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Change, Continuity, and Connectivity

Łukasz Niesiołowski-Spanò, Marek Węcowski

The present collective volume stems from an interdisciplinary project funded by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education, within the frame of the National Programme for the Development of the Humanities (research grant no. 12H 12 0193 81). It incorporates the main results of three international workshops held in Warsaw between 2014 and 2016 with several papers specifically written for this book. The broadly defined aim of this volume – combining the import of archaeological, historical, linguistic, and scientific studies in the field – is to offer a multidisciplinary reassessment of the relationships between the Aegean and the Levant ca. 1300-900 BCE (and slightly beyond), i.e. in the period when a series of decisive historical transformations in the North-Eastern Mediterranean took place reshaping the historical and cultural fates of this region.

Traditionally, this period of cultural contacts has been conceived of teleologically, in which an ex Oriente lux interpretive pattern was the key to understanding archaic and classical Greek culture – a mono-directional or at best diffusionist view of intercultural relations. More recently, the pendulum of scholarly interest seems to have swung in the opposite direction, focusing, on the one hand, on modes of adoption and adaptation, and less on sheer transmission, of diverse cultural phenomena. On the other hand, hypothetical Aegean “influences” on Levantine cultures seem to have come to the fore, going far beyond the simple study of the geography, or “ethnography” of migrations, including the most famous case of the so-called Sea Peoples of the Late Bronze Age.

The title of this volume shows its intention to study the North-Eastern Mediterranean at the turn of the Bronze Age and in the Early Iron Age as a hub of supra-local connectivity by tracing – on a general historical level and in almost each particular essay – textual and archaeological evidence of both change and continuity. To some extent at least, it may be much easier to observe discontinuities and novelties in the broadly defined field of cultural history. However, for a historical period of unquestionable crisis marked by political, social, and no doubt economic upheavals on an unprecedented scale in the North-Eastern Mediterranean, continuities and connectivities may be no less striking to a contemporary student. To find the balance between the two perspectives may perhaps be seen as the main challenge of the historical studies of this period.

It is not our intention to present an authoritative and fully up-to-date version of the historical phenomena and processes involved, but rather to contribute to a fresh scholarly debate by juxtaposing informed but nonetheless often opposed points of view. As will be clear to every reader of this volume, the authors’ methods and general approaches differ considerably. Most importantly, whereas the historical implications of some of the essays are presented in a refreshingly optimistic manner, striving for a new understanding of some general cultural phenomena or of regional histories, other essays are soberly minimalistic regarding the feasibility of drawing firm conclusions with the current state of research. It is good to keep in mind that both maximalist and minimalist approaches may be equally valid.
The first and central part of the book (“Change, Continuity, and Connectivity – Regional Reassessments”) contains a series of essays arranged in a broadly geographical and chronological order, from Hittite–Mycenaean relations in the north, through Asia Minor, Cyprus, Cilicia, Syria, and the Levant, up to the Jordan Valley. This section has a double nature as it includes both general essays and case-studies. The case-studies are drawn from specific archaeological sites and their implications and focus on several particularly important problems of regional history.

In this section, Piotr Taracha offers an introduction to the study of a fundamental historical problem of Hittite–Mycenaean interconnections in the Late Bronze Age, a starting point of the story to be followed in this book, dealing both with archaeological evidence for cultural links between the Mycenaean world and western Anatolia, and with the “Ahhiyawa problem” in a number of Hittite texts. This is a sensible reassessment of local political interactions in a liminal zone of western Anatolia – one of the crucial peripheral regions within the geographical scope of this book – having recourse to diverse archaeological, historical, and anthropological analyses. Later in the same section, Rostislav Oreshko tackles the crucial but debatable issue of the (conceivable) Aegean ethnic names in the eastern Mediterranean in his study of Ahhiyawa, Danu(na), combining his primarily linguistic approach with archaeological and historical considerations. This essay offers a meticulous study of old and new Hieroglyphic-Luwian evidence on the issue and may be conveniently compared to the general linguistic essays assembled in Part Three of this volume. Next, in his methodologically rich essay, Emanuel Pfoh studies socio-political changes and continuities in the Levant between 1300 and 900 BCE, addressing, first, particular factors in the twelfth century BCE transition relevant to socio-politics, but ultimately advocating for a longue durée view of the historical phenomena involved. Pfoh’s main intention is to challenge the scholarly consensus that “a key change in socio-political structures occurred [in this period], marking a transition from territorial polities to ‘national’ or ethnic polities” (p. 64). Instead, he observes “the fundamental permanence, after the twelfth century crisis, of hierarchical territorial structures based on kinship and patronage in the Levant” (p. 64). In a refreshingly provocative paper that invites further discussion, Jeffrey P. Emanuel tackles the difficulty of differentiating between regular naval warfare and piracy in the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Age Mediterranean. On a more general level, this issue is an example of the larger historical and methodological problem of studying non-state, asymmetrical, or guerrilla warfare typical of the periods of deep transition and change. As such, this paper discusses one of the crucial historical factors influencing the fates of the North-Eastern Mediterranean in the period under scrutiny in this volume. Ann E. Killebrew deals with the interactions and interconnections between Cyprus and the southern Levant during the Early Iron Age. Challenging the traditional view of the the last two centuries of the second millennium BCE as “a period of societal breakdown following the disintegration of the great Late Bronze Age empires”, Killebrew has recourse to the results of recent excavations in the southern Levant and on Cyprus as well as to extensive provenience studies of ceramics and metals. The emerging picture is one of decentralized but regionally-connected polities
on Cyprus and the coastal Levant that survived and even flourished after the collapse of established socio-economic structures. Guy D. Middleton discusses the “Sea Peoples” and Aegean migrations at the end of the Late Bronze Age, arguing against “the ‘migrationist’ characterisation of the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age eastern Mediterranean – specifically the idea of a Mycenaean or Aegean migration to the southern Levant which saw the introduction of novel locally-produced Aegean cultural features” (p. 95). In yet another revisionist paper, Francisco J. Núñez offers an overview of the impact of the “Sea Peoples” in the central Levant and the socio-political and cultural repercussions for urban environments and explains the reasons for this particular situation, which are to be found, as he argues, in the fact that the gravitation point of the entire issue of the Sea Peoples in the Levant should be sought in events and circumstances that occurred in its northern part. Namely, “the issue in its entirety seems to have been a north to south phenomenon in which the battle [somewhere north of the Chekka cape, in north Lebanon] between Ramesses III and those foreign peoples changed the course of events and led to a new situation” (p. 128).

