were rather artificial.

It seems to me that for both names, Alaksandus and Kukkunnis, the
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\textsuperscript{4} J. Chadwick, \textit{The Mycenae Tablets III} (\textit{Transactions of the American Philosophical Society} 52.7, 1962) 64-65, No. V 659. For Sommer’s objection see infra, n. 5.
same two explanations are possible: Either they are Anatolian, and the Greek names — if indeed their similarity is not purely accidental — are Greek interpretations of foreign names; this was Sommer's view. Or these names are actually Greek, Alexandros and Kyknos, respectively, and the forms we read in the cuneiform text are Hittitizations.

2. The date of Alaksandus. Hittitologists have given reasons for dating the installation of Alaksandus as king of Wilusa to that part of Muwatallis' reign which falls before the war with Egypt that culminated in the battle of Qadesh. According to the newest view on the chronology of the Egyptian New Kingdom, the battle occurred in 1275, which gives an approximate date of ca. 1280 for the Alaksandus treaty. How this date of Alaksandus compares with the date or dates proposed for the Trojan War I hope to learn from the other symposiasts.

3. The names Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa. Sommer, with all due disclaimers that this was not his opinion but only a possible "way out" for those who insist on the equation of Wilusa with Ilios, suggested that in addition to the initial digamma one might assume a form "Wiliwa "without the -s- suffix": "Wilius > Wilios."

As for Wilusiya, the additional -iya is no obstacle to the identification with Wilusa, since there are other Anatolian place names that occur with and without this augment.

Forrer's claim that Ta-ru(-ú)-i-sa was "Troy" was discussed by Kretschmer and Sommer, both admitting that the equation could be accepted on the assumption that the first syllable was only the graphic device in cuneiform for writing the cluster tr and that the name had a secondary form without the -s-. So one might posit Truisa > Truiya > Troïë.

The relationship among the three places will be discussed later.

4. The history of Wilusa. The Alaksandus treaty, like many others, contains a preamble outlining the events that led to the conclusion of the treaty. Unfortunately most of this introduction is very poorly preserved. Since Friedrich's edition of 1930 some additional material has turned up,
but not enough to fill all the gaps.10 The first few lines can now be rendered as follows:

After my forefather Labamas had, long ago, subjugated all the lands of Arzawa [and] the land of Wilusa, Arzawa began hostilities, but Wilusa defected from Hatti — since the matter is long past I do not know from which king. (But even) when Wilusa had [defected] from Hatti, they (its people) were at peace with Hatti and kept sending [messengers]. But when Tudhaliays came to Arzawa he did not enter Wilusa: [it was] at peace and kept sending [messengers].

According to this account Wilusa was brought under Hittite overlordship already under Labarnas, probably II, of the Old Kingdom (before 1600), but later became independent again. It is amusing to see that Muwatallis confesses his ignorance regarding the date of this defection. But he then stresses that Wilusa maintained peaceful relations even after it gained independence. The Tudhaliays mentioned next must be one of the kings of that name who reigned around 1400, most probably Tudhaliays II. The statement that he did not enter Wilusa because it was at peace is of importance for the discussion of the assumed identity of Wilusia with Wilusa (to which we shall turn later).

The fragmentary next section deals with the time of Suppiluliumas I, apparently in the same sense that this king fought Arzawa but that Kukkunnis, king of Wilusa, was at peace and kept sending messengers. The section dealing with the next Hittite king, Mursilis II, the father of Muwatallis, is unfortunately very badly damaged. From other sources we know that he defeated Arzawa and concluded vassal treaties with Mira-Kuwaliya, Seha-Appawiyia, and Haballa. Just the names of these countries are mentioned in our treaty; the context is lost. Preceding these names there are four beginnings of lines reading:

the land of Wilusa . . .
the king of Wilusa . . .
help . . .
he attacked . . .

Did Mursilis help the king of Wilusa? Was this Kukkunnis? Against whom did he help him? There follows another section which Friedrich restored in the sense that Kukkunnis adopted Alaksandus as son and heir, but this is

only one possibility; the relationship between the two rulers remains unknown.

Where Muwatallis comes to his own time, the still fragmentary text seems to say that he helped Alaksandus against some aggressors, among them the country of Masa, before concluding the treaty.

What happened to Wilusa after the conclusion of the Alaksandus treaty?

Some time after the treaty an attack on Wilusa by Hittite troops is mentioned in a letter of Manapa-Tarhuntas, king of the Seha River Land, but its reason or significance is not clear. 11

Still later is the so-called Tawakalawas letter,12 which is addressed to an unnamed king of Ahhiyawa by an equally unnamed Hittite king (their names must have been on the first tablet of this long letter, which is not preserved). Most scholars now believe that the writer was Hattusilis III (ca. 1255-1230) rather than Muwatallis. At one point the writer (Hattusilis) asks the addressee (the king of Ahhiyawa) to remind a third person of the fact that the two kings made peace in the matter of Wilusa about which they had been fighting. The name of the town is slightly damaged, and the reading Wi-lu-sa has therefore been doubted. But an enlarged photograph, which I owe to the kindness of Mrs. Ehelolf, shows the three signs clearly enough, so that I do not hesitate to accept the reading. I thus take it as fact that a Hittite king (most probably Hattusilis III in the middle of the thirteenth century) and a Great King of Ahhiyawa "were at odds over the matter of Wilusa."13 The following clause: "He (the Hittite) persuaded me (the Ahhiyawan) in that matter and we made peace" may indicate that it was only a diplomatic confrontation, but the possibility of actual war is not ruled out. Whatever event is meant here, it would be very different from the Trojan War of tradition!

The next text containing information on Wilusa is the so-called Milawata letter.14 The main part of the tablet is broken in such a way that more than half the length of each line is lost. Nevertheless it was used over the years as one of the principal sources for the Ahhiyawa problem. Recently Harry Hoffner found an adjoining fragment (both pieces are in Berlin and have been physically joined) which completes the last ten lines of the reverse and the five lines of the lower edge.15 It is in this completed section that Wilusa is mentioned.

12. AU 2-19; the name Wilusa in col. iv 8 (p. 16) with discussion, pp. 169-170.
13. Thus CHD III 20 s.v. laknu- 6.
14. KUB XIX.55, AU 198-205.
The introduction to this letter consists of a single line of which only the words "Thus (speaks) His Majesty to [ . . . ]" are preserved. No greeting or blessing follows. This was the way to address subalterns. The use of the mere title "My Majesty" without the name of the king is standard in such cases. In the text the royal writer calls the addressee "my son." Since in the course of the letter he mentions the addressee's own father, it is clear that the addressee is not the king's real son; the term "my son" is rather used to address a vassal in a condescending way; conversely a vassal occasionally addresses his overlord as "my father." This Hittite vassal may or may not have been the ruler of Milawata, but if his realm was not Milawata itself it must have been close to its borders.

At the time of the Tawakalawas letter Milawanda/Milawata, which is most probably Miletos, belonged to the king of Ahhiyawa; the Milawata letter obviously presupposes a different situation. Above, we dated the Tawakalawas letter to the reign of Hattusilis III. The unnamed writer of the Milawata letter is probably Hattusilis' son, Tudhaliyas IV. This dating is based on some spellings characteristic of the late thirteenth century and, more specifically, on the mention of a couple of cities otherwise known from a hieroglyphic inscription of Tudhaliyas.

In the completed section of the letter we read:

My son, send Walmus to me! Then I shall install him again in the kingship of Wilusa: just as he was previously king of Wilusa, let him now likewise [be king of Wilusa], and just as he was previously our . . . vassal, let him now be likewise a . . . vassal [of . . . ].

In the fragmentary preceding lines, restored only partially by the join, it was apparently told that someone (Walmus?) had fled, following which one reads: "Another lord for them." Apparently there had been what we now call a coup in Wilusa, and this event prompted the Hittite king to reinstate the legitimate vassal, Walmus.


17. In the version of this paper read at the Bryn Mawr Symposium, I followed a tentative interpretation offered by Hoffner (supra n. 15) for the verb written on the joining fragment with a rare logogram (DU). It resulted in a translation "When we, My Majesty, and you, my son, took away territory of Milawata." Afterwards I found that a better attested reading of the same sign (as CIN) results in "established/fixed the border of Milawata for ourselves," which amounts to the same as Sommer's free restoration (AU 202-203.47). Another ambiguity is in the subsequent phrase "I did not give you [such and such place] in addition to the territory of Milawata" or "within the borders of Milawata." I now prefer the second alternative in both cases ("established the border" and "within the border"), but even so the addressee may originally have ruled in a neighboring area.
Finally there is a small fragment of a royal letter\textsuperscript{18} that dealt with the affairs of Wilusa but is broken in a most tantalizing way. It is addressed by 

"[... , the Great King of Hatti, to Mas\textsuperscript{\textipa{\textcedilla}}ittas, king of [...].]

Instead of Mas\textsuperscript{\textipa{\textcedilla}}ittas one can also read Par\textsuperscript{\textipa{\textcedilla}}ittas (the name is not attested elsewhere). The next three lines contain the usual statement that all is well with the writer and the wish that it may be the same with the addressee. This indicates that the addressee was a sovereign king, and we would love to know what his country was. The next lines, of which only the ends in decreasing length are preserved, contain the following words or phrases:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textellipsis] in that year kingship
  \item[\textellipsis] killed (3d. sg.), but to/for me the land of Wilusa
  \item[\textellipsis] but Wilusa not to/for me
  \item[\textellipsis] was (3d. sg.) [\textellipsis]
  \item[\textellipsis] in that affair
  \item[\textellipsis] at the time of my father the land of x[\textellipsis]
\end{itemize}

(The sign is not \textipa{\textomega}; it could be \textipa{\textomicron}.)

It is clear that there was trouble in Wilusa. Was it the same as that just mentioned? According to the handwriting, the tablet seems to belong in the thirteenth century, but I cannot date it more precisely or determine its chronological relation to the Milawata letter.

This is what we can glean of the history of Wilusa. Is that Troy?

5. The relation of Wilusa, Wilusiya, and Taruisa to one another. So far we have looked at the occurrences of the name Wilusa. The other two, Wilusiya and Taruisa, occur together in the annals of Tudhaliyas\textsuperscript{19}, one of the texts that have recently been redated, on linguistic grounds, to Tudhaliyas II of ca. 1400 B.C. Both these names occur only here.

In the first section of this text which is at least partially preserved Tudhaliyas mentions, among other countries, Arzawa, the land of the river Seha, and Haballa, i.e., those parts of western Anatolia later referred to as the Arzawa lands. After he had returned to Hattusa, he continues: "the following countries started hostilities: [...jukka, Kispuwa," etc. This is the beginning of a list of which about twenty names are preserved while a few additional ones are lost. The last preserved items in this list are "land of Wi-lu-\textipa{\textomicron}-ya, land of Ta-ru(-\textipa{\textomicron})-i-\textipa{\textomicron}-\textipa{\textomicron}a" (the additional \textipa{\textomicron} sign is in the duplicate). The text then says that all these countries combined their troops

\textsuperscript{18} KBo XVIII.18.

against the Hittite king but that he defeated this whole army. He adds that he went into every single one of the countries that had formed the coalition and deported their inhabitants. He then sums up the whole action with the words “When I had destroyed the land of Assuwa.”

This has been interpreted in the following way: The twenty-odd countries are called “the Assuwa coalition.” The name Assuwa has been taken as the root of the later term Asia which refers to Lydia in its earliest attestations but was soon extended to include most of western Anatolia. The list is supposed to be arranged geographically, although there is no evidence for the assumption. The first name, broken [ . . . ]ukka, was restored to [L]ukka by some, but not by all scholars. Since Lukka is supposed to be Lycia or Lycaonia the list was interpreted as running from south to north, so that Wilusiya and Taruisa became the northernmost countries in the west, which beautifully fitted the Troad!

I guess this listing of all the assumptions suffices to show how shaky the whole argument is. In addition there is the contrast between what Tudhaliyas says about Wilusiya in his own annals and what Muwatallis mentions in the historical part of his treaty. There we read that Tudhaliyas went into Arzawa but not into Wilusa because it was at peace; but in his own annals Tudhaliyas reports that Wilusiya was part of the coalition and that he went into every one of the member countries, even deported their people.

Furthermore, Wilusiya and Taruisa are listed side by side, both as countries. How does that fit the assumed equations Wilusiya = (W)Ilios and Taruisa = Troïa? It is generally accepted that for the Greeks Troïa was the name of the area, while the city was called Ilios. In the Tudhaliyas annals they are both called “country.” Of course one could argue that the scribe who compiled the list had no real knowledge of all the place names and mechanically put the logogram KUR, “country,” in front of every one. Or, in order to save the Greek distinction, one could take KUR = Taruisa as apposition to the preceding name and translate “the land of Wilusiya, a region of Taruisa.” But that would be an ad hoc interpretation and therefore not acceptable.

One scholar proposed to take Taruisa as the royal citadel and Wilusiya as the region surrounding it, thus reversing the distinction made by the Greeks, and added that this was the land of Ahhiyawa, and that Troy VI


21. One could try to avoid the contradiction by assuming that the two texts refer to two different kings Tudhaliyas, both of the Middle Hittite period. But this would be an ad hoc interpretation. As long as we know so little about those kings, it is more natural to ascribe these western campaigns to one ruler.
was the royal citadel of that country. This proposal was immediately refuted. I only cite it as an example of a divergent view. What is certain is that Wilusa in almost all its occurrences is clearly the name of a country, in contrast to the Greek use of Ilios. The writing without the sign KUR, "land," in the Tawakalawas letter (as reconstructed by Sommer, preceded by the logogram INIM, "the affair of") does not necessarily mean that it was only the city about which the two kings quarreled. Omission of KUR after another logogram is frequent. On the other hand, the normal writing KUR Wilusa may, but need not, imply the existence of a city of that name.

6. Location of Wilusa. Garstang and Gurney, followed by Heinhold-Krahmer, argued that the reason why Wilusa was able to stay out of the conflict between Arzawa and Hatti was its distance from both countries. That Manapa-Tarhuntas, the king of the land of the river Seha, mentions an attack on Wilusa in his above-mentioned letter has been taken as indication that Wilusa was not too far from his own country. As for the Seha River itself, the importance given in the same letter to an attack on Lazpa — assuming that it is indeed Lesbos — has been interpreted as showing that the Seha is one of the more northerly rivers, either the Kaikos, the river of Pergamon (thus Garstang), or the Hermos, which has a more impressive plain. If then Wilusa was farther than the land of the river Seha from Arzawa with its capital Apasa = Ephesos, it may well have been north of the river Seha, which would fit its position in the Troad.

I cannot discuss here all the reasons given by various scholars for putting Wilusa in the Troad, or those given by others for putting it elsewhere. Suffice it to say that the localization in the Troad seems to me the most likely one, although — as with most of Hittite geography — no strict proof is possible. The fact that a king of Wilusa, according to the Milawata letter, took refuge with the ruler of Milawata/Miletos or of a country near it does not necessarily disprove the northerly localization of Wilusa.

7. The gods of Wilusa. At the end of the Alaksandus treaty the gods of Hatti and of Wilusa are invoked as witnesses. While the names of the gods of the Hittites fill twenty-six lines, the enumeration of the gods of Wilusa consists of only the following names: "The Stormgod of the Army, [one name lost, ]x-ap-pa-li-u-na-aš, the male and female gods, mountains, rivers, [springs] and the subterranean river(?) of Wilusa."27 Despite the break it is not likely that there were many signs lost before ap,28 and the context demands a divine name. It is therefore quite probable that we have here a god called Appaliunas. This was equated by Forrer29 with Apollo, in an old form *Apeljōn reconstructed from Cypriote Apeilon and Doric Apollōn. The double writing ap-pa is the normal Hittite way of rendering voiceless /p/; Hittite a corresponds to epsilon also in Apasa/Ephesos, Lazpa/Lesbos, Tawakalawa/Etewokelewes. The equation was, of course, rejected by Sommer.30 It is true that the evidence is not sufficient for proof; but neither is there any reason why the equation could not be true. The origin of Apollo, both of the god himself and of his name, is by no means clear and has been sought outside Greece by many commentators. In the Iliad Apollōn is on the side of the Trojans. If Wilusa were Ilios and had Apaliunas/Apollon as one of its three named deities it would make good sense, especially since this god need not have been "Greek" Apollo. It is in conjunction with the other names here discussed that the hypothesis Apaliunas/Apollon gains importance.

