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Ah˘h˘iyawa und kein Ende:  
The Battle over Mycenaeans in Anatolia*

GARY BECKMAN

Over the past century and a half cuneiform studies have experienced a number of bitter disputes, for example, the early debate over the essential character of the Sumerian language,¹ the Peters-Hilprecht controversy concerning the alleged “temple library” uncovered at Nippur,² the schism within the Italian Ebla team brought about by differences regarding the cultural affiliations of the civilization revealed at that Syrian site,³ and the argument between the Marburg and Munich schools of Hittitology about the proper use of paleography in dating Hittite tablets.⁴ But no problem in ancient Near Eastern research has given rise to more heated and lengthier debate than has that of the identity of the country Ah˘h˘iya/Ah˘h˘iyawa mentioned in a couple of dozen texts and fragments from the archives of the Hittite Great Kings at Bo˘gazköy/Hattuša.⁵

Of course, what is at issue here is whether Aḥhuids should be recognized as the realm of the Homeric Achaeans, that is, as the culture and polity (or polities) now known to scholarship as Mycenaean. The identification of a number of other geographic and personal names associated with Aḥhuids in the Hittite sources with places and individuals from ancient Greek tradition has also been hotly disputed. And, in a closely related matter, renewed work at the site of Hisarlık on the Dardenelles has recently sparked a resumption of the argument as to whether the archaeological remains excavated there indicate the likely historicity of the Trojan War. I do not pretend that I will put to rest any of these problems here. I wish only to recount a colorful dispute from the early years of Hittitology in the hope that my friend from student days, Jared Klein, will find it amusing.

The Ah˘h˘iyawa question first came to the attention of a wider public with a lecture delivered by the Assyriologist Emil Forrer to the Vorderasiatisch-ägyptische Gesellschaft in Berlin on January 3, 1924, a presentation soon followed by papers in two scholarly journals (Forrer 1924a and 1924b). In one of these, Forrer relates the personal background to his

---

¹See Budge 1925:210–2 and Jones 1969:24–47.
⁴On the one side see e.g. Orten 1969 and Carruba 1971; on the other Kammenhuber 1969.
⁵For a list of these attestations, see del Monte and Tischler 1978:1–2. These texts have all been edited and commented upon in Beckman, Bryce, and Cline 2011.
researches: he had begun his scholarly career with an interest in the peoples of early Europe, and had therefore greeted the discovery of the Hittite epigraphic material with great enthusiasm. When in 1917 Otto Weber, Director of the Vorderasiatische Abteilung of the Royal Prussian Museum, had offered him the opportunity to study the tablets and fragments from the Hittite capital Boğazköy/Ḫattuša belonging to the collections of that institution or on loan there from the Ottoman authorities, it was his greatest hope that these most westerly of cuneiform texts would illuminate the ethnology of the Near East and thereby also that of Europe, building a bridge from Babylonian culture to European prehistory, the scholarly field of my father.⁶ . . . It is very doubtful whether I would have had the perseverance to read through all of these 11,000 tablets had I not been driven by the quiet hope of hearing something new about Troy and Priam.⁷

Forrer’s main points concerning Ahḫḫiyawa may be summarized as follows:

1. There are significant phonetic correspondences between a number of Hittite and Greek proper names. Compare cuneiform Ahḫḫiyawa to Greek Ἀχαιϝα (Achaeans); Ayawala to Aeolian; Lazpa to Lesbos; Taruiša to Troy; Tawagalawa to Eteokles; Antarawa to Andreus; Attariššiya to Atreus. It should be noted that Forrer did not equate Hittite Wiluša with Homeric (W)ilios, but rather with the obscure town of Elaiusa in Cilicia; nor did he identify Alakšandu with Alexandros.⁸ These latter claims were first made by Paul Kretschmer (1924), and by the American D. D. Luckenbill, already in 1911(!), respectively. Finally, Forrer did not connect Milawa(n)ta to Miletus⁹ or Apaša to Ephesus.¹⁰

2. Ahḫḫiyawa was a major power at the end of the second millennium BCE, as demonstrated by the facts that in the Hittite documents its king is once tentatively listed along with the rulers of Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria among the equals of the Hittite monarch,¹¹ and that he could be addressed by the latter as “My Brother,” that is, on terms of parity.¹²

3. As demonstrated by its recorded interactions with the Hittites, Ahḫḫiyawa held possessions in Anatolia—Forrer locates these in Pamphylia—as well as on the offshore islands (particularly Lesbos), but the kingdom was too important to have been restricted to such insignificant territories. On two occasions, ships or sea travel are mentioned in connection