In an archaeological case-study, David Ben-Shlomo presents various aspects of change and continuity when studying pottery and terracottas in Philistia during the Early Iron Age. He observes a peculiar duality in the material culture of this region. Southern Levantine pottery and terracottas show clear signs of Aegean and Cypriote immigration as well as continuity of Canaanite traditions. He concludes that:

[T]he traditional view seeing the Philistine phenomenon as representing a group of people arriving from the west [...] to Philistia during the beginning of the 12th century BCE, and bringing various aspects of their material culture with them, can be maintained. Yet, the effect of this phenomenon on the local political scene of the southern Levant may have been more gradual and complex“ (p. 150)

In the same section, Aren M. Maeir presents a reassessment of “Philistine” material culture by reconsidering the extant archaeological evidence from sites thought to be Philistine, and relevant Egyptian iconography, and compares both to Biblical accounts of Philistines. He argues for a strongly ideological import of “early Israelite/Judahite foundation stories”. Teresa Bürge and Peter M. Fischer deal with regional and interregional contacts (trade, migration, hybridization etc.) between the Jordan valley and the eastern Mediterranean in the light of the Early Iron Age strata of the site of Tell Abu al-Kharaz. To round-off Part One of our volume, it may be instructive to quote some of the conclusions of this well-balanced paper (p. 179):

[…] it is clear that the settlers of early Iron Age Tell Abu al-Kharaz were influenced by the transformations in the 12th century BCE. Limited migration of individuals or families, which arrived from the Eastern Mediterranean through the Jezreel Valley, is suggested. These migrants mingled with the local population most likely by intermarriage, which explains the amalgamation of local and foreign traits in the material culture of many Phase IX contexts at Tell Abu al-Kharaz. This migration process might have lasted years, decades or even generations. Therefore, it is problematic to refer to these migrants as ‘Sea Peoples’, as the immigrants to Tell Abu al-Kharaz had already experienced cultural changes on their way to Transjordan due to the time lapse from their arrival at the Mediterranean littoral until they finally settled at Tell Abu al-Kharaz. However, these descendants, who represent one of the outcomes of the ‘Sea Peoples Phenomenon’, contributed to a rich, flourishing, well-organized and multi-cultural society at early Iron Age Tell Abu al-Kharaz.
Moving from the regionally-oriented and chronologically more focused studies of our Part One, the second part (“Cross-Cultural Approaches”) offers some broader cultural perspectives on the historical period studied in this book. Not inappropriately, it is hoped, some of the essays included in this section go well beyond the chronological scope of the volume to study far-reaching historical and cultural consequences of some of the phenomena involved. Some others study notoriously debatable and methodologically demanding historical issues originating from historical comparisons between the two geographical extremes of the North-Eastern Mediterranean, the Aegean and the Levant.

Jan Paul Crielaard studies the role of individuals with multiple identities dependent on cross-cultural contacts in the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age central and eastern Mediterranean, comparing them “to other individuals attested in the archaeological and textual records who seem to have possessed comparable positions in intercultural or transcultural situations of increasing interconnectivity” and thus highlighting “the possible role of [such] individuals in culture contacts” (p. 196) and exploring the phenomenon of cultural hybrids. Sarah Murray deals with eastern exotica on the Greek mainland in their immediate context with a view to go beyond their traditional, and elite-oriented archaeological interpretations. She argues that the largely ritual contexts and functions of many 13th through 10th century exotica may instead be indicative of “a variety of mechanisms, not only […] of economic or political exchange systems associated with the élite, but also […] of the movements of humble individuals, or in conjunction with non-local supernatural beliefs”. Thus, “imported exotica in the early Greek world may in some cases have served to provide individuals with an unseen superstitious or supernatural advantage rather than a socio-political one” (p. 228). In the same section, Giorgos Bourogiannis – by offering a lucid overview of the relevant material – deals with the problem of the transmission of the alphabet to the Aegean with a view to answer fundamental questions of “how, when and where the adoption of the alphabet by the Greeks took place” (p. 236). Vicky Vlachou discusses the imagery of funerary rituals and cult practices in the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean, arguing that “despite the strong influence of Egyptian and Near Eastern beliefs, Aegean funerary iconography embodies regional traditions and beliefs”. At the same time, the author stresses the workings of “the varying symbolic meanings that these images seem to adopt during each period, and the importance that is placed on the different parts of the rituals in order to better serve the needs and aspirations of the communities that are undergoing significant shifts and transformations of their own” (p. 272). In her essay, S. Rebecca Martin asks what we really know about the Levantine institution of the marzeah, a type of feast often associated with, or even studied as a model of, the Greek aristocratic banquet, or symposion. As far as the similarities, and hence conceivable historical links, between the Levantine and the Aegean commensal practices go, she argues that “the symposion and marzeah were only as much alike as any elite occasion that involved wine drinking” and therefore scholars “must seek the symposion’s origin stories elsewhere” and not, simplistically, in Levantine social practice (p. 303). This section of the book concludes with Gunnel Ekroth’s essay on holocaustic sacrifices, rituals where an entire animal was put into the fire, in ancient Greek religion and on their conceivable links to Levantine rituals. The author combines here archaeological, zooarchaeological, and written evidence for holocaustic sacrifices in the Greek Early Iron Age and historical periods (ca. 900-100 BC). After an exhaustive overview of the relevant Greek material and a sober discussion of possible contact between the Aegean and the
Levantine practitioners of holocaustic rituals, Ekroth’s concluding remarks, as in the case of the previous Part One, may be quoted to conclude this section of the volume as well (p. 322):

The similarities between the Greek burnt animal sacrifice, holocausts as well as *thysiai*, and the practices in the Levant are fascinating, but also pose methodological challenges. Are we to focus on the likenesses or the differences? We are clearly facing ritual actions, which in many ways are similar but which also diverge as to the execution and to the purposes and meanings. A holocaust of a bull in the temple at Jerusalem was undoubtedly something different from the holocaust of a piglet to a local Greek hero. And could there be a greater distinction in the perceptions of the divine, between the Greek gods, anthropomorphic in the full sense of the word, the almighty God of the Hebrew Bible? Even so, they were both really fond of sweet-smelling fatty smoke.

Part Three (“Linguistic Approaches”), much more systematic in its presentation of relevant material than the two previous ones, covers the field of interactions between the Levantine, Anatolian, and Aegean languages. The evidence of the interaction of Aegean and Levantine languages recognizable in the linguistic material of historical periods should in principle be one way of assessing the interaction of populations in the northeastern and eastern part of the Mediterranean. Such an approach is naturally not free of methodological pitfalls that must be taken into consideration when the results of linguistic analyses are used by non-specialists to support or disprove historical and archaeological generalisations regarding the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Age history of the North-Eastern Mediterranean.

In this section, Dariusz R. Piwowarczyk discusses the methods of dating the linguistic developments pertaining to the languages involved in the cultural transfers studied in this volume. In general, when studying such linguistic phenomena, one can a priori speak of a “triangle” of mutual linguistic relationships whose “angles” would be formed by Greek, Anatolian, and Semitic languages. Within this framework, Rafal Rosłól deals with Semitic influences in Greek, Paola Dardano with Semitic influences in Anatolian languages, Zsolt Simon with Anatolian influences in Greek, and Wilfred G.E. Watson with Anatolian influences in Semitic languages.