Summing up, we found the following:
Wilusa was a country, perhaps, but not certainly, with a capital city of the same name.
The localization of Wilusa in the Troad is possible, even likely, but not

27. KUB XXI.1 iv 27-29; Friedrich (supra n. 10) 80 with additions after an old copy by Hugo Winckler: H. Otten, "Zusätzliche Lesungen zum Alaksandu-Vertrag," Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung 5 (1957) 29.
28. F. Sommer, "Apollon von Ilios?," Indogermanische Forschungen 55 (1937) 181, found that a photograph showed a trace before the ap which could best be a "broken vertical" as found at the end of the signs a, za, ya, and kar. The choice of a may be begging the question, but since spelling a-ap- in initial position is normal in Hittite, it remains the most likely restoration. Sommer (178-179) expects a mention of the main goddess in this line. Her name would easily fit into the lacuna. (Should we venture a restoration *[START-li-iš] as interpretatio Hethitica of Aphrodite?)
30. Sommer (supra n. 28) 176-182.
strictly provable, and the suspicion remains that it was influenced by the thought that Troy was meant.

There is nothing in the glimpses we get of Wilusa's history that has any similarity to the Trojan War.

The name Wilusa can be combined with Illos, but only if a number of morphological and phonetic changes are accepted.

The relation of Wilusa to Wilusina and T(ara)uisa remains unclear.

Alaksandus is ruler of Wilusa as Hittite vassal, while Alexandros is a son of the independent king Priam.

Muwatallis was a Hittite Great King, while Motylos, founder of a city on the Carian coast, had no comparable position.

The identity of [ ]appulunias with *Apeliön/Apollön is possible—some would even say probable—but cannot be considered proven.

Neither can any of the four equations, Kukkunnis = Kyknos, Alaksandus = Alexandros, Muwatallis = Motylos, and Wilusa = (W)ilios, be proven; there are even some counterindications, as we have seen.

Yet the five similarities remain very suggestive, and there will be some who argue that the combination of these five cannot be accidental. For the sake of argument let us suppose that the similarity can be trusted and, in addition, that Alexandros was the original name of the man called Alaksandus by the Hittites. We would then have a man with a Greek name ruling over Illos, a city and country which, apart from the remote past under Labarnas, had been independent of the Hittites until he, Alexandros, became a Hittite vassal ca. 1280. After him the area seems to have remained under Hittite rule. That the epic tradition remembered just the existence of a royal personage of that name (and of Kyknos) and incorporated these men somehow into the story of the Trojan War would not be surprising. That the Hittite text never says anything about their ethnic background despite their Greek names is not surprising either, since the designation as rulers of Wilusa was sufficient. We said that Alaksandus is never called an Ahhiyawan, and that is as it should be. I have argued that the Great King of Ahhiyawa, equal in rank to the Great King of Hatti and, by implication, to those of Egypt and Babylonia, can only be a ruler of the rank of an Agamemnon.31 We heard that after the Alaksandus treaty he and Hattusilis quarreled about Wilusa. This shows that the city was not considered part of Ahhiyawa by the Hittites. All this would, of course, fit the picture of Troy as a local kingdom, quite distinct from the Greeks who fought against it. If

31. See my articles cited supra, nn. 2-3.
our two Wilusian friends really have Greek names, they are not different from those Trojans in the epic who carry such names. I hope to learn more about the significance of this phenomenon. 32

I said “let us suppose for the sake of argument.” Having spun out this nice hypothesis I must repeat that it is no more than just that: a hypothesis. We cannot claim with any certainty that Wilusa is Illos or that Alaksandus is Alexandros. It would be nice if we could say that the bards remembered the name of a historical ruler, but what they made of him has about as much relevance for the historical Alaksandus as the role of kings Etzel and Dietrich von Bern in the Nibelungen Lied has for Attila or Theodoric. 33

32. On Greek and non-Greek names at Troy see the contribution by C. Watkins, pp. 53-55.
33. Postscript: L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies, eds., The Trojan War, Its Historicity and Context: Papers of the First Greenbank Colloquium, Liverpool 1981 (Bristol 1984), has just appeared; D. F. Easton, “Hittite History and the Trojan War,” pp. 23-44, has a different approach and does not mention the “five names,” while placing Wilusa outside the Troad.
THE LANGUAGE OF THE TROJANS

Calvert Watkins

I have been asked as a linguist, an Indo-Europeanist, to address the question of “the language, or the languages, of the Trojans.” Speaking at the Fifth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies in Salamanca in 1970, the French Hittitologist Emmanuel Laroche said: “The Anatolian Northwest, comprising the future lands of Bithynia, Mysia, Lydia, and the Troad, forms a uniform blank on the linguistic atlas of the second millennium. There is not the slightest indication which would permit us to imagine what population group the people who formed the background of the Homeric lay belonged to.” I shall return to these lines presently; but they are a salutary point of departure.

The linguistic situation in general in Anatolia in the second millennium may be briefly sketched as follows. I limit myself to central and western Anatolia. The Old Hittite Laws (sixteenth century) recognize three regions of Anatolia: Hatti, Pala, and Luiya. Hatti is the Hittite kingdom proper, the northern Anatolian region of the great bend of the Halys river (Kızılırmak), and extends south approximately to a line running east from the southern end of the Salt Lake (Tüzgölü). The Hittite language was native here, already at the beginning of the second millennium. The Hittite language is still called nesumnili “in Nesian,” after the city Nesâš = Kaneš.

To the northwest across the Halys lay Pâla, in classical PaphLAGONIA. (That Pâla and [reduplicated] Paphla- are connected seems plausible to me, though I cannot recall having seen it stated.) The language was Palaic (Hitt. palamnili); we have enough material (from Boğazköy, not Pâla itself, which is archaeological terra incognita) to classify it as an independent branch of Indo-European Anatolian, with closest affinities to Hittite.

In a language with considerable geographic spread it should not surprise us to find dialect differences. The Hittite texts of Boğazköy are

1. For comments, suggestions and criticisms I am deeply indebted to Anna Morpurgo Davies, Hans Gustav Güterbock, and John Koch.
basically uniform (allowing for differences of chronology), but a few seem to reflect a northern Anatolian dialect close to but not identical with Hittite, e.g., *KUB* XLVIII.69. That it was a literary language would appear to follow from the mythlike character of the text.

The autochthonous pre-Indo-European language of Hatti, and probably also Pala, was Hattic (sometimes called Proto-Hattic); from it the Hittites took their self-designation. It is unclear whether Hattic was ever used outside these areas. It survived as an important cultic language in Old Kingdom times, in chants, recitatives, bilingual rituals and myths, but there is no evidence that it was still a living language.

South of Hatti was Luiya. The geographical name ceases to be used after Old Hittite times — the Middle Hittite copy of the Laws substitutes *Arzawa* for *Luiya* — but survives in the name of the language, *luili* “in Luvian.” Luvian was spoken over most of the southern half of Anatolia, Kizzuwatna to the east, the region of Cilicia, and the Arzawa lands to the west. Arzawa included a number of petty kingdoms, and we might expect linguistic diversity; but the onomastic stock — personal names are all we have to go on — is almost entirely Luvian, as Laroche notes.3

Luvian covers thus a considerable geographical area, and the expected dialectal diversity was recognized by scholars from the outset.4 We distinguish Cuneiform Luvian, known from magical and ritual texts found in Boğazköy, almost all from the New Kingdom,5 and Hieroglyphic Luvian, known from a small number of badly understood monumental rock inscriptions of the New Kingdom (and numerous seals from even earlier), and surviving in the more extensive and better understood inscriptions and other texts of the principalities of northern Syria in the first third of the first millennium. (It is sometime unclear what language is being written in the second millennium texts.) Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luvian are not identical, but are clearly developments of dialects of the same language: Luvian or Common Luvian is the southern branch of Indo-European Anatolian. Lycian, attested in the extreme southwest in texts from the fourth century B.C., is also derived from a prototype closely related though not identical to Luvian. The Lukka lands of Hittite texts are probably to be identified with Homeric Λυκίς; the later, historical Lycians

5. Recent scholarship (F. Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, StBoT 30 [Wiesbaden 1985] passim) would assess at least some of our Luvian texts as 14th or 13th century copies of 16th or 15th century originals.
called themselves *trīm-ili-* (with aphaeresis), a name derived from the city of Attarimma in the Lukka lands, mentioned in the Tawakalawas letter. The remaining significant Indo-European Anatolian language is Lydian, attested in the middle of the first millennium in inscriptions and glosses. The evidence of the language would classify it provisionally as an independent branch of Anatolian. These are the Meionians of Homer, allies of Troy, and the poet Hipponax in his Ερμη κυνάγχα, μηνοιστι Κανδώλα graphically illustrates the bilingualism of the place in his own time. But the Hittite sources tell us nothing.

The Carians, alone labeled βαρβαρόφωνοι in Homer (Iliad II.867), remain linguistically opaque, despite the efforts of scholars. Caria has been identified as the land of Karakisa in the list of the Assuwa coalition defeated by Tudhaliyas II (ca. 1400), mentioned in syncopated form Karkisa as a potential trouble spot in the Alaksandus treaty (ca. 1300). But the equation with Κάρκις seems to me uncertain, since the Ionic long ἄ remains unexplained by it; compare the uncontracted feminine Κάτειρα.

The western coast of Asia Minor from Lycia to Troy is peppered with Mycenaean finds, graves, and even settlements, like Miletos. Economically this means trade, and linguistically it means widespread Greek-Asianic bilingualism: languages in contact. It is perhaps in the context of both, trade and bilingualism, that we should note that the Greek word for merchant, ἐμπόρος, looks very like a calque or loan-translation of the Hittite word for merchant, unattallas: both mean “im-porter.” The Greek word occurs first in the seventh century poet Semonides, the Hittite in the sixteenth century Laws. Hence the presumption that the Hittite word is older. But we know the Mycenaeans traded as far as Egypt, Syria, and Italy, and Homer might have known the word and avoided it — he has no word for merchant, unless I am mistaken. The word might have been avoided in the elevated language of epic poetry for the reasons that caused E. Benveniste, in his book *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, to entitle one chapter “A trade without a name: commerce.”

To complete the linguistic survey of second millennium Anatolia we

---


must mention two more languages. For the poet of the *Iliad*, the Phrygians were already in Anatolia, but still just across the Bosporus, in Bithynia and the region of the Sangarios river (Turkish Sakarya), and not yet in the more southern habitat of the historical Phrygians of the first millennium. Phrygian is not genetically Anatolian, but a separate branch of Indo-European, dialectally agreeing with the *satem* group.

The remaining language is not in Anatolia at all: I refer to Etruscan. I will have nothing further to say about Etruscan, for lack of competence; but I wished only to record that the people and language may have migrated to Italy from western Asia Minor, and that possibly some time in the second half of the second millennium.

We come then to the topic proper; what was, or were, the language(s) of the Trojans?

To try to answer such a question, the linguist’s approach is no different from that of an archaeologist or philologist. In the absence of texts the only evidence is onomastics. The difference between linguists and others — variable with the individual linguist — is an abiding skepticism about deducing too much from names. One reason for this has to do with etymology and meaning; names are of little value because they differ in kind from the ordinary lexicon; they are indexical rather than symbolic. But basically we proceed in the comparative method. One looks for *similarities*, on the one hand, and *structural sets* on the other: *phonetic* similarity (along the axis of similarity — here the horizontal), and *isomorphism* (along the axis of contiguity — here the vertical) of one sort or another, where the linkage between members of a set is arbitrary. In the case we have seen,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Aleksandros} & \quad \text{Alaksandus} \\
(W)\text{ilios} & \quad \text{Wilusa}
\end{align*}
\]

The first step in this hypothesis is the equation of the two names of each, *Aleksandros* = *Alaksandus*, *(W)ilos* = *Wilusa*. Hans Güterbock has eloquently presented it in his contribution to this volume, and we can accept that part of the hypothesis. But we are still far from the question of what language we are dealing with.

For the comparative method, the next step after equations is systematicity. Precisely here the nature of the evidence breaks down. The first law of the comparative method is: you’ve got to know what to compare. In the case at hand, and I think this insufficiently emphasized
heretofore, we have two bodies of linguistic tradition, with a simple presumption that they were in contact at some point since they are geographically more or less contiguous: the Greek world (Mycenaean second millennium and Homer first millennium or older, and other Greek tradition of first millennium or older) and the Hittite world (second millennium) to which comes also the Luvian world (via Hittite for Cuneiform Luvian, independently for Hieroglyphic Luvian) of the second millennium and first millennium and both the Lycian and Lydian world of the first millennium.

Consider the further equation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuknos</th>
<th>Alaksandus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>(W)ilios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukkunnis</td>
<td>Wilusa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarity relation is there, but the coming together of similarity and contiguity of the Hittite evidence (Kukkunnis as predecessor of Alaksandus in Wilusa) is not matched on the Greek side. Kuknos has nothing particular to do with Aleksandros; but he does with (W)ilios, as a Trojan ally slain by Achilles. So we retain the comparison.

Observe now the language question. Aleksandros is a Greek name, Alaksandus is not very Anatolian in its structure, and as Laroche saw “le nom n’est probablement qu’une transcription maladroite du grec Alexandros, et n’a rien à voir avec les langues asianiques.” Alaksandus is however a historical Asianic king, and I would suggest that it is in the context of widespread Greek-Asianic bilingualism on the western coast of Anatolia that we should try to explain why a king of Wilusa can bear a Greek name, namely Alaksandus (Ἀλέξανδρος). I take it as a sort of “nom de plume,” or “nom de guerre,” or even “nom de commerce.” It was for him his “international name.” Kukkunnis exhibits a good Anatolian structure as Hans Güterbock showed, and Kûkvoç “swan” looks very like folk etymology. The relations (source language and target language) are reciprocal, itself an interesting fact. We are beginning a dossier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Alaksandus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuknos</td>
<td>Anatolian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let me backtrack a bit, and introduce some general considerations, and some possible working hypotheses.

We do not know when the Anatolian Indo-European speakers entered Anatolia; nor do we know whether they entered from the east or the west. We do not know whether they entered at the same time, nor even at the same place, although the similarity of all the Anatolian languages to each other in the second millennium argues strongly against one branch (e.g., Luvian) entering from the east and another (e.g., Hittite-Palaic) entering from the west, as Laroche saw. What we do know is that the Hittites were already in situ by the nineteenth century B.C., since their names and loanwords occur in the Old Assyrian documents of Kültepe. This makes it very likely that the Indo-European Anatolians immigrated before 2000. Recall that according to Blegen, Troy VI ushers in the Middle Bronze Age “shortly after 2000 B.C.,” when in his words “People of a new stock, who brought the horse, took over the citadel.” That sounds like speakers of an Indo-European language, whether or not one of the Anatolian branch, and whether or not third millennium Troy was Indo-European speaking. The anthropological evidence gathered by J.L. Angel, insofar as I understand it, is consistent with the Trojans being Indo-European, and my first working hypothesis is that their language in the second millennium was of the Indo-European family.

Perhaps worthy of note in this connection are some shared institutions. The Iliad tells us that the Greeks and western Anatolians had \( \xi \nu \nu \zeta \) relationships: Menelaos of Sparta and Paris of Troy, or Diomedes of Argos and Glaukos of Lycia, the last inherited from their grandfathers. The initial \( \xi \) of ksen(w)os is the zero-grade of the root *ghos- of English guest and Latin hostis. On the Hittite side we may note intermarriages between Hatti and Arzawa (Kupanta-\( ^4 \)Kal), and the absence in the Treaty with Alaksandus of any trace of the ethnological “otherness” which so marks the treaty of Suppiluliumas with Hukkanas of Hayasa. To these institutions I would add levirate marriage, which was practiced both by the Hittites and the Trojans. Compare the Hittite Laws 193: “If a man has a wife and the man dies, his brother takes his wife,” and Proklos’ summary of the Little

10. The first Indo-European words written down anywhere on earth are the words for “contract,” and the word for “night watchman.” The first is an ethical notion of obligation; the second should be compared with the Old Hittite practice of conducting important military operations at night.

Iliad which tells us that after the death of Paris his brother Deiphobos married Helen.

Certain general impressions about Troy and the Trojan host arise from reading Homer. The first is one of linguistic pluralism:

Iliad II.803-804

πολλοὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου ἐπίκουροι
ἀλλὰ δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων
"for there are many allies about the great city of Priam and language differs from language among the scattered nations"

Iliad IV 437-438

οὔ γὰρ πάντων ἦν ὁμός θρόος οὐδὲ ἤγαρ
ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα ἐμέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δὲ ἔσαν ἄνδρες
"for they had not all the same 'noise,' nor a single speech, but their language was a mixture; they were men called from many lands"

The latter passage is curious also in that θρόος and γῆρως are both found only here in Homer, and γλῶσσα in the metaphorical sense of “language” occurs only in these two passages and the related ἀλλὰ δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιμένη of Crete in Odyssey xix.175; elsewhere it means “tongue.” The preceding simile in Iliad IV.433-435 likens the Trojans in the face of the advancing Greeks to a bunch of ewes bleating in a courtyard: a prototypical soldier’s reaction to a foreign language, and one which suggests, even in the absence of the explanation that there were lots of allies, that the Trojans were certainly not Greek speakers.

