

HETTITOLOGIE

WILHELM, G. (Hrsg.) — Hattuša-Boğazköy. Das Hethiterreich im Spannungsfeld des Alten Orients. 6. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 22.-24. März 2006, Würzburg. (Colloquien der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, Band 6). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2008 (24,5 cm, XXII, 438). ISBN 978-3-447-05855-1. ISSN 1433-7401. € 49,-.

The volume under review contains most of the papers presented during a three-day conference in Würzburg, Germany, in 2006. This conference was organized in order to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the German archaeological expedition in the Hittite capital Boğazköy-Hattuša.¹⁾

The volume is divided into six sections: (I) *Die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy: Neue Perspektiven*, (II) *Die Keilschrifttexte aus Hattusa: Edition und Auswertung*, (III) *Verbindungen zum syro-mesopotamischen und ostmediterranen Raum*, (IV) *Verbindungen zum pontischen sowie zum westanatolischen und griechisch-ägäischen Raum*, (V) *Aspekte der hethitischen Politik* and (VI) *Zum Nachleben altanatolischer Kunst*.

The first section, Excavations in Boğazköy: new perspectives, comprises three contributions. J. Seeher, the previous director of the German archaeological expedition, discusses the results of the excavations (2001-2005) that were carried out by him near Sarıkale in the western *Oberstadt* of the capital. The earliest structures found here, the so-called *Quadratgebäude-Horizont*, interpreted as soldier barracks, are dated to c. 1500 BC. Later buildings, a metal workshop (*Werkstatt-Horizont*) and domestic unit with bathroom (*Badezimmerhaus-Horizont*) have been assigned to the second half of the 15th and the first half of the 14th century BC respectively. Hence, contrary to the traditionally held view that Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV — in the second half of the 13th century BC — are to be held responsible for developing the *Oberstadt* of Boğazköy-Hattuša, the beginning of this process should probably be placed in the early 15th century BC.

¹⁾ I would like to thank Prof. J.H. Crouwel and Drs. J. Zhang for reading an earlier version of this review.

The first section of the volume contains two other papers, one by U.D. Schoop, another one by W. Orthmann. Schoop elaborates on the past and future role played by archaeology in the investigation of Hittite culture. According to him, traditional chronologies based on dates tentatively assigned to specific Hittite kings need to be replaced by an independent science-based system of dating. This paradigmatic change in Hittite archaeology, as Schoop calls it, should be founded on objective natural scientific methods, including C-14 carbon dating and quantitative-statistical analyses. The latter approach is designed to observe relative changes in pottery consumption. True type fossils that mark the beginning of a new stylistic period in Hittite archaeology are close to non-existent. As a result, quantitative-statistical analyses are the only means by which assemblages or contexts may be relatively dated, however, needless to say dependent on the discernability of patterns — rise and decline — in the use of pottery in ancient Hittite times. If combined with C-14 technology, such relative dates can be turned into approximate absolute dates. Finally, W. Orthmann discusses Hittite art and how the excavations in Boğazköy-Hattuša, in the last 50 years, have contributed to increasing our understanding of the Hittite artisan.

The second section of the volume is devoted to the ‘social history’ and study of the cuneiform texts from Hattuša. Contributors are H. Klengel, G. Wilhelm, the editor of the volume under review here, and Th.P.J. van den Hout. Klengel pays attention to the ‘social history’ of the tablets, c. 30.000 fragments of which have by now been uncovered at the site. Among other things, he discusses their discovery and how they were moved from Turkey to Germany and back. Wilhelm elaborates on the history and future of Hittite text editions, including the founding of the *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* (KUB), *Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy* (KBo) and *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* (StBot) series, as well as future plans, which are being developed by means of the online platform *Hethitologie Portal Mainz*.

The third article, by Th. van den Hout, addresses the seeming arbitrariness of the distribution of clay tablet fragments in Boğazköy-Hattuša. By using find spot information, available through S. Košak’s *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln*, he demonstrates that, proportionally, most texts written in old and/or middle Hittite ductus were stored in *Gebäude A* on Büyükkale, which, thus, appears to have functioned as some sort of archive. *Gebäude A* also contained a good many tablets written in late Hittite script. In any case, the majority of texts written in the late Hittite ductus were found in the *Haus am Hang* in the *Oberstadt* and the ruins of (the storerooms around) Temple 1. Besides ductus, van den Hout also pays attention to the distribution of particular text-genres in the city. For example, he shows that the *Haus am Hang* and Temple 1 contained a proportionally large amount of, what he calls, *unica*, i.e. texts without duplicates (e.g. letters, administrative and religious texts). The inventory of *Gebäude A*, on the other hand, mainly consisted of documents with duplicates, including treaties, instructions and rituals. Hence, *Gebäude A* may have functioned as a ‘central depot,’ from which texts could be temporarily removed when new texts had to be composed.