Besides presenting a polyphonic, and not smoothed or artificially consistent, version of Aegean-Levantine interconnectivity, the main novelty of this book is a fourth and final set of essays discussing new scientific approaches that transcend traditional multidisciplinary debates concerning the conflicting attitudes and, at times, conflicting methodologies of archaeology, history, and linguistic studies. Scientific studies can be groundbreaking, but their conclusions are sometimes ambiguous or difficult for non-specialists to understand. Scholars lacking the requisite methodological skills and field experience are sometimes prone to misunderstanding and misapplying technical studies.

Therefore, in the final Part Four of the volume (“Scientific Perspectives”), Maciej Chyleński, Marcin Grynberg, and Anna Juras present some prospects for approaching the problem of Late Bronze Age migrations in the Mediterranean, using ancient DNA. In the same section, Argyro Nafplioti tackles the hotly debated issue of using isotope ratio analysis as a tool for reconstructing past life histories.
The Editors of the volume can only hope that this book will find its way not only to the specialists interested in the historical period between ca. 1300 and 900 BCE, but also to the scholars grappling with methodological and theoretical problems involved in studying various aspects of pre-modern archaeology and cultural history.
Ahhiyawa - Danu(na). Aegean ethnic groups in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Light of Old and New Hieroglyphic-Luwian Evidence*

To the memory of Sergej R. Tokhtas’ev, a Teacher and a Friend

Rostislav Oreshko

The topic of the present contribution is two ethnic terms of likely Aegean origin specified in the title, which appear, in different guises, in written sources of the late 2nd and early 1st millennium BC across the entire Eastern Mediterranean, from Egypt in the South to the Levant to Cilicia in the North (besides the Aegean itself). ¹ My discussion of them will be, however, not quite the same. As for the first one, Ahhiyawa or Hiyawa, I will summarize the recent discussion revolving around recognition of this name in the Hieroglyphic-Luwian inscription KARATEPE, adding some details and placing it in a more general historical context. The second and central part of the paper will concern Danu(na), in which a full linguistic reassessment of this term and a revision of different sources which mention it will be offered. The third part will discuss the distinction between the two terms, also touching upon the problem of ethnolinguistic boundaries in Late Bronze Age Greece.

Part I. Ahhiyawa/Hiyawa²

The idea of Greek settlement in Plain Cilicia at some point at the end of 2nd (or in the early 1st) millennium BC, which has been distinctively present in the scholarly discourse since the 1930s, owes its coming into being to the Greek legendary tradition about colonization activities of the soothsayer Mopsos there. Paul Kretschmer was the first who took these accounts seriously and made an attempt to prove the veracity of the Greek tradition by philological and linguistic argumentation.³ He argued that the name of the country known from Assyrian sources as Qawe or Que and located in Plain Cilicia finally goes back to the form Ahhiyawa

* Although some parts of the paper go back to a much earlier time, the paper as a whole is written as a part of project ‘The Trojan Catalogue (Hom. II. 2.816-877) and the Peoples of western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age. A Study of the Homeric Text in the Light of Hittite Sources and Classical Geographical Tradition’ (2015/10/P/HS3/04161), which has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 665778 with the National Science Centre, Poland. I’m much indebted to Craig Melchert for improving the language of the paper; all the remaining infelicities remain, of course, solely my own responsibility.

¹ Initially I intended to include in the paper also a discussion on the origin of Palastina, a third ethnic term of likely Aegean origin, exploring the idea of identity of this name with that of Pelasgians. The subject required, however, an analysis of a quite different type of sources than those used in the case of Ahhiyawa and Danu(na) and it was finally decided to publish it elsewhere as a separate paper.

² The section summarizes and picks up the discussion which was initiated by Oreshko 2013 (but finally triggered by the publication of the ÇİNEKÖY bilingual thirteen years earlier (Tekoğlu, Lemaire 2000) and subsequently unfolded in (in chronological order) Hawkins 2015; Yakubovich 2015b; Oreshko 2015; Hawkins 2015; 2016; cf. also Simon 2015. For earlier literature not quoted below see Oreshko 2013: 19–20.

³ Kretschmer 1933; cf. further Kretschmer 1936.
which had been shortly before discovered in Hittite texts and was compared with one of
the Homeric appellations of the Greeks, Ἀχαιοι (<*Ἀχαιϝοι) “Achaeans”. In support he also
adduced a report of Herodotus according to which the people of Cilicia were earlier called
Ὑπαχαιοί (Hdt 7.91), literary “Sub-Achaeans”, but probably rather “Mix-Achaeans”. In the
next decade, excavations at the Early Iron Age fortress Karatepe in Cilicia brought to light
the famous Phoenician-Luwian bilingual (KARATEPE 1) in which the name of Mopsos
was identified (mpš in Phoenician and mu-ka-sa- in the Luwian part), 4 which brought about
a further corroboration that the Greek legends about Mopsos do contain a grain of truth.
However, the inscription has produced no evidence bearing on the problem of Ahhiyawa/
Achaeans. The name of the people inhabiting Cilicia was read in the Phoenician version of
the inscription as dnnym (nom.pl., generally vocalized as *Danunayim, for which s. below)
and as Adanawa (ā-TANA-wa/i-) in the Luwian part; both forms of the name were claimed
to be derived from the name of the capital city of the kingdom, Adana. 5 Rather unsystem-
atic archaeological work in Cilicia during the 20th century also failed to produce strong
evidence for settlement in the region of newcomers form the Aegean at the end of the 2nd
millennium BC, even if it left no doubt that some sort of contact did take place. 6 Due to a
combination of these factors, the idea of the Greek colonization of Cilicia gradually lost its
popularity towards the end of the 20th century. A new life was breathed into it by the publica-
tion of a new Phoenician-Luwian bilingual found in Cilicia in 2000 (the ÇİNEKÖY bilin-
gual). In this inscription, the local name of the people in the Luwian version is not Adanawa,
as in KARATEPE, but Hiyawā (hi-ia-wa/i-), although it corresponds to the same dnnym in
the Phoenician part. The form Hiyawā looks exactly like an aphaeretic (i.e. with apocope of
the initial a-) form of Ahhiyawa and has perfectly fitted into Kretschmers reconstruction.
Furthermore, a very close form of the name, Hiyawī (alternating with Hiyāu), came to light
a few years later with the publication of two letters from Ugarit written in Akkadian, in a
context with Lukka/Lycia which made it quite likely that under Hiyawā is meant the same
people/country which the Hittite texts refer to as Ahhiyawa, i.e. (the land of) the Mycenaean
Greeks. 7 This evidence tilted the balance again in favor of the idea of Greek settlement
in Cilicia at the end of the 2nd millennium BC and the derivation of the name Que from
Ahhiyawa, although an interpretation of Hiyawā as an indigenous Anatolian toponym still
finds its advocates.

