

THE AHHIYAWA TEXTS

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature



Writings from the Ancient World

Theodore J. Lewis, General Editor

Associate Editors

Edward Bleiberg
Billie Jean Collins
Daniel Fleming
Martti Nissinen
William Schniedewind
Mark S. Smith
Terry Wilfong

Number 28
The Ahhiyawa Texts

THE AHHIYAWA TEXTS

by

Gary Beckman
Trevor Bryce
Eric Cline

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

THE AHHIYAWA TEXTS

Copyright 2011 by the Society of Biblical Literature

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Beckman, Gary M.

The Ahhiyawa texts / by Gary M. Beckman, Trevor Bryce, Eric H. Cline.

p. cm. — (Society of biblical literature ; no. 28)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-58983-268-8 (paper binding : alk. paper)

1. Hittite language—Texts. 2. Hittites—History. 3. Achaeans—History. I. Bryce, Trevor, 1940- II. Cline, Eric H. III. Title.

P945.A3B43 2011

891'.998—dc23

2011042792

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994 standards for paper permanence.



CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vii
Explanation of Signs	viii
List of Illustrations	ix
Preface	xi
Introduction: The Ahhiyawa Problem	1
Texts	8
AhT 1A–1B (CTH 61). Annals of Mursili II, Years 3–4	10
AhT 1A (CTH 61.I). Ten-Year Annals	10
AhT 1B (CTH 61.II). Extensive Annals	28
AhT 2 (CTH 105). Treaty between Tudhaliya IV of Hatti and Shaushgamuwa, king of Amurru	50
AhT 3 (CTH 147). Indictment of Madduwatta	69
AhT 4 (CTH 181). Letter from a king of Hatti (probably Hattusili III) to a king of Ahhiyawa—the “Tawagalawa Letter”	101
AhT 5 (CTH 182). Letter from a king of Hatti (probably Tudhaliya IV) to a western Anatolian ruler (Tarkasnawa, king of Mira?)—the “Milawata Letter”	123
AhT 6 (CTH 183). Letter from a king of Ahhiyawa to a king of Hatti (probably Muwattalli II)	134
AhT 7 (CTH 191). Letter from Manapa-Tarhunta of the Seha River Land to a king of Hatti (probably Muwattalli II)	140
AhT 8 (CTH 209.12). Letter from a Hittite official to a king of Hatti (Hattusili III?)	145
AhT 9 (CTH 209.16). Letter from a king of Hatti(?) (perhaps Mursili II or Hattusili III) to a king of Ahhiyawa(?)	150
AhT 10 (CTH 209.17). Letter	153
AhT 11 (CTH 211.4). Offenses of the Seha River Land (royal edict of Tudhaliya IV?)	154
AhT 12 (CTH 214.12.A). Prayer of Mursili II/Muwattalli II/Urhi-Teshshup(?)	158

AhT 13 (CTH 214.12.B). Memorandum(?)	162
AhT 14 (CTH 214.12.C). Extract from a letter(?) from a king of Hatti(?) (Tudhaliya IV?) concerning Urhi-Teshshup	164
AhT 15 (CTH 214.12.D). Letter from a king of Hatti (Hattusili III?) to another Great King	168
AhT 16 (CTH 214.12.E). Fragment	172
AhT 17 (CTH 214.12.F). Fragment	173
AhT 18 (CTH 214.16). “Boundary” list(?). Reign of Hattusili III or Tudhaliya IV(?)	174
AhT 19 (CTH 243.6). Inventory	176
AhT 20 (CTH 570.1). Oracle report	183
AhT 21 (CTH 570.2). Oracle report	210
AhT 22 (CTH 571.2). Oracle report	220
AhT 23 (CTH 572.1). Oracle report	234
AhT 24 (CTH 572.2). Oracle report	242
AhT 25 (CTH 581*). Letter	244
AhT 26 (CTH 590). Votive prayer of Puduhepa(?) (wife of Hattusili III)	248
AhT 27A–27B. Letters from the Hittite court to Ammurapi of Ugarit	253
AhT 27A. Letter from Suppiluliuma II to Ammurapi, king of Ugarit	254
AhT 27B. Letter from Penti-Sharruma, a Hittite official, to Ammurapi, king of Ugarit	258
AhT 28. Inscription of Warika, king of (Ah)hiyawa	263
Epilogue: Mycenaean–Hittite Interconnections in the Late Bronze Age	
Revisited	267
Sources	285
Bibliography	289
Indices	297