The third part of the volume focuses on different kinds of relations — trade/exchange, religious and cultural — between Hittite Anatolia and the Syro-Mesopotamian and eastern Mediterranean realm. Contributors include D. Charpin, J.G.

Dercksen, C. Günbattı, D. Schwemer, S. Herbordt, T. Richter, E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, I. Singer and S. de Martino.

Charpin, Dercksen and Günbattı focus on the first half of the 2nd millennium BC. Attention is paid, among other things, to the functioning of the Assyrian trading network in central Anatolia, as well as to relations between the local authorities and the Assyrian merchants. Religious ‘tolerance’ in the Hittite world is discussed by D. Schwemer. He argues against the popular notion that the incorporation of foreign gods in the Hittite state pantheon can somehow be explained as an indication of respect towards ‘exotic’ deities, religious tolerance or a strategy aimed at facilitating the political integration of subjected peoples into the Hittite state.

S. Herbordt ‘measures’ the influence of Hittite imperial expansionism into culturally distinct areas, in particular northern Syria, using the evidence of Hittite sealing traditions. She concludes that only few ‘foreign’ influences can be observed among the many seals and seal impressions that have come to light at excavations in Hittite Anatolia.

Cancik-Kirschbaum and Singer focus on the diplomatic relations between Assyria and Hatti. Singer primarily pays attention to a late episode in Assyrian-Hittite relations, namely the struggle over the throne of Babylon at the turn of the 13th century BC. Kirschbaum offers a more extensive historical picture. She comments on three affairs in Hittite-Assyrian diplomatic relations: the struggles over Hanigalbat (former kingdom of Mittanni in southeast Anatolia), Išūwa (eastern Anatolia) and Suhu (region in the Middle Euphrates area). Finally, S. de Martino scrutinizes relations between Alašiya, identified as a kingdom located on Cyprus, and Hatti, according to the textual and archaeological evidence.

In the fourth section of the volume, the northern ‘periphery’ of the Hittite realm is taken into consideration. R.M. Czichon presents the results of a survey, carried out under his supervision, in the area of Vezirköprü in north-central Anatolia, close to Samsun. Noteworthy finds include a seal-impressed clay bulla and a number of fragments belonging to clay tablets, all of which were picked up around the hill Oymaağaç. This site is also known to have had a *Poterne* or underground passage, many examples of which are known from the Hittite capital Boğazköy-Hattuša (e.g. *Poternenmauer*). Based on the above finds, among other things, and the presence of monumental architecture, also including monumental wall segments, an excavation project has recently started (2007) at the Oymaağaç Höyük under the directorship of J. Klinger and R.M. Czichon.

In the volume under review, Klinger discusses texts dealing with the geographic and/or political situation in the northern periphery of the Hittite state. The Kaška people have often been mentioned in conjunction with this area, comprising such important places as the cult site Nerik, Hakmis and Zalpa. Based on the literary evidence, they seem to have posed a continuous threat to Hittite supremacy in this part of Anatolia.

The fourth section of the volume also includes an excursus on Hittite-Mycenaean relations, according to the archaeological and textual evidence. W.D. Niemeier, the current director of the German Institute at Athens, presents a summary of the textual evidence, focusing, among other things, on the role of Ahhiyawa, a country sometimes mentioned in Hittite texts and tentatively identified as (part of) Mycenaean Greece, in Hittite affairs in western Anatolia. He also offers an overview of the latest archaeological finds from the west

coast of Turkey. Sites such as Miletus, Iasos, Değirmentepe and Müsgebi have yielded a relatively large number of Mycenaean-type artifacts, including pottery, lentoid seals, terracotta figurines, jewelry and weapons. These finds are often interpreted as indicating a Mycenaean colonial presence in this part of Anatolia.

