might then have found themselves in a position where they could neither satisfy their overlord's demands nor retain sufficient supplies for their own people.

Ironically, then, the rebuilding of Hattusa might have actually accelerated the kingdom's final decline. Tudhaliya's enterprise marked a brilliant, brief florescence of Hittite culture at the very end of the city's and the kingdom's existence. It took but a few years for Hattusa to reach its spectacular new heights. Within a few years of its builder's death, the seat of empire was no more. The city which had risen up almost 500 years earlier in defiance of Anitta's curse had now ended. Abandoned by its population, nothing remained of it but a smouldering ruin. The curse had taken effect. Anitta's vengeance was complete.

CHAPTER 14
Links across the Wine-Dark Sea

Greeks and Trojans confront each other on the plains of Troy. In the space in between, two warriors meet—Diomedes, son of Tydeus, from Argos in Greece, and Glaukos, son of Hippolochos, from Lycia in the remote south-western corner of Anatolia. As they prepare to do battle, Diomedes calls upon Glaukos to identify himself, to state his lineage and place of origin. He learns that Glaukos too has ancestral origins in Argos, that there have been close bonds between their families, bonds extending back several generations. Enmity between the two is set aside. They exchange weapons and armour, and pledge to renew their families' traditional links.

From the Bronze Age onwards, there have been many meetings, many links between the peoples of the ancient Greek and Near Eastern worlds—all contributing in greater or lesser measure to the ongoing process of cultural transmission and cultural exchange between east and west. The process involved two-way traffic, sometimes predominantly in one direction, sometimes predominantly in the other. During the middle centuries of the first millennium BC, the Greek world had a profound influence on a number of its Near Eastern neighbours; the remains of the Hellenized cities of the Anatolian littoral are amongst the tangible witnesses of this. In the early centuries of the millennium and in the preceding millennium, the Greeks in their turn derived much from their contacts with their neighbours across the wine-dark sea. Mainland and island Greece lay towards the western end of a cultural continuum which began with the earliest historical societies of Mesopotamia. Customs, traditions, and institutions which first appeared in these societies passed ever westwards, from one generation to another, from one civilization to another, and from one region to another over a period of several thousand years, sometimes undergoing substantial changes and modifications along the way. The Hittites were participants in the process, as they absorbed within the fabric of their own
civilization cultural elements drawn from the wide range of civilizations with which they came into contact, either directly or through cultural intermediaries. In their turn they may well have played an important role in the transmission of elements of Near Eastern culture further westwards to the Greek world.

In recent years scholars have been giving renewed attention to the nature and extent of the role played by the Near East in shaping Greek culture in its early developmental stages. With this has come an increasing conviction that Near Eastern poetic and mythological traditions exercised a direct and pervasive influence on early Greek literature, most notably the poems of Homer and Hesiod. We have already noted the parallels between the Kumerbi epic cycle, preserved in a fragmentary Hittite version in the archives of Hattusa, and the works of Hesiod. We shall now turn to some of the parallels and possible links between Near Eastern traditions, particularly those that surface in the Land of Hatti, and the traditions used by Hesiod’s near contemporary Homer in the Iliad and the Odyssey.

Parallels abound between the cultures of the Near Eastern and Greek worlds and have already been dealt with in a range of publications.2 But no matter how striking some of these parallels may appear to be, they are not in themselves demonstrative of actual east–west contacts. If we are to argue that they are more than mere coincidences, that there are actual links between them, we need first to demonstrate in historical or archaeological terms at least the likelihood of cultural transmission between the different regions where they made their appearance. Some steps have already been taken in this direction, by Professor Martin West and others. And some of the mechanisms of cultural interaction between the Near Eastern and early Greek worlds are already becoming clear. What is still to be determined is whether this interaction was primarily a feature of early Iron Age contacts, or whether it was already in play at least several centuries before, in the Bronze Age.

There is no doubt that in the Late Bronze Age commercial and cultural links were well established between the Mycenaean world and western Anatolia and the Syro-Palestine region, and indirectly extended further east into Mesopotamia. The Uluburun shipwreck (see Chapter 5) provides some indication of how these links were maintained. The ship’s cargo of copper and tin ingots and luxury items is indicative of the commercial contacts between Egypt, the eastern Mediterranean lands, and Greece in the fourteenth to thirteenth centuries, and the nature of the trade between these regions. But there may have been other cargo as well, not identifiable in the archaeological record—what has been referred to as ‘human talent’.

Westward Population Movements

In recent years a number of scholars have postulated a westward diaspora of Levantine craftsmen and merchants in the Late Bronze Age, including entrepreneurs in search of new resources and markets, and travelling along the established trade routes. From our Hittite sources we know that by the middle of the thirteenth century a substantial number of western Anatolians were living in Mycenaean Greece, called Ahhiyawa in Hittite texts. In a letter to one of the kings of Ahhiyawa Hattusili III complains of the resettlement of some 7,000 of his western Anatolian subjects from the Lukka Lands in Ahhiyawan territory.3 Complementing this information, the Mycenaean Linear B tablets indicate that western Anatolia was one of the regions from which labour was obtained for the Mycenaean palace’s workforces, for textile-making and the like. The same region may also have served as a recruiting ground, through raids and other means, for supplementing the substantial workforces required for building the massive fortifications at sites like Mycenae and Tiryns. This would fit neatly with an admittedly late attested tradition recorded by the first-century Greek writer Strabo, crediting the building of the walls of Tiryns to the Cyclopes, giants from Lycia.4 The Lycians, as the Greeks and Romans called them, were first-millennium descendants of the Late Bronze Age Lukka people, who lived in parts of southern and western Anatolia. Many of these people were resettled in the Mycenaean world around the middle of the thirteenth century, in the period when the Mycenaean citadels were being extensively refortified.5

The new arrivals in Greece, whether from western Anatolia or regions further east, no doubt included many who were skilled in manual crafts, as well as healers, seers, and singers or poets—indeed, just as they are listed by Odysseus’ wineherd Eumaeus amongst the categories of demioergoi, craftsmen who can always be assured of a welcome wherever they travel: ‘No man of his own accord goes out to bring in a stranger from elsewhere, unless that stranger be master of some craft, a prophet or one who cures disease, a worker in wood, or again an inspired bard, delighting men with his song.’ The wide
world over, men such as these are welcome guests.* Through the resettlement of foreign *dei noergetoi* and their fellow immigrants from the Near East, customs and traditions of the societies to which they had originally belonged would have become known in the Greek world. Indeed these foreign settlers were very likely the most important agents of east–west cultural transmission.

The thousands of Anatolian settlers in Mycenaean Greece very likely included some who had been trained as scribes, and continued to serve as scribes and interpreters in the Mycenaean courts. Their services would presumably have been called upon for communications between their new overlords and his subjects or agents in western Anatolia. They could also have served as channels of communication between the Ahhiyawan king and their former overlord, the king of Hatti. And they may well have brought to their new land something else in addition to their scribal skills. We have earlier remarked that scribes educated in the Near Eastern scribal school tradition would in the process of their education have learnt the ‘classics’ of Mesopotamia, notably literary compositions emanating from the Sumerian, Babylonian, and Hurrian peoples which found their way into the Hittite world—compositions like the Gilgamesh epic and the Kumarmbi Song Cycle. Further to the west, in another world that was clearly receptive to stories of heroes and great achievements from the past as well as the present, it is very probable that narrative traditions from the Near East also became known in Mycenaean court circles—at least partly through the agency of Anatolian scribes who had become familiar with them in the course of their scribal training.

Yet there must have been others too who conveyed stories originating in a Near Eastern context westwards to the Greek world. Episodes from the Gilgamesh epic were probably in wide circulation, especially among travellers. The epic is by and large a traveller’s tale. And as we have already remarked, the tales of the Kumarmbi cycle with their themes of sex and violence would almost certainly have had widespread appeal at all levels of society. Immigrant craftsmen and artists, itinerant merchants, sailors from vessels which plied their trade throughout the ports of the Mediterranean, indeed any traveller capable of spinning a good yarn, may all have been agents in the process of east–west cultural transmission, in the course of which episodes from the Mesopotamian and Hurrian epics made their first appearance in the Greek world. If so, they may well have exercised, already in the Late Bronze Age, a significant influence on the development and shaping of the traditions which provided the genesis of Homeric epic as well as basic material for the poems of Hesiod.

*Gilgamesh and the Homeric Epics*

We can readily identify a number of features which the Gilgamesh epic has in common with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The introductory passage of the Gilgamesh epic which depicts Gilgamesh as a restless hero—the far-journeying wanderer who endures many hardships and gathers much wisdom—reminds us of Odysseus in the opening lines of the *Odyssey*. The very notion of a long journey in which the hero is beset by many obstacles and temptations is as fundamental to the Gilgamesh epic as it is to the *Odyssey*. The aleviw Wife-temptress Sinuri in the former calls to mind Calypso and Circe in the latter. The divine intervention motif is constantly in evidence in both the Gilgamesh and the Homeric compositions—there are those deities who support and assist the hero, and those who are implacably hostile to him and seek his downfall—for an insult he has committed against them, for an injury done to them or to other members of their family.

The Mesopotamian and Greek epics all have a greater or lesser preoccupation with death and the Underworld, and there is much in common between Mesopotamian and Greek concepts of the afterlife. 'Achilles’ meeting with Patroklos’ ghost in Book 23 of the *Iliad* recalls Gilgamesh’s meeting with Enkidu’s ghost in the twelfth tablet of the Gilgamesh epic. Gilgamesh’s summoning-up of the spirit of Enkidu has its counterpart in Odysseus’s summoning-up of the ghost of Teiresias in the *Odyssey*. This is of course a common literary *topos*—in which the living seek advice from the dead, as we see also in Aeneas’ consultation with the ghost of his father Anchises, or in a biblical context Saul’s consultation with the ghost of the prophet Samuel.  

What do such parallels really signify? Direct influence of one tradition upon the other? Mere coincidence? Or was there an original common source from which common elements have been independently retained in two divergent cultures? The most sceptical view
would have it that the broad similarity in themes observable in the Gilgamesh and the Homeric compositions indicate similar but quite unrelated responses, encapsulated in literary form, to similar problems, questions, hopes, aspirations, and fears raised by the different environments in which human societies evolved and developed. Things like the preoccupation with the theme of death and what lies beyond, and a yearning for some form of immortality which will transcend death; or the tension or conflict between the ephemeral, hedonistic delights of this world, and a desire for nobler, more lasting achievement, whatever hardships and dangers that may entail. Are the themes of the epics essentially independent reflections of what is inherent in human nature?

This view would become less tenable if we had conclusive proof that Near Eastern literary or mythological traditions, like those reflected in the Akkadian epics, were already known in thirteenth-century Greece. Such proof has yet to be found. We can, however, be sure that many people from the regions where the epics were read, copied, recited, and performed in the Late Bronze Age either resettled in the Greek world, or visited it in the course of trading enterprises. If they carried their traditions and folk tales with them, and if at this time the poetic and historical traditions on which Homer drew were already taking shape, it would be perverse to argue that they did so in complete isolation from Near Eastern traditions with which they shared a number of similar features and which were then known in the Greek world.