However, an important corollary of the discovery in the ÇİNEKÖY bilingual of the form
Hiyawā was initially overlooked: it undermined the idea that Phoenician and Luwian ethnic
designations of the population of Cilicia should necessarily correspond to each other pho-
netically, suggesting that the long-established reading of ā-TANA-wa/i- as Adanawa in the
Luwian part of KARATEPE – which heavily relied on the Phoenician form dnnym – may

4 For the most recent edition of the inscription see Hawkins 2000: 45–68 (pp. 51, 56 for the attestations of
Mopsos).
5 See below (Part II) for literature and a detailed discussion.
6 For a general overview of the excavated sites in Cilicia with abundant bibliography see Symington
2006-2008. Aegean or “Aegeanizing” ceramic of the LH IIIC period has been brought to light by exca-
vations of only a few sites in the south-western parts of Cilicia, from which only Tarsus and Soli
deserve special mention, and in the course of surveys in the Adana plain (notably Kazanlı), but its
quantity is rather modest (cf. Jean 2003). A more or less representative ceramic set with Aegean links
has been retrieved only at Tarsus (more than 800LH IIIC sherds, see French 1975, and more recently
7 See discussion in Singer 2006a, esp. pp. 250–252 with further references.
be false. Arguments for a re-reading of á-TANA-wa/i- as á-hi(ya)-wa/i- were first presented in Oreshko 2013 and further elaborated by Yakubovich 2015b and Oreshko 2015, following publication of Hieroglyphic-Luwian inscriptions ARSUZ 1 and 2 which shed new light on the issue. Below I recapitulate the arguments presented there, specifying them and adding some further observations.

The form Hiyawa instead of Adanawa is not the only feature which proved to be different in ÇİNEKÖY in comparison with KARATEPE. Two names found elsewhere with initial a- appear in ÇİNEKÖY in aphaeretic forms: Suri(ya)- instead of Asura/i- “Assyria” (found e.g. KARKAMIŞ A15b, §19) and Warika- instead of Awariku- (found in KARATEPE, §2). The forms Hiyawa, Suri(ya)- and Warika form thus a clear pattern and aphaeresis may be defined as a specific feature of ÇİNEKÖY distinguishing it from KARATEPE, whatever is the underlying reason.8 Given this fact, a question is justified why we have in KARATEPE not the form Hiyawa with initial a-, i.e. Ah(h)iyawa, but Adanawa instead. The latter name is strikingly close to the expected form, coinciding with it in the initial and final part; only the middle part of the name is different, the part which is rendered in the hieroglyphic spelling of the name by only one sign, L.429. This similarity of Ahhiyawa and Adanawa looks suspicious, and the question if all is right with the reading of L.429 as <tana> is in order. Looking into the matter, one finds out that there is little firm evidence to offer in favor of this reading, as the sign is attested only in the writing of this very geographical name; to the KARATEPE attestations the evidence of ARSUZ 1 (§11) can now be added, in which the sign appears to function as a logogram rendering the same name on its own. In fact, the value <tana> has been initially established solely on the basis of internal evidence of KARATEPE, namely on the fact that in rendering á-*429-wa/i- the Phoenician text oscillates between ’mq ’dn and dnn(y)(m), both of which were thought to reflect, in different ways, the name of Adana. However, it is precisely the idea that the Phoenician and Luwian forms have to exactly phonetically correspond to each other that has been undermined by the evidence of ÇİNEKÖY. If we dismiss the Phoenician forms from the discussion and rely instead on the clues provided by the Luwian part of ÇİNEKÖY, we have to read L.429 not <tana> but as <hiya>, obtaining thus the name of Ahhiyawa in KARATEPE. This reading of the sign is based, however, not only on theoretical reasoning. There can be adduced four sets of evidence supporting it: 1) structural evidence concerning the phonetic and graphic shape of the sign; 2) the evidence of KARATEPE; 3) the evidence of SÜDBURG; 4) the evidence of the newly published ARSUZ inscriptions.

1. Structural evidence:
The phonetic sequence /tana/ (or /dana/) is a trivial one for Luwian and is spelled with two usual signs (<ta>, <tá> or <tà> plus <na>) elsewhere in the Hieroglyphic-Luwian corpus. If the sign were to read <tana>, it would be strange not to find it elsewhere. In contrast, besides

---

8 Aphaeresis in the Luwian dialect of Cilicia was most probably a linguistic reality (and not just a scribal convention), which is supported on the one hand by appearance of the form Hiyawī in cuneiform (cf. above) and, on the other hand, by existence of this phenomenon in other 1st millennium BC dialects of southern Anatolia (the Pamphylian dialect of Greek, Lycian and possibly Carian). However, it seems extremely unlikely that only some dialects of Cilicia had this feature while some others did not. The non-aphaeretic forms of KARATEPE may then be explained as corrected or archaizing spellings of the geographical and personal names, while those of ÇİNEKÖY reflect the phonetic reality of the second half of the 8th century BC.
CINEKÖY, the combination /hiya/ is found only once in the corpus (a personal name la-hi-ia- in KULULUL lead strip 3, reg. 1).

Graphically, the sign L.429 can be explained as a late form of L.306, a sign attested only on the monuments of the Empire period and traditionally read as <hi> (cf. fig. 2, (a) below). The usual form of L.429 found in KARATEPE (cf. fig. 2, (e)), appears to represent the last stage of a long simplification (or a “geometrization”) process in the course of which all elements of the sign were reduced to circles/dots and lines. The form of <hi> attested on a sealing from Emir (ME 30c) exemplifies a transitional phase of this process. Moreover, the form of L.429 found in ARSUZ 1 now corroborates this explanation (see below). It is also noteworthy that the name Lahiya- is spelled as la-hi in the Empire period.

2. Evidence of KARATEPE

Traditional perception of the phonetic spelling á-ta-na-wa/i- (URBS) found in KARATEPE §37 as merely a variant of á-*429-wa/i- (URBS) cannot be upheld. In fact, the evidence of the passage, if examined carefully, speaks rather against the reading of L.429 as TANA: there can be no good reason offered why the scribe would spell the name nine(!) times in the sign L.429 in the preceding text and then, right in the middle of a sentence, would suddenly switch over to a different spelling to write it the tenth and the last time. In fact, the juxtaposition of á-ta-na/wa/i-za (URBS) TERRA+LA+LA-za “plain of Adana” and á-*429-wa/i- (URBS) can be much better explained as aimed at contrasting a name of the people and that of the region or, as proposed by Yakubovich,9 a name of a political entity and a geographical designation. Elsewhere in the text, this contrast does not play any crucial role and one could freely use á-*429-wa/i- (URBS) both in geographical (= ’mq ’dn) and in an ethnical/political (= dny(m)) sense.