The last two sections of the volume focus on aspects of Hittite politics and the after-life of Hittite art, following the end of the Late Bronze Age. The first section includes contributions by M. Giorgieri and A. Altman. Giorgieri discusses the role of conflict and intrigues in the Hittite royal court. Altman makes a comparison between Hittite imperial practices and the way the Roman Empire treated its subordinate states.

Papers not mentioned in this review include T. Richter’s ‘*Suppiluliuma I in Syrien. Der ‘Einjährige Feldzug’ und seine Folgen*’ and A. Özyar’s ‘*Untersuchungen zu den kleinen Orthostaten aus Tell Halaf: Späthethitische Kunst, Aramäische Bildwerke oder hurritisches Erbe?*’.

In all, the volume demonstrates the considerable progress that has been made in the last couple of decades in the field of Hittite studies. The editor is to be applauded for the speed with which this volume has been produced, only two years after the conference took place.

Amsterdam, December 2010

J. Eerbeek

*
* *

KELDER, J.M. — The kingdom of Mycenae. A Great Kingdom in the Late Bronze Age Aegean. CDL Press, Bethesda, 2010. (24 cm, XII, 172). ISBN 978-1934309-278. \$ 40.00.

The book by Jorrit M. Kelder, which presents us with the market-edition of his dissertation, is well written and highly stimulating. His main point of departure is formed by what the Hittite and Egyptian sources have to tell us about the political constellation of Mycenaean Greece, in order to investigate subsequently how these external data relate to the relevant archaeological material. For an inward looking discipline like Mycenaean studies happens to be, this is a refreshingly original line of approach. Yet another advantage of this study, at least in my view, is that the author, who is of origin trained as an archaeologist, uses archaeological data in order to extract their historical relevance so that he proofs himself to be a genuine Mediterranean protohistorian.

The book sets out with a discussion of the Linear B evidence on the *wanaks* “king”. Is it possible to determine whether there were local kings, one at the head of every palatial entity, or was there just one king ruling over all the distinct provinces, in other words: a great king? Unfortunately, it has to be admitted that for the limited nature of the Linear B archives, which only deal with daily administrative routine, the answer is *non liquet*.

Much more positive on this question are the Hittite and Egyptian sources. A survey of the evidence on Ahhiyawa, which covers the period of almost 200 year from c. 1400 BC to the latest decades of the 13th century BC, points out that at certain times during this period the king of Ahhiyawa was recognized by his Hittite colleague as an equal, that is to say as a great king. This happens to be the case in the so-called

Tawagalawas-letter, which is usually assigned to the reign of Hattusilis III (1264-1239 BC), but according to Oliver Gurney (2002) should rather be situated in the reign of Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC). As a matter of fact, Kelder himself draws a conclusion which is in conformity with the latter view when he states that another letter from the dossier, the Manapatarhundas-letter “dates to around the same time as the Tawagalawa[s-]letter”, because Manapatarhundas has been replaced as king of the Seha river-land by Masturis already in the reign of Muwatallis II (Bryce 2010: 227): instead of down-dating the Manapatarhundas-letter this leaves us no other option than up-dating the Tawagalawas-letter. However this may be, what primarily concerns us here is that in the Sauskamuwa-treaty from the reign of Tudhaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC) the king of Ahhiyawa is no longer considered a member of the illustrious club of great kings, a reference to him in this context being erased.

Turning next to the Egyptian evidence, a first text of relevance to the topic consists of a passage from the annals of Tuthmosis III (1479-1425 BC) as recorded for the year 42 of his reign, i.e. 1437 BC, which runs as follows: *inw n wr n tii3y h3st* “tribute of the chief of Tanayu”. This ruler of Tanayu, then, offered metal vases to the Egyptian pharaoh, who was on campaign in the Levant at the time, as a means to open up diplomatic and/or trade connections between the two countries. That Tanayu refers to Mycenaean Greece is definitely proved by the Kom el-Hetan text from the reign of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) (see most recently Edel & Görg 2005). This text no doubt reflects a diplomatic mission by the Egyptians into the Aegean, more specific to Crete and the Greek mainland. As keenly observed by Kelder, a central position in the enumeration of the place-names is taken by Nauplion and Mycenae, representing the Argolid. Furthermore, other important palatial centres like Pylos and Thebes are referred to not as places, just like the rest, but as provinces, namely Messenia and the Thebaïd, respectively. This leads the author to the conclusion that Mycenae (with its harbor Nauplion) forms the seat of a kingdom with over-arching powers affecting provinces to the west and the east. In other words: a kingdom headed by a “king over kings” (if only these provinces were ruled by a local *wanaks*, on which see below) or a great king!