There are, furthermore, a number of specific points of comparison between Homeric and Near Eastern tradition which seem to go beyond mere superficial or commonplace parallels. In Book 5 of the Iliad Diomedes maltreats the goddess Aphrodite, and the goddess complains of this to her parents Zeus and Dione. But her father is not at all sympathetic, and in fact gently rebukes her for making the complaint. We are reminded of Gilgamesh’s maltreatment of the goddess Ishtar (Aphrodite’s Near Eastern equivalent). Just as Aphrodite had done, Ishtar complains to her parents Anu and Antu of Gilgamesh’s behaviour. For doing so in complete isolation from Near Eastern traditions with which they shared a number of similar features and which were then known in the Greek world.

In Book 4 of the Odyssey, Penelope learns of her son Telemachos’ journey to find news of Odysseus, and the suitors’ plot to kill him on his return. In great anxiety, she prays to Athene to keep him safe. In the Gilgamesh epic, the goddess Ninsun learns of her son’s dangerous journey to fight the giant Humbaba, and she too prays for his safety. Of course there is nothing surprising about a mother praying for a son, especially when she perceives him to be in great danger. But a comparison of the two episodes takes us beyond this mere commonplace. After lamenting her son’s plight, Penelope bathes and puts on clean linen, then filling a basket with sacred barley, she goes to the upper storey of the palace, and makes supplication to Athene to keep her son safe. When Gilgamesh goes off to fight Humbaba, his mother Ninsun enters her chamber, she puts on a garment and other adornments, then taking a special herb, she goes upstairs to the roof of the palace, and makes supplication to the Sun God Shamash for her son’s safety. Burkert remarks that what elevates this comparison from the commonplace is the fact that here narrative content, structure, and sequence are virtually identical.

We might also take a little further the comparison between Homer’s Circe and Siduri of the Gilgamesh epic. Each attempts to persuade the hero to abandon his mission—in Gilgamesh’s case the quest for Utnapishtim, in Odysseus’ the completion of his journey home—and neither succeeds. Yet there are dual, apparently contrasting aspects of the roles which the temptresses play. Gilgamesh prevails on Siduri, who lives on the edge of the sea and knows its ways, to give him directions which will lead him across the waters to Utnapishtim. Odysseus too entreats Circe to provide directions for his homeward journey; she advises him that to reach his final destination he must first visit the house of Persephone and Hades, and there seek counsel from the spirit of the seer Teiresias. In both cases the dangers of the journey ahead are highlighted. Gilgamesh is warned thus: ‘There has never been a ferry of any kind, Gilgarnesh. and nobody from time immemorial has crossed the sea (to the realm of Utnapishtim).’ Odysseus has similar apprehensions: ‘O Circe, who will be the guide for this journey? Never yet has anyone reached by black ship the realm of Hades.’ But Circe reassures him. Like Siduri, she is knowledgeable in the ways of the sea. In both cases, the temptresses are not merely obstacles put in the hero’s way. They play essential roles in the forward movement of the journey. For the directions they give are critical to the attainment of the hero’s goal. In this case too Mesopotamian and Homeric tradition closely parallel each other in concept, structure, and detail.
Cultural Transmission

Near Eastern influence on Homer was by no means confined to the sphere of literary tradition. On a broader level, elements of Hittite and other Near Eastern ritual practices occasionally surface in the Homeric epics. We have already referred to the close parallel between the procedures followed by Odysseus in summoning up the dead at the beginning of Book 11 of the *Odyssey* and the Hittite chthonic ritual in which the deities of the netherworld were summoned from their infernal abode (Chapter 10). One further example may suffice. In Book 23 of the *Iliad* (233–61), Homer describes the funeral rites of the Greek hero Patroklos. His body is disposed of by cremation. This has occasioned some surprise, since inhumation was the regular Greek practice in the Bronze Age, the period in which the Trojan War is set. What Patroklos’ burial rites do recall are the procedures laid down for the disposal of the remains of Hittite kings, as described in Chapter 10. In both cases the deceased’s body is consumed upon a funeral pyre; the pyre’s smouldering embers are quenched with wine before being thrown through them for the bones of the deceased; the bones are immersed in a vessel of oil and then wrapped in fine linen. To be sure, there are also differences between the Hittite and Homeric burial procedures. But the features which they share strongly suggest that they are in some way connected. The nature of this connection, and how it came about, remains a matter for speculation. We can but note how remarkable it is that a peculiarly Hittite royal burial practice which as far as we know did not outlive the Bronze Age and was unlikely to have been otherwise preserved in a Greek context should strike such a familiar chord in Homeric epic centuries after its last attestation in the Hittite texts.

Scholars like Walter Burkert and Martin West present at considerable length the case for strong Near Eastern influence on Greek culture. But they tend to focus on a later period of cultural transmission, during the so-called orientalizing period (mid-eighth to mid-seventh century) when itinerant craftsmen and artists from the Near East may once again have brought to the Greek world a range of manual and intellectual skills, including the Semitic art of writing, and a range of literary and religious traditions. On the other hand West concedes that the orientalizing period seems to fall too late to be connected with any major reshaping of Homeric epic. It may well be that much of what Homeric tradition may have owed to Near Eastern influence was already known and was being used in the Mycenaean period when the traditions incorporated in Homeric epic were beginning to evolve. So too elements of the Kumarbi epic cycle may already have been known in the Greek world some centuries before their reappearance in Hesiod, though a number of scholars have long seen their transmission to the Greek world as a later phenomenon, perhaps due to Phoenician contact with this world.

This is not to deny that later Near Eastern influences also contributed significantly to the final version of the Homeric poems. There are many features or elements of the poems which are clearly of Iron Age origin. And in many respects they reflect the world of the late eighth or early seventh century, as is clear from archaeological material and from numerous allusions contained within them. Above all the introduction of the alphabet into the Greek world must not merely have brought with it the technology of writing. It also drew the Greeks into the whole world of contemporary Near Eastern written culture. Within this culture the Gilgamesh tradition was still very much alive and being freshly recorded in Assyria, in much the same period as the composition of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In any case, the Homeric poems are now being seen much less as a product of an essentially monocultural environment and much more as the result of complex interactions of a number of factors, many of non-Greek origin.

To what extent, then, are we able to identify the actual building-blocks of the Homeric poems? What can we say is distinctively Greek about them? What is distinctively non-Greek? And where are Greek and non-Greek elements so tightly interwoven that they simply cannot be disentangled? These questions open up very large areas of investigation which we can do no more than touch upon here. And we should do so with some degree of caution.

With regard to the Homeric pantheon Martin West, one of the most vigorous proponents of extensive Near Eastern influence on Greek culture, writes thus: ‘It is hardly going too far to say that the whole picture of the gods in the *Iliad* is oriental.’ He argues that ‘The Homeric and Hesiodic picture of the gods’ organization, and of the past struggles by which they achieved it, has so much in common with the picture presented in Babylonian and Ugaritic poetry that it must have been formed under eastern influence. The gods are conceived as a corporation that regularly assembles on Mt Olympos,
feasts and discusses human affairs. They have a chief Zeus to whom they make representations, and he makes decisions and gives permissions, sends messengers, and tries to control events. But the other gods are often wilful; they argue vigorously with one another, and Zeus on occasion has to threaten or exert physical violence in order to subdue them. This lively poetic scenario does not correspond with actual Greek beliefs about the gods, who were worshipped and invoked at appropriate places and times; two gods might be associated in a cult, but there was no sense of their being members of a larger assembly, nor of gods squabbling and jostling among themselves. 16

There is no doubt that Homer’s gods, if not substantially derived from a Near Eastern context, would at least have been fully at home in a Near Eastern environment. But the assumption that they were actually taken over holus-bolus from the Near East may be going too far. In general, we should be cautious about using a line of reasoning which reduced to its simplest proportions seems to work along these lines: Here we have elements which were apparently alien to later Greek society. These elements were a feature of Near Eastern Bronze Age and early Iron Age societies. Therefore their appearance in Homer must be due to Near Eastern influence. To maintain this, we would first have to demonstrate that they were not also some sort of residual feature of pre-Homeric Greek society which survived in Homeric tradition but otherwise disappeared. Homer’s divine society may well be a reflection of a widespread set of concepts about how the gods behaved and interacted, as much a part of early Greek and more generally Indo-European tradition as it was of Mesopotamian tradition.

In general terms closer attention to Near Eastern–Homeric text parallels may well give us a good deal more insight than we presently have into the actual processes involved in the composition of the Homeric poems, and a greater understanding of how the poet’s compositional skills operated. We could take the view that an eighth-century epic poet was merely the last in a succession of ‘Homers’ extending back over a number of generations, each of whom contributed to the culling, shaping, and refining of the material, with the last in the series adding the final touches, or bringing the compositions to what West calls their astonishing acme in the eighth and seventh centuries. And Burkert and others may well be right in their claim that this was a period of much more intensive east–west con-
nections and cultural transmission than was the case in the Bronze Age. But this is in no way incompatible with the notion of an earlier stratum of cultural transmission as well.

In any case, the epics drew on a wide range of sources and reflect a wide range of influences over a period extending back well before they reached their final form. The tradition of a Trojan War very possibly has a basis in historical fact. But if so it almost certainly represents a conflation of events, beginning perhaps a century or more before the alleged dates of the war in Greek literature and continuing beyond the end of the Bronze Age. Throughout this period, there was regular commercial and political contact between the Greek and Near Eastern worlds (allowing perhaps for a hiatus of 100 years or so in the eleventh century BC), and undoubtedly a considerable degree of cultural interaction between these worlds.

It has been suggested above that primarily through the agency of large groups of immigrants and traders in Bronze Age Greece, Near Eastern intellectual and cultural traditions became known in this world. It would be remarkable if Near Eastern contacts with and a significant Near Eastern presence in the early Greek world, as attested by both archaeological and written evidence, failed to make any major or lasting impression on Greek civilization. Given that the development of the Homeric epics was a long evolutionary process which incorporated a wide range of historical, social, and cultural elements, we can hardly accept that it could have developed in isolation of social and cultural forces from the East which were impacting on the Greek world during the developmental period of Homeric tradition. Speaking in relation to the impact of the Near East on the development of Greek mythological tradition, Professor Kirk comments thus: ‘That Greek myths were infected by Near Eastern themes is of very great importance. Not only because it casts a faint glimmer of light on the development of Greek culture and ideas in their formative stage, but also because it makes it easier to isolate the specifically Hellenic contribution, the particular intellectual and imaginative ingredients that made Greek civilization such a very different phenomenon from those of western Asia and Egypt.' 17

As yet we are only imperfectly aware of the specific ways in which social and cultural forces helped shape Homeric tradition. But greater attention to the links across the wine-dark sea may well contribute significantly to Homeric scholarship in the future—as we see
increasingly how the poet adapted, moulded, and transformed a vast range of disparate material into a coherent, compelling narrative, giving it a character and status which led to its position as one of the great masterpieces of Greek artistic achievement.