PREFACE

This project began in snowy Montreal, during the final dinner held at the workshop on *Mycenaeans and Anatolians in the Late Bronze Age: The Ahhiyawa Question*, organized by Annette Teffeteller at Concordia University in January 2006. We (the three co-authors of this volume) were providentially seated together at the dinner. By the end of the meal, the plan for this volume had been hatched, for in the course of our conversation about the Ahhiyawa texts, the problem of asking American undergraduate students to study these documents had come to the fore. The editions, translations, and discussions of these various texts have been published in a variety of languages, including German, French, Italian, and English. Moreover, they have been published in a multitude of different books and articles scattered across the academic landscape, many in journals not readily available at small college or university libraries. Not since Ferdinand Sommer's book *Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden*, published in 1932 and written in German, has any serious attempt been made to collect all of the texts and republish them together in a single place (although see the abbreviated catalogue in Cline 1994: 121–25). We decided that it was time to do something about the situation and to present the texts as a corpus and in one language, with a fresh transliteration and translation of the texts, as well as commentary on each one. We do so in order to make them accessible to graduate students and undergraduates alike, in addition to professional scholars active in related fields, such as Classics and/or Near Eastern archaeology.

After much deliberation, we decided to present the texts following the standard order as set forth by Laroche (1971) in his *Catalogue des Textes Hittites* (CTH), rather than attempting to present them chronologically, since the dating of so many of them is still problematic. For those unfamiliar with the CTH system, we note that the numbering is arranged as follows:

- Historical Texts (CTH 1–220)
- Administrative Texts (CTH 221–290)
- Legal Texts (CTH 291–298)
- Lexical Texts (CTH 299–309)

- Literary Texts (CTH 310–320)
- Mythological Texts (CTH 321–370)
- Hymns and Prayers (CTH 371–389)
- Ritual Texts (CTH 390–500)
- Cult Inventory Texts (CTH 501–530)
- Omen and Oracle Texts (CTH 531–582)
- Vows (CTH 583–590)
- Festival Texts (CTH 591–724)
- Texts in Other Languages (CTH 725–830)
- Texts of Unknown Type (CTH 831–833)

Of the Ahhiyawa texts presented here, nos. 1–26 have long been known and therefore have CTH numbers. The final texts (nos. 27A–B and 28) are fairly recent discoveries and do not have CTH numbers. In order to create a definitive corpus for these texts, we have now given each of them a new number as well, in the same manner that J. A. Knudtzon long ago numbered the so-called Amarna Letters. Thus, each now has a number within the series AhT 1–28 (not AT, because this is already the siglum for the Alalakh texts).

The translations follow the style of the WAW series; that is, with little or no grammatical commentary and as little use of brackets as possible. Gary Beckman was responsible for these translations, as well as for the transliterations of the texts and the brief introductions to each. Trevor Bryce was responsible for the commentary following each text, which puts each into a larger historical and interpretive framework. Eric Cline was responsible for this preface, the introduction, and the epilogue, as well as for overseeing the project as a whole and shepherding it through the publication process. We are grateful to Dr. Geoff Tully for drawing the maps and to Ted Lewis and Billie Jean Collins for their support and assistance throughout, as well as their patience.