The epic convention is of course that the Trojans spoke Greek; after all, the Arabs speak Spanish in El Cid, and French in the Chanson de Roland, and we should not expect it to be otherwise. It is probable that the Greek names born by most Trojans, major and minor, are “fictions,” as are quite consciously the names Ἐκτωρ and his infant son Ἀστυναξ. Cf. Iliad VI.402-403: “Hektor would call him Skamandrios, but other men Astyanax — for only Hektor guarded Ilios.” Hektor too could well have borne a “real,” local Anatolian name, which never surfaced.

It is a natural assumption that with allies (ἐπίκουροι) from as distant places as European Macedonia and Thrace to the west, Paphlagonia and the mysterious Alube to the east, and Lycia to the south, a lot of languages would be represented at Troy. The allies bivouacked separately, as we learn from the Doloneia in book X, and doubtless the Trojan army like the Greek army would have gone into battle κατὰ φύλα, κατὰ φρήτρας (Iliad II.362). To introduce sociolinguistic considerations, a lingua franca,
perhaps a pidgin — γλώσσα ἐμέμικτο — could well have existed in the army, and that language might have been the one used by Hektor in his rallying cry Τρόις καὶ Λύκιοι καὶ Δάρδανοι ἀγγιμαχηται recurring six times. In this sense the language of Troy and the language of the Trojans as an army might not be the same.

Certainly bilingualism must have been widespread, not merely among soldiers and camp followers, but also possibly in the royal family. Priam when a young man was himself an ἐπίκουρος, an ally fighting with the Phrygians against an Amazon invasion (Iliad III.184ff.). He could have had more than a little of the language, for his wife Hekabe, also mother of Hektor, was herself a Phrygian, own sister of Asios, who dwelt in Phrygia by the Sangarios river (Iliad XVI.717). Since we find widespread Hittite-Luvian bilingualism in later Hittite Empire times in central Anatolia (Boğazköy-Hattusas), and by implication in the southeast and southwest Luvian-speaking Kizzuwatna and Arzawa, we could expect a priori a similar situation in the northwest under similar sociocultural conditions.

The Trojan Catalogue, Iliad II.816-877, is the standard place to begin in “Trojan studies,” from T.W. Allen (writing before the decipherment of Hittite) through Wace and Stubbings, Huxley, Page, to Hope-Simpson and Lazenby. I will not rehearse what they said, save to recall Huxley’s apt comparison of the catalogue of Trojan allies with the enumeration of the lands forming the Assuwa coalition in the text of Tudhaliyas mentioned earlier by Hans Güterbock (KUB XXIII.11). The new dating of the Middle Hittite text to ca. 1400 (Tudhaliyas II) requires complete revision of all the historical conclusions, but shows the antiquity of the practice of such “coalitions”; they are a salient cultural feature of Anatolian sociopolitics. The Hittite and probably Luvian verb for this federating is (anda) tarupp—.

13. G. Huxley in Achaeans and Hittites (Oxford 1990) 35 identified the place name Ἄλυς, the home of the most distant Trojan allies, the Ἀλλούς, further away from Troy than Paphlagonia (Pala of the Hittites), with the land of Ἁλ-λου-ά in the Assuwa coalition. This seems unlikely for geographical reasons: the coalition countries were far from Hatti. But the name Ἀλυς could still be a Hittite word: ἅλυς means “deep” and it is the traditional epithet of valleys in Hittite mythology: ἁρίους-καν ἅλυσα[mus] sanha “search the deep valleys!” The transferred epithet — where an adjective comes to denote and replaces the noun it originally modified — is common enough: Latin terra, cognate with Greek τῆροςμια, originally just meant “dry,” and the channel was a fixed locution “dry land.” The same ἅλυς could also be continued in the classical name of the Ἄλυς (Halys) river, Hittite Ἄρασσανιας, itself identified with Ἀλυς long ago by Sayce (see T.W. Allen,
To return to the Trojan Catalogue and the language of the Trojans, I would add a few comments on the names. In those names both personal and local which are certainly or probably non-Greek, the vocalism a predominates: Pandaros, Dardanoi, Aisepos, perhaps Aineias, Apaisos, Abudos, Arisbe, Asios, Larisa, Askanie(-os), Dares, Dumas. Even where the name is Greek it seems to have been selected for the same phonaesthetics: Akamas, and Adamas in the striking line, *Iliad* XIII.759 (771)

'Ἀσίαςδην ὑ' Ἀδάμαντα, καὶ Ἄσιον Ὑρτάκου υἱόν

"Adamas son of Asios and Asios son of Hurtakos"

---


'Ἀλόβη' is termed "the birthplace of silver" in the Catalogue (*Iliad* II.857), ὅπερ ἀργυρόν ἔτις γενέθλια. Surely there is some connection with the fact that Hattusas and Hatti are sometimes written just with the Sumerogram for "silver": 𒂗𒆠, 𒂗𒆠-ti-. That the Hittites could have been requested to send, and sent, a detachment of infantry and cavalry for the defense of Troy, is certainly conceivable; the eventualy is explicitly mentioned in Muwatallis' treaty with Alaksandus of Wilusa §17: "Or if you ask for infantry and cavalry of me, the Sun, to fight some enemy, and I, the Sun, give you infantry and cavalry..." Only some five years after the treaty (cf. Güterbock's contribution to this volume) a detachment of *drdny* fought as allies of the Hittites at the battle of Qadesh, as we know from Egyptian sources: they can only be Ἀδράναι.

Laroche, (supra n. 2) 126, in a footnote to the passage with which I began says, "If the Achaeans of Agamemnon had really known of the existence of the Hittites, their eastern contemporaries, why did nothing remain of it in the epic tradition? The assimilation of the Amazons to some tribe of Hittite Asia Minor rests on nothing." The explanation of the Amazons as clean-shaven, robed Hittite soldiers is perhaps far-fetched, though it is entertained by reputable scholars such as Gurney. But it is well to remember that it is very great deal of epic material relating to the Amazons has been lost, notably the Amazonia of the *Aethiopis*. Note also the memorable SAL 𒀮createCommand: "woman of the bow" of Hittite ritual: see infra.

I would note one last point relating to possible Hittites in epic. The inhabitants of Ἀλόβη the birthplace of silver are called Ἀλιζῶνες (-voi?). If that is Greek it ought to mean "sea-girl, girdled by the sea" (Callimachos *Sos.* 24, AP 7.218). The Proclamation of Telepinus tells us that Labarnas — who was the first to subjugate Wilusa — first "made them boundaries of the sea" (n-us arunas irhus išt), i.e., extended the boundaries of the Hittite kingdom to the sea. The phrase is formulaic; it occurs first in a Hittite-Hattic bilingual prayer in the old ductus (see E. Neu, *StBoT* 25, nos. 112 II 4-6 and 113 II 14-16): "May the king be living..." Of his land may "the sea [be the boundary] on this side, [on that side may] the sea [be] the boundary." Is there a connection between this image and the name Ἀλιζῶνες? Strabo incidentally records that for Ἀλιζῶνες (-voi) some read Ἀλαζῶνες, and others Ἀμαζῶνες, 12.550 (12.3.21). Laroche's assertion that the equation of the
There is not a single short e in the line, and the only short o's are the Greek inflectional ending -on. I think it is not coincidence that no Indo-European language of the Anatolian branch in the second millennium had a phoneme /o/, and that Luvian also lacked short /e/.

The name Asios borne by this leader and by Hekabe's Phrygian brother is probably, though not certainly, to be identified with the Asu- of Assuwa (-uwa is a well-attested Anatolian place name suffix). (That Assuwa is connected with the post-Homeric place name "Asia is also plausible, as critics from Sommer to Page have agreed.) The initial vowel of Homeric "Asios is long, reflecting earlier Ασσιος: the name is borrowed into Mycenaean Greek and occurs in Knossos, Pylos and Mycenae as a-si-wi-jo "Ασσιος. Pylos has also the epithet po-ti-ni-ja a-si-wi-ja Ποντιά Ασσιος, and Homer's 'Ασσιος ἐν λευκών, Καυστρίου ἄμφι δέσθρα (Iliad II.461) may well be the mead of Assuwa. It is tempting to identify the onomastic element as- etymologically with the Anatolian (Hittite and Luvian) verb ass-iya- "to be dear, find favor," Hieroglyphic Luvian aza-, (related to Hittite assu- "good," Greek ηύς), which is frequent in theophoric personal names of the type "Beloved-of-X": Hieroglyphic Luvian Aza-tiwatas "Beloved-of-the-Sun-God." Again we find a possible linguistic link with southern Anatolian.

"Asios is the son of "Ὑπακος; in an Anatolian context the name naturally recalls Hittite hartakas, old script hartagas, the word for "bear" (or "wolf"?) and the cognate of Greek ἄρκτος. The identification may just be "die Sirene des Gleichklangs," the Siren of phonetic similarity. But Greek ἄρκτος "bear" is also the name for a kind of crab in Aristotle, and the Lexikon of Hesychios knows a ὑπάκοα meaning "oyster." Coincidence? The word hartakas is attested only in Hittite; but its phonetic shape is certainly Common Anatolian, northern and southern.

Laroche, in a footnote to the quotation I began with, says "It is hard to resist the temptation to asianize Trojan names. For example, Priam coincides exactly with Pariya-muwas, contracted to Priamos. But several of his sons have Greek names (Hektor, Deiphobos, Alexandros). By such


exegeses we explain, at best, isolated onomastic elements; we never restore homogeneous series, which alone would be probative for ethnic affiliation." It seems to me that in identifying "Ἀσιος with a Luvian name Ἀσι(γα)-, and his father Ἔρτακος with the Anatolian word for “bear” ἡρατάκας, we are at least beginning just such a “homogeneous series.” It is the more so when we note the existence of a colorful and surely memorable “bear-man,” perhaps a priest wearing a bearskin, in Hittite cult. And finally there is a town of the same name, Ἔρτακκας, of unknown location. For the discrepancy of the vowel in the first syllable compare the equation of the Carian city Ἡλλαρίμμα with Hittite Ὅλλαρίμμα in the text of Tudhaliiyas II.16

The three passages in published Hittite texts attesting the bear-man are listed by Pecchioli Daddi;17 only one is not in broken context. To these comes an unpublished text, cited in part by Güterbock,18 Otten (KBo XVII, io n.5), and most extensively Neu. The clear passages are:

Bo 2740+ 24'-28' (Neu StBoT 18.82-83; thirteenth century copy of an Old Hittite ritual)

\[\text{. . .SAL tūBAN} \]
\[\text{hwartagga} \text{Gί-It I-SU siezzi} \]
\[\text{t-an wastai tān-a siezzi} \]
\[\text{t-an hazziazzi ta halzāi} \]
\[\text{a-wa₂-a-i-ya a-wa₂-a-i-ya} \]

The female archer

shoots once with an arrow at the bear-man,

and she misses19 him. But she shoots a second time

and hits him. And he cries,

“ awāya, awāya!”

KBo XXV (= Neu, StBoT 25) 43 I 8'-17'. Old Hittite text and tablet.

\[\text{idGUDU w[ra Đa]uniya ispanduziassar KUBABBAR dāi ta-kkan} \]
\[\text{paizzi idL[UL-siyan]} \]
\[\text{sipanti idLUL-siyas-a-ma arāi ta ganenatas tarukzi sarāz[zit]} \]
\[\text{papparaskizzi EGIR-ŠU id meneyas iëtta kētta kētta G[I-an]} \]

15. Laroche (supra n. 2) 126, n. 32.
16. Carstang and Gurney (supra n. 12) 98.
19. In Hittite as in Greek (ἀπατάω), the verb “to miss the mark” is the verb “to sin.” Cf. also Tocharian AB trik-.
huittaniarnu tarnai-m-an natta i-i halzissäi LUGAL-i parâ I-ŠU paizzii appa-ma-sta nêa li-menean lu-sarazzit walahzi parâ-[m]-as paizzii lu-Šet ALAM.ZU-us walahzi

[lu²hartag]as lu-Šet ALAM.ZU-an GIRbi-GIR-SUNU sêrhit sartai ta
namma tarukzi
[namma]-patt-a QATAMMA iêuzzi ta āqUTÛL-sa saliga uuûR-
asta dâi t-[a[z]
[âpp]a āqUTÛL-sa pesîeuzzi t-as pîddâi I bi-hâpes lu²hartagassa
[ninda] LuL-siys UDUN-niya paizzii ta-sta [ninda]tûnîk

The priest of Dauniya takes a silver libation vessel and goes and
consecrates the singer. The singer rises and whirls around in
a squatting position. He asperses with a leather water bottle. The
"face"-man (lu²meneya-, perhaps masked) walks behind and draws
an arrow this way and that, but does not release it. He keeps crying
"eee!" He goes forward once to the king. When he turns back he
hits the "face"-man with the leather water bottle, and when he
goes forward he hits the jesters.

The bear-man rubs the feet of the jesters with serhas, and then he
whirls around. Then he likewise does the same. He approaches the
pot and takes a piece (of lamb) out and then throws it back in the
pot. Then he runs off. One hapia-man and the bear-man. ————
—. The singer goes to the oven and brings forth tûnîk-bread and
kuita-bread.

Despite the unclear shifts of subject we get a vivid picture of ritual
buffoonery which would surely make an impression on a chance traveller
from the west, much as the Turkish whirling dervishes did on the English
already in the early seventeenth century of our era.\(^\text{20}\)

Laroche's explanation of Πρίαμος as Pariya-muwas is attractive,
though hardly probative, any more (or less) than that of Kukkunnis or
Alaksandus. But it has the advantage over the others that it can be
localized. Pariya-muwas is a man of Zazlippa, in Kizzuwatna; he and his
name are Luvian. Again, we have a possible linguistic link of Troy with
southern Anatolian. The name Priamos may also recur in the personal

\(^{20}\) References in *Oxford English Dictionary* III (1933) 233-234 s.v. dervish.
name Παρμοῦς near Kaisareia in Cappadocia—formerly Luvian-speaking—in classical times. 21

Laroche, in good structuralist fashion, thought the—alone probative—homogeneous series was absent because Priam’s sons bore Greek names. But we must recall that one bore two names, one Anatolian and the other Greek, just like Hektor’s son Skamandrios-Astuanaks: precisely Paris-Aleksandros. If we compare Priamos with Pariya-muwas, can we not also compare Paris with the name of a Hittite scribe Pari-LÜ?

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Priamos} & \quad \text{Pariya-muwas} \\
\text{Paris} & \quad \text{Pari-LÜ}
\end{align*}
\]

The last name is to be read Pari-zitis, as Laroche gives it in his catalogue of Hittite names; and it too can be linguistically identified as Luvian. The second element of the compound is the Luvian word for “man.” Even though the bearer of the name was a Hittite, his name came from southern Anatolian, as discussed by Laroche. 22

The equation Πρίμως: Pariya-muwas was also made, independently of Laroche, by V. Georgiev, who also at the same time equated Πάρις and Pariya-, Pari-zitis. But Georgiev failed to note that both names are linguistically Luvian, and not Hittite as he labelled them. 23

The two forms Pari- and Pariya- are probably equivalent, and are so taken by Laroche. It would not surprise us that a king *Pariya-muwas would name a son from the same onomastic stock, but with a variant: *Pari(ya)-MAN. It is just coincidence that Paris’ other name is Aleks-ANDROS, with the Greek word for man as second member? Laroche withdrew his earlier comparison of Greek names ending in -avrop -avropOC; with Luvian names ending in -zitis, since the Luvian semantic type “man of x” does not accord with the Greek semantics. 24 But folk etymology may also have played a role.

We have added so far a few more speculative linguistic—onomastic—

22. Laroche (supra n. 9) 325, 364.
23. V. Georgiev, “Die ethnischen Verhältnisse im alten Nordwestkleinasien,” Balkansko Ezikoznanie / Linguistique Balkanique 16.2 (1972) 7; see also his “Die troianische Herkunft der Elymer,” 21.3 (1978) 6-7, where both equations are reaffirmed.
24. Laroche (supra n. 9) 325, n. 24; earlier comparison in Recueil d’onomastique hittite (Paris 1951) 142.
links of Troy with southern Anatolian, i.e., with Luvian. The Hittites themselves seemed to have felt the same way. As Garstang and Gurney put it, "Muwatallis . . . recognized Wilusa, probably because of the racial affinities of the population, as an Arzawan land."25 §17 of the treaty begins "you all who are the four kings in the Arzawa lands, you Alaksandus, . . ." I do not know what Gurney and Garstang meant by "racial affinities," for the more obvious affinities to look for would be linguistic, and the Luvian character of Arzawa is universally recognized.

The hypothesis of a Luvian or Luvoid dialect in Wilusa is certainly consistent with what the Hittites say about Wilusa, though of course it does not follow from it. The same holds true for Ilios (Troie) in Homer, as we have seen: Luvian is weakly consistent with the scanty evidence. Can we be more certain at all? With all hesitation I would like to offer one more piece of evidence, which I do not recall ever being adduced in the Trojan question.