Notes

Introduction

2. In Hebrew their name is hittî (singular) hittim (plural). For a summary of biblical references see McMillon (1989: 71–7).
4. However, a direct connection is still uncertain. According to Beckman (1996b: 24), it is more likely that the name is employed here in the looser Assyrian sense of 'Westerner'.

Chapter 1: King, Court, and Royal Officials

1. CTH 6, ed. Sommer and Falkenstein (1938). The description above is based in part on the reconstruction of events proposed by Melchert (1991). Whether in fact the king died now, or later, remains unknown. For a different interpretation of his speech, see de Roos (2001).
2. See Bryce (1908a: 193–9).
3. In the document commonly referred to as the Proclamation or Edict of Telipinu (CTH 19), most recently ed. Hoffmann (1984).
5. See the text editions of von Schuler (1957).
7. For references, see Del Monte and Tischler (1992: 160 s.v.). The city of Sapinuwa, suggested as an alternative identification, is probably to be identified with the site at modern Ortaköy, which lay some two days' journey (in Hittite terms) from Mașat.
8. In philological terms they belong to the Middle Hittite period. In archaeological terms they belong to level three of the five-level site.
9. The letters have been published by Alp (1991), and are discussed in some detail by Klinger (1995).
Myth, Legend and the Trojan War

When Greece finally emerged out of its Dark Age, it did so not with a written history of what had gone before but with a network of myths and legends that had been passed down over the centuries from bard to bard. This oral tradition told tales of an heroic age and the great exploits of those who lived in it. Unfortunately, these poems survive today in mostly fragmentary form, sometimes only preserved as quotations in the works of later writers. The Iliad and the Odyssey are the only ones to have survived in anything like a complete form and recount certain episodes from the story of the Trojan War, in which the Greeks set sail and lay siege to Troy for ten years before finally gaining access to, and sacking, the city. Much of the lost network of poetry, myth and legend that tells the rest of the story was clearly, however, known to the Classical Greeks, who painted scenes from it on their pottery and used it as the theme of many of their tragedies.

It was the Iliad and the Odyssey that inspired Heinrich Schliemann to go in search of the Trojan War and its protagonists. His quest took him first to the mound of Hissarlik in the Trojan plain, where he found the lost city of Troy, and then on to the Greek mainland in search of the Homer's Achaean heroes, where he began the discovery of the Mycenaeans. Schliemann's faith in the historical accuracy of the poems was absolute, and it led to him to some of the most spectacular archaeological discoveries ever made, but to what extent was this belief justified?

We have already established that there was no writing in Greece for several hundred years, from around 1200 BC to the mid-eighth century BC, so the poems cannot in any real sense be history. Could they, though, be a record, however modified or embellished, of a real war fought between the Greeks and the Trojans back in the Late Bronze Age?

HOMER AND ORAL TRADITION

The answer to this question must begin with an understanding of the nature of the poems themselves as being products of an oral tradition. The bard painted around 1200 BC on the wall of the megaron in the Mycenaean palace of Pylus, seated on a rock and playing a lyre.
or relatively soon afterwards. References to him and his works exist from the fifth century, the earliest being found in Xenophon and Herodotus around 500 BC.

Much of the argument as to the historicity of the poems has been based on the reliability of oral tradition, a question that provokes polarised views. Can we use archaeology to provide an answer?

THE MYCENAEANS: HOMER’S ACHAEANS?

Well over a hundred years have now passed since Schliemann’s great discoveries at Troy and the Mycenaean sites of the mainland. Our understanding of Mycenaean culture has grown since those early days, and the picture we now have is much more complete than that available to Schliemann late in the nineteenth century. Many scholars have studied the poems in an attempt to place the world they portray in time, and it is clear that they contain elements that range in date from the Late Bronze Age, through the Dark Ages to the eighth century BC.

What elements are there in the poems, then, that can be identified as survivals from an oral tradition that has its roots in the Late Bronze Age? Homer’s kings lived in large, luxurious and brightly painted palaces, a setting now familiar to us from the Mycenaean world. Likewise, Homer’s heroes had weapons of bronze at a time long after they had been largely replaced by iron. Homer is here self-consciously heroizing his poems, setting them in a bygone age. Iron itself in the poems is recognized to be useful for tools and weapons, but is still viewed as essentially a metal of great value, even when unworked, looking back to a time when this was indeed the case – in the Bronze Age.

References to bronze body armour could date back to the Bronze Age, but could equally belong in Homer’s own day, as examples have been found from both periods. Allusions in Homer to a corselet, or thorax, of bronze are paralleled in Linear B tablets, which have an ideogram for them. A full suit of Mycenaean sheet-bronze body armour (fig. 69), remarkably similar in form to that drawn on the tablets, was found in a small chamber tomb in the necropolis of Dendra near the citadel of Mycenae, complete with a boar’s-tusk helmet and a pair of bronze greaves (leg-guards), the latter bringing to mind the Homeric epithet ‘strong-greaved Achaean’. Bronze body armour is, however, also known from the time of the poems’ composition, for instance the fine bronze corselet and helmet discovered in a late eighth-century warrior grave at Argos.

Shields in Homer also appear to recall Mycenaean examples. The large tower-like shield, notably carried by Ajax in the Iliad, may be compared to the full-length shields used by the Mycenaeans. The lion hunt inlaid dagger from shaft grave IV at Mycenae shows hunters wearing two types of full-length body shield: the figure-of-eight and the tower shield, tall and rectangular in form (fig. 21). The shield of Ajax in the poem is furthermore described as being made of seven oxbides, and indeed those seen on the dagger have this patterning, as do fresco friezes of large figure-of-eight shields that are painted on the walls of the palaces of the Mycenaeans.

Several individual objects detailed in the Iliad and the Odyssey clearly belong to the world of the Mycenaeans. Perhaps the most striking example is the highly prized helmet described in the Odyssey: Menelaus gave to Odysseus a bow and a quiver and about his head he set a helm wrought of hide, and with many a tight-stretched thong was it made still within, while without the white teeth of a boar of gleaming tusks were set thick on this side and that, well and cunningly, and within was fixed a lining of felt. This constitutes a very accurate account of the Mycenaean boar’s-tusk helmet, known from actual examples and depictions spanning the entire Late Bronze Age, but going out of use at the end of it.

Similarly, the massive shield made for the hero Achilles by the smith-god Hephaistos is created from bronze, tin, silver and gold and decorated with many pictorial scenes. The vivid description of this shield is thought to reflect a memory of the Mycenaean art of inlaying bronze with cut-outs in precious metals. This technique was used to make miniature scenes of figures, animals and abstract and floral motifs for instance on daggers of the Shaft Grave Era and on a variety of vessels.

More interesting perhaps than this matching of objects is where we find certain aspects of life in the poems that we are familiar with from the archaeological record. Elements of the funeral rites described in the poems certainly do echo those uncovered during excavations of Mycenaean tombs. The most complete account comes in Book XXIII of the Iliad with the description of the funeral of Patroklos. The poet tells us that the body of Patroklos was laid on a large funeral pyre, upon which were then sacrificed four horses, two dogs and twelve Trojan captives. The pyre was then set alight and, once the body was burned, the fire was extinguished with wine and the ashes and bones of the hero were gathered up and put in a gold jar. The bones of the hero were easily distinguishable from those of the sacrificial victims dedicated to him because his lay in the centre of the pyre and theirs to one side.

The sacrificing of horses, or other equids, is attested sporadically at tholos tombs of the Late Bronze Age in Greece, such as at Marathon in Attica. They were usually placed in pairs lying in the dromos (entrance-way) of the tomb, in front of the doorway to the burial chamber. Bones of dogs have also been found at Mycenaean burials of high status, presumably sacrificed to accompany their erstwhile master in death. In a pit dug in the floor of the tholos tomb at Dendra, inside the burial chamber but close to the doorway, were found dog bones mixed up with human bones. It may be that they both had been lying
in the chamber from an earlier burial, had become intermingled and were cleared away into a pit when the tomb was prepared for subsequent use. It is, however, possible that the human bones found with those of the dog can be counted amongst the rare instances of what may be human sacrifice at Mycenaean tombs. These, known for example at Mycenae and Argos, usually involved a skeleton found under the packing of stones blocking the doorway to the burial chamber, or lying just above the level of the doorway in soil used to fill the dromos. In one instance a total of six skeletons lay at various levels in the soil fill in front of the door.

The form in which the remains of the dead were interred, though, was very different at a Homeric burial: in the poems, Homer had his heroes cremated, whilst the Mycenaeans, always uniformly practiced inhumation. Mycenaean cremations were extremely rare until the closing years of their culture. The site of cremation described in the poems thus belongs to a post-Bronze Age phase of the transmission of the poems. A closer parallel for the kinds of rites seen in the funeral of Patroklos is found in the hero burial of the tenth century at Lefkandi on the island of Euboea. Here the ashes of a cremated hero had been found placed in a bronze cauldron and he was placed in his tomb accompanied by several skeletons of sacrificed horses and the inhumation of a woman. The latter had apparently been buried at the same time, richly dressed in gold jewellery and with an ivory-handled knife lying next to her head. There is a strong possibility that she, along with the horses, had been sacrificed at the time of the cremation burial.

The relation of such burial rites found in the ground to those described in the poems is a complex one. Horse and human sacrifice were not practised by the eighth-century Greeks of Homer's day, and the poems may therefore be recording a reminiscence of such rites practised at some other period of the poems' transmission, reflecting perhaps Mycenaean burials or ones such as that of tenth-century Lefkandi. A group of burials from eighth- and seventh-century Salamis on Cyprus share elements in common with the burial of Patroklos in the Iliad. The leitmotif of the tombs was horse sacrifice, and in one instance at least there was clear evidence of human sacrifice. One of the burials was a cremation in a bronze cauldron, though the others were inhumations. They have been interpreted as the people of Salamis imitating Homeric rituals, but are equally likely to be part of a sporadic tradition of hero burials, incorporating sacrificial elements.

After the funeral of Patroklos, games were held in his honour, including a chariot race, a foot race, a sport that seems to have been a combination of boxing and wrestling, hand-to-hand combat and a spear-throwing competition. The painted coffins from the Mycenaean cemetery at Tanagra in Boiotia include examples that appear to depict funeral games, indicating that such rites go back to the Bronze Age (see p.168). The mourning scenes on these coffins bear a remarkable resemblance in many respects to those painted on Late Geometric funerary vases of the late eighth century.