INTRODUCTION: THE AHHIYAWA PROBLEM

The Ahhiyawa Problem—or Ahhiyawa Question, as it is sometimes called—still remains unsolved and unanswered almost a century after it was first introduced. Simply stated, the question asks whether the term “Ahhiyawa” (and the earlier version “Ahhiya”), as found in nearly thirty Hittite texts from the time of Tudhaliya I/II and Arnuwanda I in the late-fifteenth–early-fourteenth century B.C.E. to that of Tudhaliya IV and Suppiluliuma II in the thirteenth century B.C.E., was a reference to the Bronze Age Mycenaeans. If so, was it meant to be a reference to all of the Mycenaeans on mainland Greece and elsewhere? Or, since we know that the Mycenaeans were split up into what were essentially a series of small city-states, was it a reference only to those in a specific region or locality, such as the Peloponnese (e.g., Mycenae), Boeotia (e.g., Thebes), Rhodes, or western Anatolia? Could the meaning have changed over time, as Hittite relations with these foreigners evolved over the centuries? Furthermore, if it was not a reference to the Mycenaeans, then to what—and to whom—did it refer? The discussion is more than merely an academic one because the texts, at least indirectly, may shed light on various aspects of the Trojan War, or at least on the kernels of truth that seem to underlie the story as told to us by Homer.

The origins of the Ahhiyawa Question, and the ensuing debate, go back to 1924, when the Swiss scholar Emil Forrer gave a lecture in Berlin and then published two articles on the topic, in the German periodicals *MDOG* and *OLZ* (1924a, 1924b; see now Beckman forthcoming). Based on his readings of approximately twenty-five texts among the thousands that had been found in the archives of the Hittite capital city Hattusa during the German excavations that had begun at the site in 1906 under the direction of Hugo Winckler, Forrer tentatively linked Ahhiyawa to the Mycenaeans of the Bronze Age Greek mainland, that is, the Achaeans. He also made connections between specific individuals and place names mentioned in the Ahhiyawa texts and those from Greek legends about the Trojan War. These included identifying Lazpa in the Ahhiyawa texts as the island of Lesbos; Taruisa as the city of Troy; Attarissiya and Tawagalawa as the legendary Greek heroes Atreus and Eteokles; and so on.

Forrer was not the first to suggest such possibilities, for Luckenbill—back in 1911—had already suggested a link between Alaksandu in the Ahhiyawa texts and Alexander/Paris, legendary prince of Troy (Luckenbill 1911; see now Beckman forthcoming), a connection which Forrer repeated and endorsed. However, Forrer's articles were the most systematic and thorough studies presented up to that point.

Forrer's suggestions were met with a variety of reactions, ranging from acceptance to disbelief. Reservations were raised almost immediately by a number of scholars, including Kretschmer in 1924 (see also 1935, 1936), who equated Wilusa in the Hittite texts with (W)Ilios/Troy of Greek legend rather than with Elaiusa in Cilicia as per Forrer, and Hrozný in 1929, who linked Milawata in the texts with the city of Miletus in western Anatolia, rather than with the lesser known location of Milyas, as per Forrer (Beckman forthcoming). Forrer presented his thoughts on more relevant texts in 1926 and, following attacks on his work by Friedrich (1927) and Götze (1927a-c), still more texts in 1929 (1929a-b; for the full historiographic discussion, see Beckman forthcoming). Additional relevant texts, or editions of texts, were also studied by Götze in 1928 and 1933 (**AhT 1A-B** and **AhT 3**: the Annals of Mursili II and the Madduwatta text, respectively), as well as by Güterbock in 1936 (**AhT 14**: a possible letter concerning Urhi-Teshshup) and Szemerényi in 1945 (**AhT 2**: the treaty between Tudhaliya IV and Shaushga-muwa of Amurru).

The most vocal of his opponents was Ferdinand Sommer, who in 1932 published a comprehensive volume in German entitled *Die Aḥḥijawā-Urkunden* (i.e., *The Ahhiyawa Documents*), containing translations of all of the texts in question that were available at that time, with his interpretations, including previously unpublished editions of additional Ahhiyawa texts: a letter from a king of Ahhiyawa sent to a Hittite king, perhaps Muwattalli II (**AhT 6**); a letter sent by a Hittite official to a Hittite king, perhaps Hattusili III (**AhT 8**); an edict of Tudhaliya IV (**AhT 11**); a prayer of Mursili II/Muwattalli II/Urhi-Teshshup (**AhT 12**); two letters (**AhT 9-10**); a memorandum (**AhT 13**); a boundary list (**AhT 18**); and two oracle reports (**AhT 20-21**). In his book, Sommer disagreed with nearly all of Forrer's suggestions, and argued that Ahhiyawa was simply an Anatolian state (cf. Bryce 1989a: 297).