An indirect supportive argument comes also from observations on the name Adana. As pointed out by Yakubovich,10 Adanawa is basically an artificial form extracted from á-*429-wa/i- (URBS), since the name of the city, as attested in non-Luwian sources, was Adaniya or Adana.11 Once the connection of á-*429-wa/i- (URBS) with Adana is dismissed, the only remaining attestation of the latter toponym in KARATEPE §37, á-ta-na-wa/i-za (URBS), can be naturally analyzed as adana-wan-za, i.e. root + ethnic suffix -wan(a/i)+ particle -sa. This analysis produces the entirely expected Luwian form of the name Adana.

9 Yakubovich 2015b: 57.
11 Besides Phoen. ’dn, the name is attested in Hittite (Adaniya, see del Monte, Tischler 1978, s.v. Atanija), in Ugaritic (adny, recently found in RS 94.2405, see Bordreuil, Pardee 2004), in Greek (Adana), in eastern Armenian and in modern Turkish (Adana). It is noteworthy that the material adduced by Laroche (1958: 267–268) to substantiate the existence of the form Adanawa is simply irrelevant. The evidence does suggest a variation between stems in -uwa- and -a-, as in Ankulluwa-/Ankuwa-, and in -iya- and -a-, as in the case of Adaniya-/Adana-. However, there is not a single example showing variation between -awa- and -a-. As for the character of the dental in the stem, I do not see any evidence supporting Yakubovich’s rendering of the name as /addana-/ (Yakubovich 2015a: 28 and 2015b: 57). All external sources give no hint whatsoever that a process of fortization or devoicing of the dental has ever taken place here. Nor is the writing of the name with the sign <ta>, which in the early texts of Karkamish tends to render the fortis dental, diagnostic for the texts from Cilicia. Moreover, there are good reasons to think that the writing with <ta> goes back to the Empire period practice (cf. below).
3. Evidence of SÜDBURG

Furthermore, there is every reason to think that there is another Hieroglyphic-Luwian attestation of the name of Adana in a much earlier text. In the edition of the Empire period inscription SÜDBURG, Hawkins tentatively suggested that ta-NEG(URBS) (or ta-nā(URBS)) could stand for Adana, noting, however, that the geographical context – appearance in conjunction with TONITRUS.URBS.REGIO, identified by him as Tarhuntassa – is problematic for this identification. However, detailed reconsideration of all the evidence concerning TONITRUS.URBS.REGIO shows that this name refers rather to the south-eastern parts of Anatolia or, still likelier, to northern Syria. This identification proves to be much more in accordance with the identification of ta-nā(URBS) as Adana. The absence of the initial a- can be explained as a purely graphical phenomenon. The appearance of the name in SÜDBURG is significant from two points of view. First, it demonstrates once again that the Luwian form of the name had no fancy wa-extension. The second implication harks back to the structural argument discussed above under (a). The name is written with two normal phonetic signs (the usage of nā can be considered normal for SÜDBURG), not with a special logogram. In view of the fact that SÜDBURG heavily uses logographic writings and phonetic signs with complex values (as, for example, <hana>), this strongly implies that, once a sign with the putative value <tana> were available, it would be used in the name of Adana, which is, however, not the case.

4. Evidence of the ARSUZ inscriptions

The text of two almost identical inscriptions found in 2007 in Arsuz, located on the south-eastern coast of the İskenderun bay, mentions both hi-ia-wa-(REGIO) (§13) and a city/country whose name is rendered solely by the sign L.429 (§11). It is clear that some sort of military confrontation is described in this part of the text, but the phrasing is atypical and the exact course of events and the number of participants is not immediately obvious. This uncertainty opened up a possibility to argue either against the identity of hi-ia-wa-(REGIO) and *429-(REGIO), or in favor of it. However, the issue can be solved by a careful examination of the text directly on the stone, namely the partly broken line 3 in ARSUZ 2 which contains the name of the country at the beginning of §11. Even if the major part of the name is broken, it is not difficult to see that the sequence of signs cannot be the same as *429-sa-pa-wa/i-mu(REGIO) in ARSUZ 1: first, the first partly broken sign of

12 Hawkins 1995: 42.
13 In Oreshko 2016: 250–262 I argued that TONITRUS.URBS.REGIO may conceal a name of the land known from cuneiform sources as Kizzuwadna or Kummanni. However, due to the change of interpretation of some other elements of the text, I’m now much more skeptical about this interpretation; a more cogent solution seems to be at present to see in TONITRUS.URBS a reference to the main north-Syrian ‘city of the Storm-God’, Aleppo, and in TONITRUS.URBS.REGIO, accordingly, a reference to Northern Syria. The arguments for this interpretation will be elaborated in the revised edition of the book, now in preparation.
14 Note also the usage of the same TA-sign (<ta>) in both ta-nā(URBS) and in a-ta-na(URBS) in KARATEPE.
15 Two versions of the text use different determinatives: ARSUZ 1 uses URBS, while ARSUZ 2 uses REGIO.
16 For the text and translation see Dinçol et al. 2015: 64–65.
the name has a clearly visible semicircular upper-right edge, a feature reminiscent of "<hi>" or "<sa>", but incompatible with the shape of *429; second, the nom.sg. ending -<sa> stands not below the first sign, as is the case in *429-<sa>-<hi>, but to the left of it, which means that the name should have been written with at least three signs (including nom.sg. ending -<sa>). The picture, which might seem otherwise puzzling, can be easily explained, if one proceeds from the assumption that *429-(REGIO) in ARSUZ 1 conceals Hiyawa-: the first broken sign in ARSUZ 2 is "<hi>" and the signs lost in the gap are "<ia>" and "<wa/i>". In other words, one has in §11 of ARSUZ 2 an alternative – purely phonetic – spelling of the name found further in §13 of both inscriptions. This results in the interpretation of §§11-13 as: “The land Hiyawa put me to the spear, so I rose up (SUPER+<ra/i> CRUS-) and (then) routed also (-<ha>) the land Hiyawa”. It is noteworthy that the structure of this passage closely corresponds to that of the preceding section (§§7-10), which describes one single event – suppression of an uprising in “this city”, apparently Arsuz/Rhosos itself – and follows the scheme: “negative event – rising up (SUPER+<ra/i> CRUS-) – victory”. In fact, the section §§7-10 makes it quite obvious that SUPER+<ra/i> CRUS- refers to the onset of a counter-attack and not to a victory, from which it follows that §§11-12 cannot represent a separate passage and should be taken together with §13, which once again – now on the text-structural level – proves the identity of *429-(URBS/REGIO) and hi-ia-wa/i-(REGIO). The enclitic -<ha> (“also”) following the name of Hiyawa in §13 has to be taken, accordingly, in a wider sense as connecting two passages §§7-10 and §§11-13 and possibly picks up “<i>-<ti>-i” in §10 which can be interpreted as “first” (rather than “at once”).