On a yet more fundamental level, can it be said that the political geography of the Homeric world reflects that of the Mycenaeans? The poems are set in a world that has Mycenae and its king, Agamemnon, in a position of loose hegemony over the other kingdoms. If we look to archaeology, is this the picture that emerges from the ground from the Late Bronze Age? From archaeology it is clear that Mycenae was exceptionally rich and powerful, but other than that there is nothing to indicate that its king held sway over the rest of the Mycenaean kingdoms. It has been thought that Tiryns, lying so close by, was under the dominance of Mycenae in some way, but Linear B tablets found there fairly recently offer no evidence of this. Likewise the archive found at Pylos, which has been extensively studied, gives no indication that the king of that palace owed allegiance to anyone or anywhere else.

The most comprehensive description of the political geography of the world of the poems comes in the 'Catalogue of Ships', a long and detailed passage in Book II of the Iliad. This Catalogue details the battle line-up of the Greek forces, listing the towns, settlements and regions of Greece and the names of their legendary leaders and how many ships they sent to fight at Troy. The passage sits rather oddly in the Iliad, the action of which is set towards the end of the ten years of siege. It would fit more naturally near the beginning of the cycle of stories that told the whole story of the Trojan War, when the ships set out from Aulis, and therefore may well have been transplanted from another part of the epic cycle into the poem.

The 187 geographical names listed in the Catalogue cover almost all the areas of Greece. Many of the sites which appear wealthy and important in the Catalogue were indeed so in Mycenaean times and not in Homer's day. The palace of Pylos, famous as the home of the legendary king Nestor, sent many ships, but was in Homer's time a small and unimportant place. Similarly, descriptions in the Catalogue have led people to go in search of some of the sites mentioned and using clues given in it have identified the ruins of hitherto unknown important Mycenaean settlements.

Another striking feature of the Catalogue is that it appears to be Boiotia-centric and some scholars have argued that it was compiled at a time when the palace of Thebes was at its height. Thebes, so important in Greek myth and legend, is now proven through archaeological evidence to have been a rich and powerful palace. In the 1950s a large cache (some 250) of Linear B tablets was found there. These tablets belong to the palace archive of the Kadmeia, which was destroyed by fire around 1200 bc. Much interesting geographical information on the extent of the kingdom of Thebes has been gleaned from them and they show that the palace not only ruled the territory of Boiotia but also the
strategically important island of Euboea. Thus Thebes appears to have controlled a far larger area than any other palace, even than Mycenae itself.

Interestingly, as work on the tablets from the Kadmia progresses, more correspondences with the Catalogue of Ships are revealed. Amongst the thirty place names on them are Peteon, Eleon and Hyle, which all appear together on a line of the Catalogue as part of the Boiotian section. Eutresis (another place in the Catalogue also mentioned in the tablets), which has been identified and excavated, was destroyed in the thirteenth century BC and abandoned until around 600 BC and thus was known in the Bronze Age but not in Homer's own time.

The Catalogue, then, delineates what is apparently a fairly accurate picture of the geography of Mycenaean Greece. But even it is not without its anomalies: parts of it imply recognition of much later, post-Bronze Age, political realities, such as the references to Cretans from Gortyn, which as far as we know was not settled until after the end of the Bronze Age.

As these tales were sung from bard to bard throughout the generations, they have retained something of their Bronze Age roots, albeit incorporating elements from subsequent centuries through which they passed. Can the poems have also kept a memory of a real conflict between the Greeks and the Trojans? Can we answer the question: is the Trojan War myth or history?

TROY VI AND VIIA

Schliemann's belief in the historicity of the Trojan War led him to discover Troy. As we now know, though, he dug down more than a thousand years too deep, driving his great trench through the levels where one might look for the Troy of the poems, and reaching Troy IV (2600–2400 BC). Subsequent excavations at the site have identified two levels of the city, Troy VI and Troy VIIa, which between them spanned the years from around 1700–1200 BC and were thus contemporary with the culture of the Mycenaean in Late Bronze Age Greece. Both Troy VI and Troy VIIa have of course been thoroughly scrutinized for any clues that they might have been besieged and sacked at any point in their history. Mycenaean pottery has been found in quantities in both levels, demonstrating that the people of Troy and the Mycenaean were in trading contact. Was there any evidence, though, of less friendly contact - indeed, of a war?

Manfred Korfmann began work at Troy in 1988 and for the first time an archaeologist who had worked extensively in Turkey (rather than Greece) was directing at the site. He was interested in Troy as an Anatolian site and was not intent on proving the historicity of the Iliad. As his excavations progressed, however, he made some extraordinary discoveries.
both sides. Further protecting the town, this defensive ditch enclosed an area of 200,000 sq m (some 2,000 acres); a second ditch was subsequently dug 100 m (109 yards) further out, perhaps as the town expanded.

Troy was clearly a large and important regional centre – an Anatolian city that must have derived its great wealth and power from its standing as a mighty trading centre. The bay of Beşik, some 8 km (5 miles) to the south-west of Troy appears to have been the city’s harbour and Troy must have taken full advantage of its extraordinarily strategic position. The winds and currents prevalent in the Dardanelles could condemn ships to long periods in harbour waiting for favourable conditions in which to make the arduous journey into the Black Sea. Likewise it was the last safe anchorage before making the journey, so even in favourable conditions ships would need stop there to stock up on the necessary food, water and other provisions. This provision’s immense wealth to the city, a factor that is evident as far back as Troy II.

Troy VI, then, would seem a suitable candidate for the legendary city of Priam and Hecuba, as described in the poems. But it is now known to have been destroyed around 1300 BC by a great earthquake and not by siege or sack by an enemy. Troy VIIa was built on the earthquake-damaged ruins of Troy VI, and it lasted for roughly a century before being destroyed itself around 1180 BC. When we look at this city, the conditions under which its population lived were clearly different to those of the preceding one. Now we see its people living crammed within the walls of the citadel, living in houses huddled back to back and with pitheoi (large storage jars), sunk into the floors of the buildings. It looks like a city under siege. Hasty buried bodies, quantities of arrowheads and spearheads found in the ruins, and piles of stone sling shots lying in the streets waiting to be fired at the enemy show that the Trojans put up a fierce fight. We have no way of knowing how long they withstood the siege, but the city finally fell to its attackers and was sacked around 1180 BC.

The city built subsequently, Troy VIIb, shows signs of an influx of new people, with pottery types from the Balkans. But who was the enemy? Nothing has yet been found in the ruins of Troy to identify those who sacked the city. Could the enemy have been the Mycenaeans, thus corroborating Homer’s tale? Is there any evidence from elsewhere that might help us put together a picture of what really happened?

To try and answer this question we need first to look back to the Greek mainland, to what was happening there at the time when Troy was sacked. The picture is similar, at roughly the same time, the mainland suffered terrible destructions, with Pylos perhaps sacked from the sea and all three Argolid citadels falling in the face of a great earthquake.

Our difficulty here is in trying to decide whether Troy fell first, or the Mycenaean citadels, or whether these events happened simultaneously. Our relative chronology for these events is based on pottery styles. The same pottery is found in the ruins of Troy VIIa and the destructions in Greece, but as the pottery covers a fairly broad time span they could have happened as much as twenty years apart.

If we envisage Troy being destroyed first, then it is feasible, but still only a hypothesis, that the Mycenaeans could have set sail, lay siege to Troy and then come home before their own palaces fell. The securing of water supplies from within the citadel walls might then be seen as a measure taken in fear of reprisals. If it was the other way round, and the Mycenaean palaces fell before Troy, then Mycenaeans displaced from their own world may still have sacked the city, the oral tradition connecting the glory days of the great palaces to a raid that belonged to a post-palatial era. These are both possible scenarios, but they are still only guesswork.

**TROY IN THE HITTITE TEXTS**

And here we must look back to Troy, as an Anatolian city belonging to an Anatolian world, to see if there is anything in the texts of the Hittite kings that might corroborate a Greek legend.

Excavations at the Hittite capital Hattusa uncovered the imperial archive, documents that chronic the history of the empire from around 1450 to 1190 BC. Soon after the script was deciphered scholars reading the texts discovered a treaty between the Hittite king Muwattali II (1290–1271 BC) and Alakandu of Wilusa. The treaty included, as was usual in such documents, a summary of the relations thus far between Wilusa and Hattusa, dating back to the time of king Tudhalija (1420–1400 BC) and so recounting a history of some 150 years. It also refers further back in time to a military conquest of Wilusa by Hattusa, perhaps as much as 300 years earlier. Since this first reference was discovered, other mentions of Wilusa have been identified in the Hittite texts. Amidst mounting speculation the question was asked: could it be that Wilusa is in fact one and the same as Ilios (Willos in early Greek dialect), the other name for Troy in the Homeric epics?

But where was Wilusa? To identify Wilusa as Ilios, it needed to be located within the political geography of the Hittite world. A major breakthrough came with the discovery in Hattusa of a bronze tablet dating to reign of Tudhalija IV (1240–1215 BC) which gave information on countries to the west and north-west of Asia Minor, including an area in the latter, namely Wilusa. But could it be located even more exactly than that? In 1997, rock-cut figures of rulers accompanied by hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions in the Karabel pass near Izmir finally gave up their secret: the inscriptions referred to the land of Mira, which was known to share borders with Seba, hence by inference clearly placing Wilusa in the Troad.
Here archaeology stepped in to corroborate the identification of Wilusa with Troy. The Alaksandru treaty had invoked the gods of Wilusa and the subterranean watercourse of Wilusa. During the 1997–8 excavation season at Troy, Kortmann discovered this very watercourse – a complex system of a reservoir, overflow tanks and channels – dated by scientific dating methods to the beginning of the third millennium.

From Troy itself the only form of writing found so far is a hieroglyphic Luwian reversible seal made of bronze. The discovery of this Luwian seal at Troy, written in one of the languages of the Hittite Empire, indicates that there may have been a long-standing connection between the Great King at Hattusa and the ruler of Wilusa. What form this relationship took before the reign of Muwatalli II (1290–72 BC) is not clear, but with the Alaksandru treaty Wilusa became a vassal of the Hittite king. The last mention of Wilusa in the archives dates to the final years of the Hittite empire and was written during the reign of Tudaltija IV (1240–1235 BC) to another ruler as yet unidentified, known as the Millawanda letter. It implies that the ruler of Wilusa has been deposed and the Great King is asking the help of the recipient to restore him to his throne.

HITTITES AND AHHJIAWANS

There is by now wide consensus that the name in the Hittite texts for mainland Greece is Ahhijawa and that it refers to a land which encompasses territory on the mainland, some of the islands and cities established on the coast of Asia Minor, most notably Miletos (Millawanda in the Hittite texts). Where the land of Ahhijawa was ruled from is still debated, with some scholars favouring Mycenae, and others Thebes.