⁷"[W]ar es meine größte Hoffnung, daß diese am weitesten nach Westen vorgeschobenen Keilschrifttexte die Ethnologie Vorderasiens und damit auch die Europas erheben und die Brücke bilden würden, die von der babylonischen Kultur hinüber zur Vorgeschichte Europas, dem Arbeitsgebiet meines Vaters, führt. . . . Es ist sehr zu bezweifeln, ob ich die Ausdauer gehabt hätte, alle diese 11,000 Tafeln durchzulesen, wenn mich nicht die stille Hoffnung getrieben hätte, von Troja und Priamus einmal Näheres zu hören" (Forrer 1924:1–2). Translations throughout are my own.
⁹Rather with Milyas. The identification with Miletus goes back to Hrozný 1929:329.
¹⁰Rather with Tarsus. For the identification with Ephesus, see Garstang and Gurney 1939:88.
¹¹Treaty between Tuddalḫiya IV of Ḫatti and Šaušga-muwa of Amurru (CTH 105); see my translation, Beckman 1999:106 §11; and Beckman, Bryce, and Cline 2011:60–1 §13′ (AhT 2). The scribe of the tablet later incompletely erased the reference to Ahḫḫiyawa.
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Therefore its primary center should be sought overseas—undoubtedly in mainland Greece and on the Aegean islands.

In these first publications on Ah˘h˘iyawa, Forrer proceeds to elaborate a scenario linking personages and events in the history of the Hittite Empire with elements of Greek traditions concerning early times. Today, this part of his exposition detailing l’histoire événementielle may be dismissed in large part, since Forrer, like all scholars writing before the recognition of paleographic criteria for dating Hittite manuscripts, incorrectly conflated sources from the first half of the fourteenth with those of the thirteenth century. Furthermore, the recognition that ayawalla- is an adjective denoting high rank rather than a gentilic, “Aeolian,” has vitiated one of the underpinnings of Forrer’s historical reconstruction.

First reaction to Forrer’s presentation was positive, although it must be borne in mind that at the time of his initial claims, most of the relevant cuneiform sources remained unpublished and perhaps only Bedřich Hrozný had enjoyed comparable access to the Hittite tablets themselves. The general public was enthusiastic. The Greek philologist Paul Kretschmer (1924), although dissenting on some particulars, largely endorsed Forrer’s position. Other writers, such as Hrozný (1929), S. Przeworski (1924–5), and P. Dhorme (1924) were also in basic agreement. Forrer himself presented a more detailed discussion of his views in his self-published Forschungen (1926b, 1929b).

But within a short time, a negative reaction had set in. Most importantly, in his contributions to the series Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi Albrecht Götze made available hand copies of a good number of the Ah˘h˘iyawa texts, thus allowing other scholars to consult Forrer’s primary material. Prominent among the skeptics were the senior Indo-Europeanist Ferdinand Sommer, who had taught himself cuneiform in order to be able to participate in the new field of Hittitology, and the Hittite specialists Johannes Friedrich and Götze.

Indeed, a sizable portion of the first fascicle of the new journal, Kleinasiatische Forschungen (I/1, 1927), founded by Sommer and Hans Ehelof, curator of the Vorderasiatische Abteilung, was devoted to the refutation of Forrer’s positions. In his contribution, Friedrich (1927) criticizes Forrer’s use of comparative linguistics, concluding,

I therefore consider Forrer’s hypothesis concerning the Greeks to be for the most part erroneous. Forrer himself provides us with the means to understand this false approach. In the introduction to his article in MDOG 63 (p. 2), he says that in working through the Hittite texts he “was driven by the quiet hope of hearing something new about Troy and Priam.” Thus from the beginning he began his investigation with certain preconceptions, and under the influence of

13Ten-Year Annals of Mursili II (CTH 61.1); see the translation by R. Beal in Hallo and Younger 2000:86. Treaty of Tudhaliya IV of Hattı and Saügata-muwa of Amurr (CTH 105); see my translation (Beckman 1999:106 §13; and Beckman, Bryce, and Cline 2011:62–3 §15’ [AhT 2]). I am not convinced by the efforts of Steiner (1989) to eliminate this attestation of Ah˘h˘iyawa.

14For a summary of this development, see Heinhold-Krahmer et al. 1979.

15See Houwink ten Cate 1970.

16Or perhaps the noun “son”: see Melchert 1980.

17HW 4.48; see already Götze apud Friedrich 1927:98 n. 4.

18See the short note by Schachermeyr (1931) in a semi-popular periodical.

19Volumes 14 (1926), 21 (1928a), 23 (1928b), and 26 (1933).