As Denys Page records in the first of his Sather Lectures presented at the University of California, Berkeley in 1957-58 (Page 1959), Fritz Schachermeyr summarized the situation in 1935, in his volume *Hethiter und Achäer*. Soon thereafter, Sommer continued his attack, publishing a 128-page article entitled "Aḥḥijawā und kein Ende?" in the journal *Indogermanische Forschungen* in 1937. Since then, the pendulum has swung back and forth, as George Huxley (1960), Gerd Steiner (1964), and others weighed in on the debate (see, e.g., bibliography in Page 1959 and, more recently, in Bryce 1989b), even as additional

texts were added to the corpus (e.g., Houwink ten Cate 1983/84; Kořak 1982), important joins were made to existing pieces (e.g., Hoffner 1982), and additional learned and knowledgeable voices joined or continued the discussion (e.g., Güterbock 1983, 1984, 1986; Bryce 1989a, 1989b; Steiner 1989, 2007). The most recent survey of the current state of affairs was published by Fischer in 2010, to mixed reviews (see, e.g., Kelder 2010a).

At the moment, as has been stated elsewhere (Cline 1994: 69; 1996: 145), if the Mycenaean can be equated with the Ahhiyawans (Ahhiyawa = Achaia = Achaeans = Mycenaean), then there is substantial textual evidence for contact between the Hittites and the Mycenaean throughout the course of the Late Bronze Age, in a variety of contexts ranging from hostile to peaceful and back again, as will be discussed in the Epilogue below. If, however, the Mycenaean are not the Ahhiyawans, then they are never mentioned by the Hittites. This, though, seems unlikely, for Ahhiyawa must, essentially by default, be a reference to the Mycenaean. Otherwise, we would have, on the one hand, an important Late Bronze Age culture not mentioned elsewhere in the Hittite texts (the Mycenaean) and, on the other hand, an important textually attested Late Bronze Age “state” without archaeological remains (Ahhiyawa).

Unfortunately, particularly in regard to the relationship between the Hittites and Ahhiyawa over time, the precise date of many of the Ahhiyawa texts is unclear. Some can be assigned to a specific period within an individual king’s reign, but others only to a king’s reign, and still others only to a particular century at best. Bearing these limitations in mind, we might still attempt to order the texts chronologically, as seen in Table 1. Note that the order of the texts is almost certainly subject to change somewhat, especially for those dated only to a particular century. However, the date and order of the most important texts, including the Indictment of Madduwatta, the Annals of Mursili II, the so-called Tawagalawa and Milawata Letters, as well as others, are fairly firmly established now. If Ahhiyawa is equated with the Mycenaean, as seems likely, these texts can be used to discuss in detail the relations between the Hittites and the Mycenaean over the course of the Late Bronze Age, as will be done below, after the presentation of the texts themselves.

We are also left with the question of which Mycenaean were being referred to by the Hittites when they were using the term “Ahhiyawa,” for the Mycenaean world was large and not always unified during the centuries of the Late Bronze Age. Previous scholars have attempted to place Ahhiyawa in Rhodes, Thrace, Cilicia, northwest Anatolia, and elsewhere in the Mediterranean region (see maps and references in Niemeier 1998 as well as references in Cline 1994: 69). However, Hawkins, in his 1998 article, while noting that Ahhiyawa is located “‘across the sea’, and reached at or via the islands,” also showed conclusively that there is no room on the Anatolian mainland for Ahhiyawa (Hawkins 1998:

esp. 30–31). In the same year, Niemeier persuasively and logically eliminated all of the other suggested possibilities except for mainland Greece (see previously Bryce 1989b: 3–6; also Mountjoy 1998; Hope Simpson 2003; and now Kelder 2004–2005, 2005, 2010b; contra Steiner 2007, who remains almost the lone voice of dissent).