It is clear that the relationship between the Hittites and the Ahhijawans did not always run smoothly, as one might expect from the two great lands with conflicting interests, especially along the Asia Minor coast. A letter found in the imperial archive at Hattusa was written not long after 1300 BC by a Hittite vassal king, Manatarbarhunta of Sebata, to the then Hittite king Muwatalli II. He was writing to complain about the activities of a man called Pjamaradu, operating out of Millawanda (the Mycenaean colony of Miletos), who had been causing problems in Wilusa. The king of Sebata went to the aid of Wilusa and asked for the help of the Hittite king. Muwatalli sent reinforcements but before they could reach Wilusa Pjamaradu had already raided the island of Lesba (Lesbos) and carried off craftsmen to Millawanda.

That Pjamaradu continued to be an aggressive and disruptive influence in the region for decades is made clear by other references to his activities, notably a letter written by the Hittite king Hattusili III (1265–1240 BC) to the King of Ahhijawa in the mid-thirteenth century BC. Known as the Tawagalawa letter, it asks the king of Ahhijawa to restrain Pjamaradu and stop him from attacking Wilusa and Lesbos. Apparently the Hittite king couldn’t capture him because he kept fleeing by ship to Ahhijawa, and there is now archaeological evidence from Miletos (Millawanda) that control of the city passed from the Greeks to the Hittites in the mid-thirteenth century, presumably in the context of this conflict.

The relationship between the Hittites and Ahhijawans was to deteriorate still further. In 1220 BC the Hittite king Tudaltija IV made a treaty with one of his vassal kings, Sausaminwa of Amarru (a kingdom in northern Lebanon), in which Amarru was obliged to impose a trade embargo on Assyria (a powerful military rival with whom Hatti was at war) and to prevent the Assyrians from trading with Ahhijawa. Ahhijawa was clearly not only a security threat to Hittite lands, but also an economic one.

CONCLUSION

The texts, then, reveal a history of potential conflict over Wilusa spanning several decades of the thirteenth century, in a context of military and economic rivalries. But to date there is no mention of the city being besieged and sacked, by the Greeks or anyone else. To go back to the wider picture, it was of course not only Troy that fell in Anatolia and the east at that time, but city after city and empire after empire, eventually bringing to an end the Bronze Age in that region, just as it ended in Greece. A vivid evocation of life in the beleaguered cities of the coast comes from Ugarit, where a cuneiform tablet, found still in its oven waiting to be baked, has written on it a letter from the king of Ugarit to the king of Cyprus, telling him of the burning of his towns by a sea-borne enemy.

Such raids are usually attributed to the Sea Peoples, who, according to Egyptian records, attacked the great cities of western Anatolia early in the twelfth century BC, laying waste the lands of Arzawa and the Hittites before going south, where they were defeated by Ramesses III in 1180 BC. Could then the Sea Peoples have been responsible for the sack of Troy? And, indeed, might not displaced Mycenaean themselves have been an element of these Sea Peoples, who appear to have been piratical warrior raiders of several nationalities.

Archaeology has given us a sack of Troy around 1180 BC, and in the form of the Hittite tablets has given us its Anatolian name, Wilusa, and a context of conflicts between Greeks and Hittites. What archaeology has not yet done, and perhaps never will, is tell us who the attackers were. That a Trojan War is history and not simply myth has been established. Whether the Trojan War is fact remains an open question.
identical figure with the same relative pronoun (in the dative singular) recurs for a
certainty in the contemporary inscription from Penna San Andrea (TE[ramo] 5),
in which a lengthy sequence of twenty words and seven or eight alliterative pairs (as in
TE 2 cited above) finishes at the very end of the inscription.

praistaklasa posmuí.

Who has (to whom is) this eminence/token of award.

Here praistakla-sa makes both an etymological figure and a semantic play on the verb
praistai “furnishes, provides, praeside” earlier in the text, as Eichner suggests.

The first age of poetry in Italy is not confined to Faliscan and South Picene, nor
are the texts we have examined their only poetic monuments. It is to be hoped that
further study will yield more results and that the soil of Italy may yet give up more
verbal treasures. The advent of writing in Italy in the seventh and sixth centuries only
opened a window onto an extraordinarily thriving world of different but related poetic
cultures.

Most ancient Indo-Europeans

1. Hittite ritual and the antecedents of drama

Most scholars and thinkers since Aristotle have proceeded on the assumption that the
chorus of Greek drama, certainly the chorus of comedy and satyr-play and possibly the
chorus of tragedy as well, originated with the cult of Dionysos.¹ Henrichs cites a
number of recent treatments, from Pickard-Cambridge and Webster 1962 through
Burkert 1966 to Winnington-Ingram 1985. For tragedy this view has been challenged
or modified by other scholars who prefer to situate tragedy and its chorus more
concretely in the contemporary framework of the polis religion and of active
Dionysiac cult (Henrichs),² in the social and psychological context of the Greek city-
state in the crucial 5th century, which spanned the birth and death of tragedy in Athens.
These views were originally expressed and elaborated by the French schools of Henri
Jeanmaire, Louis Gernet, and subsequently Jean-Pierre Vernant and Pierre Vidal-
Naquet. In a contribution originally presented in 1968, Vernant wrote ‘Over the last
half century the inquiries of Greek scholars have centered above all on the origins of
tragedy . . . thus the problem of origins is, in a sense, a false one. It would be better
to speak of antecedents.’³ Virtually the same was said by Gernet in a 1953 essay⁴ (on
Jeanmaire’s Dionysos): ‘As a historical problem that of the origins of tragedy could
well be a pseudo-problem. We can perceive the surroundings; we can just catch a
glimpse of some antecedents’ (1982:97). It is in their sense that I use the terms
antecedents in my title.

It is not my intention in this chapter to address the question of possible ritual
antecedents, direct or indirect, of drama in Greece, and still less the question of the
position of tragedy or the role of Dionysos, which is the thrust of Henrichs’ own work.
My aim is much simpler. I find the evolutionist ritual model (tragedy as sacrifice) of

¹. Here and in the next lines I follow the historical introduction, with rich bibliography, of an as yet
Burkert 1966 oversimplified and overstated, as in his concluding line ‘Human existence face to face with death—that is the kernel of ἔριψατι’ (p. 121), but I do find myself in sympathy with the arguments advanced by Seaford 1984, in his introduction to his edition of the only satyr-play we have preserved more or less intact, Euripides’ Cyclopes, particularly his straightforward conclusion (p. 14) that ‘the unfashionable view that the performance of tragedy originated in the practice of ritual is thereby confirmed.’ I would only substitute ‘has its antecedents for ‘originated’.

As we noted in chap. 4, the great majority of our documents in the 2nd-millennium Anatolian languages Hititite, Luvian, and Palaic are rituals. Thanks to the diligence of the Hititite scribes and their supervisors these clay tablets, inscribed and recopied often over centuries, faithfully record, catalogue, and preserve all the details of these rituals: the requisite material objects and their sequential manipulation and deployment in ritual acts, and the verbatim recording of all the ritual utterances and their speakers in their proper sequence. The purpose is to assure the correct and flawless regular re-performance of the ritual, on which the well-being of the society was felt to rest. The result for us is that we are far better informed about 2nd-millennium Anatolian ritual than about that of any other Indo-European culture of the period, and indeed better than Greece in the 5th century and earlier.

My aim as a comparatist in this chapter is simply to call to the attention of Hellenists certain manifestations within Hititite and Anatolian rituals which show clear and striking affinities to what we think of as drama. They thus afford a typological comparandum to the possible but unattested antecedents of Greek drama in ritual. The comparison is typological, and the Hititite and Luvian ritual texts are in question are more than a thousand years earlier than 5th-century Athens. Still, it is well to remember that Anatolian-speaking and Greek-speaking cultures were geographically contiguous and certainly in contact at this early period, and that the worship of Dionysos is attested in second-millennium Mycenean Greek documents.

My first example is taken from one of a collection of Old Hititite compositions grouped together by Laroche as CTH 820, Bénédiction pour le tabarna-roi. CTH 820.5 was unearthed in 1933 (excavation no. 406/c) but not published (in cuneiform autograph) until 1973, as K’elkisfrisitexte aus Boghasköl) 21.22. The fragmentary text has been transliterated and translated by Kellerman 1978 and (independently) Argh 1979.

The text is a single-column tablet, written continuously on recto and verso. The beginning is broken off, as is the colophon that probably followed verso 57‘ in the empty space at the end. The intelligible part contains a series of ritual episodes, graphically demarcated by a double paragraph line. They each conclude with the phrase AWAT x QATI ‘The word/formula/spell (Hititite utter) of the x is finished’. Compare Ro. 18‘21’, which contains the only first person singular of the celebrant:

\[
\text{AWAT GİS.ERİN araḫça QATI} \]
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Behold! I lift up the scales, and I put up for sale the long years of the Labarna-king; behold, I lift up the scales, and I put up for sale the long years of the Tawananna-queen. The spell of the scales outside is finished.

If that spell involved pantomime and the manipulation of an object, perhaps with the words being accompanying explanation, another clearly includes question and answer, even if we have no indication of anyone speaking besides the celebrant. Verso 36‘45‘:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DIM-aš wattaru uit n}=&\text{at mahḫan iyan} \\
\text{katta}=&\text{ṣara}=\text{at}=\text{kan NA₄-ta uedan iškiyian }julu[t] \\
\text{n}=&\text{at parsaneš pahḫanta watar}=\text{ṣed}=\text{a}=\text{kan[} \\
\text{lilìaz araḫzi}=&\text{an}=\text{pahḫašnuandu lab(an)an} \\
\text{[LUG]AL-un paššileš}=&\text{n}=\text{aš DUTU-waš=<Ş> AN.BAR kišar[u} \\
\text{DIM-aš wattaru iyanı nu}=&\text{wa wattaru mahḫan iyan} \\
\text{kunnunt}=&\text{at uedan arzīlt}=\text{at ḫanīššan} \\
\text{AN.BAR}=\text{at iškiyian n}=\text{ašta }\text{DIM-naš tın annaš}=\text{ṣiš} \\
\text{kattanta pait n}=&\text{at}=\text{aš ešat }\text{DIM-ni}=\text{aš }\text{AMA-ŠU} \\
\text{labarn}=&\text{ma}=\text{aš išhešša}=\text{ṣišt AWAT NA₄}=\text{paššileš QATI} \\
\end{align*}
\]

There came the fountain of the Storm God. How is it made? From bottom to top it is made of stone, it is coated with [Panthers protect it. But its water [ ] flows from a pool. Let them protect him, the pebbles the Labarna-king, and let him become the iron of the Sun God.

They make the fountain of the Storm God. “How is the fountain made?” It is made with copper, it is plastered with gypsum, it is coated with iron. The mother of the Storm God came down for the second time, and she sat down on it. For the Storm God she is his mother, but for the Labarna she is his binding. The spell of the pebbles is finished.