Among our Luvian texts the rituals from the cult city of Istanuwa occupy a place apart, as Laroche saw.26 If the vocabulary is often unlike the usual monotonous mumbo-jumbo of Luvian magical texts, the morphology and syntax are straightforwardly Luvian; the difference is that the Songs of Istanuwa "develop different themes," in Laroche's phrase. The language describing the ritual is Hittite; the Luvian parts are the incipits (Liedanfänge, StBoT 30.300) of interspersed choral chants and responsions, which are sung (StIR-RU), and which are termed "sacred words" (suppa uddär). In short, the Songs of Istanuwa are Luvian verbal art. For their date Starke considers it likely that "... die Istanuwa-Texte bereits in althethitischer Zeit verfasst wurden," and that "der Istanuwa-Kult in seiner Entstehung also auf das 16. Jh. zurückgeht."27

One (transcribed in DLL 163ff.) contains the following paragraph (KBo IV.11, 45-46):

ECIR-ŠU ėSuwasunan ekuzi
ahha-ta-ta alati awienta wiusati

[Hittite] "Afterwards he drinks to Suwasuna. [and they sing:]
[Luvian] 'When they came from steep Wilusa'."28

25. Garstang and Gurney (supra n. 12) 101.
26. DLL 12.
27. Starke (supra n. 5) 301-304.
28. "Quand ils vinrent de l'ali-" Laroche DLL s.v. ahha; "wilusa- Nom de la ville de Wilus(iy)a?" and DLL s.v. For ali- (a-a-li-) "steep, high, sheer" see infra, n. 29.
The line could well be the beginning of a Luvian epic lay, a “Wilusiad”; compare the beginning of the Akkadian creation myth Enuma elis “When on high.” The word order is poetically elaborated: adjective and noun (compare alinza HUR.SAGℓa-tinza “steep mountains”) have been distracted and the verb, normally final, interposed. That the line falls into two equal seven-syllable hemistichs, which rhyme, with an alliteration bridging the break, is surely no accident.

ahha-ta-ta alati || awi(e)nta wilusati

In a place with the fine Welsh name of Bryn Mawr it is appropriate to compare thematically the first line of the Oldest Welsh epic lay, the Gododdin (ninth century, perhaps going back to the sixth):

gwyrr a aeth Gatraeth

Men who went to Catraeth . . .

Both the thematics and the poetic devices are strikingly similar to the Luvian. Recall also the first line of the Aethiopis, describing the coming of the Amazons (fr. I Allen):

άς οι γ' ἀμφιετον τάφον Ἐκτορος, ἡλθε δ' Ἀμαζών

Thus they performed the burial of Hektor. Then came the Amazon . . .

The phrase recurs in Priam’s words in Iliad III.189:

Τῆς τοῦ δέ τε τ' ἡλθον Ἀμαζώνες ἀντιήνεραι

on that day when the Amazons came, peers of men

There is one more comparandum, however, closer to home. The traditional epithet for Ilios in the Iliad is άιπεινή “steep.” It occurs six times, always verse initial (Iliad XIII.773 and passim). Again, it is the semantic identity Φίλος άιπεινή and alati wilusati, “steep Ilios” and “steep Wilusa” just coincidence?29

29. A note on the semantics: LSJ render the Greek adjective άιπεις as “high and steep,” its abstract άιπος (*aipeio-) as “height, steep” (the noun), and the possessive adjective formed from the latter άιπεινής (*aipeio-ν-) as “high, lofty, of cities on heights.” Greek άιπεινή (and άιπίσσα) are also epithets of Mount Pedasos, in the same metrical slot as άιλος. I chose “steep” for Φίλος άιπεινής as more colorful than “high,” as did translators of the Iliad like Lattimore and Murray.

The Luvian adjective ἄλι- is used for Wilusa-; “mountains” alinza HUR.SAGbl-tinza; of a geographic feature alin alassamin in the same passage paralleling “mountains,” “roads,” “rivers” and “streams”; and of the “lieu de provenance du sel” alin uwaniyati. This latter word was identified by Laroche DLL 106 and HH no. 267 with Cuneiform Luvian wanni-, perhaps wani(ya)nti-, and Hieroglyphic Luvian wa-ni-zu, the word for “stele, (inscribed) block of stone.” F. Starke, KZ 94 (1980) 84 n. 35 distinguishes 1) wana- “woman,” 2) uwan- “Lieu de provenance du
The Luvian line "When they came from steep Wilusa" is evidently formulaic; for we have a variant. It is found in a paragraph in KUB XXXV.102(+)103 III 11ff.,30 evidently a Sammeltafel, since it follows the colophon II hukmais arnawas QAT[I] "2 pregnancy conjurations — finished," and a double paragraph line. Our paragraph has nothing thematically to do with the preceding and following prose birth rituals. Starke31 observes that in this passage the signs are spread more closely than in the preceding lines. The passage goes:

ālati-tta ahha zitis awita [wilusati?]
pata-du tarweya issara-du [ 
dāwazan tiyammin dūpita[a 
sarra ḫ-x-la tarṣītā [ 32

When the man came from steep [Wilusa']
his feet (were) planted firm(?), his hands [(were) . . . 
He beat the dāwazzan earth [ 
He charged' up/assaulted' the . . .-la [ 33

sel," 3) wanni- "stèle" among the forms gathered by Laroche, DLL s.v. wan(n)-. While this appears valid for the "woman" word, 2) and 3) are probably the same word. The spelling is not decisive: if we have wannis and āNARU for "bloc de pierre, stèle" in KUB XVII.33, 10.12.17, but uwani- and uwāni- for "lieu de provenance du sel," we have the latter spelling for the denominative verb āuwarītai- "petrify, turn to stone." An original meaning "rock face" will accommodate both 2) and 3). The most reasonable semantic common denominator of the Luvian adjective āli- in āli-Wilusa-, āli-HUR.SAG-ti-, and āli-uwāni- must be something like "high," "steep" or "sheer"; it may thus be identified semantically with Greek ἀιθήνης. It is hard to avoid connecting Luvian āli- "steep, high, sheer" with Hom. ἄλη-βατος (πέτρη) "high, steep, sheer," Pind. (πετραοι) ἀλι-βατον (Ol. 6.64), despite the difficulties of the Greek form (cf. also ἄλη-τευνης πέτρα: ἵναιλῃ Suda) and the anomalousness of the apparent Indo-European preform. 4 al-i- would be most easily accounted for by a borrowing from Luvian into Greek.

31. Starke (supra n. 5) 222 n. 54.
32. Tab. LŪ-is for zitis, GIRreset-ta-du for pata-du. Whether anything should be restored in line 11 (there appears to be space for ca. 5 signs, e.g., ī-i-lu-sa-ti) is uncertain but plausible. Line 12 probably ended with an adjective parallel or identical to tarweya; lines 13 and 14 are possibly complete.
33. Literally "feet to him . . . hands to him." My colleague J. Schindler has recognized these forms as duals, the first clear instances of the dual in Anatolian. This is perhaps relevant to the date of composition of the passage. Luv. pata and īss(a)ra may thus correspond exactly to Mycenaean (tiri)pode and Homeric χειρε,
THE LANGUAGE OF THE TROJANS

Observe the variance in word order ălăti-ta ahha and ahha-ta-ta alăti; Luvian ahha can behave in this respect like Hittite măhhan (CHD 110-111). If we restore Wilusati in line 11 we get a verse-line of two hemistichs of 8 and 7 syllables framed by the distracted adjective and proper noun. A number of phonetic figures and responsions are clearly in play, which are more palpable if we note the probable vowel quantities and stresses:

ălăti-ta aḥha zātis || awīta [Wilusati]

Grammatical parallelism forms the hemistichs of line 12

pata-du taweya || īsra-du . . .

while 13 alliterates and consonates (d-t-d, graphically), and rhymes with 14 (dūpīta:tarīta). There can be little doubt that this is verse.

Other Luvian passages in the same tablet we first cited exhibit metrical features, like the succeeding paragraph (KBo IV.11 Vo. 47-49), with a strophe-like sequence of three 7-syllables followed by an 11-syllable:

tappasi-tar tapala

lammur tītiyāla

alinan haltittari massaninzi

The word tapala is spelled tapāla twice in KUB XXXV 139 I 10, 12, giving rhyme or homoioteleuton with tītiyāla, and the 11-syllable (massaninzi written out for tab. DINGIRmet-zi) even scans mechanically as a tolerably though the -a could also be a generalized thematic *-ō. The ending recurs in Hittite sakuwa “eyes.” For tar-ū-e-ya, also written tar-wa-i-ya, I very tentatively assume connection with the words discussed in Gedenkschrift Kronasser 257-258. In his pioneering discussion of this passage, P. Meriggi, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 53 (1953) 215, took dūwaz(z)an (tiyammin), which occurs also KUB XXXV.107 II 11, as an epithet of the earth, e.g., “broad.” For the suggestion tarīta “drive (on a chariot)” see Güterbock (supra n. 4) 124. The meaning “charioteer” for the agent noun *tarsip(iy)ala- attested from Old Hittite on (Neu, StBoT 26, s.v.), seems assured. But the use of glossenkeil :tarsi- in the Hittite passage KUB XXXI.71 III 1’ff. cited by Güterbock, and by Laroche, DLL, suggests a more aggressive, perhaps metaphoric use. The Queen is speaking: “. . . they :tarsienti. And I the queen sat down and began to cry. The charioteers are making fun of me, and they even drove away those horses. And nobody :tarsita, me, and nobody urinated on me . . . ” Hence my very tentative suggestion “charged (up)” for Luvian (serra) . . . tarsīta, which could also be extended metaphorically to “attacked, assaulted” or the like, as in the Hittite passage. For the etymology note perhaps late Vedic and Epic dharṣaya- “to venture on attacking, assault, violate, dishonor (a woman).”
good Sapphic. While nothing proves that Luvian verse was quantitative in the Greek sense, it is a priori plausible that the opposition of stressed and unstressed long and short vowels which plays so important a role in Luvian morphophonemics would also play a role in Luvian poetics.

Our speculations on the language of the Trojans have taken us far afield, into the uncharted waters of Luvian poetry, and a verse line that must mean “When they came from steep Wilusa.” Oliver Gurney in his book The Hittites has a chapter on the Achaians and Trojans in the Hittite texts, which concludes with some speculations on Alaksandus and Wilusa and the wise final sentence, “But it must be emphasized that this is not history.” 35 We have no way of proving that Luvian wilusa- is a city, nor, if it is, of proving that it is the same as the Wilusa of Hittite, though the presumption favors it. We cannot prove that the name wilusa- should be restored in the second Luvian variant formula. Furthermore, if the Luvians had a song or epic lay about Wilusa, it does not follow that Wilusa spoke Luvian. But it is one more link, and a not inconsiderable one.

The semantic identity of the epithets in “steep Wilusa” and “steep (W)ilios” could be just an elementary parallel. But that is what the site looked like; which suggests the phrase in each language goes back to an eyewitness, or that one translates the other. Is the epithet a shared convention between the two languages, Luvian and Greek? If that were so, it would raise all manner of implications for both history and literature in second millennium Greece and Anatolia. Perhaps we are, after all, a little closer to the unknowable language of the Trojans.37
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36. The absence of the “city” determinative URu is not a counter-argument, cf. DLL 130 s.v. Paṣūhalta.
37. Postscript: For an interpretation of the god’s name “Suwasuna as containing the Indo-European word for “sun,” and for the existence of visible salt deposits on a steep rock face near Delice, observed by Güterbock, see the forthcoming proceedings of the Colloque Anatoliien, Paris, 1-5 juillet, 1985, to be edited by R. Lebrun in the series Hethitica.
In August 1938, at the Eski Şark Müzeleri in Istanbul, I studied the 90 or more skeletons excavated at Troy by Carl Blegen and the University of Cincinnati Expedition. My wife Peggy recorded data. We stayed at the German Institute headed by Kurt Bittel, who also made available to us the Yortan-culture skeleton which he had excavated in 1936 at Babaköy. I thank Blegen and Bittel, members of their expeditions C.G. Boulter, J.L. and E.G. Caskey, Marion Rawson, J. Sperling, J.R. Stewart, Museum Director Aziz Oğan, and my wife for their help. It was particularly kind of Blegen, Bittel, and Oğan to entrust study of skeletons from the critical northwest corner of Anatolia to a graduate student beginning his first major piece of research.

Samples are small: 12—or 36, including fragments—of Early Bronze or Troy I-V date; 45 of Middle and Late Bronze date (Troy VI to VIIb [-VIII]), of which almost all are cremations and hence very fragmentary and incomplete; 11 (-16) are Hellenistic (Troy IX), and 6 Late Roman to Byzantine. The Early Bronze circum-Troad sampling area includes Kum Tepe (4 adults excavated by Kansu),1 Hanai Tepe B (9 adults excavated by Frank Calvert in 1856 and later with H. Schliemann),2 Babaköy (1 adult excavated by Bittel in 1936),3 Thermi on Lesbos (1 adult excavated by Winifred Lamb in 1930-1933),4 Yortan (2 adults excavated by Paul Gaudin

2. See R. Virchow, Alttrojanische Gräber und Schädel (Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1882).
in the nineteenth century,\textsuperscript{5} and Boz Höyük (2 adults excavated by Alfred Körte in 1895).\textsuperscript{6} The means of these samples I compared with 31 other samples from the eastern Mediterranean and the Near East.\textsuperscript{7}

By 1984 comparative samples are much bigger and correspondingly more rewarding and time-consuming to study. They come from: Early Bronze Karataş in Lycia (\(N = \text{ca. 560}\)) excavated by Machteld Mellink in 1963-1977,\textsuperscript{8} early farming Çatal Hüyük (\(N = \text{ca. 300}\)) excavated by James Mellaart and Ian Todd,\textsuperscript{9} central and eastern Anatolian sites such as Alişar excavated by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, and Kalnkaya recently excavated by Raci Temizer in 1971; hunting-period sites such as Hotu excavated by C.S. Coon,\textsuperscript{10} Karain excavated by Kiç Kökten,\textsuperscript{11} Franchthi Cave Mesolithic excavated by T. Jacobsen,\textsuperscript{12} and peripheral Vlasac excavated by M. Garašanin.\textsuperscript{13} For comparisons in


\textsuperscript{7} J.L. Angel, \textit{Troy. The Human Remains} (Supplementary Monograph 1, Princeton 1951).


\textsuperscript{10} C.S. Coon, "Excavations in Hotu Cave, Iran: A Preliminary Report," \textit{Proceeding of the American Philosophical Society} 96 (1952) 231-249.


\textsuperscript{12} I.K. Kökten, \textit{Karain Kilavuzu (Antalya)} (Ankara 1967).

protohistoric and historic periods we have sites in Greece and finally Kalenderhane Camii excavated by Striker and Kuban\textsuperscript{14} from ninth to twelfth century Constantinople. Hissar we may consider peripheral, like Cypriot sites, Natufian and later sites in Israel and sites in Egypt.\textsuperscript{15} For the general time before and during the Trojan War we have a lot of good samples from Greece, including the Submycenaean Kephallenians excavated by P. Kavvadias and S. Marinatos,\textsuperscript{16} with their use of iron, evidence for Adriatic trade contacts, and head wounds. There are samples from Cyprus, Iran, Alişar, and especially from Hittite Gordion excavated by Rodney S. Young and Mellink for the University Museum and which I measured at Ankara University in 1977, through the courtesy of E. Bostancı.

From the standpoint of energy to survive, to hold territory, to trade, and to be creative the critical factor is health.\textsuperscript{17} Adult longevity\textsuperscript{18} is the best single measure of health. Then come the ratios of infant deaths and of child deaths to adult deaths, especially in relation to births per woman per generation.\textsuperscript{19} Then come the many indicators of successful growth and adequate nutrition: skull base height in early childhood and pelvic brim depth later on responding to protein, minerals, and vitamin D precursors plus sunlight,\textsuperscript{20} flattening of bone shafts, bowing, and also stature determined finally in adolescence, responding to calories and exercise. All


\textsuperscript{16} J.L. Angel, "Ancient Cephallenians," \textit{American Journal of Physical Anthropology} n.s. 1 (1943) 229-280.


growth acts within variable genetic limits, and hormones respond to genes and to body mass. Tooth enamel arrests (hypoplasia), teeth lesions, and also anemia are important clues, the last especially linked with malaria. Degrees of variability versus war wounds are markers for social health versus stress. Actual daily diet is very hard to infer from animal bones and plant remains and hearths (as well as millstones, storage pithoi, and flint blades used in sickles or in threshing-sleds). No trace elements have been studied in Trojan human and animal bones and soils. An important early farming probability is phytate in unleavened grain products. Phytate binds protein, iron, zinc, calcium and thus will hinder growth unless balanced by enough meat and/or the exact balance of vegetable proteins to give the essential amino acids, or unless it is eliminated by leavening of bread in baking — a possibility by about the time of the Trojan War.