It now seems most reasonable to identify Ahhiyawa primarily with the Greek mainland, although in some contexts the term “Ahhiyawa” may have had broader connotations, perhaps covering all regions that were settled by Mycenaean or came under Mycenaean control (see, e.g., Bryce 2011: 10). Furthermore, if Ahhiyawa is primarily on the Greek mainland, and is to be equated with one of the known Mycenaean kingdoms, it seems most likely that it should be identified with Mycenae, as has been suggested by a number of scholars, most recently Kelder (2010b: 93–99), in part because of Mycenae’s clear international connections during the Late Bronze Age, including imports found at the site itself (Cline 1994). Arguments for an identification with Boeotian Thebes (Latacz 2004) are not convincing and can be readily dismissed (cf. Kelder 2010b: 88–93).

Kelder, though, has recently suggested that Ahhiyawa was much larger than anyone has supposed to date. He sees it as a “Great Kingdom,” ruled from Mycenae, and equates it with essentially the entire Mycenaean world, including “the (larger part of the) Peloponnese, the Thebaid, various islands in the Aegean and Miletus on the Anatolian west coast, with Mycenae as its capital” (Kelder 2010b: 120, cf. also a similar statement on p. viii). Although he is quite correct that “Archaeologically speaking, the Greek mainland in the Late Bronze is remarkably uniform” (Kelder 2010b: 118), and that “the cultural uniformity, the uniformity of the palatial administrations, and the ability to embark on large-scale projects ... allow for some sort of an overarching authority” (Kelder 2010b: 119), it is difficult to see how this entire region could truly have been ruled by a single king. Kelder himself pointed out in earlier articles (and repeats in his recent book) that the existence of a “larger Mycenaean state” ruled by a single *wanax* is not supported by the Linear B texts (Kelder 2005b: 135–38; 2008: 74; 2010b: 20, 119).

However, several years earlier, Kelder (2005, 2006) had proposed a slightly different suggestion, which he also mentions in passing in his book (2010b: 44) and which seems much more compelling. He cited a portion of the Indictment of Madduwatta (**AhT 3**), wherein Beckman (1999: 153) had suggested reconstructing the text to read “100 [chariots and ... infantry] of Attarissiya [drew up]” (Kelder 2005a: 155; 2005b: 139, 144; 2010b: 24; see also Steiner 2007: 597 and, several decades earlier, Güterbock 1983: 138). Attarissiya, as known from this text, is almost certainly to be equated with the unnamed “enemy ruler of Ahhiya,” referred to in the oracle text **AhT 22** (§25). Ahhiya is an early, and older, form of the name Ahhiyawa; these two texts are the earliest of all the

Ahhiyawa texts, with one dating to the time of Tudhaliya I/II and the other from just afterward but describing events from his reign.

An updated, but similar, translation from the Indictment of Madduwatta is given in the pages below and can be repeated here, with the bellicose context made clear:

§12 (obv. 60–65) But [later] Attarissiya, the ruler of Ahhiya, came and was plotting to kill *you*, Madduwatta. But when the father of My Majesty heard, he dispatched Kisnapili, infantry, and chariotry in battle against Attarissiya. And you, Madduwatta, again did not resist Attarissiya, but yielded before him. Then Kisnapili proceeded to rush [...] to you from Hatti. Kisnapili went in battle against Attarissiya. 100 [chariots and ... thousand infantry] of Attarissiya [drew up for battle]. And they fought. One officer of Attarissiya was killed, and one officer of ours, Zidanza, was killed. Then Attarissiya turned [away(?)] from Madduwatta, and he went off to his own land. And they installed Madduwatta in his place once more.

Based upon that reconstruction, that is, that Attarissiya of Ahhiya (Ahhiyawa) may have fielded as many as one hundred chariots, in addition to infantry, Kelder suggested that “the military capacity of Ahhiyawa as indicated in the Hittite texts, as well as certain political and geographical characteristics, point towards a larger entity in the Aegean than anything that is attested in Linear B texts” (Kelder 2005a: 159; see also now comments in Kelder 2010b: 34). He further stated that Ahhiyawa “must have had the military capacity at least three times the size of that of the Kingdom of Pylos. It has already been established that there is no indication in the Linear B texts of such an entity in the Mycenaean world; any evidence for it therefore must be sought elsewhere” (Kelder 2005: 159). He concluded that “the only plausible explanation ... is that Ahhiyawa was more than one of the Mycenaean palatial states” (Kelder 2005a: 158), that is, that “Ahhiyawa must have been a conglomerate of several of these kingdoms” (Kelder 2010b: 44).