ARSUZ 1 has also provided confirmation of the idea tentatively expressed in Oreshko 2013 that the fuller phonetic value of *429 might be hiyawa (possibly derived from the Luwian word for “rain”, hēu-/hēyaw- in Hittite), as the sign is used here on its own to render the entire name. 20 This logographic value of the sign explains why the Empire period sign

18 Hawkins 2016: 26 is right in pointing that my drawing proposing a restoration of the signs in the gap (Oreshko 2015: 124) is not quite correct, as it does not properly take into consideration the fact that the signs should have been situated on two different sides of the stele. However, this does not change the situation significantly. First, there is enough space for "<hi>", if we take into consideration that the scribe could have used not the broad variant of the sign found in hi-ia-wa/i-(REGIO) in line 4, but its more compact variant found in the writing of the verb hi-nu-wa/i-a little further in the same line. Second, the three signs "<hi>-<ia>-<wa/i>” can indeed be accommodated in a single column – especially if we count with the more compact variant of "<hi>” as the scribe regularly does this in the same line of the inscription: cf. the groups "<wa/i>-<mu>-<ta>, "<na>-PONERE-<wa/i>” or "<ru>-<wa/i>-<i>”. This is a more plausible variant of the restoration. On the other hand, contra Hawkins, there is at least one case when the sign straddles from the one side of the stele to the other and it is just the sign "<wa/i>” in ARSUZ 1, line 4, the first “square” of the sign "<wa/i>” which follows PONERE-<wa/i>-<ta> (making part of the particle chain "<a-<wa/i>-<ta>” is written immediately near "<ta>” on the one side, while the “stroke” and the second “square” of the sign are put on the next side (which is seen quite well on the photo and could be confirmed during my autopsy of the text in the Antakya museum in June 2017). So, the restoration I proposed in Oreshko 2015 is not completely excluded (with slight modifications), but still is less likely.

19 ARSUZ 1: §§: za-sa-pa-wa/i-mu URBS+MA/I PES,PES(-)tara/i-ta §§: *a-wa/i-mu-tá (DEUS) TONITRUS [MANUS-tara/i-na ]PONERE-wa/i-ta §9: a-<wa/i> SUPER+<ra/i> CRUS-ha §10: *a-wa/i-tá “<i>-<ti>-i ara/i” INFRA-tá CAPERE-ha “This city revolted (against) me, and the Storm-God put (his) hand (upon) me, and I rose up and suppressed it first”.

20 Hawkins’s assertion (2016: 27) that this value should somehow conflict with the assumed value "<hi(ya)>" is based on some misunderstanding. <Hiyawa> is a logographic value of the sign, while "<hi(ya)>" is a phonetic value derived from it acrophonically, which is, of course, a normal practice in Hieroglyphic-Luwian. Moreover, there is nothing strange in the possibility of usage of the same sign in both values,
<hi> was preserved only in the writing of this very city name. In contrast, the rendering of the sign as (A)TANA in Dinçol et al. 2015 is an ad hoc solution, which, furthermore, simply ignores the question why allegedly the same name has an additional -wa- in KARATEPE. Lastly, ARSUZ 1 also produced evidence supporting the development of the sign *429 from the Empire period *306 (<hi>). A careful examination of the details of *429 in l. 4 of ARSUZ 1 (see fig. 1) reveals that the sign represents something other than merely a crude form of the main KARATEPE variety of the sign, as it is rendered in the drawing by H. Peker.21 Unlike the KARATEPE variety, the sign in ARUSUZ 1 has no rotational symmetry; this is due to the fact that its middle horizontal line is situated somewhat lower than the horizontal axis of the sign (which is easy to check turning the sign 90°). Second, the horizontal lines are somewhat slenderer and are rendered in lower relief than the vertical ones; the bulges (and not “dots”) clearly make part of the vertical elements.

Figure 1. Sign *429 in ARSUZ 1 (drawing by the author)

As a result, the sign seems to represent something like three vertical posts with bulges/ knots which are connected by three thick lines. The similarity of the general structure of the sign with that of <hi> becomes now even more perceptible (note especially the KARGA variant, fig. 2, b) and the sign can be naturally integrated into the sign evolution scheme proposed earlier as a further transitional form:

Figure 2. Presumable evolution of L.306 = L.429 = <hi(ya)> = PLUVIUM (hiyawa-)

cf., e.g. the case of VIR used as logogram for zida/i- “man” and its phonetic value <zi> or BONUS as a logogram for wāsu- “good” (actually, an ideogram for any notion associated with “goodness”) and its phonetic value <wā/i>. To transliterate the name in KARATEPE as ā-hi(ya)-wa/i- or as ā-hiyawaaw/i- or as ā-PLUVIUM-wa/i- is a matter of taste; the first one, as the simplest, seems to be preferable. 21 See Dinçol et al. 2015: 61 (fig. 2).
In sum, the interpretation of the sign *429 as <hi(ya)>/<hiyawa> results in a perfectly coherent picture. In contrast, the old reading <tana> is more or less directly disproved by a number of factors and, as noted, its sole foundation (correspondence of á-*429-wa/i-(REGIO) to the Phoen. dnny(m)) is discredited by the evidence of ÇINEKÖY. Identification of Ahhiyawa in KARATEPE, in conjunction with the evidence of ÇINEKÖY, ARSUZ and external sources, allows the following conclusions to be drawn:

(a) The only name of the Early Iron Age polity in Plain Cilicia was Hiyawa, which appears as Qawe, Que or Quaya in Assyrian, as Hume in Babylonian, and as Quh in Hebrew and Aramaic sources. The name goes back to Ahhiyawa, a name under which the Hittites knew the Mycenaean Greeks (< *Ἀχαιϝόι) and their land.22

(b) The form *Adanawa is a phantom, as it does not correspond to the name of any geographical, political or ethnic entity in the region. The name of the capital city of the country was Adana (and earlier Adaniya), as attested both in external sources and in Luwian inscriptions themselves. The city – or more precisely “the metropolitan region” – does play some role in KARATEPE, as an inscription discussing local matters, but there is no evidence that the name was ever used to designate the region in general or its population.