From the standpoint of determining origins and continuity of population, shape details of teeth, of bone, and of skull are important, though genetic influences are complex. Details can change puzzlingly from microevolutionary selection, and usually change less but more clearly from immigration or emigration.

Tables 1 and 2 list relevant data from the above two standpoints (see pp. 72-75).

Third-millennium B.C. Trojans seem to have a short adult life span and high rate of juvenile deaths: the infant:child:adult ratio is 8+:4+:10 compared with 7?:3+:10 at sixth to fifth millennium Çatal Hüyük and 6-:5:10 at Early Bronze Karataş. During earliest childhood nutrition at Troy was almost as poor as at Çatal Hüyük, judging by skull base height and long bone shaft flattening, but improving by adolescence judging by rather few tooth lesions. But in contrast with the latest hunters (Table 1) the nutritional health and also the general health of nearly all the early farmers of the sixth through the second millennium B.C. was poor. This generalization includes the Trojans apparently, perhaps because of both phytate and falciparum malaria. Karataş was nutritionally much healthier than the other sites, perhaps more because of its good farmland than its relative isolation. Trojans are striking for excellent teeth and lessened anemia, at least as compared with the inhabitants of Çatal Hüyük.

The geological and, partly eustatic, sea level findings of Kraft, Kayan, and Erol show that the hill of Hissarlık in the Early Bronze Age overlooked on north and west a sandy and marshy estuary combined from the Simoeis and Skamander rivers (Dümrek and Kara Menderes) in a bay just south of the Dardanelles. The founders of Early Bronze Troy, traders and merchants, may have chosen this site after the time when early sailing ships, aided by high sea levels slightly diminishing the Black Sea-to-Mediterranean water drop, began to be able to penetrate the straits when a southwesterly wind blew. If driven back by the current (less than the present 9.5 kph) they could take refuge in the sandy bay and unload at Troy. Korfmann makes a strong case for Beşik Bay as a much better unloading point, stressing the combination of a 9 kph east current and a 10 kph east wind.

The marshiness of the plain on each side of the Skamander-Menderes then, and down to the present, would have favored anopheline mosquitoes (A. superpictus upstream and A. sacharovi in the marsh). In the nineteenth century Virchow found splenic enlargement and periodic fever of malaria in otherwise tough village populations of the Troad. It is not clear if

29. Angel (supra n. 24).
30. Angel (supra n. 28).
falciparum malaria was involved or if abnormal hemoglobin genes occurred; the anopheline-plasmodium-human cycle had not been discovered in the 1870s. The anopheline spread northward, the mutational development of *P. falciparum* and the rise in frequency of (new?) mutant hemoglobin genes probably began during the first post-Pleistocene warmup. The deadly *P. falciparum* as well as the host-adjusted *P. malariae* (less likely *ovale* too) must have spread among Neolithic settlers. And it may have been possible to settle finally only on the high points where the Troad's windiness would blow away the mosquito hazard much of the time.\(^{35}\)

Diet must have been normal for the period,\(^{36}\) judging from animal bones\(^{37}\) including those from Hanai Tepe B described by Virchow.\(^{38}\) Cattle are important as well as sheep and goats. But we have no information on amounts of emmer, barley, vetch, beans, or even olives or grapes though Blegen found them all.\(^{39}\) There are no data on cooking methods except for the use of many pottery containers. Sheep probably were important for wool production,\(^{40}\) for trade and for clothes. There must have been enough wood to fire ovens for big pithoi.

The Troy VI to VII infant: child: adult death ratio is 6:2:10 (\(N = 45\)). This is an improvement, possibly better than in contemporary Greece (Table 1). As in Greece, there may have been during Troy VI and VII an increasing rate of population growth coupled with longer female life span.\(^{41}\) It would be nice to have from the Troad well-preserved female pelves to get estimates of female fecundity. If such population expansion occurred, as suggested also by the historically remembered migrations of the later part of the Late Bronze Age, the population pressure would have been part of the socio-economic, mineral prospecting, mercantile, and "imperial" military pressures which produced the desire to control travel through or across the Dardanelles and Bosporus and hence produced the

34. Cf. Angel (supra n. 24).
35. M. Korfmann, verbal communication.
38. Virchow (supra n. 2) 60-65.
40. Blegen (supra n. 39) 88.
41. Cf. Angel (supra n. 17).
THE PHYSICAL IDENTITY OF THE TROJANS

Trojan War. Perhaps earlier expeditions remembered as those of Herakles and of Jason were more linked with prospecting for iron-metallurgy techniques and for gold.

The two males, 19 Tr (VIIa) and 25 Tr (VI), have incomplete skeletons but preserve upper extremity bones which are muscular and give tallish stature estimates (173 cm.). The skull of 25 Tr (figs. 26a-d) would not be out of place in Mycenaean (or Submycenaean) Athens; it shows post-mortem damage and loss but no war wounds. Again, we need a bigger sample from the Troad to understand this period.

Historic-period Trojans show nothing striking in health plus disease status. Constantinopolitans from Kalenderhane appear definitely healthier as well as strikingly varied; many of them do show healed war wounds.

As to origins (Table 2) the linearity of the Trojan skull, face, and nose fits derivation directly from eastern (Hotu, Karain) as well as from northern (Vlasac, Vasilievsk, Voloschko) populations of hunters, with not much from the south nor from western Siberian steppe territory, later Mongoloid. Probable African-derived traits — striking prognathism, broad nose, and wide nasal bones — occur occasionally in Early Neolithic Çatal Hüyük and Nea Nikomedea, perhaps as part of the earliest spread of farming immigrants going with the separation of Semitic from Hamitic-speaking ancestors. Such traits are not clear in Early Bronze Troy, though Virchow hints at them in 4 Tr, a subadult female and one of the three short-heads in the Troy I-V sample. There are two high-vaulted non-linear skulls: the subadult female 4 Tr and the child 5 Tr. The two could have been at home in Early Neolithic through Bronze Age central and eastern Cyprus. So there is proof of mixture at Troy, as elsewhere. Both Çatal Hüyük and Karataş sample averages are less linear than those from Troy or Early Bronze central Anatolia (Table 2). Karataş population is quite varied, with identifiable immigrations from the southeast and east.

42. A study by J.L. Angel and S.C. Bisel on remains from this site is forthcoming; see supra n. 14.
43. Angel (supra n. 15).
44. Virchow (supra n. 2).
One Troy IV (-V) skull vault, 12 Tr (figs. 25a-e), is low as well as wide, with pinched forehead, like Alaca (as far as known) and Alişar Hittite people. But in addition to short-heads who appear at about the time of first spread of Indo-European speech, there are also linear, high and deep-headed, convex-faced people who may have Iranian origins, as at Tepe Hissar in Iran, Early Bronze Pagmak Öreni excavated by R. Harper in 1969, in the Kebar.46 at Karataş from early to late Early Bronze, including the horse-faced lady and Mukhtar, #503 and #91 Ka, and almost a millennium later in Middle Bronze Lerna, Asine, and Eleusis.47 Obviously we do not know what languages these individuals spoke, but the occurrence of these people of contrasting physical appearance timed with western spread of speakers of proto-Indo-European languages is interesting. It is part of the immigrations into Middle Bronze Age Greece which give it its unbelievable heterogeneity, shared (at Mycenae) by rulers and ruled alike. 25 Tr (figs. 26a-d) fits the Hellenized version of the Iranian complex of traits, and some of the Troy VI cremated adults, as well as 19 Tr, suggest the short-headed extreme. In any case by Troy VI-VII times these diverse traits might be as set as in Hittites or Lycians (or Luvians?).

Except for these added variant traits I would expect Homeric Trojans to maintain the norm of their fairly linear Early Bronze Age ancestors, already mixed, as occurred in Greece, in Cyprus, apparently in Lycia, and perhaps in Phrygia. We cannot test if Trojans were like other Luvian speakers,48 because we do not have skeletons from western Anatolia from north to south until Classical to early Hellenistic times. At that point Aeolian-Ionia, Greece, and Lower Egypt (largely comprising Greek colonial descendants) all show a quite similar blend.49

The Phrygian connection is another question. Hekabe was said to be Phrygian.50 The small sample from Hittite-period Gordion is not unlike that from Troy or Lycian Karataş and is in fact too small to be certain. But there is a cultural detail, a special form of elongating skull deformation, which occurs in two of the 6 skull vaults from second-millennium Gordion as well as in the short-statured man from the largest Iron Age tumulus, probably the Phrygian king Midas. This deformation is produced by

46. Angel 1970 (supra n. 8).
47. Angel (supra n. 28).
49. Cf. Table IV in Angel (supra n. 7).
50. T.D. Seymour, Life in the Homeric Age (New York 1908) 56.
encircling the head of the newborn infant with diagonal wraps in order to maintain, or increase, the elongating and forehead-flattening moulding of the newborn head resulting from squeezing through the birth canal. Fürst\textsuperscript{51} describes this practice in Late Bronze Age Cyprus, uses for it Dingwall’s designation of “Classic” deformation and compares 2 people in Enkomi Tomb 10, especially 29 FCE, with Thracians who show this deformation. Its effect is very similar to the special “Cypriot” deformation which elongates by pressure on the top of the head (no forehead band), occurs commonly in south and east Cyprus from the Late Bronze Age\textsuperscript{52} into the Iron Age, and in 2 people in Early Bronze Age Karataş. Fürst\textsuperscript{53} compares the Akhnaton-Nefertiti deformation. Both of these are antithetical to the cradleboard occipital flattening often seen in the past generation of Turks, Albanians, Peloponnnesians, and Cypriots, not universally but somewhat by family preference. The Troy VI-VII skulls do not show either of the elongating deformations. We need new skeletons from the Troad to test these and other possible connections.

\textit{National Museum of Natural History}
\textit{Washington, D.C. 20560}

\textsuperscript{51} C.M. Fürst, \textit{Zur Kenntnis der Anthropologie der prähistorischen Bevölkerung der Insel Cypern} (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift N.F. Avd 2, vol. 29, nr. 6, Lund 1933) 91-100.
\textsuperscript{52} Cf. Angel, \textit{Bamboula} (supra n. 45).
\textsuperscript{53} Fürst (supra n. 51) 91-100.
Table 1

DATA FOR GENERAL, NUTRITIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at death (adults=15-x)</th>
<th>Vlasac</th>
<th>Çatal Hüyük</th>
<th>Troy I-V</th>
<th>Karataş, Lycia</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Hittite Cordón</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td><strong>m</strong></td>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td><strong>m</strong></td>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td><strong>m</strong></td>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull base ht. mm.</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvic brim index</td>
<td>?high?</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>?low?</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stature, cm.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>168-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platymeric index (upper femur A-P × 100/Tr.)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robusticity (middle femur A-P + Tr./ Bic. lght.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth lesions per mouth</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2+</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porotic slight hyperostosis N</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractures: Forearm (%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull (N)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigma ratio</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Bronze</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>Modern U.S.A. White (1957-1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greece VI-(VIII)</td>
<td>Greece Troy IX</td>
<td>Kalenderhane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f m f m f m f m f m</td>
<td>f m f m f m f m f m</td>
<td>f m f m f m f m f m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at death</td>
<td>32.6 39.6 31.4 32.8</td>
<td>38 41.9 45.2 34</td>
<td>37.3 46.2 75 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(adults=15-x)</td>
<td>120 182 8 8</td>
<td>50 103 3 2</td>
<td>32 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>census</td>
<td>6.5:6:10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(6):4+:10 .01:.1:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull base ht.</td>
<td>17.6 18 18.7 18.2</td>
<td>20.4 21.2</td>
<td>11 162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>102 1</td>
<td>95 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvic brim index</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>86.6 81.5</td>
<td>87.9 93+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11 4</td>
<td>19 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stature, cm.</td>
<td>154+ 167</td>
<td>173 156+ 172</td>
<td>155 165 165 170 163 175</td>
<td>41 56 2 20 23 5 5 16 68 63 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platymeric index</td>
<td>76.8 72.2</td>
<td>79.6 83.7</td>
<td>84.3 87.3</td>
<td>98 1</td>
<td>40 8</td>
<td>71 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(upper femur A—P×100/Tr.)</td>
<td>12.4 13.0</td>
<td>12.5 13.2 12.7 13.2 12.8 13.2 11.9 12.7</td>
<td>21 38</td>
<td>10 9 3 4 14 31 63 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robusticity</td>
<td>6.7 4.0</td>
<td>5.2 6.5</td>
<td>3.4 15.6</td>
<td>134 2</td>
<td>114 6</td>
<td>163 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(middle femur A—P+Tr./Bic.lgth.)</td>
<td>8% 0?</td>
<td>11% 0%</td>
<td>3% 2%</td>
<td>1% 0%</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth lesions per mouth</td>
<td>215 4</td>
<td>132 5</td>
<td>100 180</td>
<td>0 20 0 0</td>
<td>10 17 0 0 0 12 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porotic slight hyperostosis + N</td>
<td>0 20 0 2</td>
<td>10 12 2 2</td>
<td>10 42 59 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractures:</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105 114 105</td>
<td>Sigma ratio</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

MALE SKULL MEASUREMENTS (SIZE) AND INDICES (SHAPE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hunting</th>
<th>Early Farming</th>
<th>Early Bronze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotu</td>
<td>Çatal Hüyük</td>
<td>Troy I-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull circumference</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin height</td>
<td>35-</td>
<td>35+</td>
<td>33+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramus br.</td>
<td>35-</td>
<td>36-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Indices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br./Ight.</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Ht./Ight.+br.</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronto-parietal</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face br./skull brdth.</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigonial br./frontal br.</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face ht./face br.</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper face ht./br.</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose br./ht.</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbit ht./brdth.</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alv.-palatal br./Ight.</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>124.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face proj./skull base</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>92.4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Bronze</td>
<td>Late Bronze</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>Modern U.S.A. White (1957-1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Hittite</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Troy VI-(VII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>513?</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>80??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>(74.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>100?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>81.3?</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>76.2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>118.3?</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>112.3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>97.3?</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>94.2?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments on Tables 1 and 2.

Table I: Tabulated figures represent averages in first line, N (number of individuals studied) in second.

**Age at death: Modern U.S.A. White:** These are the census figures for individuals who died between 1957 and 1981. The actual ages at death of the modern white sample (forensic and willed, middle class) are: female 36.4 (N = 81), male 42.4 (N = 125).

**Sigma ratio:** Variability: 100 = “normal” for a site.

Table 2: In the Late Bronze Age column for Greece, statistically significant changes from Middle to Late Bronze Age samples are underlined.

Comments on figures in Plate Section: Skulls.

Fig. 24a-e.: 3 Tr from Troy II (Square E6, Burial #2 in stony fill of city walls phases IIa-IIb, excavated 1936) is a young adult female of tall stature (160 cm.) for Early Bronze date. She represents the major linear trend of the third millennium B.C.—chiefly “Basic White” of Palaeolithic to Mesolithic origin plus Iranian traits (cf. Sialk and Hissar “proto-Mediterranean” complex) filtering westward, especially with earliest Indo-European immigrants and precursors.


Fig. 25a-e.: 12 Tr from Troy IV or V (Square F8, Area 412, phase IV2, excavated 1937) is a young adult male, representing the lateral trend, minor in the third millennium and stronger in the second millennium B.C. with increasing Indo-European presence. He is also low-headed, and must have had a hexagonal face, probably quite low and non-projecting, comparing well with what little we know of the central trend among Hittites (cf. Alişar and Alaca).


Fig. 26a-d.: 25 Tr from Troy VI to VIII (Square A5-6, Trench S, excavated 1937) is a middle-aged adult male of tall stature (174 cm.) for latest Mycenaean date, with missing but reconstructible forehead region. The linear rather gabled vault and aquiline face with hexagonal outline fit the main Mycenaean to sub-Mycenaean trend in Attica, seem close to Phrygian period Alişar and what we know of Middle Bronze Gordion, and foreshadow classical period skulls from the Aeolis and Ionia.


Fig. 26e-f.: 34 Gor from the Hittite period at Gordion (Tumulus H area, Burial H36, excavated 1951) is a female young adult, showing in side and top views the Phrygian-Thracian annular deformation. This deformation pulls back the forehead and makes the vault more linear. Fürst finds two examples in Late Bronze eastern Cyprus and carefully distinguishes this deformation from the Late Bronze to Early Iron vertex flattening of his “Cypriote” deformation (which I also found at LC III Bamboula). I find both types in separate tombs of Early Bronze Age Karataş. Hence I am not sure of its place, time, and meaning in western Anatolia. King Midas also shows it.