20See Kronasser 1961.
these ideas his fantasy sometimes lured him into unsustainable conclusions. And the agreement of the Hittite texts with our previous knowledge of Greek pre-history, which was seemingly so close, is to be explained by the fact that Forrer unconsciously read into the Hittite records things that we already knew.  

For his part, Götze presents three articles negatively assessing Forrer’s reconstructions of Hittite geography (1927a) and chronology (1927b), and then, for good measure, his general philological competence (1927c). Götze ends the last piece with the remark:

This long list [of corrections], which in general only notes repeated offenses at their first occurrence, will demonstrate to everyone how careful one must be with Forrer’s translations. In closing it must be stressed—which in any case cannot be made clear enough—that remarkably often Forrer misconstrues the syntactic linkage of sentences.

Forrer was stung by the criticism of his colleagues, and published a rejoinder, directed primarily at Friedrich, in the second fascicle of *Kleinasische Forschungen*. Maintaining (p. 253) that the primary evidence in his original argumentation had been historical rather than philological (that is, points 2 and 3 in my précis given earlier), Forrer nonetheless goes on to defend most of the comparisons of proper names that he had adduced. He then effectively cuts the ground out from under Friedrich by demonstrating that one cannot expect regular sound laws to operate across language boundaries in the process of borrowing (pp. 268–72). Indeed, he points out that by the reasoning displayed in his critique, Friedrich would have had to reject Grotefend’s original decipherment of Old Persian cuneiform, which had been based upon the recognition of the names of the Achaemenid monarchs.

A few years later, in his major contribution to the subject—the still essential *Die Ahbijjavã-Urkunden*—Sommer compares his own work to that of Forrer, at the same time condescending to the public that had warmly welcomed the latter’s efforts:

By the very nature of things, only a few will be able to evaluate the purely Hit-titological side of my investigations. How far beyond that I may be able to have any effect, time will tell. I present a straightforward interpretation of texts

---

21”Ich halte also Forrer’s Griechenhypothese in der Hauptsache für einen Irrweg. Diesen Irrweg zu verstehen, gibt uns Forrer selbst die Mittel an die Hand. In der Einleitung des Artikels MDOG 63, S. 2 sagt er, bei der Durcharbeitung der hethitischen Texte habe ihn ‘die stille Hoffnung getrieben, von Troja und Priamus einmal Näheres zu hören.’ Er ist also von vornherein mit bestimmten Tendenzen an die Untersuchung gegangen, und im Banne dieser Ideen hat ihn seine Phantasie gelegentlich an unhaltbaren Folgerungen verlockt. Und die scheinbar so gute Übereinstimmung der hethitischen Texte mit unserem bisherigen Wissen von der griechischen Vorgeschichte erklärt sich so, daß Forrer unbewußt Dinge, die wir schon wußten, in die hethitischen Urkunden hineingelesen hat” (Friedrich 1927:107).

22”Die lange Liste—die übrigens wiederkehrende Verstöße im allgemeinen nur an der jeweils ersten Stelle nennt—wird jedem zeigen, wie vorsichtig man Forrers Übersetzungen gegenüber sein muß. Zum Schlusse sei noch betont—was sonst nicht deutlich genug sein könnte—daß F. auffällig häufig die syntaktische Verbindung von Sätzen nicht richtig erfaßt” (Götze 1927c:136).

23Forrer 1929a. Notes at the beginning of the text inform us that the manuscript had been submitted in September 1927, that is, soon after the appearance of the critical essays just discussed, and that Forrer had threatened to withdraw the piece should the editors (Sommer and Eheloff) maintain their insistence that he abandon his particular system of transcription of Hittite vocabulary and proper names.

24Sommer 1932. A new edition of this material (with some additions unavailable to Sommer) is to be found in Beckman, Bryce, and Cline 2011; an up-to-date German-language edition is in preparation by S. Heinhold-Krahmer.
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whose contents, in my opinion, are not on the whole particularly fascinating, to counter a very intriguing set of assertions directed in fact to a wider audience. Already at its initial publication this argumentation was launched in a slick and captivating form. It inevitably had a resonance, and no one not fully acquainted with the difficult and irksome methodology of Hittitology is to be blamed for embracing it. However, since in my opinion the methodological shortcomings could not be overlooked, I would have expected a rather greater reserve. Even now—and this is only human—there will be those who will find it hard to admit that they have been too quick to agree. But I indeed trust that only a few have so corrupted their stomachs on a tasty pastry that they cannot bear the dry—but I believe nevertheless carefully and well-baked—bread that I am able to offer, even if in comparison it does not taste particularly good. In the end, I will be satisfied if a thorough comparison of my edition with what has previously been offered leads to the realization that a fundamentally more complicated apparatus and a far more careful and meticulous procedure must be employed in the study of Hittite documents than has been the case in regard to the Greek question.  