The quotation marks in the question in the second paragraph translate the particle =wa of direct, quoted speech. The symbolism of much of this allusive and elliptic, perhaps condensed or abbreviated spell escapes us, but the question and answer is apparent, as is the hymnic, dithyrambic choral character of the benediction. The action of the Storm God’s mother sitting on the fountain recalls the spithet saddāyoni- of Agni (RV 5.43.12) and the verb phrase yónim sad- ‘sit on the seat’ of Agni, Mitra-Varuṇa, and

5. In the interest of the buyer, i.e. the king and the queen, as shown by Neu 1980:82. The frankly commercial metaphor in the ritual is striking.
other Vedic deities. The 'mandate' (see Melchert 1988) represents a contractual notion of obligation, cf. *iṣṭhaun 'contract' from the same verbal stem *iṣṭhiya- 'bind'. It appears to symbolize the divine legitimation of the Labana-king and his authority.

The most striking in dramatic character of the spells of this text that is contained in Verso 22'-30', between the two just cited. Here an almost stichomythic riddling dialogue leads directly into a veritable hymnic choral. The dialogue exchange is formally marked by the particle *=wa of quoted speech. The text follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bās nu kēy z uwaśi śuppaz=}=wa \text{ uwa mi} \\
u=wa \text{ kēy z śuppazay zaḫaḫittennaz=}=wa \\
u=wa \text{ kēy z zaḫaḫittennaz PUTO=}=wa \text{ ē-az} \\
u=wa \text{ kēy z PUTO az ēs=}=set=wa \text{ GIBIL-an GAB-ŠU GIBIL} \\
\text{[SAG]-ZU=}=wa \text{ GIBIL-an LŪ-tar=}=set=wa \text{ nēw=an}
\end{align*}
\]

[KA x U]DHU-ŠU-wa ŠA UR.MAIJ IG[DHU-ŠU-wa b]hāranaš 
(nu=wa b)hāraniš ša<k>u>i[s]kīzi

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{]x namma parā[} \\
\text{] AWAT [}
\end{align*}
\]

"Open!"
"Whence comest thou?"
"From the Holy."
"From what Holy?"
"From the zaḫaḫittenna."
"From what zaḫaḫittenna?"
"From the house of the Sun-God."
"From what Sun-God?"
"His form is new, his breast is new, his head is new, his manhood is new."

"His teeth are those of a lion; his eyes are those of an eagle; he sees like an eagle."

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{] moreover forth [} \\
\text{] the spell of the [} (is finished)
\end{align*}
\]

The initial imperative 'open!'\(^6\) provides a dramatic frame to begin the dialogue,
a device that is still with us today from doorkeeper scenes to knock-knock jokes. This is its first appearance in the Indo-European speaking world. For the adjective *ṣuppi-
'ritually pure, consecrated, holy' see Watkins 1975d. The word *zaḫaḫittenna-
is attested only here, and its meaning is unknown. It is probably a Hattic loanword,\(^7\) perhaps a word for a particular house or temple.

We are fortunate in having another version of this same spell, in two fragments which duplicate each other. They make it clear that the dialogue part involves two speakers, a 'chamberlain' (DUMU.E.GAL), one of the palace personnel, and the 'Old Woman' (SALŠU.GI) familiar from countless Hittite rituals. The 'choral' part is separated by a paragraph line, and carries no indication of speakers or singers.\(^8\) The two texts are (A) KUB 20.54 + KBO 13.122 (41/a, unearthed in 1960, published in cuneiform 1967)\(^9\) and (B) KUB 55.2 (Bo. 2226, published in cuneiform 1985). I give a composite based on B, with restorations from A in parentheses. B ro 5' follows the paragraph line. A 1 is the first line of the verso; the recto is missing.

Ro. 5'  DUMU (E.GAL)] tezzi ḫəš SALŠU.GI(1 tezzi) nu kuezza (uwaite)[]ši10 Umma DUMU E.GAL Šu(ppazaywa=wa pe)daza uwauieni
7'  Umma SALŠU.GI nu=wa kuezza śuppaya paḏa[za UMMA DUMU E.GAL] zaḫa<ne> Šenaza UMMA SALŠU.GI
Vo. 1 (nu=wa kū)iza zaḫaḫittennaza UMMA DUMU E.GAL [UMMA]? (PUTO=sa=wa par'na)];11 Umma SALŠU.GI nu=war=as GIM-an DUTO=sa

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{3 (ēs=}=set=w)a \text{nēw=an GAB-ŠU=}=wa \text{nēw=an pišna[=[(par=}=set=w) (nēw=an SA)]G.DU-ZU AN.BAR=sa KA x UD-ŠU=}=wa ŠA UR.MAIJ šakwa=}=set=wa \\
5 (barran)a=wa nu=wa hāraniš šākukišizi uddani=[}=set=wa=}[=wa(a nēw=an)
\end{align*}
\]

The chamberlain says,\(^12\) "Open!"
The Old Woman says, "Whence come ye?"
As follows the chamberlain: "We come from the Holy Place."
As follows the Old Woman: "From what Holy Place?"

---

7. The audience of these benedictions for the labana-king is clearly Hattic; the Hattic divisions

\[ [\text{living in the fragmentary following section, Vo. 34', recur in the same order in a Hattic}

\[ \text{script in KUB 28.74 Ro. 7. The same Hattic text (Vo. 1.3) contains both the words labana 'king' and}

\[ \text{hṭakilkan 'of iron', recalling the second of our Hittite spells cited above.}

8. The "choral" parts of both (one was still unpublished) were first treated by Neu and Otten in 1972,

\[ \text{in their classic paper equating the Semerogum LŪ-natār 'manhood' with the new versions pišna, thus}

\[ \text{demonstrating the reading } pišna- \text{ for the Hittite word for 'man, male' (Semerogum LŪ) and its evident}

\[ \text{etymology } *pena- \text{ having a *pes- (cf. Greek } νεός < *pes-ot, Latin } \text{pēnis } < *pes-).}


11. So Kellerman. The tablet has an-na-at.

12. Dialogue sentences introduced by tezzi 'says' lack the quotative particle =wa. Those introduced by

\[ \text{UMMA 'as follows' have it, as do those of the following "chorale", with one probably inadvertent

\[ \text{exception. But see n. 15 below.}
As follows the chamberlain: “From the zahanattenna.”
As follows the Old Woman: “From what zahanattenna?”
As follows the chamberlain: “From the house of the Sun-God.”
As follows the Old Woman: “How is he, the Sun-God?”

“His form is new, his breast is new, his manhood is new.
His head is of iron, his teeth are those of a lion, his eyes
are those of an eagle, and he sees like an eagle. <All> that
of his in the spell, moreover, is new.”

The text clearly describes the performance of a ritual dialogue by the palace personnel. Note that the chamberlain (DUMU É.GAL) is in the singular throughout, despite the plurality (‘Whence come ye?’ ‘We come . . . ’) of his role in this version. He is thus by a dramaturgic convention a speaker-person, like the Marut in the dialogue hymn RV 1.165. Note also how the successive questions of the dialogue lead into the hymnic chorale, which is framed by the nembat ‘(is) new’ clauses. The pregnant notion of ‘renewal’ is apparent in another Old Hittite ritual with close affinities to the texts we have cited: KUB 29.1 and its duplicates (one in the Old Kingdom ductus), CTH 414, the famous ‘Bauritual’. It is most recently edited by Carini 1982 and Marazzi 1982. Note only ii 48-54, with a variant of the same “chorale”:

DUTU-uš
DU-ašši=a utne EGIR-pa LUGAL-i manišḫi̇b<br>MUUL-i:ašši=a EGIR<br> newaṭḫiri najšaraat
newaṭḫiri

ALAM-i:šši14 NAGGA-šši ir SAG-DU-ZU AN.BAR-šši
ir šākuwa=šši ÁMUSEN-šši irš
KA x UDUT-i=a=šši UR.MAH-šši irš.

The Sun-God and the Storm-God have entrusted the land to the king;
They have renewed his years, they have renewed his awesomeness.
They have made his form of steel (lit. tin), they have made his head of iron, they have made his eyes those of an eagle, they have made his teeth those of a lion.

This lengthy ritual involves substantial recitation, as punctuated and italicized in

---

13. This interpretation of addani=a šet=yawa (the reading is sure) is very uncertain. Neu and Otten omit it.
14. Here and in the following the Old Hittite original probably had ašši ‘his’ in place of šši ‘to him’, to judge by the Akkadogram in SAG-DU-ZU ‘his head’ and the variants we have seen. ALAM is the Sumero-grammar for Hittite ašši.

15. Here the dialogue sentences introduced by tezz ’says’ do contain the particle =wa; see note 12 above.
16. These KILAM ‘gate-house’ ritual passages are now discussed in Eichiner 1993:112-113. In the first it is tempting to see a bird’s name in the unexplained thistled laretel of the sea (aranat), namely the abundant blackheaded gull, Larus ridibundus, whose present winter range covers almost all of central Anatolia as well as its littoral according to the map in Jonsson 1993:264. If the similarity laretel: Greek kápos (‘sea’) gull is not just coincidental, rubbundus ‘sobbed, gasped’ would refer to this bird’s cry, described in Jonsson as ‘a nasal melodious ‘auhe’, near colonies screaming and obtrusive’. The verse (KBO 10 24 iii 11–14’, Singer 2:18) would then mean something like ‘When the thistled gulls of the sea sobbed, the divine ones above in heaven were shrieking.”
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Carini 1982. Even the freestanding fire altar (GUNNI, Hittite haššaš : Latin āra) has a small speaking role (iii 47 etc.):

GUNNI tezzı15 apät=wa=mu=za ššu

The altar says, “For me that is good.” (= “I like that.”)

As our final example we may take a text first published in cuneiform only in 1988 (KUB 58.48), which is now edited with other duplicates and parallels identified by van den Hout 1991. This scholar correctly identified the passage as ‘a dramatic interlude in the Hittite KILAM ritual’; for the latter see Singer 1983-84. As I stated in Watkins 1993:475, cf. 478: ‘... col. iv of the new tablet... contains a dialogue in dramatic form—complete with stage directions—between the king and the chief of the men of Tissaruilly, then at the king’s behest between the chief of the bodyguard and the man from Tissaruilly. This confirms the suggestion of I. Singer (SiBoT 27.49, 61-2) and V.G. Ardzinba and V.V. Ivanov (cited ibid.) that the KILAM festival contained episodes of a literary nature, recitations of mythological matter, perhaps in verse (Ivanov), as clearly in 1.b.iii 11’-14’. The passage of 58.48... makes the impression of an “entertainment” in dramatic dialogue form. Like the dramatic stichomythic and chorale episodes in other Hittite ritual texts... these texts have much to teach us about the possible ritual origins (or “antecedents”...) of drama in Early Greece as well.”

In what follows I give a composite text and translation of van den Hout’s 1.A = KUB 58.48 Vo. iv 1’-16’ and duplicate 1.B KUB 36.45, 1’-11’. Occasional additions have been made to the translation from his 2. KUB 43.31, left col. 1’-11’, which appears to be in the old ductus, and 3.A KBO 13.228 Ro. and 3.B KUB 44.10 Vo. These are enclosed in square brackets. Conjectures or interpretations of mine are enclosed in parentheses.