While not confirmed by any means, one wonders whether Kelder might have been on to something with this suggestion, despite the fact that he seems to abandon it by the end of his own book. It is quite possible that the entity known as Ahhiyawa to the Hittites (and Tanaja to the Egyptians) may have been larger than any one Mycenaean palatial kingdom and could well have been a unified force comprised of several of them. We need only look at the Mycenaean forces mustered by Agamemnon for the Trojan War, as listed in the Catalogue of Ships in Book II of the *Iliad*, to see that the Mycenaean were reportedly capable of creating such an entity. Although the *Iliad* was, of course, not written until the eighth century B.C.E. and cannot be used as historical evidence in general, the Catalogue of Ships in specific is regarded by scholars as an authentic piece

reflecting Bronze Age realities. If so, someone like Agamemnon (or his real-life equivalent), who is described as “King of Kings” in the *Iliad*, could easily have been regarded by the Hittites as a Great King, despite the existence of other minor kings from the same general area. The beauty of this suggestion is that one is not forced to part ways with the evidence of the Linear B tablets for multiple small Mycenaean kingdoms (as one must do in following Kelder’s later argument for a “Greater Mycenae”). The obvious analogy would be to the political conglomeration known to the Hittites as Assuwa, which the Hittites themselves indicate was a confederation of twenty-two smaller cities and states in northwest Anatolia during the later-fifteenth century B.C.E. (KUB 23.11; see discussion in Cline 1996: 141–42).

So, is it possible that Ahhiyawa was similarly a confederation of Mycenaean kingdoms, rather than one single kingdom? Such a suggestion may resolve many of the lingering questions about Ahhiyawa, including the problem of why there was a single “Great King” recognized by the Hittites, when we know that there were multiple Mycenaean kings ruling at the same time. If so, we might perhaps draw a parallel and see Ahhiyawa as a very early version of the Delian League (which itself morphed into the Athenian Empire), with members contributing money, men, and ships to a common cause such as overseas trade or warfare. Mee (1998: 143) suggested something very similar more than a decade ago, when he wrote: “My proposal for the location of Ahhiyawa is based on Thucydides who saw the Thalassocracy of Minos as a forerunner of the Athenian Empire. Could Ahhiyawa also have been a maritime confederacy which was led by one of the mainland Mycenaean states, such as Mycenae?” The answer, it seems, is yes; such would have been quite possible, and plausible.

At the very least, perhaps we can say that the Ahhiyawa Problem/Question has been solved and answered after all, for there is now little doubt that Ahhiyawa was a reference by the Hittites to some or all of the Bronze Age Mycenaean world. It seems that Forrer was largely correct after all.

TABLE 1. THE AHHIYAWA TEXTS IN ROUGH CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER.