Having arrived at this point, it becomes almost inevitable that the Hittite designation Ahhiyawa, which reminds one of the Homeric Achaeans as a designation of the Mycenaean Greeks, refers to the Greek mainland in like manner as Egyptian Tanayu, apparently based on a variant form of address of the Mycenaean Greeks, likewise preserved in the Homeric epos, namely Danaoi (especially used for the inhabitants of the Argolid). In any case, it is clear that there is no room in the Aegean for more than one great kingdom during the period in question.

The identification of Hittite Ahhiyawa with Mycenaean Greece can, as shown in chapter two, further be sustained by archaeological evidence. During the period of c. 1400 BC to 1200 BC Mycenaean material culture can be shown to have radiated to precisely those regions of western Asia Minor where the Ahhiyawans were active according to the Hittite texts. Foremost in this connection was the region of Miletos and Müsgebi, where on the basis of the diversity of the finds, ranging from pottery to house-forms, kilns, figurines and chamber tombs, Mycenaean settlers may be assumed during the period from Late Helladic IIIA2 to Late Helladic IIIB1,

c. 1375-1230 BC. This inference coincides with the fact that according to the Hittite texts Millawanda or Milawata, the Hittite indication of classical Miletos, had been drawn into the sphere of influence of the king of Ahhiyawa as early as in the beginning of the reign of Mursilis II (1321-1295 BC), and remained within this sphere up till an advanced stage in the reign of Tudhaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC). Very revealing is also the Mycenaean influence recorded for Ephesos, which entails open and closed shaped pottery and figurines. This influence, as duly observed by Kelder, is restricted to the Late Helladic IIIA1-2 period, which coincides with Ahhiyawan support of the Arzawan ruler Uhhazitis, whose capital was Apasa, the Hittite preform of classical Ephesos, and the fact that this support came to an end as a result of Mursilis II's conquest of Arzawa and subsequent reform of this state into the province Mira under a loyal vassal, Mashuiluwas, who, when he revolted, was quickly replaced by the even more loyal Kupantakuruntas.

In similar vein, the identification of Egyptian Tanayu with Mycenaean Greece can also be underlined by the presence of Mycenaean ware in Egypt. Especially in connection with the finds from Amarna, which entail closed shapes like pilgrims flasks and stirrup jars dating from Late Helladic IIIA2 to the beginning of Late Helladic IIIB1 and of which the origin has been traced back to Berbati in the Argolid, the author argues convincingly for direct trade contacts between the two countries. In any case, as worked out in Kelder 2009, it seems feasible that the vessels in question were containers of olive oil, a product up to that time foreign to Egypt and previously imported from the Levant. In the course of such direct contacts, the capital of Mycenaean Greece, Mycenae, received from the side of Egypt for example faience plaques with the cartouche of Amenhotep III (1390-1352 BC) — perhaps in the course of the aforesaid diplomatic mission as commemorated in the inscriptions from Kom el-Hetan. Note in this connection that the Mycenaean capacity to partake in long distance trade may receive welcome confirmation by the interpretation of the Linear B tablet Ta 711 from Pylos according to which the (local?) *wanaks* “king” appointed a certain Aukewas to *damokoro* “trader” (< Akkadian *tam-kāru-*), at which event the palatial *thesauros* with metal vessels for gift exchange (as we have seen a prerequisite for opening up diplomatic contacts and trade relations with foreign powers) was inspected by a palace official named *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* (see Woudhuizen 2009: 193-4).

In his third and final chapter the author tries to correlate the external evidence from Hittite and Egyptian sources as discussed in the preceding with the archaeological data of Mycenaean Greece. Crucial questions are in this connection: can it be established that there was a unified kingdom in Greece during the latter half of the Late Bronze Age, and, if so, what was the capital of this unified kingdom?