LUGAL-uš EGIR-pa G]AL MEŠEDI pīezzi
UMMA ṢU:-MA mā=wa zaštīya
LUGAL-uš tēizzi nu=wa=tä kuit
kāسا=tä=wa PU-an atta =man
nu=wa mamuan kitta nu=wja UZU UDU kitta

ēt nu=za[i špaį ekuy nu]=za ninki
UMMA ṢU:-MA takkum=i=wa OL=wa=za ētim
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takkumi=wa ITERALwa=z ekumi zaḫḫiya=wa
uwanun LUGAL-š=ə tezzı
diya=wa zaḫḫiya=ma uätzlich nu=wa SIG3-in

GAL LŪMES URU-Tiššaruliya LUGAL-i
menaḫḫanda SAG.DU-ZU ninikzi
taša paizzı EGIR-pa=ma=aš
namma uizzı n=ə NAḪḫwašiya
ḫiktı LUGAL-ùš GAL MESEDI
pfezi GAL MESEDI <GAL> LŪMES URU Tiššaruliya
punuḫzi kuit=wa uätzlich
UMMA SUMA kuiima=wa [)
pān ÉRINMESₐ₂=miš=a
ḫanti šarrattı

(the king sends the chief of the bodyguards to ask the chief of the men of the city of Tissaruliya)

"Why have you come?"
"I would like to call upon the king."
The chief of the bodyguards brings the message to the king. The king sends back the chief of the bodyguards. As follows (the man of Tissaruliya): "I would like to fight." The king says, "What to you (have I done?) Behold, for you (I have invoked?) the Storm-God my father. [Maruwa-drink has been set out;] mutton has been set out.

Eat and satisfy your hunger, drink and satisfy your thirst.
As follows (the man of Tissaruliya): "I will (hold out?) I will not eat. I will (hold out?) I will not drink.
I have come for a fight."
The king, however, says, "But why have you come for a fight? (Everything is) fine."

The chief of the men of Tissaruliya shakes his head at the king, and he departs. But then he comes back, at the huwaši cultic stone he bows before the king. The king sends the chief of the bodyguards. The chief of the bodyguards questions the chief of the men of Tissaruliya: "Why have you come?"
As follows (the man of Tissaruliya): "While ... I went but my army has broken apart."

One can only speculate what is meant or intended by this dramatic interlude, but it is certain that it formed a part of the Old Hitite KILAM (gate-house) ritual, a cult ceremony of Hittic origin, involving liturgical recitations in Hitite and lasting for three days. The 'men of Tissaruliya' otherwise figure only as cultic functionaries who get rations in the KILAM tablets (Singer 1983-84:1.26 et passim). Another set of texts, CTH 742, mention 'women of Tissaruliya' (SALMES URUTIŠ), who sing in Hittic. Clearly the city was at some point real, and Hittic-speaking or in the Hittic sphere. Perhaps our text is a historical playlet, a vignette which is a dramatic re-employment of the hostilities or tensions between the immigrating Hitites and the autochthonous Hittic speakers. This dramatic vignette might have concluded with a symbolic re-employment of the resolution of those conflicts, in the cultural symbiosis of Hitite and Hittic which is attested by the continued performance of the ritual itself. Our text unquestionably goes back to the Old Hitite period, as do all the others we have examined in this chapter. The implication is clear; by the 17th century B.C. we have unambiguous evidence for the incorporation of self-contained episodes of dramatic dialogue into the performance of ritual in Hitite Anatolia. The seeds of drama are there.

In just the same way Lévi 1890:301f. could point to the seeds of Indian drama already in the dialogue hymns of the Rigveda. As he noted, the number of speakers is never more than three, and frequently a collectice personage, a sort of chorus, functions as a character. Thus the dialogue of Indra, Agasty, and the (spokesman for the) Maruwa, Saram and the (spokesman for the) Papis, just as we saw in Hitite the King, the chief of the bodyguards, and the (spokesman for the) men of Tissaruliya. And the different versions of the Hitite question-and-answer series, climaxing in the question 'How is the Sun-God? / What is the Sun-God?' which elicits the choral hymn of definition of the deity, find an exact counterpart in the dialogue of the divine bitch Saram and the Papis, RV 10.108. I cite just the first one or two pādas of the first four verses:

kṣmit iechanti saramā prēdām ānąt

The Papi: In search of what did Saramā come here?

indrasya dūṭr isita carāmī
mahā iechanti pañaya nīthīna vah

Saramā: Sent as Indra's messenger I come in search of your great treasures, o Papis.

kīdīnā ndrāṣa saramē kā dīśka
yāṣyedām dūṭr āṣara parakāt

The Papi: What is Indra like, o Saramā, what is his appearance, as whose messenger you have come from afar?

17. 1.165, 170, 179; 3.33; 4.18; 7.33; 8.100; 10.10, 28, 51-53, 86, 95, 108, thus already in the oldest layer, the Family Books.
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ndhám tám veda dbhyam dábhat sá
yádyedám dūfr ásaram parákát

Saramã: I do not know him as one to be deceived; he deceives, as whose messenger I have come from afar.

In India as well as Anatolia dramatic dialogue in ritual hymnic poetry is already fully developed and skillfully deployed by the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C. Had we such texts from Crete, Mycenae, or Athens from the same period it is not unlikely that they would exhibit the same phenomenon.

2. The language and poetry of the Trojans

This section subsumes and brings fresh evidence for the thesis, advocated first in Watkins 1986, that the language of Troy and the Trojans in the northeast corner of Anatolia was a variety of Luvian, close to if not probably identical with the language of our Cuneiform Luvian monuments of the middle of the 2nd millennium.

Among our Cuneiform Luvian texts is the ritual of one Puriyanni, which sets forth in detail directions for performing a private household ritual of sympathetic magic, a conjuration designed to ward off evil and impurity from someone's house. For the whole text and its dating see Starke 1985:55f.; the oldest tablets, from the beginning of the 14th century, are themselves for internal reasons copies of an earlier archetype of at least 15th-century date. The text is bilingual: the directions for the ritual actions are in Hittite while the ritual utterances, what we may call the "spells", are in Luvian. The 'Conjuration of water and salt' in KUB 35.54 Vo. i11 12-21 contains two paragraphs, the first in Hittite and the second in Luvian:

nu=tan ANA GAL GIR₄ kuit watar lābuwan
MUN=ya=kan anda išpuwan
n=at=kan Š-acanda papparazi
ANA BEL SISKUR=ya=šan šara papparazi
nu kilšan memai

waraša=tta ñd-ti [nan]amman
MUN=ša=pa šalši uwa[niyat] upamman
waraša=tta zil[ä ñd-il] anda nawa iti
MUN=ša=pa= [ta z]ila ali uwa[niya] na[wa iti]

(Hittite) The water which is poured into the clay bowl and the salt which is shaken in it

18. The reciprocal figure is a variant of 'the slayer slain' formula defining the hero or the divinity, discussed in chap. 33: RV 8.84.9 nākīr ydm ghñntī hdnī yəh 'whom none slay, who slays'.
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He sprinkles in the house and sprinkles on the celebrant and speaks as follows:

(Luvian) "The water is led from the river and the salt is brought from the steep rock face; the water to the river nevermore will go back and the salt to the steep rock face nevermore will go back,"

We recognize at once the rhythm, grammatically parallel, syntactic strophic style of the Luvian spell, which is clearly verbal art.

The adjective ali - 'high, lofty, steep' of mountains, rock face, may have been borrowed, perhaps as a toponym, by Mycenaean Greek speakers and transformed into δίσσυρος (πέρα Pindar, Aeschylus), ἄβισσος (νηρι Homer), 'steep (rock)'. The Luvian form ali-, with lengthened a in open syllable, may be related to the family of Latin al-tus.

Now this Luvian adjective has one further attestation, which has serious implications: it is an epithet for the city of Wilusa. The city of Wiliada or Wilüšiyka is well attested in Hittite texts, as a city of the Luvian-speaking Arzawa lands of Western Anatolia, with a king Alaksandus whose name immediately recalled Alexandros, the other name of the Trojan prince Paris, son of Priam. For this and other reasons the identification of Wilusa with Greek (F)λιος (W)ilos, one of the names for Troy, was made long ago and is today widely, though not universally, accepted (Güterbock 1986; sceptical Bryce 1988).

It is therefore of considerable interest that Wilusa is also found in a very special Luvian-language context and genre: the 'sacred songs' (Hittite suppà uddar) of the rituals of the cultic city of Istanuwa. The location of the city is unknown, but its name must be derived from that of the Anatolian Sun-deity, Hittite Istanu from Hattic Eštan. Among our Luvian texts the rituals from Istanuwa occupy a place apart, as Laroche saw (1959:12). The vocabulary is often unlike that of the usual Luvian magical texts, though morphology and syntax are straightforwardly Luvian. It is possible, though not certain, that they represent a special dialect, but the real difference is that these 'sacred words' 'develop different themes', in Laroche's phrase. The
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language describing the ritual is Hittite; the Luvian parts are incipits ('Liedeinfange', Starke 1985:300) of interspersed choral chants and responses, which are sung (SIR^2, išhamiškanzi). In short they are Luvian verbal art, Luvian poetry. Following Starke ibid. there are good linguistic grounds for dating the Istanuwa texts as a group to the Old Hittite period (16th century).

The text to which I called particular attention in Watkins 1986 is KBo 4.11, 45-6 (Starke 1985:339-42):

EGIR-ŠU DŠuwašuran ekuzi
aḫḫ=ata=ta alati awienta Wilušati

(Hittite) Then he drinks to the god Suwasuna (and they sing:)

(Luvian) "When they came from steep Wilusa."

As I suggested there, we have the beginning of a Luvian epic lay about the city of Wilusa, which we may equate with (W)lusios or Troy: a "Wilusiad". This view has been accepted by some (Eichner 1993), received with skepticism by others (Bryce 1988). But there can be no disagreement about the poetics of this line of Luvian verse, which is quite clear. We have two half lines which rhyme, and an alliteration bridges the break. The word order has been permuted according to the now familiar pattern of Indo-European poetic syntax, the adjective (epithet) distracted from its constituent noun to straddle the verb, and both adjective and noun adjoining metrical boundary. All that can scarcely be accidental:

aḫḫ=ata=ta alati il aWišenta Wilušati.

In this single line of Luvian poetry we can plainly see the same aesthetic and the same poetic devices—phonetic, morphological, and syntactic—which inform the mantras of the Indo-Iranian kavīs and the epic and lyric verses of the Greek aoidoi. As well as signalling the stylistic figure of the distracted noun phrase, the rhyme in alati il . . . wilušati, at the end of successive hemistichs in the privileged poem-initial position of prominence, can be exactly paralleled by the end-rhymes in RV 4.53.7cd, where the lines occupy the privileged poem-final position of prominence:

sā naḫ kṣapāḥiḥ aḥabhiḥ ca jīnvatu
prajāvantam rayām asmē sāṁ jīnvatu

Let him strengthen us by night and by day,
let him produce for us wealth in offspring.