Of course, time would show that Emil Forrer was not the great philologist that Sommer was—few scholars were, nor was he the equal of Friedrich or Götze in this regard. And Forrer was indeed susceptible to enthusiasms that led him to stretch his evidence—witness his later writings in support of the hypothesis that there had been significant contacts between the Mediterranean and the New World in the pre-Christian era. But Forrer nonetheless had rendered significant services to the infant science of Hittitology, such as his pioneering article on the languages of the Hittite archives (1919), and his Boghazköi-Texten in Umschrift (1922, 1926a), which included the first sign-list for the Boğazköy texts. 

What then might account for the most uncollegial and dismissive manner in which, as we have seen, his work was evaluated? What was the root of the patronizing disparagement and sarcasm? On the basis of the extensive biographical sources presented by R. Oberheid, we may speculate. 

It seems that Hans Ehelolf may have played a crucial role in this matter. Upon his
demobilization in 1918, Ehelolf took up a position in the Vorderasiatische Abteilung, eventually becoming its curator in 1927. Since his own scholarly training had been primarily in Akkadian, while his duties now included caring for many Hittite tablets and fragments as well, he prevailed upon Emil Forrer to introduce him to the study of the newly recovered language. Forrer, it will be recalled, had been actively engaged for some time with the material from Boğazköy in the Museum, for, despite having been born in Prussian-ruled Alsace, he was a Swiss citizen and therefore not subject to conscription into the German military.

Eventually Ehelolf repaid Forrer’s kindness by evicting him from his work room in the Vorderasiatische Abteilung and restricting his access to the tablet holdings. Whether resentment over Forrer’s spending the war years getting the jump on potential rivals in Hittite studies while he himself was ruining his health in the Kaiser’s service in the Near East was a motivating factor for Ehelolf in these actions is uncertain, but archaeologist Kurt Bittel later speculated that Ehelolf, “who did not count among the particular friends of Forrer,” was instrumental in preventing the latter from being entrusted with leadership of renewed excavations at Boğazköy in the early 1930s.

Forrer’s chief antagonist, Ferdinand Sommer, had become a close friend of Ehelolf, co-authoring a volume with him and jointly editing Kleinasiatische Forschungen. Perhaps this relationship motivated Sommer’s attacks on Forrer. On the other hand, O. Szemerényi (2004:92) attributes Sommer’s hostility to simple jealousy of the younger man. As for Götzte and Friedrich, they will have been dependent upon Ehelolf’s goodwill in facilitating their study of the materials in the Vorderasiatische Abteilung.

Be that as it may, the severity of this published criticism, particularly by the influential Sommer, as well as effective behind-the-scenes politicking by Ehelolf, essentially blocked Forrer’s advancement within the German academy. After World War II, having failed in his efforts to insinuate himself once more in the Berlin Museums, he emigrated to Central America, where he pursued pre-Columbian archaeology, wrote for the local press, and served as an advisor to the Foreign Ministry of El Salvador. He died in San Salvador on January 10, 1986.

Looking back over Forrer’s career, H. G. Güterbock concludes, “[T]here is no doubt that the criticism of his Ahhiyawa theory went too far. Even though his unyielding insistence provoked even more criticism, he did not deserve such harsh treatment” (2004:105).

Lest we be tempted to attribute all virtue in this dispute to one side, and all unpleasantness to the other, I should mention that there is evidence that an unsolicited evaluation of

---

29 His service during the Great War consisted of a brief stint in the Swiss Border Police.
31 See Falkenstein 1940:2.
33 See the dedication to Sommer 1932 and also p. xii of that work.
34 Sommer and Ehelolf 1924.
37 In her diary, his wife Dorothea records that other members of the Museum staff had threatened to resign should he be appointed (Oberheid 2007:309).
38 See Groddek 2004:26–32.
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Ehelolf that Forrer submitted to the leader of the Berlin chapter of the Nazionalsozialistisches Dozentenbund was instrumental in the failure of Ehelolf to win appointment to the professorship of Assyriology in Berlin in 1939.39

Besides Forrer, in the 1920s and 1930s the most prominent German proponent of the identification of Ah˘h˘iyawa with the Mycenaean Greeks was Paul Kretschmer (1924, 1933, 1935). His opinions also drew the critical attention of Sommer, who dedicated a book (1934) and a long article (1937) to their refutation. However, in sharp contrast to his attitude toward Forrer, Sommer was careful to express his respect for Kretschmer’s achievements in areas outside of what he called the “silly Greek hypothesis (leichtsinnige Griechenhypothese).”40