For Gordion tomb H36 see Machteld J. Mellink, *A Hittite Cemetery at Gordion* (Museum Monographs, Philadelphia 1956) 14. The tomb dates to the Middle Bronze Age, approximately contemporary with Kültepe-Kanesh Karum level Ib.
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"PRIAM'S CASTLE BLAZING"
A Thousand Years of Trojan Memories

Emily D.T. Vermeule

The citadel of Troy provides one of the oldest continuous memories in the western world. Its real forms survive in good health, and its imaginary forms are prolific and infinitely renewable, from visions of the fifth century B.C. through Chaucer and Shakespeare to our own mental pictures of it. Most Troys have formidable and prominent walls, some kind of royal castle, terraces and streets filled with royalty and Helen-watchers. It is usually in danger, from an army camped outside the walls, and the imaginary moment of choice usually contrasts the present alarms with the old wealthy days of peace "before the sons of the Achaians came" (Iliad IX.403). We were brought up to believe that Troy would never have fallen had not the walls been breached and the mysterious mechanism of the Trojan Horse brought inside, the aboriginal treachery. That scene is familiar shorthand for the whole Achaian effort to win loot and vengeance in western Anatolia, whenever we believe the Trojan War took place, if we believe that it did.

Why has the western world such powerful memories of an old, old fight far away? Why does the Trojan War stand in some way for all wars, and supersede many more recent wars in interest? Of course it is the power of Homeric poetry, the Iliad the first poem that gives equal dignity to Trojans and Achaians and shows the "enemy" in a compassionate and noble light. In its long celebration of heroic death the Iliad may be an especially Greek contribution to human ideas of what poetry was for, that the attackers could be just as greedy and short-tempered as the defenders could be frivolous and luxurious, and that we are all caught up in the same short life under the sun and face disasters in the same ways, gallant in failure.

The Trojan War has come down to us in many ways, even outside the Iliad text, which was probably never just like the text we have,' at least not

at all times in all towns. The Epic Cycle, the lyric poets, a startlingly high proportion of fifth century tragedies, and an unbroken chain of artistic images all provide separate visions. Most of our awareness of these Troys is, perhaps unfortunately, channeled through Athens, while different traditions of other cities were neglected except by local antiquarians, or lapsed out of the accepted literary canons. Athens, with its rather weak role in the *Iliad*, nevertheless in the sixth and fifth centuries was extremely influential in insisting that an awareness of the historic past which the *Iliad* represented should be part of education and should be made publicly vivid in monuments and paintings.

Why the Achaian experience at Troy should so consistently have been regarded as history, and a history necessary for later culture, is a vast subject. What the Greeks really knew about their own past is another. Not as much as they thought they did, to judge from Thucydides (I.1-2), who, although he could see the Bronze Age Acropolis walls and walked the essentially Bronze Age roads, believed that those early Greeks could not fortify their towns or provide safe communications. Thucydides was perhaps writing with an expectation of linear “progress” from primitive to civilized in a way familiar to us from Plato’s *Protagoras* 320d ff. or *Laws* III.676 ff. as though early man could do nothing of permanence or great importance, but the cycling of the centuries brought ever finer creations and greater power, culminating, inevitably, in the enormous achievements of the present generation. This attitude, which we in turn have perhaps unconsciously absorbed from Thucydides, may have seriously affected aspects of Homeric scholarship.

The Trojan War was certainly “better known” than more recent wars like the Lelantine, and more important to a sense of Hellenism, unity, and culture. It was not the physical remains of the Bronze Age visible on many points of the Acropolis at Athens that caused Perikles and Pheidias to decide on Trojan War motifs for some of the metopes on the north flank of the Parthenon, but rather some sense of presenting to the citizens of Athens the noble fall of the kings of Troy as models of the barbarian opponent and as subjects of the oldest Greek historical undertaking of which any adequate record survived. That this historical event was entirely encoded in epic verse seemed to make no difference to an appreciation of the *Iliad*’s transcription of “the facts.”

The repertory of images that Athenians and others chose for the Fall of Troy — the murder of Astyanax, the death of supplicant Priam at the altar, the rape of Kassandra — were all traditional, from the second quarter of the seventh century, when the Mykonos Pithos showed the Wooden Horse on wheels, and elegant panel scenes of the rape of wives and murder of young boys. The Greek murder of the Trojan Royal House became traditional in the centuries leading down to the Parthenon, on vases or bronze shield bands, and is probably best known on the Kleophrades Painter’s famous kalpis which has moved so many scholars of our time to eloquent passages of sympathy for Trojans in various stages of captivity, murder, rape and exile at the hands of expressionless Greeks. Such scenes of course are not part of the Iliad but of the Epic Cycle and the Odyssey, which were always more popular sources for illustration. On the face of it these are curious subjects for the new imperial Parthenon celebrating Athenian power and past glory, and put the Trojans in the heroic failed position that Euripides and others also favor, victims of cruel and unthinking military policy. But they are traditional and highly formulaic images, a point worth meditating, since the power of persistent formula is part of the larger Homeric picture.

The Epic Cycle and the Odyssey spurred illustration because they seem more romantic, fantastic, picturesque and overtly emotional than the Iliad. Odysseus and the Sirens, or Polyphemos, or the Judgment of Paris, or the Suicide of Aias, were poetic scenes that almost sketched themselves, in contrast to the more difficult battle or arming scenes of the Iliad. In other words, the Odyssey and the Cycle were, in antiquity, sensed to be fiction with a little history, while the Iliad was thought of as history with a little fiction in it, and the artist is more drawn to fiction than to history since his own craft is to make formally attractive lies or at least persuasive unrealities. The older historical poem is seldom illustrated at all except as

6. L.A. Stella’s recent survey of these illustrations, Tradizione micenea e poesia dell’Iliade (Rome 1978) 243-256, includes most older studies of Cyclic imagery.
8. To call the Iliad history is short-hand: “history” within the limits of the Indo-European poetic tradition and its habits of deforming facts toward valued sets of behavior.
formal duels between two figures whom we call Greek and Trojan, sometimes labelled as on the Euphorbos plate, more often not.9

Most Greeks thought the Trojan War was really fought once, at Troy, by Achaians, and that the Iliad presented the finest account of the action. Herodotos and Thucydides are sometimes sceptical about the poet's authority, but they always accord him greater respect as an historian than they do the Odyssey or Cyclic poets. The myth and fantasy of the Cycle seemed then, as now, to contrast with "real" episodes at Troy: the problems of supplying the Greek army, the desire to obtain horses from King Laomedon, the need to chop wood and water the mules, the sacking of Lesbos or Thebe, the acquisition of metal goods, cattle, and women, the erection of palisades or thatched huts, the beaching and propping of the ships, the bathing of sweaty limbs, the polishing of armor, or night councils and the pursuit of spies. Most events in the Iliad are perfectly believable as well as moving, and seem right for the place and the time.

What time and what place? Those questions have been argued since early literate antiquity, and may never be answered with objective accuracy, since the only thing certain about difficulties in Homeric scholarship is that each lover of the Iliad has a different set of impressions and prejudices about the poem. This is a major crux about the Trojan War; on the one hand, an instinctive feeling that a historical event lay behind the poem (and indeed it would have been far more difficult to "invent" a Trojan War as pure fiction than to continue the traditions about it if it were really fought); on the other hand, a genuine lack of information about the where and the when. The where seems no real difficulty: at Troy, of course, a town never lost in antiquity however much the shoreline changed. The when was always more difficult. The Greek historians who were interested in that problem produced a series of dates, usually calculated by genealogy, ranging from Douris of Samos' 1334, past Herodotos' thoughtful "about 1250," to the popular "about 1183" of Ktesias and Eratosthenes, to the late 1135 of Ephoros.10 All agreed the war took place in our Bronze Age, and that it was not later invented by Ionian or Lesbian colonists after the "Dark Ages" or Athenians fighting around Sigeion in the sixth century.

Greeks had inconsistent ways of getting in touch with their own past,

9. Characteristic exceptions would be the once-independent Kalydonian boar-hunt, and in the fifth century, the Ransoming of Hektor, with its perversions of symposium behavior.
in the absence of a chronological system that would apply to all towns, and
given the notorious inequality of ancestral lineages. There were, to put it
too simply, five obvious ways of "remembering" the past.

The first is by accident — the chance discoveries of graves and grave-
goods, and the "huge skeletons" of "heroes." Such would be the accident in
the course of fifth century civic works in the Agora at Athens which
chopped off the legs of a skeleton in a Mycenaean tomb under the later
Temple of Ares, and caused someone — magistrate or foreman — to lay a
deposit of White Ground lekythoi in place of the missing bones.11

Reflections of such chance finds may prompt apparent classical
descriptions of early Mycenaean niello metalwork as in Euripides' _Electra_
vv. 476-477.

A second is harder to prove: direct family continuity for some part of
the span between the end of the Bronze Age and the Geometric period.
That might be when, in the same Mycenaean tomb in Athens, a
Proto-geometric boy was buried in the dromos outside; we cannot tell what
the family still knew about their genealogy (they had been burying there
since the fifteenth century) but it does not look quite like accident.12

A third is the deliberate linking of oneself to the dead of the past in old
tombs — the establishment of "hero cult" in places like the tholos tomb of
Menidi with gifts of fresh vases,13 or the establishment of cult in spots
connected poetically with the deaths of Achaian heroes like Menelaos' helmsman Phrontis at Sounion.14 The offerings are often vases with scenes
of battle or chariot races, and suggest that the donor has chosen to link
himself with the heroic past just as tragedians would almost always turn
back to the Trojan War as a model for the present.

A fourth is unarguable continuity under conspicuous circumstances.
Certainly the old tholos tombs were at times conspicuous, but even more
so would be surviving buildings like the Mycenaean hall in the sacred
precinct at Eleusis which still stood through Geometric times, with
additions, and was apparently preserved, surely recarpentered by then,
into the fifth century as the setting for the sacred drama of one of the great

11. E.D. Townsend, "A Mycenaean Chamber Tomb Under the Temple of
12. Townsend (supra n. 11) fig. 1.
Sociétés Anciennes_ (Paris 1982) 107-119; J.N. Coldstream, "Hero-Cults in the Age
14. H. Abramson, "A Hero Shrine for Phrontis at Sounion?," _California Studies
ancient mysteries. The ancestor of the Eumolpidai, the priests of the cult of Eleusis, was also apparently honored through the centuries, a claim to continuity of blood as well as ritual practice.15

The fifth and most general method of getting in touch with the past was through the historical records of the past, which was, for the Greeks, the Iliad, ever renewed and ever very old. The poetry made the past vivid at festivals and in individual minds, the most satisfactory kind of memory because in poetry the characters of long ago are still alive and talking, far better than bones and quaint old buildings. Because the dramatic setting at Troy was always in the present, the need to fix an actual date for the events was, no doubt, of less interest than the unfolding conflict. While the characters present themselves as "historical," "a song for men to come" (Iliad VI.357-358), it has always been perplexing to trace with any confidence the connection between the singer Homer and the events of his song.

People my age used to be taught to believe the following scenario: that Homer was an Ionian poet who lived — probably — in the eighth century B.C.; that the details of his life that have come down to us are largely fictional and contradictory, but that antiquity believed he was a blind poet, perhaps from Smyrna or Chios. His masterwork, the Iliad, was largely of his own genius and design, and reflected the Ionian world of a pre-alphabetic moment of enormous excitement and achievement, in a culture where the best were witty, ironic, mordant, decorative, compassionate, energetic, and human. Sometimes we were also told that Homer's construction of the Iliad had all the power, symmetry, inverse composition, ring composition and bold rhythms of a Geometric pot.16

There had been other poets before the genius Homer, of course, from whom he had learned something of the story and some of the formulaic expressions so fundamental to oral poetic composition (although many of the similes of daily life and weather must have been drawn from his own world even if he could not see it). This anterior poetic tradition was guaranteed by the Aeolic dialect elements in the verse which seemed to precede the Ionic — and there were signs of changes in the text we had, among which the loss of the digamma was always treated in the most

breathless fashion. These older poets might also have sung about Troy, but
certainly did not have the power or originality to give the *Iliad* the depth of
color (Hektor, Andromache, Thersites) or the formal poetic control
that our text has.

Those older poets, linking back from the earlier Geometric period to
the Dark Ages, were themselves singing about a heroic Bronze Age past
which could only have been a dim memory even to their grandparents,17
and which often confused them. Since they themselves had no direct
experience of chariot fighting or archaic weapons, bronze armor, silver-
studded swords, boars' tusk helmets, tower and figure-of-eight shields,
they often made unintentionally stupid mistakes in deploying these
heirlooms of an older world. So, for example, in the *Doloneia* of *Iliad* X
Diomedes, having killed the Thracian prince Rhesos, debates in his heart

whether to seize the chariot, wherein lay the bright armor
and draw it away by the pole, or lift it and carry it off with
him, . . .

(*Iliad* X.503-505, trans. R. Lattimore)

A Bronze Age chariot could not be lifted, the commentators said, and so
the *Doloneia* must be a "later" book "inserted" in the *Iliad* when it was
finally written down in its most monumental and leisurely form.18 Now, thanks
to the genial researches of the expert Spruytte, the reconstructed
chariot can be lifted by any healthy man, and conventional thinking on the
*Doloneia* must be rethought, with hundreds of other conventions.19

Behind the confused Dark Age poets lay the convulsed late Bronze
Age when the whole Mediterranean was occupied with wars, shifting
alliances, disruptive tribes and disrupted commerce. Somewhere in that
convulsion lay The Trojan War. Greeks thought the war occurred
somewhere between the fourteenth and the twelfth centuries. The
excavators Schliemann and Dörpfeld associated it with the great city of
Troy VI.20 Severe burning, or perhaps earthquake, afflicted these walls,

Age and Oral Poet," makes the best presentation.
18. But W. Leaf, *The Iliad* I (London 1900) 459, points to the light chariot of
Zeus at VIII.441, perhaps dismantled.
owe this reference, and all my knowledge of Bronze Age chariots, to Mrs. M.A.
Littauer; see especially her "Chariots in Late Bronze Age Greece," *Antiquity* 57
20. Cautiously, without fixed chronology, W. Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion*
(Athens 1902) 181-182.
gates and houses. The excavators of the University of Cincinnati ascribed that damage to earthquake alone, near 1300, and associated the "historical" war with Troy VIIa, destroyed around 1240 (or sometimes around 1270).21

None of the excavators took wild positions, but it was always the presence of various styles of Mycenaean imported pottery in the strata of Troy VIg and h and Troy VIIa that supplied the dates.22 Certainly not all the Mycenaean pieces from Troy have been published, and the mixture of levels between Troy VIh and VIIa has been noted by M. Korfmann (supra p. 27), but the desire to "know at last" when the Trojan War took place has given these dates wide acceptance.

Whenever the War took place, the Iliad was not composed immediately, somehow; the victorious Achaians commissioned no songs of celebration, and it was probably not until the period of the Ionian Migration when mainland Greeks were coming once more to Asia Minor, and could perhaps see the ruins of Troy as yet unoccupied by Aeolic settlers from Lesbos, that they were stirred to voice their admiration. Then, when they were in difficulties with local Anatolian populations, and brooded over the superior successes of their heroic ancestors, who could lift stones such as no two men of their day could lift, the first Dark Age poet began in his unpractised way to construct a primitive tale of Troy that Homer would later recreate at genius level.

It used to be clear to almost everyone that the Iliad could not be a Mycenaean Greek composition of the same age as the war itself.23 Among the many reasons were: the Mycenaeans were crude, perhaps even barbarous, generally illiterate, bound to old vegetation cults, bloody and primitive, while the poet of the Iliad was more like us, civilized, warm, wise, rational and fair. Also, Homer did not seem to know much even about the kind of writing the Mycenaean Greeks could do, and was ignorant of the palace bureaucracies and their systems of taxation and distribution. If he was just as ignorant of Ionian matters of his own day, like the sanctuary of Hera on Samos, the explanation was not chronological but one of poetic preference: he did not care for female goddesses, or something.

23. There have, of course, been many believers in Mycenaean poetry, such as Bowra, Hoekstra, Page, Ruijgh, Wathelet, Webster and West.
Now that the situation is so much changed — now that Güterbock and Mellink have taught us more about the situation in Anatolia in the fifteenth century B.C., and the Achaians exploring the southern river valleys of western Anatolia with chariots and infantry, engaging the Hittite army with one hundred chariots, fighting duels with their chief generals, and playing power games with the Minoans of Crete who were established at sites like Miletos and Iasos and Knidos — the possibility that the Trojan War was one of these engagements with an Anatolian dynast in his walled castle at the height of the early Mycenaean age must at least be considered. Since a fifteenth century Hittite drew a sketch of one of these Achaian warriors in full battle dress and plumed helmet and since one of them dropped his sword (was buried?) as far north as Smyrna, their presence in western Anatolia is not just philologically demonstrated but physically established. The Mycenaean grave at Ephesos with LH IIIA.1 vases may provide a kind of terminus to the first great Achaian surge on the Anatolian side, as the contemporary Dendra Cuirass grave does on the mainland side.