A close variant of our Luvian line occurs in another text, also as a first line. It is found in a fragmentary paragraph in KUB 35.102 (+) 103 iii 11ff., following a colophon and a double paragraph line, indicating the beginning of a new text, as discussed in Watkins 1986:60. The paragraph reads:
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ašu aša LÜ-iš awita [EGIR-MES-ta-du tārwaya tššara=d[u
dū wazan tişnymmān dūpit[a
šarra il ǧ-x-ša tašša

When the man came from steep [his feet . . ., his hands [ . . .
He beat the . . . earth [up the . . he . . .ed

For suggestions about the last three lines see Watkins 1986:60 and Eichner 1993:110; they will not concern us further. But in the first line it is difficult not to restore [Wilušati] in the lacuna on the right, yielding (with Luvian phonetic reading of the Sumerogram for 'man' LÜ-iš) two formulaic variants as first lines (whether of the same or of related texts):

ašu aša zitiš il awita [Wilušati]
aḫḫ=ata=ta alati il aWišenta Wilušati

When the man came from steep [Wilusa]
When they came from steep Wilusa.

Compare from the initial pāda of the first and third verse of the same Rigvedic hymn, 6.23.1a, 3a:

sutā it tvām il nāśiśa indra sāme
pūtā sutām il indro astu sāmam

You are indulging, o Indra, in the pressed soma
Let Indra be the drinker of the pressed soma.

The positions relative to metrical boundary of the distracted noun-phrase constituents, as well as their order (Adj. + N), are identical in the two languages, Luvian and Vedic. The number and the precision of the similarities in the manipulation of poetic formulas are such that we must assume inheritance from a common poetic grammar O*, just as the morphophonemic precision of the equation Hittite 3sg. kuen-ti / 3pl. kun-anzi and Vedic 3sg. hän-ti / 3pl. ghan-anzi is by itself sufficient to require assumption of inheritance from a common grammar O. The relative rarity and isolation of these examples in Anatolian, given their special character among our limited documentation of Luvian, is methodologically no object. For all that the Indo-European languages of 2nd-millennium Anatolia have been in contact with and doubtless culturally influenced by the poetic traditions of Hattic on the one hand and Hurrian on the other, it is clear that there is a significant inherited Indo-European component in their poetics as well.

21. For the subject pronoun ātā (with intransitive verb) see Melchert 1993b s.v. a-; with reference.

22. With overt subject the pronominal subject clinic is not necessary.
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In Watkins 1988 I called attention to the similarity of our two Luvian lines in thematics and poetic devices to the first line (subsequently repeated as a sort of refrain) of the Old Welsh epic lay of the Gododdin,

gwyr a AETH GatrAETH

The men who went to Catraeth ...

and to the first lines of the Cyclic Epic Athiopis (fr. I Allen):

Thus they performed the burial of Hector. Then came the Amazon, daughter of great-hearted man-slaying Ares.

Similarly ll. 3.189:

on that day when the Amazons came, peers of men.

For the poetic devices of sound texture compare the notation of the Old Welsh line with the same of the Luvian:

\[ \text{aḥ = at = alat = aWlenata Wliušati} \]
\[ \text{ilat = ata abha zitiš = aWlata Wliušati}. \]

Another, more striking thematic link is the traditional epithet for the city of (W)Ilios in Homer: αἰανή 'steep'. It occurs 6 times, always verse-initial (ll. 16.773 etc.). Is the semantic identity of Greek (P)Ilos αἰανή 'steep Ilios' and Luvian alai Wliušati 'steep Wilusa' just coincidence, or just an elementary parallel to describe a walled city? Or is it part of a common poetic tradition, a formulaic convention shared between the two geographically contiguous languages, Luvian and Greek? 'If that were so, it would raise all manner of implications for both history and literature in 2nd-millennium Greece and Anatolia,' as I concluded in Watkins 1986. If the Luvians had a song or epic lay about Wilusa-(W)Ilios—Troy—it does not follow that the inhabitants of Wilusa-(W)Ilios—the Trojans—spoke Luvian. But it is one more link, and a not inconceivable one.

Another is the following. The name of the Luvian cult city of Istanuwa is derived from that of the Anatolian Sun-God Istanu. Wliušati figures in the incipi of the Luvian spell—\text{suppa uddar 'holy words'}—which is sung to the god Szawušuna. The name of this deity, otherwise attested only in another Istanuvian ritual as D\text{Szawušuna} ([2447 = KUB 55:65 iv 30, Starke 1985:314]), looks very like a form of the Indo-European word for 'sun' (cf. Gothic sunno) with intensive or expressive reduplication,23 or conceivably an ancient compound with Indo-European *sume-'own' (cf. Hittite D\text{siwk}s-summuš 'your' own (Sun-)God', *deys-sumeršiš-

In the Hittite Alaksandus treaty the gods of the city of Wilusa are called witnesses. The only one mentioned by name is D\text{ja-ap-pa-li-nu-na-as}, as restored by Forrer and defended by Güterbock 1956:42, and the name was already for Forrer equated with that of the Greek god Apollo, in the Common or Proto-Greek form *apelión securely reconstructible from Doric (Cretan, Laconian, Corinthis, etc.) Ἀπέλλαος, Cypriote to-i-a-pe-lo-mi ICS 215, b 4 (tot. 'Ἀπέλλος') and especially Mycenean [a]-pe-ro-ke NE KN E 842.3 (Ruijgh 1967:274).24 As originally proposed by Burkert 1975 the name is derived from a word preserved in Doric ἀπέλλαος 'assembly'; but as Peters shows the original meaning must have been rather the Indo-European institution of the "Männerbund", the 'hunter-warrior society of unmarried and propertyless young aristocrats' (McCon).25 Apollo (*apelión) in this aspect was the leader of such a band (*apelā). One might speculate—it is no more than that—that Alaksandus of Wilusa took Appalunas as his personal god at the same time and from the same cultural source as his 'international' name, Greek Aleksandros, perhaps from personal experience in an *apelā.

Apollo's role in the later Greek pantheon is of course much broader. Whether his later connection with the sun can be projected back to the 2nd millennium is uncertain at best, but it is clear in the \text{iliad} that Apollo is the special patron of the city of Troy, Ilios, and the Trojans. The syntactic and paradigmatic linking of god and city would seem to form a cultural continuum from Luvian to Greek (the determiner D marks gods, URU cities):

D\text{PUTU = Istanu = D\text{Suwasuna = D\text{Appalunas = *Apolļaon}}}

URU\text{Istanuwa = URU\text{Wilusa = (P)\text{Ilias - Tropē}}}

Another argument may be noted. Stephanus of Byzantium mentions the Asiatic Aeolic city of Elaea ("olive") : 'Ελαΐα πόλις τῆς 'Ασηίας Αἰολικῆς... ἡ κεκατὸν δαινις (text tit χλιδίνις) ὄνομαζετο "Ελαΐα... which was also called Daimi'is'. The emendation is due to G. Neumann apud Usmani 1986:162, who compared Luvian daimin- 'olive oil', daiminЯ = 'of olive oil'. Starke 1990:241, convincingly equating the Luvian word with Greek οἶνος, observes that daim-, daiminЯ- are not Lydian, but Luvian, pace Usmani, for morphological reasons. He is sympathetic to Neumann's suggestion that Greek 'Ελαΐα translated DaiminЯ-, but skeptical because of the location of the city, on the northwestern coast of Anatolia on the Elatic Gulf across from the island of Lesbos: 'admittedly a long ways from Luvian-speaking territory'. But if Troy and the Troad just to the north spoke Luvian the local name of the city would make perfect sense, and I consider Neumann's interpretation as cogent as it is ingenious.

23. Compare the South Slavic (Peperrina, Doda) and Greek (σαῦρον, Ζεύς, σαῦρωσκος) parallels.
24. See the fundamental discussion of the name of Apollo in Peters 1988:211-13. (He does not mention the Anatolian form.)
I conclude by pointing out a curious phrasal coincidence between Luvian and Homeric Greek, which is shared to my knowledge with no other Indo-European language. As we noted in chap. 2, Wackemagel in his famous lecture on Indo-European poetic language chose to illustrate the "law" of clitic placement which bears his name with a conjectural reading at II. 1.8: τις ταρ σπασ θεόν 'Who of the gods (brought) these two...', with the enclitic particle ταρ (so explicitly Herodian at II. 1.65 and 93) of the Teubner and Bude texts, not τ' ὑπ with the Vulgate as printed in the Oxford text. For the particle ταρ, attested by the Venetus A, see LSJ and Chantaine, DELG s.v. despite Neumann 1987. The sentence- and frequently episode-initial combination τις ταρ recurs at II. 2.761, 3.226, 18.182 and doubtless elsewhere; with other interrogatives we find at least τις ταρ, πῶς ταρ, οἷς ταρ, κλ. ταρ, τῇ ταρ. That 'τις after interrogative is always followed by ὑπ(α), i.e. τ' ὑπ, with Denniston 1966:533, strains credulity; Munro's view that 'the ancient grammarian's ταρ is probably right' is surely preferable. Wackemagel's insight on τις ταρ is vindicated, I would suggest, by later evidence of which he could have had no knowledge, the Luvian 'locatival' enclitic sentential particle ταρ precisely in the combination with the indefinite relative pronoun καθ' = ταρ,26 the sequence identical to the Greek combination with the interrogative pronoun τις ταρ, both from earlier *κ'ις ταρ. The 'coincidental' similarity is the more striking when we realize that in the 2nd millennium, long before the elimination of labiovelars in Greek, the phonetic sequence κ'ις ταρ in both languages would have been for practical purposes substantively identical.

The locative force of the Luvian particle is clear in another of the sacred songs of Istanuwa, found in the paragraph immediately following that with the incipit 'When they came from steep Wilusa', KBo 4.11 Vo. 47-9 (to the god DWandu):

tappaša = tar tappaša = tar tapala
lammaur tityyla
alinan halittarri maššanini

There in heaven...
There in heaven...
...
"Gods of..." is called out.

The interpretation is largely uncertain, but the particle in the repeated line, which reinforces the alliteration, is sure. Note that we have three rhyming 7-syllable lines followed by an 11-syllable, with a genitival noun phrase distracted to straddle the verb. The last line, as I stated (1986:61), 'even scans mechanically as a tolerably good Sapphic.' For other suggestions and differing rhythmic analysis see Eichner 1993:111.

Now the Luvian particle ταρ is also found enclitic to clause-initial finite verb: mammanna = ταρ 'regard with favor!' (2x). Compare the Iliadic formulas in verse-initial position ἰγνόεν ταρ ἔπεκτα 11.254, ὀμολογέν ταρ ἔπεκτα 15.397 etc., κάκουεν...

26. The text in which it occurs (attested in three passages) is quoted in full in chap. 33.