As far as the first question is concerned, a cultural unity, which might (but need not) be indicative of a unified state on the political level, is observable in several aspects of the material assemblage. Thus the palaces are of regular megaron type and embellished by similar type frescoes, the Linear B administration in these palaces is characterized by standardized tablet forms, and in these tablets we find everywhere the same system of measurements and the same dialect, the pottery style as found in the various sites is so uniform that one speaks of the Mycenaean *koinē* and as far as religion is concerned the phi- and psi-idols are omnipresent. On top of

this, there can be distinguished the remains of infrastructural projects, like road building, the drainage of lakes (Kopais in Boiotia) and swamps (in the Nemea valley to the north of Mycenae), the construction of a harbor (at Pylos) and a wall (across the isthmus). Some of these projects may have entailed the recruitment of manpower and means on an over-arching “national” level. As such, then, the archaeological evidence is in conformity with the idea of a unified Mycenaean kingdom — even though strictly speaking it cannot be considered proof of a unified polity.

Remains the question where the capital of this unified state was seated. In dealing with this matter, Kelder poses that there are only two candidates for an imperial capital, namely: Mycenae and Thebes. One of the criteria applied is the presence of orientalia, in which respect Mycenae out-matches Thebes, and for example Pylos lags far behind. Furthermore, Mycenae can boast monumental tholos tombs, which are not found in the region of Thebes. Finally, it can reasonably be argued that Mycenae controlled the entire Argolid, including such important sites as Tiryns, Argos and Midea, as well as the Corinthian isthmus and Achaia, and as such constituted a province of larger dimensions than the Thebaid, even if this latter region included part of the island Euboea as deducible from the mention in the Theban tablets of Karystos and Amarynthos. Most decisively in the choice between Mycenae and Thebes as the capital of a unified kingdom, however, is the fact that central Greece was notoriously unstable in the later phase of the Late Bronze Age, which saw the destruction of Thebes itself, first during the Late Helladic IIIA1/2 transitional period (c. 1350 BC) and later on once more at the end of Late Helladic IIIB1 (c. 1250-1230 BC), when also the neighboring Gla and Orchomenos went to wrack and ruin. Hence, this latter region is unlikely to have been able to sustain the means necessary for campaigning in western Anatolia up to the level of forming a serious threat to the Hittites over a period of almost two centuries.

Although I agree with Kelder’s choice for Mycenae as the seat of the capital of a unified kingdom, I think he is, in his efforts to convince the reader, downplaying the role of Thebes a little bit. As a matter of fact, Thebes may have played a crucial role in maintaining control of the Ahhiyawan bridgehead in Anatolia, viz. Millawanda. In the Thebes tablets, namely, the ethnic *mi-ra-ti-jo* (= Greek Μιλᾶτιος) “Milesian” turns up as much as 7 times (Aravantinos e.a. 2001: Fq 177.2; 198.5; 214.[12]; 244.2; 254+255.10; 269.3; 276.6). This is more than the number of attestations of the related forms *mi-ra-ti-ja* and *mi-ra-ti-ja-o* in the Pylos tablets, which add up to 6 times in sum (Ventris & Chadwick 1973: glossary, s.v.; Aravantinos e.a. 2001). Moreover, the name *Tawagalawas* of the brother of the Ahhiyawan great king as recorded for the letter named after the former corresponds to Greek *Eteoklēs*, one of the mythical rulers of Thebes. In addition, it deserves our attention in this connection that according to a recent proposal by Frank Starke in the Hittite text catalogued as KUB 26.91, which is likely to be attributed to the aforesaid Tawagalawas, one should read *ka-ta-mu-* “Kadmos” for the name of the great-grandfather of the sender of this letter. Is it the result of mere chance that we are confronted in this manner with the relative sequence of two rulers of Thebes which agrees with that of Greek literary tradition, according to which Kadmos is indeed an ancestor of Eteokles?

It must be admitted that Kelder is skeptical about this new reading. But if we allow ourselves to further investigate the matter, it may be of interest to note that the aforesaid letter KUB 26.91 further informs us that Kadmos had received disputed islands in the Aegean from the king of Assuwa at the event of the betrothal of his daughter to the latter king. Now, among the orientalia at Thebes, which for a great part consist of a cache of 39 lapis lazuli cylinder seals, there can be found an Anatolian seal, numbered no. 25, with a scene of four deities, three of which are associated with a Luwian hieroglyphic legend in front of them. The image of the second deity, which is topped by the symbol of a winged sun-disc, presents us with the name(s) of (a) great king(s), presumably of Arzawa or Assuwa [= a shortlived coalition of forces headed by the royal house of Arzawa, which rose to prominence in an earlier stage of the reign of Tudhaliyas II (1425-1390 BC)],¹⁾ whereas the fourth deity, a goddess, is associated with the name of a lower functionary. Only the image of the third deity has no Luwian hieroglyphic signs in front of it, but only the image of a figure seated on a throne. Apparently, the latter image serves as an icon for someone who was unable to express himself in Luwian hieroglyphic, and, because the seal with a view to the remnants of a gold casing has actually been worn, that person is likely to be identified as a king of Thebes. Against the backdrop of KUB 26.91, then, it is highly conceivable to assume that king Kadmos of Thebes in his capacity of vassal of an Arzawan or Assuwian great king had received a seal from the latter in order to enable him to exercise his power over the islands in the Aegean that had been granted to him in loan, while at the same time leaving daily matters to a lower functionary of the great king in question (Woudhuizen 2009: 204-11).