It is equally established now that there are a certain number of "pre-Mycenaean" hexameter verses in the Iliad. The most famous of these is no doubt the λιποδο' ἀνδροτητα καὶ ἡ βην verse that links the heroic deaths of Patroklos and Hektor (Iliad XVI.857; XXII.363). The verse is impossible to scan when spelled ο'ποτ'τ'ητ' and requires the more archaic syllabic p which had already disappeared from the Greek language before the time of the Mycenaean Greek texts in Linear B. It guarantees at the least that deaths of heroes were sung in the fifteenth or fourteenth centuries, if not the tales of Patroklos and Hektor themselves. Among other archaic verses

---


25. K. Bittel, "Tonschale mit Ritzzeichnung von Boğazköy," Revue Archéologique 1976, 9-14, figs. 2-3; for the Aegean and Trojan connections of his sword, see 13, n. 5.


28. I am deeply indebted to Calvert Watkins for his discussion of these points; and learned much from C.J. Ruijgh's presentation of "Le mycénien et Homère" at the Dublin International Classical Congress, September 1984, and L'élément achéen dans la langue épique (Assen 1958); cf. A. Hoekstra, Epic Verse Before Homer (Amsterdam 1981).
are Μηριόνης τ’ ἀτάλαντος Ἑνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντη (Iliad II.651; VII.166; VIII.264; XVII.259), always in connection with the fighting Cretans at Troy, Idomeneus the grandson of King Minos and Meriones his able attendant.29 Still other verses allude to the strength of Herakles, or Minyan Orchomenos; phrases like δίος Ὀδυσσεύς, Odysseus descended from Zeus, are thought to be old, and archaisms are seen in patronymics of the form Τελαμόνιος Άιας, or epithets with internal accusatives like βοήν ἄγαθος or πόδας ὀκύς which never faded out of the text.

If persistent features in the Iliad text are older than the forms of Greek current in the palace bureaucracies of Knossos and Pylos, and the union of Achaeans and Minoans fighting western Anatolians is placed both archaeologically and through the Hittite records in LH II or IIIA.1, there may be exactly parallel cases between archaeology and poetry at Troy. As Schliemann at first dug through Troy VI because he could not believe that anything so impressive could be prehistoric enough for Priam, so we have tended to separate the Iliad from its natural context because we cannot believe that a poem so impressive can be prehistoric. And of course it is not entirely prehistoric on any theory of oral composition, but had to be recomposed every time it was sung. It is enough to recognize that there are very early verses and characters in it, and that it was always about the fight at Troy.

The connection of this old poem to our beloved blind Ionian poet Homer in the late eighth century B.C. has always been a crux; he must have “remembered” those ancient events in a professional way, by using someone else’s old formulas he learned as a boy in “Homer” school. Still, it seems fairly clear that no one used the name “Homer” to refer to an individual person until, about 500 B.C., Xenophanes and Herakleitos created him to find fault with him.30 Most serious scholars now agree that Homer is not a person but a process, not a noun but a verb, ὄμοιο + ἄραρισκω or something like it,31 a verb of fitting multiple parts

together to make a single whole, like a carpenter using timbers and pegs to make a hall or a ship. Whatever he homers can be larger or smaller and he can build it differently next time. The poem is a professional construction like any other, a piece of τέχνη, and since there are fifteenth or early fourteenth century verses in it (although never consecutively), it is exactly the old philosophical problem of a ship on extended voyage replacing her timbers from time to time. When on her final voyage she comes into the last harbor all gleaming in fresh oak and pine except for the ancient keel, we worry how old she is, and if she is the same ship. If most parts were replaced in the same place, she is probably a very old ship.

Is there any archaeological evidence that fighting at Troy took place in LH II or IIIA.1? Throughout that time Greek and Cretan goods had been coming into Troy, and were of fairly high quality. There are three areas of special interest. The Pillar House produced a Minoan stone lamp, 17 sling bullets, and 25 pots of which "most, if not all, are datable to the early years of LH III."32 House VI G was rich, too, and seriously burned, though its collapse was ascribed to earthquake forces. It yielded a Mycenaean carnelian lentoid bead, a crystal, ivory box fragments with close analogies to the Shaft Graves (nos. 34-401, 35-508), one with an arcaded net pattern that Blegen compared to the pattern of the Silver Siege Rhyton from the Shaft Graves (p. 263, fig. 304). There were also a number of fragments of ostrich eggs, a luxury article that scarcely appears after LH IIIA.1. The pottery was late LH II or early LH IIIA.1, including a sherd of Cypriote White Slip II, which we know from the Kea excavations is stratified in the Aegean before ca. 1400-1375 B.C.33

The door in the east wall of House VI G opened onto an area by the fortification wall. Here were an arrowhead and a knife of Mycenaean type (p. 297, no. 37-780), a crystal bead, a white marble pommel, a bone handle like those in Hittite levels at Alişar and Boğazköy, and twelve Mycenaean vases, 175 sherds, all of LH II or LH IIIA.1. They are decorated "in a late stage of the Palace Style and an early stage of LH III" (pp. 278-279). There was a Cycladic sherd recalling Phylakopi ware.

In House VI F an architectural analogy was noted with the Town Mosaic of Knossos. There was an ivory disk like one in Tomb 518 at Mycenae (no. 34-514, fig. 304). The twenty-three vases in Deposit A on the

32. C.W. Blegen et al., Troy III (Princeton 1953) 241; lamp: fig. 298. Henceforth all references in the text are to this volume.

floor, "scattered in the course of some vigorous housecleaning" (p. 301) were from Greek mainland and other Aegean centers, in "the bold Palace Style of Late Minoan I b = Late Helladic II" (p. 302), "all or most of these pots were manufactured within a generation or two around 1400 B.C." I have suggested elsewhere that the "vigorous housecleaning" may have been done by Greeks, like Herakles in his profound disagreement with King Laomedon of Troy who would not "give up the horses for whose sake he had come from far off," when "with six vessels only and the few men needed to man them/ (he) widowed the streets of Ilion and sacked the city" (Iliad V.651, 640-641, trans. R. Lattimore).34

At least it seems that relations between the mainland Greeks and the Trojans changed after that period. The quality of imports declines, and many more imitations, and imports from perhaps provincial Anatolian centers, are noticeable. Although one should never try to second-guess an excavator, it does not take a major adjustment to believe that the principal early contacts — and confrontations? — between the Achaians and the Trojans took place early in the Late Bronze age, when Blegen himself noted that of 1000 Mycenaean sherds the majority came in the period down to LH IIIA.1. After that it is almost as though a curtain came down between Troy and the Argolid and Crete; with the exception of the Amarna-period group of sherds from the Pillar House (Troy III, fig. 403; possibly fig.416.5), the rest of the "Mycenaean" material is amateurish or plain bad (Troy III, figs.404-405, 410-414). Perhaps the Hittites established firmer control over the northwest and installed the feudal vassals who could keep the Greeks out, obedient to Bogazköy policy as Walmus would be later, and as Priam does not seem to have been.35

I need not stress that the great period of Troy VI down to the early fourteenth century is also the great period of Greek interest in battle art and siege scenes. There are the brilliant documents of tower and figure-of-eight shields, so familiar in the Iliad, on the gold rings, the silver battle krater, the shield-embossed sword and niello lion-hunt dagger of the Shaft Graves; the chariot battles on the Shaft Grave stelai and the gravestone with the powerful memorial to stallions in the heart of Ahhiyawa land seem to match the horse-acquiring expeditions and the chariot battles in western


Anatolia; the siege scene on the silver rhyton looks like everyone’s mental picture of the siege at Troy, with the women on the walls, the fights in the plain below, the ship coming in with a Mycenaean helmeted captain, the arcade pattern matching the Trojan ivory and the steatite rhyton with an archer from Knossos. There is the contemporary battle rhyton from Epidauros, with the ships and perhaps slingers; there must have been other artistic celebrations of the siege theme.36

There are exactly the same themes in contemporary Minoan Crete, the Zakro sealings with the city on the hill and the old-style helmet and shield,37 the archer, the men marching with figure-of-eight shields,38 real boars’ tusks and images of them at Knossos, Haghia Triadha, Praisios and Archanes,39 and the bronze helmet which is a Cretan analogue to Hektor’s “shining helm.”40 The stucco vases with helmet and shield are of the same period, LM IA,41 predecessors of the famous helmet vase of Katsamba.42 Out of such a strong context the arrival of Meriones’ boar tusk helmet at Troy should surprise no one (Iliad X.261ff.).43

We have all played games between the Iliad and the site at Troy, as Schliemann did before us, and Gladstone, and Strabo, and Hestiaia, and Thucydidies, and Herodotos, and Alkaioi, trying with a kind of desperate eagerness to reach the historical truth behind our beloved homer. Why are we so hopeful that Paris-Alexandros and Alaksandus may correspond? Why would we want Priam’s youthful battle on the Sangarios documented in the Hittite archives? What are those Trojan vassals of the Hittites, Walmus and Kukkunnis, to us or we to them? Are they any more substantial


37. A. Evans, Palace of Minos I (London 1921) 308, fig. 227a, b.
38. Evans, (supra n. 37) 694, fig. 516; III (London 1930) 106, fig. 59.
40. D.L. Page, History and the Homeric Iliad (Berkeley 1959) 249-251; Borchhardt, (supra n. 39) 60, Cat. 11.1.
41. Evans, III (supra n. 38) 310.
43. Page, (supra n. 40) 219-264; Borchhardt, (supra n. 39) 77-84.
or persuasive than those members of the Trojan royal house we have known and loved so long, Ganymede or Anchises, or those good non-Greek names Kapys and Assarakos? Why are Homer’s non-Greek names for Trojans, Priam or Amisodaros or Pandaros or Palmus any less historical than other names of western Anatolians, like the local kings Mennes and Ouatias recorded in the foundation legends of the Phokaians? Why, if Homer says that Achilles sacked Lesbos, can we not believe it without the testimony of the distant inland Hittites? If the remark had been made in prose, would it carry more conviction?

These matters seem important because the *Iliad* is really a different kind of poem from any other, not only grander, deeper and so on, but so clearly non-mythological and non-fantastic, and so in accord with the evident values of the princes of the Shaft Graves and tholos tombs; and the fighting role of the Cretans is stressed when Crete is most vividly armed. After the period we used to call the Fall of Knossos, early in the fourteenth century B.C., the standards of Greek and Cretan art really decline, and pictures of battles and warriors might often stir one to derisive laughter rather than emulation; siege scenes are fewer, too. Most pottery and wall paintings are mass-produced, and heavily formulaic in a way that preserves the old armor — the boars’ tusk helmets in the wall paintings at Pylos and Orchomenos, even the figure-of-eight shield and the tower shield preserved on pictorial vases of the later thirteenth century in an effort to conserve the heroic past whose outward forms had already vanished. Other antique formulas include the warrior between his horses, and chariots in an agonistic race, both surviving by guardian tradition into the Geometric repertory of images. The palace period with its bureaucracies and tax policies already seems far less grand than the *Iliad* atmosphere; suppose what we always thought is wrong, and the *Iliad* is pre-palatial after all, and really belongs in the generations when the Greeks and Cretans were joining and clashing, at Knossos or Trianda or Miletos, and rioting in Anatolia like Atarrissyas and his one hundred chariots? The

early verse-forms and the Cretan connections seem to confirm this; why is it so hard to believe?

We say, the Trojan War must be fought when Mycenae is most powerful, with fortification walls and gates, around 1250 B.C. Why? The walls are far more likely to be designed to prevent attacks from neighbors than to have any link to overseas policies or raids. The *Iliad* never mentions walls and gates at Mycenae; for the Catalogue poet the only walled town in Greece is Tiryns, Τίρυνθα τε τειχίσεωσαν (*Iliad* II.559), like the problematic Gortyn in Crete, perhaps a metrical replication (*Iliad* II.646). There seems no internal obstacle to setting the poem back when Achaians were both wealthy and hungry, before the civil wars and οὕτως ὡς that the thirteenth century walls suggest.

The only impressive walls in the *Iliad* are the famed walls of Troy: Troy with its high gates, towered, steep, with browsed defenses, holy.\(^\text{47}\) I see no real archaeological or literary obstacle to having this Troy as the most renowned walled city of the Greek Bronze Age, one of the first Anatolian castles the Achaians had seen, in the fifteenth or fourteenth century, the constant focus of the Homeric warrior, Agamemnon's central desire:

Let not the sun go down and disappear into darkness until I have hurled headlong the castle of Priam blazing and lit the castle gates with the flames' destruction

(*Iliad* II.415, trans. R. Lattimore)

That the Mycenaeans, early in their career, should have been so impressed by the walls of Troy that they made a poem around them seems no more difficult to believe than that, for example, some Dark Age poet had heard dim reflections of them from his great-uncle, or some poor colonist from Lesbos brooded about them, or, even, that the walls of Troy came into the *Iliad* at Athens when in the sixth century she fought the Lesbians around Sigeion which might have been built from the stones of Troy. In early Mycenaean art the theme of the walled city is dramatic; let it be so in early Mycenaean poetry as well.

The formulaic conservatism that led from the imagery of the early

---

\(^{47}\) Cf. C.M. Bowra, “Homeric Epithets for Troy,” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80 (1960) 16-23; 22: “If we think that the *Iliad* was composed in the eighth century by a man called Homer it is clear that he had very little part in bringing these epithets for Troy into the epic language.”
seventh century onto the metopes of the Parthenon already existed in the Bronze Age, in the careful guardianship of the image of the archaic fighter. If the walls of Troy are as carefully depicted in the art of the fifth century as they are in the fifteenth, the only walls that figure much in classical art, it must be because the poems of many homers through that thousand years provided the most powerful and unforgettable medium for Greek memories of Troy.
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POSTSCRIPT

Machteld J. Mellink

The papers presented at the symposium were discussed briefly by official commentators James D. Muhly and Spyros Iakovidis, as well as by members of the audience, and the range of observations ran from healthy scepticism to a cautious belief in the possibility of putting the elements from various categories of evidence together to make a working hypothesis for the history of Troy-Wilusa.

Tentative reconstructions have been made and will be made in other symposia, television specials, and critical monographs. The optimism expressed by some of the speakers and participants is reflected here in some comments on selected aspects of this Troy symposium, while no claim is made that this postscript is a consensus statement of the symposiasts.

Chronology

We all agree that matters should be put in chronological order. Absolute dates used in the following will be those of a middle chronology which is somewhat higher than the Egyptian dates advocated recently by several Egyptologists and adopted by Hans Güterbock (p. 35 supra), but in any case all East Mediterranean dates including those of Troy and the Aegean world will move up or down together if agreement is reached on the corrections needed in Egyptian absolute chronology.

The internal chronology of Troy-Hisarlik in the second millennium B.C. is based on the stratification of the citadel. Absolute dates for the individual levels are, in view of our incomplete understanding of West Anatolian ceramic developments, circuitously derived from a correlation with the Aegean sequence with the aid of Mycenaean pottery found stratified in Trojan context. Aegean ceramic chronology in turn depends upon correlation with Egypt, whether directly or via the Levant.

In Aegean archaeology, the definition of the characteristics and chronological brackets of Late Helladic IIA and IIB, IIIA.1 and 2 and IIIB pottery is a matter of continuing debate and adjustment. We here assume the conventional dates of LH II = 1500-1425, LH IIIA = 1425-1300, LH IIIB = 1300-1200 B.C.

The fortification walls of Troy VI, as excavated, mostly belong to
phases VIIf-h, the late sub-period of the sixth citadel. Traces remain of fortification walls dating to earlier stages of VI and even to its predecessor V. The large mansions forming the first inner terrace along the fortification walls of VI were freestanding structures, some built at the end of the middle period (House VI F), but most of the others in late VI (Houses VI E, VI G, VI M and the Pillar House, probably also VI A, B and C).

Imported LH II and IIIA1 pottery gives a range of ca. 1500-1375 B.C. to the middle phases of Troy VI, with a date of ‘a generation or two around 1400’ proposed for the floor deposit of house VI F (Vermeule, pp. 87-88 supra). Late Troy VI continues with LH IIIA.2 imports and lasts into the beginning of LH IIIB, early in the thirteenth century B.C. After the ruin of Troy VI, the citadel was rebuilt as VIIa in the course of the LH IIIB ceramic period and destroyed by conflagration in early LH IIIC, shortly after 1200 B.C.

_Troy’s Position, Aegean Interests_

If we explain the rise of Troy in the terms of Manfred Korfmann’s discussion of topography and navigation, the site can be understood as having had, from its beginning, a strategic position in the control and conduct of navigation to the Propontis and Pontus. The site rose to remarkable prominence in the third millennium B.C. but even then had its vicissitudes. The rising economy and prosperity of Troy VI are expressed in its monumental architecture and fortifications. As a West Anatolian site with commercial interests directed toward navigation, Troy based its economic prosperity also on control of the agricultural and technical assets of the Troad and its inland routes.

Aegean interests in Troy increased at the time of the Achaian expansion to Crete, Rhodes, and the Anatolian coast, as attested by archaeological evidence for trade or settlement in the Halikarnassos peninsula, Iasos, Miletos, Ephesus, Klaizomenai, Smyrna and the Larissa area. This expansion is strongest in the LH IIIB period, from ca. 1425 on.