This result does not radically change the existing picture, but still is quite important. It proves that the Greek tradition about colonization activities of Mopsos does reflect memories about real migration and settlement of the Achaean Greeks in Cilicia, presumably at some point after the fall of the Hittite Empire in the first quarter of the 12th century BC. This constitutes an important piece of still not so abundant textual evidence concerning Aegean presence in the Eastern Mediterranean in the late 2nd millennium BC. Moreover, together with Philistia in southern Canaan and Palistina/Walistina in the Amuq plain, the case of Cilician (Ah)hiyawa establishes a clear pattern: all three regions bear names derived from the respective ethnica of Aegean origin. This pattern not only bolsters the whole concept of the Aegean settlement in the region, but also gives a possibility of using a comparative approach, both in analyzing cultural developments in the respective regions and in investigating the origin of the migrants. However, the conclusions reached above have also a more immediate consequence. Downgrading of Adana from the position of a settlement eponymous for a whole region and the people inhabiting it to that of an ordinary even if still locally important city calls for a reassessment of the complex issue associated with dnny(m), an ethnic name which was, since its discovery in the Phoenician part of KARATEPE, almost universally associated with Adana.

Part II. Dnny(m) – Danuna – d3-jnjw(-n3)

1. Identity of dnny(m) – Danuna – d3-jnjw(-n3)

When the form dnny(m) emerged in the Phoenician part of the newly discovered KARATEPE bilingual in 1947, two very similar names were already known from other sources: Danuna mentioned in Amarna letter EA 151, later discovered also in another Akkadian text (KBo
Aegean ethnic groups in the Eastern Mediterranean

(31)

28.25), on the one hand, and $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ (or $d3$-$jn$jw), usually rendered as Denyen, figuring in Egyptian texts as one of the “Sea Peoples”, on the other. If the cuneiform evidence was of little help for establishing the identity of the people or the location of their land,23 providing, however, a good idea of vocalization of the name, the identity of the $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ suggested a connection with the Aegean and, consequently, a possibility of seeing in them the Δαναοί, a recurrent designation of the Greeks in general – in interchange with Χανισφηνοί and the somewhat rarer Αργεῖοι – in the Homeric poems.24 In the second preliminary report on Karatepe, in which only the Phoenician part of the bilingual was discussed, H. Bossert still tentatively considered the possibility of identification of $dnny(m)$ with Δαναοί.25 However, his subsequent work on the text, including now also the Luwian part, made him change his opinion and connect $dnny(m)$ with the name of Adana which, as already mentioned, appears several times in the Phoenician part as ‘$dn$.’26 This idea was later elaborated by E. Laroche and since then has achieved a nearly universal acceptance.27 M. Forlanini seems to be the only dissenting voice, defending the view that $dnny(m)$ of KARATEPE has its origin in the ethnic name of Δαναοί.28

The equation $dnny(m) = Danuna = d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$, the phonetical side of which raises no serious doubts, in combination with the seemingly certain connection of this name with Cilicia, resulted in a rather paradoxical picture. On the one hand, one had to admit that the home-land of the “Sea People” $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ was Cilicia.29 This conclusion proves to be in blatant contradiction with several strands of evidence. First, as unequivocally suggested by the combined evidence of the Egyptian, Ugaritic and Hittite sources, Cilicia, as a part of the Hittite Empire in the early 12th century BC, should be one of the target lands of the Sea People’s raids and not its source. Second, Papyrus Harris I explicitly states that the $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ come from “their islands” ($m$ $n3$.$j.sn$ $jw.w$),30 under which only the islands of the Aegean and, possibly, those of the central Mediterranean can be meant. Moreover, this statement is corroborated by the evidence of the reliefs of Medinet-Habu: here the appearance of $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ demonstrates no perceptible differences with that of the Philistians, in the Aegean origin of whom there is no serious doubt. On the other hand, a fusion of the two views – that

23 Thus contra Simon 2015, who argued that the Amarna attestation is compatible only with a Levantine location of Danuna (for a discussion s. below).

24 The identification of $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ with Δαναοί, going back to 19th century, is one of the most widely accepted identifications, even if, due to the peculiar nature of the evidence on the “Sea Peoples”, it is still not infrequently cited with some caution, cf. Luckenbill 1914: 92–93; Schachermeyr 1938; Stadelmann 1984: 816 (with further references).

25 See Bossert, Alkım 1947: 29–30. The connection of $dnny(m)$ with Δαναοί was also argued for by some other scholars, most notably by Albright 1950 and Kretschmer 1949; cf. also Laroche 1958: 263 with fn. 1 and Simon 2015: 392, fn. 8.


28 Forlanini 2005: 111–119; cf. also Forlanini 2012: 136–137. Note, however, that also Tekoğlu-Lemaire 2000: 982, who seem to take an agnostic position on the question of the origin of $dnny(m)$, and recently Simon 2015, who argues against the connection of $dnny(m)$ with Adana and recognizes the Aegean origin of the ethnonym, without, however, taking a stance on its etymology.


the name Danuna (= \(dnny(m) = d3-jn\jw-n3\)) is derived from the name of Adana, but is still to be connected with \(\Delta\nu\alpha\omicron\omicron\) – gave rise to an even more fantastic idea: that the name of the epic Greeks is derived from the name of the Cilician city.\(^{31}\) Needless to say, there is not a shred of historical evidence of any kind which might support such a derivation. The connection of the “Sea People” Danuna (“Denyen”) with Adana and Cilicia runs thus counter to practically every piece of historical evidence concerning this people; the possibility to revise the philological and linguistic foundations of the hypothesis is welcome indeed.

The re-interpretation of \(\dot{a}*-\dot{a}h(i)(y)a-\text{wa/i}-(\text{URBS})\) as \(\dot{a}h(i)(y)a-\text{wa/i}-(\text{URBS})\) undermines one of the main foundations on which the derivation of \(dnny(m)\) from \(\text{’dn}\) is based. As the Luwian name is not derived from the name of the capital city, but represents an old ethnonym brought from the Aegean, there is actually no reason to think that this would be any different in Phoenician. There remain two arguments which were used to demonstrate the connection between \(dnny(m)\) and \(\text{’dn}\): the alternation between \(dnny(m)\) and \(\text{’mq }\text{’dn}\) in rendering the Luwian *Adanawa and the possibility to present a cogent explanation of the relationship between the two forms. As for the first one, it practically loses its force when one separates \(\dot{a}h(i)(y)a-\text{wa/i}-(\text{URBS})\) from a-ta-na-(URBS): in fact, in six out of eight cases \(\dot{a}h(i)(y)a-\text{wa/i}-(\text{URBS})\) corresponds to \(dnny(m)\) (§§3, 4, 6, 24, 31, 36) and the only attestation of a-ta-na-(URBS) corresponds to \(\text{’dn}\) (§36); only in two cases \(\dot{a}h(i)(y)a-\text{wa/i}-(\text{URBS})\) corresponds to \(\text{’mq }\text{’dn}\) (§§5 and 32) and in both cases the context is indifferent about the distinction ethnonym vs. toponym.\(^{32}\) The evidence does not imply free interchangeability of \(\text{’mq }\text{’dn}\) and \(dnny(m)\), nor does it in any way suggest a linguistic affinity between the two terms. As for the linguistic side of the connection, both Bossert and Laroche assumed that the stem \(dnn-\) (= Danuna) goes back to the Luwian adjective \(adanawana/i-\) which underwent an apocope of the initial \(a-\) (aphaeresis) and a contraction of \(-awa- > -u-\). Despite its formal ingenuity, the idea contains several internal inconsistencies.\(^{33}\) First and foremost, Danuna is attested in cuneiform as early as ca. 1350 BC, in the time when Cilicia was known under the name Kizzuwadna (or Kummanni) and Adana was nothing more than an ordinary town and not the capital of the region.\(^{34}\) It is hardly possible to imagine how the name of a second-rate town could be adopted in the Levant to refer to the population of the whole region. Second, both in the cuneiform texts and in Phoenician \(dnn-/\text{Danuna}\) is not an adjective, but a noun, a country name, which is made obvious by the fact that, in order to denote the people of the country, it should be used in the form of a \(n\text{isbe}\) (adjectival formation) \(dnny-\).\(^{35}\) The claim that Danuna results from the adoption of the Luwian adjective \(adanawana/i-\) implies that some neighboring people of the Levant heard for some reason first not the root form of the city name but its derivative and, what is worse, were unable to realize and correct this later. Either assumption looks highly dubious. To the best of my knowledge, there is not a single