The early debate over Ah˘h˘iyawa had a differential effect upon wider scholarly opinion. In general, through the 1960s authors writing in German were skeptical about equating Ah˘h˘iyawa with the Mycenaeans,41 while their Anglophone colleagues tended to take the identity of the two terms for granted.42 Perhaps this intellectual isogloss can be attributed to attitudes toward the person as well as the work of Ferdinand Sommer: German scholars could well have been swayed by his acknowledged gravitas, while foreigners may indeed have found his German style difficult to penetrate. As a student I certainly found it so.

The 1980s witnessed a renewed interest in the Ah˘h˘iyawa question, with two major conferences dedicated to the matter—held at Liverpool in 198143 and at Bryn Mawr in 1984.44 Since then, the new excavations at Troy undertaken by the Tübingen–Cincinnati team have given rise to their own controversy, whose protagonists have been the late Manfred Korfmann, head of the excavation team,45 on the one side, and Frank Kolb,46 an ancient historian teaching at the same institution, on the other. Although this dispute, which has been in some ways as unseemly47 as the earlier dustup involving Forrer and Sommer, has implications for the Ah˘h˘iyawa question, its primary focus is archaeological and need not distract us here.

How does the Ah˘h˘iyawa question look now after three-quarters of a century have passed? It seems to me that many of the contributions I have touched upon earlier approached the problem on the wrong level, namely that of linguistics, in particular by trying to justify—or to disprove—the equivalence of proper nouns attested in cuneiform Hittite on the one hand, and in the Greek language and script on the other. This is precisely the methodology recently employed by I. Hajnal (2003), and he has predictably reached an uncertain conclusion.

39The text of this unpleasant document, which the Swiss citizen Forrer concluded with “Heil Hitler!” is reproduced in Oberheid 2007:239–45.
40Sommer 1934: 5; 1937: 169.
41So Goetz 1957: 183; and Schmölkel 1957: 131 n. 2; but cf. Schachermeyr 1935 and 1944: 75–6.
42E.g., Gurney 1954: 46–58; Huxley 1960; Page 1959: 1–40. French scholars also tended to accept the equation; see Dussaud 1953: 74–6.
45The discussion came about in the wake of an exhibit of antiquities recovered at Hisarlık; see the catalogue, Theune-Großkopf et al. 2001. The “official” viewpoint is presented, for example, by Easton et al. (2002) and Jablonka and Rose (2004). See also the Projekt Troia website (http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/troia/deu/) and Latacz 2004.
47See the charge of academic malfeasance leveled by F. Kolb against M. Korfmann (Kolb 2003: 135).
But we are dealing here with an historical investigation, and we should rather address it as historians, not as linguists. After all, Forrer pointed out long ago that it is unrealistic to expect or demand that regular sound correspondences or sound laws prevail when words pass from one language into another. The well-known constraints that the syllabic cuneiform writing system imposes on the representation of phonological realities must also be recognized.

Archaeological evidence has continued to accumulate for the presence of Mycenaean settlements on the mainland of western Anatolia, as well as for (perhaps indirect) trading relations between Mycenaens and Hatti. Material, albeit scanty, has been recovered at the Hittite capital and in the provincial centers of Maşat Höyük/Tapikka and Kuşaklı/Şarişşa.

In his 1984 review of the Ahhiyawa question, H. G. Güterbock made what in retrospect seems the obvious point that the Hittites must have known of the presence of the Mycenaens to their west, and furthermore he asked: If the Mycenaens did not constitute Ahhiyawa, then how were they designated in the Hittite texts? Conversely, if the land of Ahhiyawa did not correspond to the realm of the Mycenaens, then just what other (quasi-)great power might this term have indicated? Most students of the ancient Near East have now recognized the wisdom of this approach, although Ahmet Ünal (1991) continues to disagree, while Susanne Heinhold-Krahmer (2003a, 2003b) maintains her usual cautious skepticism.

In sum, it seems to me that Emil Forrer was basically correct about Ahhiyawa after all, even if he was mistaken on numerous philological and historical details, while the more erudite, meticulous, and cautious Ferdinand Sommer erred in his conclusions regarding the historical identity and role of Ahhiyawa. I believe that he could not see the forest for the trees. Nevertheless, Sommer’s Abhijavā-Urkunden remains a monument in Hittological studies, while I doubt that few other than myself have recently consulted Forrer’s Forschungen.
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