The Mycenaean interest in Troy was not, so far as we know, preceded by vigorous enterprise of Minoan seafarers, in contrast to developments in Miletos and Caria. Trojans reciprocated the Mycenaean interest, to judge by their purchases of quantities of Late Helladic II and IIIA merchandise in pottery containers as well as weapons, carved ivories, beads and stone artifacts such as a serpentine lamp. The archaeological assortment represents the tip of the iceberg because the bulk of the trade (metal, horses, Black Sea produce?) will have left little residue. The building of the increasingly stronger fortifications in late Troy VI may have been in
response to an excessive interest in the prosperous coastal station on the part of Late Helladic seafarers.

**Hittite Interests**

If we venture into the realm of Hittite records and explore the potential of admitting light from the East, proceeding on the hypothesis that Wilusa is the Hittite name for Troy or the Troad (superposed on the old assumption that Hisarlik is indeed the site called Troy by the Greeks), we can see the period of the seventeenth century B.C. as the first phase of Hittite concern with Wilusa-Troy. In the Alaksandus treaty (Güterbock, p. 36 supra) it is claimed that Labarnas, one of the venerable Old Hittite kings, subjugated the land of Wilusa, that Wilusa defected at a subsequent time, but remained at peace with Hatti and kept sending [messengers]. We know that the earliest Hittite kings were also concerned with the Pontic coast and the rulers of Zalpuwa. It is conceivable that rulers of Troy, in an early phase of Troy VI, maintained respectful relations with the ambitious Old Hittite rulers of the plateau who expanded their realm to the coasts of Anatolia.

By the mid-fifteenth century B.C., Tudhaliyas II would have had reason to assert Hittite sovereignty over Wilusa, to judge by his record of the Assuwa campaign in which Wilusiya and Taruisa were defeated along with a series of allies in the Assuwa coalition (pp. 39-41 supra). This was the era of the great chariot battles of Tudhaliyas in the West, in the plains of what later became Lydia. This war shows a beginning of coalition among the rulers of various regions in Western Anatolia. Wilusiya-Wilusa could have participated with a contingent, and certainly would have had the horses and charioteers to come to the aid of the coalition. The Hittite record is ambiguous, since the Alaksandus treaty claims that Wilusa remained at peace with Hatti when Tudhaliyas came to Arzawa and that the king “did not enter Wilusa” (p. 36 supra).

The period of the Assuwa war is the second half of the fifteenth century B.C., the LH II B - IIIA.1 period. By this time the Hittites were informed on the activities of Achaian-Ahhiyawa settlers and raiders in southwest Anatolia, where Attarrissiyas the Achaian was pursuing Madduwattas inland with his charioteers and was unsuccessfully disciplined by Hittite counter-action. Attarrissiyas also had naval forces and made a raid on Cyprus-Alasiya. The Hittites report all this and must also have been aware of Achaian exploits along the Anatolian west coast, including the LH II - IIIA.1 trade with Troy-Wilusa. They must have
known (as we do from archaeological evidence) that Ahhiyawa-Mycenaeans traded, but did not settle in Troy, in contrast to their foundation of "colonies" at Miletos and elsewhere. There may have been some struggles. Emily Vermeule suspects that the "vigorous housecleaning" noted in the scattering of the original contents of House VI F was the result of a less than peaceful visit by Achaian raiders or dissatisfied trading partners in LH IIIA.1, late in the fifteenth century (p. 88 supra). Even if we might think of a punitive raid by Tudhaliyas' troops as an alternate hypothesis, the interruption did not ruin the citadel, and House VI F was re-inhabited after cleaning and reorganization.

Under Suppiluliumas I (ca. 1372-1334?), we learn from the Alaksandus treaty, Wilusa probably remained loyal to Hattusa. The king of Wilusa, the first whose name we learn, Kukkunnis, was at peace during the Arzawa war of Suppiluliumas and "kept sending messengers" (p. 35 supra).

Troy, now in the later phases of VI (f-g), was at the most brilliant stage of its architectural and economic development. Amenophis III had listed Wirij (Wilos) in his funerary temple among his Aegean tributaries.\textsuperscript{1} Wilusa-Wirij messengers must have gone to Egypt as they went to the Hittite court as envoys for declarations of friendship and exchange of presents. The trade with the Mycenaean was still active at Troy through the Amarna period, although the exact source of the LH IIIA.2 pottery in Troy is not always Mycenaean in the Argive sense. The era of Kukkunnis seems to have been prosperous and peaceful.

Troubles started in the later part of the fourteenth century. For the era of Mursilis II (1334-1305?) the treaty of Alaksandus has a hint that help was needed by the king of Wilusa (p. 36 supra). Mursilis punished Miletos-Millawanda for its Ahhiyawa leanings, but may have relied on an Ahhiyawa deity for his health.\textsuperscript{2}

Muwatallis "helped Alaksandus against some aggressors, among them the country of Masa, before concluding the treaty" (supra p. 37). The treaty must have been concluded before the battle of Qadesh, dated ca. 1300 by the middle chronology. Alaksandus, treaty-bound, should have sent troops to fight for the Hittite king Muwatallis, and it has often been


suggested that the Drdnj-Dardanoi may have been his contingent. We are approaching the beginning of the LH IIIB period, when Troy came to an end through a catastrophe. Hostile action seems archaeologically still possible in spite of the earthquake theory. The promises of Muwatallis may not have been able to prevent an attack by Achaian forces at this time, ca. 1280 B.C. The letter of Manapa-Tarhuntas (p. 37 supra), king of the Seha River Land, refers to Hittite troops and another attack on Wilusa, and complains about Piyamaradus and his son-in-law Atpas. These are culprits better known from the Tawakalawas letter (p. 37 supra), which may contain a reference to the troubles of the last phase of Troy VI. The Ahhiyawa king and the Hittite king (presumably Hattusilis III, middle chronology 1275-1250) "had made peace in the matter of Wilusa about which they had been fighting." The Milawata letter, somewhat later, under Tudhaliyas IV (ca. 1250-1220) reveals that there indeed had been trouble in Wilusa and that Walmus, deposed as king, is scheduled to be reinstated by Tudhaliyas (p. 38 supra). The royal letter to Mashuittas (p. 39 supra) again refers to troubles in connection with the kingship of Wilusa. The era of peace and prosperity, and of successful rule of a strong fortress, its ships, troops, chariots and dependencies, is over.

We may in the Milawata letter be reading references to the status of Troy VIIa after the destruction of late VI. Tudhaliyas IV is still trying to protect the dynasty of Wilusa and to reinstate Walmus who had been in exile after having lost his throne.

Troy VIIa in the LH IIIB period was a reconstructed, crowded citadel. Its connections with the Helladic world are less direct than they were in the IIIA era, and the end of the citadel came by warlike action, looting and conflagration during the general war and destruction at the beginning of the twelfth century, in the Sea Peoples' campaigns, at a time when ceramic signs of the LH IIIC period were in evidence.

This blow to Wilusa is no longer recorded by the Hittites, since the more immediate threats came to them along the south coast of Anatolia and around Cyprus and Ugarit. The chain of raids and destructions can be seen along the Cilician coast, where Tarsus goes under as an outpost of Hittite rule, and later is settled by a group of Achaian refugees in LH IIIC. This phenomenon is not paralleled at Troy, which may well have been a victim of the same kind of Achaian raiders whose survivors settled, dispersed in the general chaos, on Cyprus and the south coast of Anatolia.

The Epic Tradition: Luvian

The proposal made by Calvert Watkins (pp. 58-61 supra) to recognize
traces of a Luvian Wilusiad in the Istanuwa texts, and Starke's estimate of an Old Hittite date for these songs, open the possibility of finding Wilusa-Troy's epic fame also in the Luvian tradition, and in terms of Troy VI of the sixteenth century B.C., when Labarna had taken Wilusa under his auspices. This horizon offers a tempting view of the Luvian and Hittite awareness of Troy, with a potential of literary residue in Luvian epic, and a traditional connection of Luvian Wilusa with rituals performed in the Luvian cult-city of Istanuwa. The gods of steep Wilusa may yet emerge from such a context to be put next to the Hittite reference to Appaliunas in the Alaksandus treaty, with its lacunae in the crucial passage listing the local pantheon of Wilusa (p. 42 supra), and the oracle text which documents Mursilis II's respect for the healing powers of Ahhiyawa and Lazpas-Lesbos gods.

The Epic Tradition: Greek

Linguists are exploring the stratification of the Trojan War epic of the Greeks and come up with relics of pre-Mycenaean hexameter verses in the Iliad (pp. 85-86 supra). The Old Luvian Wilusiad, as postulated, may have had counterparts in Achaian songs about the Troy that became so well known in the periods of Late Helladic II-III B.

The case of Troy is admittedly special when it comes to analyzing the nature of the relationship between Trojans and Greeks. The archaeological connection of the trade documented by a residue of broken Late Helladic and Late Minoan pottery is tangible so far as it consists of imports, whether Argive or of other Achaian origin. An earlier, basic affinity of Troy VI to Middle Helladic sites has been interpreted mostly in ceramic terms of Minyan ware, either as a similarity in repertoire or a borrowing one way or the other. So long as observations are confined to ceramic traits, it should also be noted that Trojan potters more than any other overseas colleagues of the Achaians began to imitate Mycenaean shapes in their own wares in various phases of Troy VI and especially in VII A.

Trojan noblemen had living patterns in common with the Mycenaeans. Both groups were horse-breeders, charioteers, warriors, sailors and traders. The Trojans seem never to have been colonized by the Mycenaeans, but a pattern of understanding and alliance of leaders may have developed, based on an underlying similarity of outlook and interest, if not of shared experience in the days of the Middle Bronze Age.

This special affinity of Mycenaeans and Trojans, which needs further analysis and definition, may have given the Trojan epic more substance and fame than other tales of encounters of Mycenaeans overseas. It may
not just be the excellence of the final poet or “homer” of the *Iliad* that made Troy a case of such pride and concern to the Greeks. The special affinity was a matter of the Bronze Age, and did not continue among Greeks and Trojans of the Dark Ages and early Iron Age, unlike what happened to the Mycenaean connection of Miletos-Millawanda, which always remained alive and close to the Greeks.

The xenos-relationships noted by Calvert Watkins (p. 50 supra) were an expression of the closeness that preceded the kind of war the Trojan War or wars may have been, conflicts between leaders and peoples previously related and connected.

The name of Alaksandus, interpreted as Greek by both Güterbock and Watkins, is a symptom of the close relationship. The bilingual status of some Trojans is to be assumed, as it would be for many of the non-Achaian residents of Millawanda and for the Hittite charioteer who had driven the chariot of Tawakalawas and Hattusilis III and was sent as an intermediary to the king of Ahhiyawa. Yet, the world of Troy-Wilusa remains a separate realm, off to the north, connected with a different system of sea-lanes and passages to the world beyond the Hellespont (Korfmann, pp. 13-16).

*The Trojan War(s)*

The difficulty of identifying one particular war against Hisarhk, archaeologically, or Wilusa, historically, as the Trojan War of Greek legend and the *Iliad* (and the *Wilusiad*) is evident. The archaeological record has material evidence of many destructions, starting in the third millennium B.C. In the era of middle Troy VI one can point with Emily Vermeule to a potential raid that may have damaged House VI F and other buildings in the course of LH III A.1 (p. 88 supra). The next blow is the end of Troy VI, which Blegen and Caskey interpreted as the result of a violent earthquake. The symposiasts did not discuss the much disputed nature of this destruction. Dörpfeld attributed the physical demolition of the citadel to enemy action. Several modern studies have revived this interpretation, which needs to be supported by technical explanations of what happened to buildings and walls, especially to the superstructure of the great citadel wall, a sample of which tumbled into the empty deep space between it and House VI E. Siege engines and battering rams were devices known in Anatolia in the Old Hittite period and by the early thirteenth century surely

3. Güterbock (supra n. 2) 136.
also available to Achaian attackers in West Anatolia. The story of the Trojan horse was explained in this manner by Pliny and Pausanias, who may be helpful in the continuing debate.\(^5\)

The end of VI was a major interruption in the prosperity of the citadel. In VII a, the citadel walls were repaired with improvised masonry and the spaces immediately behind them filled with large numbers of storage units and houses. The rich houses of Troy VI and the Kukkunnis era were only partly reoccupied or used as terraces.

The most likely working hypothesis is that the event and the time of the physical destruction of VI represent a major attack of Achaian forces on Troy, early in LH IIIB, shortly after the battle of Qadesh where some Trojan (Dardanoi) contingents were sent to fight for Muwatallis. Alaksandus may have fallen in this Ilioupersis, which would have been preceded by chariot battles, a siege, and raids in the area. Beşik Tepe is the candidate for the harbor used by Achaian ships and their landing forces. The end must have been looting and captivity, but not the great blaze envisioned by Agamemnon (*Iliad* II. 414-415), because the buildings were less susceptible to conflagration than the half-timber structures of Troy II or central Anatolian palaces. It has to be remembered that we know neither the shape nor the fate of the central buildings of Troy VI, its royal court and palaces.

The final major destruction of Troy came at the time of the wars and raids known as the era of the Sea Peoples. This was clearly the danger that the provisions of Troy VIIa were trying to defend against. In vain, because the looting and burning is evident in the fate of VIIa, Blegen’s candidate for the Trojan war. Some of the myths of the diaspora of the Greeks in the days after the Ilioupersis conflate adventures and misadventures belonging to the earlier war and the later attack, in which Achaian bands probably participated. We do not know if the Hittites had succeeded in reinstating Walmus and the old dynasty, but a valiant attempt had been made to rebuild and defend the old castle of Kukkunnis and Alaksandus.

**Perspective**

The symposium will have raised, among those optimistically inclined, expectations that more history and more cultural substance of the Trojan citadel and its rulers will come to light. Manfred Korfmann’s probings of

the harbor site and cemeteries at Beşik Tepe are yielding geophysical and
topographical evidence for the use of the harbor in the periods of Troy VI
and VIIa-b, physical evidence for the residents and guardians of this
strategic coastal station, and refinements of ceramic correlation between
Mycenaeans and West Anatolians, whose ceramic repertoire is beginning
to be better known and analyzed. Burial rites and anthropological data will
be available for interpretation to add to the meager record from the
cremation cemetery south of Troy (Angel, p. 63 supra).

Troy itself, decapitated by the good intentions of Alexander the Great
and the Romans, has never yielded evidence of writing. In this respect it
does not differ from other West Anatolian sites, yet the network of Hittite
intelligence recorded in the annals and letters of Hittite kings, especially
from the period of Tudhaliyas II on, suggests that correspondence and
treaties were in the archives of West Anatolian kings and their Hittite
contemporaries. The same applies to the king of Ahhiyawa and his brother
Tawakalawas. In Wilusa, Alaksandus must have had a copy of the treaty
with Muwatallis. The messengers sent to the Hittite court by Alaksandus
and his predecessors cannot have been without seals and writing. The
legality of Walmus’s kingship in Wilusa was recorded in documents drawn
up by (presumably) Tudhaliyas IV, and used in the effort of the Hittite
king to reinstate Walmus on the throne of Wilusa. We need patience and
luck for the evidence to surface, not just in the central Anatolian Hittite
archives but also somewhere in the greater realm of the various kings of
Arzawa, of Wilusa, of Lazpas, and perhaps, some day, in the cult city of
Istanuwa . . .
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Fig. 1. Jezayirli Hasan Pasha

Fig. 2. Hasan Pasha's tower in 1779

Fig. 3. Hasan Pasha's tower from SE

Fig. 4. Hasan Pasha's tower from NE
Fig. 5. Hasan Pasha's tower: E Side and plan of basement

Fig. 6. Hasan Pasha's tower: Graffito No. 20
Fig. 7. Hasan Pasha's tower: Walls seen from interior (Numbers give locations of graffiti of ships)
Hasan Pasha's tower
Fig. 12. Hasan Pasha's tower: Graffiti
Fig. 13. Hasan Pasha's tower: Graffiti
Fig. 14. Beşik Tepe: General plan of Cemetery Area, 1984
Fig. 15. Beşik Tepe: Area of Tomb 15
Fig. 16. Aerial view of cemetery

Fig. 17. Area of Tomb 15

Fig. 18. House with Tomb 15 from W

Fig. 19. Seal from pithos, Tomb 15
Fig. 20. Beşik Tepe. Pottery from Tomb 15
Fig. 21. Beşik Tepe. Pottery and beads.
Fig. 22. Beşik Tepe. Beads and Pottery from Tomb 21
Fig. 23. Beşik Tepe. Pottery from Tomb 27
Fig. 24. Skull 3Tr from Troy II
Fig. 25. Skull 12Tr from Troy IV or V
Fig. 26. a–d: Skull 25Tr from Troy VI–VIII
 e–f: Skull 34Gor from Hittite Cemetery, Gordion