Whatever one may be apt to think of this reconstruction, it cannot be denied that the Luwian hieroglyphic cylinder seal underlines the fact that Theban rulers were active in western Anatolia. If only for the icon of an enthroned individual, it also seems to indicate that the Theban Late Bronze Age rulers considered themselves kings, as is in accordance with Greek literary tradition. For this reason, then, I think that Kelder in his suggestion that in the Mycenaean kingdom there was only one *wanaks* “king”, *in casu* a great king, seated in Mycenae and that the latter’s provinces were administered by a lower functionary like the *lawagetas* “leader of the host” as elaborated in an article of 2008 is overstating the evidence. More likely, the various palatial centres were, in conformity with the literary tradition, ruled by local kings, who in their turn were vassals of the great king of Mycenae — which apparently did not prevent them from offering their services also to Luwian great kings of western Anatolia, as in case with the Theban king Kadmos. Finally, the crucial role played by Thebes in maintaining control over the Mycenaean bridgehead Millawanda in western Anatolia may further be illustrated by the fact that the change of this town to the Hittite side in an advanced stage of the reign of Tudhaliyas IV (1239-1209 BC) coincides with the destruction of Thebes at the end of Late Helladic IIIB1 (Niemeier 2008: 325).

Give and take a few of what I consider adjustments on minor points, I think we owe the author our thanks for his

¹⁾ For the distinction between Tudhaliyas I (1465-1440 BC) and Tudhaliyas II (1425-1390 BC), usually lumped together as Tudhaliyas I/II in the literature, see now Freu 2007.

stimulating study and I sincerely hope he will be able to continue his fruitful investigations in the field of Mediterranean protohistory.

References

- Aravantinos, V.L., Godart, Louis, & Sacconi, Anna, 2001, Thèbes, Fouilles de la Cadmée I, Les Tablettes en linéaire B de le odos Pelopidou, Édition et commentaire. Pisa-Roma.
- Bryce, Trevor, 2010, *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (reprint of the new edition of 2005).
- Edel, Elmar, & Görg, Manfred, 2005, Die Ortsnamenlisten im nördlichen Säulenhof des Totentempels Amenophis' III. Ägypten und Altes Testament, Studien zu Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des Alten Testaments 50. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Freu, Jacques, 2007, L'affirmation du nouvel empire Hittite (c.1465-1319 av. J.C.). In: Freu, Jacques, & Mazoyer, Michel, (eds.), *Les débuts du nouvel empire Hittite, Les Hittites et leur Histoire [II]*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Gurney, Oliver R., 2002, The Authorship of the Tawagalawas Letter. In: Taracha, Piotr, (ed.), *Silva Anatolica, Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Pp. 133-141. Warsaw: Agade.
- Kelder, Jorrit M., 2008, A Great King at Mycenae. An Argument for the Wanax as Great King and the Lawagetas as Vassal Ruler. *Palamedes, A Journal of Ancient History* 3. Pp. 49-74.
- , 2009, Royal Gift Exchange between Egypt and Mycenae. *American Journal of Archaeology* 113. Pp. 339-352.
- Niemeier, Wolf-Dietrich, 2008, Ḫattusas Beziehungen zu West-Kleinasien und dem mykenischen Griechenland (Aḫḫiyawa). In: Wilhelm, Gernot, (Hrsg.), *Ḫattuša-Boğazköy: Das Hethiterreich im Spannungsfeld des Alten Orients*. Pp. 291-349. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Ventris, Michael, & Chadwick, John, 1973, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge: At the University Press (2nd ed.).
- Woudhuizen, Fred C., 2009, The Earliest Cretan Scripts 2. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 129*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft.

Heiloo, December 2010

Fred C. WOULDHUIZEN