1. AhT 22 (CTH 571.2). Oracle report. Late-fifteenth–early-fourteenth century B.C.E. Reign of Tudhaliya I/II.
2. AhT 3 (CTH 147). Indictment of Madduwatta. Early-fourteenth century B.C.E. Reign of Arnuwanda I.
3. AhT 1A (CTH 61.I). Ten-Year Annals of Mursili II, years 3–4. Late-fourteenth century B.C.E.
4. AhT 1B (CTH 61.II). Extensive Annals of Mursili II, years 3–4. Late-fourteenth–early-thirteenth century B.C.E.
5. AhT 20 (CTH 570.1). Oracle report. Late-fourteenth–early-thirteenth century B.C.E. Mursili II.
6. AhT 12 (CTH 214.12.A). Prayer of Mursili II/Muwattalli II/Urhi-Teshshup(?). Late-fourteenth–mid-thirteenth century B.C.E.
7. AhT 9 (CTH 209.16). Letter from a king of Hatti(?) (perhaps Mursili II or Hattusili III) to a king of Ahhiyawa(?). Mid-fourteenth–thirteenth century B.C.E.
8. AhT 7 (CTH 191). Letter from Manapa-Tarhunta of the Seha River Land to a king of Hatti (probably Muwattalli II). Early-thirteenth century B.C.E.
9. AhT 6 (CTH 183). Letter from a king of Ahhiyawa to a king of Hatti (probably Muwattalli II). Early- to mid-thirteenth century B.C.E.
10. AhT 4 (CTH 181). Letter from a king of Hatti (probably Hattusili III) to a king of Ahhiyawa—the “Tawagalawa Letter.” Mid-thirteenth century B.C.E.
11. AhT 8 (CTH 209.12). Letter from a Hittite official to a king of Hatti (Hattusili III?). Mid-thirteenth century B.C.E.
12. AhT 15 (CTH 214.12.D). Letter from a king of Hatti (Hattusili III?) to another Great King. Thirteenth century B.C.E.
13. AhT 26 (CTH 590). Votive prayer of Puduhepa(?) (wife of Hattusili III). Mid-thirteenth century B.C.E.
14. AhT 18 (CTH 214.16). “Boundary” list(?). Mid- to late-thirteenth century B.C.E. Reign of Hattusili III or Tudhaliya IV(?)
15. AhT 14 (CTH 214.12.C). Extract from a letter(?) from a king of Hatti(?) (Tudhaliya IV?) concerning Urhi-Teshshup. Mid- to late-thirteenth century B.C.E.
16. AhT 11 (CTH 211.4). Offenses of the Seha River Land (royal edict of Tudhaliya IV?). Late-thirteenth century B.C.E.
17. AhT 5 (CTH 182). Letter from a king of Hatti (probably Tudhaliya IV) to a western Anatolian ruler (Tarkasnawa, king of Mira?)—the “Mila-wata Letter.” Late-thirteenth century B.C.E.

18. AhT 2 (CTH 105). Treaty between Tudhaliya IV and Shaushga-muwa, king of Amurru. Late-thirteenth century B.C.E.
19. AhT 27A and B (RS 94.2530, 94.2523). Letters, respectively, from Suppiluliuma II and Penti-Sharruma, a Hittite official, to Ammurapi, king of Ugarit. Late-thirteenth century B.C.E.
20. AhT 28 (Tekoğlu and Lemaire 2000). Inscription of Warika, king of (Ah)Hiyawa. Mid- to late-eighth century B.C.E.

UNASSIGNABLE TEXTS

21. AhT 10 (CTH 209.17). Letter. Thirteenth century B.C.E.
22. AhT 13 (CTH 214.12.B). Memorandum(?). Thirteenth century B.C.E.
23. AhT 16 (CTH 214.12.E). Fragment. Late-thirteenth century B.C.E.
24. AhT 17 (CTH 214.12.F). Fragment. Late-thirteenth century B.C.E.
25. AhT 19 (CTH 243.6). Inventory. Thirteenth century B.C.E.
26. AhT 21 (CTH 570.2). Oracle report. Thirteenth century B.C.E.
27. AhT 23 (CTH 572.1). Oracle report. Late-thirteenth century B.C.E.
28. AhT 24 (CTH 572.2). Oracle report. Thirteenth century B.C.E.
29. AhT 25 (CTH 581*). Letter. Thirteenth century B.C.E.

TABLE 2. CHRONOLOGY OF HITTITE NEW KINGDOM RULERS.¹

Tudhaliya I/II ²	} late-fifteenth–mid-fourteenth century B.C.E.
Arnuwanda I	
Hattusili II?	
Tudhaliya III	
Suppiluliuma I	ca. 1350–1322 B.C.E.
Arnuwanda II	ca. 1322–1321 B.C.E.
Mursili II	ca. 1321–1295 B.C.E.
Muwattalli II	ca. 1295–1272 B.C.E.
Urhi-Teshshup (Mursili III)	ca. 1272–1267 B.C.E.
Hattusili III	ca. 1267–1237 B.C.E.
Tudhaliya IV	ca. 1237–1209 B.C.E.
Arnuwanda III	ca. 1209–1207 B.C.E.
Suppiluliuma II	ca. 1207–? B.C.E.

1. The following is but one of several Hittite chronologies that have been proposed by scholars, but is the one that is followed in this volume.

2. It is uncertain whether there were one or two early New Kingdom rulers of this name; the scholarly convention, therefore, is to use “I/II.”