\(^{32}\) In §5 an extension of the territory of the kingdom is reported which is termed as “Ahhiyawan territory” (\(\dot{a}h(i)(y)a-\text{wa/i}-(\text{URBS})\) TERRA+LA1+LA2(-)wa/i+ra/i-) and as “territory of the Adana plain” (rṣ \(\text{’mq }\text{’dn}\)). Similarly, §32 reports about an extension of the kingdom’s borders which are termed as \(\dot{a}h(i)(y)a-\text{wa/i-}n\text{-zi}-(\text{URBS})\) FINES+hi-zi “Ahhiyawan frontiers” vs. “frontiers of the Adana plain” (gbl ‘mq ‘dn). These are in part discussed by Simon 2015. However, the solution proposed there – to separate cuneiform Danuna from \(dnny(m)\) – looks quite unconvincing. For a further discussion s. below.

\(^{34}\) For the most recent discussion of the historical geography of Kizzuwadna see Forlanini 2013.

\(^{35}\) If the root is vocalized as Danuna, the plural form \(dnnym\) should sound like /\text{danun(a)-(y)īm/} < /\text{dannun(a)-lyyīm}/; see e.g., Krahmalkov 2001: 148–149.
other example from the Amarna correspondence or from texts from Syria which corroborates the possibility of such misinterpretation: hundreds of toponyms appear there in their normal root forms. The idea of misinterpretation appears to be all the more incredible as the name of Adana was known in the Levant in its entirely normal form ‘dny (i.e. Adaniya), as shown by its attestation in the letter form Ugarit mentioned above (note 11). Third, the two alleged “corruptions” of the form adanawana/i- > Danuna (the loss of a- and the contraction -awa- > -u-) are found already in the earliest attestation. This means that the concept of “phénicien tardif et vulgaire” adduced by Laroche36 to explain the not quite trivial phonetic changes cannot work by definition. Neither is there any evidence to confirm a possibility of aphaeresis in a Semitic language of the Levant in the 2nd millennium BC.37 But even if one excludes cuneiform Danuna from the picture, it would hardly change the argument significantly: the intruders from the Aegean d3-jnjw-n3 are mentioned in the Egyptian sources already about 1180 BC (the 8th year of the reign of Ramses III), i.e. much earlier than the imaginary “phénicien tardif et vulgaire”; on the other hand, the later evidence of KARATEPE shows that Adana was known in its normal form and was clearly distinct from dnny(m). In sum, the derivation of the ethnic name dnny(m) from the name of Adana represents something quite different from a cogent linguistic argument. As this association strongly contradicts historical evidence concerning dnny(m) and d3-jnjw-n3, it should be dismissed, and the similarity of dnny(m) and ’dn taken as simply accidental, which would hardly look so surprising, if one takes into consideration that the phonetic sequence (voiced) dental-vowel-nasal (-dVn-) is probably one of the most frequent ones in languages of the word.38

The possibility of chance similarity can likewise not be excluded for the alternative connection of Danuna with Homeric Δαναιoi. However, possible Aegean origin of the ethnicon, already strongly implied by the Egyptian sources, now obtains a strong support from the KARATEPE correspondence dnny(m) = å-hi(ya)-wa/i-(URBS), which is indeed strikingly reminiscent of the Homeric correspondence Δαναιoi ~ Αχαιοι. Interpretation of the dnny(m)-Danuna as a term referring to a part of the Late Bronze Age Aegean population (“Greeks”) would bring historical and linguistic facts into a perfect agreement. There is, however, a formal difficulty which prevents a complete and unrestricted identification of Danuna with Δαναιοι: the presence of an additional element -na in the former. Even if the problem is to a degree mitigated by the fact that Egyptian texts know the ethnicon both with and without this element (d3-jnjw-n3 and d3-jnjw, s. in detail below), the absence of a plausible linguistic explanation of the difference still may give rise to scruples about the connection.39 A solution of this problem is offered by the new Hieroglyphic-Luwian evidence

36 Laroche 1958: 266.
37 For a more detailed criticism of the aphaeresis in Danuna see Simon 2015: 392–394.
38 Based on the phonetic similarity, it would be equally possible to fancy a connection of Danuna with virtually everything from the name of the river Don/Tanais, to the Indian race of divine beings Danava, to the Danes, to the Chinese Tang dynasty, to the Irish goddess Danu and Tuatha Dē Danann, to the Burmese Danu, to the native American Na-Dené and to Denver. A connection with the Dúnedain of the Middle-Earth might also be pondered upon.
39 It is noteworthy that earlier a number of comparisons were proposed to explain this element. Cf. O’Callaghan 1949: 195: “Anatolian termination -na”; Albright 1950: 172: “gentilic ending -na […] well attested in Hittite cuneiform sources”, which, as he thought, might be identical with the suffix seen in Lyc. Tlânna “Tloon” and with “familiar Greek” -ᾱνός, -ηνός frequently found in the toponyms of western Anatolia; Goetze 1962: 52 saw in Danuna a Hurrian toponym composed of the stem tan(u)- “do, make” and plural article -na; Astour 1965: 46 compared the suffix of Danuna with a Semitic gentilic
concerning the companions of the Danuna in the sea-borne enterprises at the end of the Late Bronze Age: the Philistines.

2. The Northern Palastina and the Origin of the Nasal Suffix.

Two new hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions discovered during the seasons of 2003–2005 on the citadel of Aleppo (ALEPPO 6 and 7) unexpectedly highlighted the significance of the Early Iron Age kingdom of Palastin(a/i) or Walastin(a/i) (for the final vowel s. below) long known from several other inscriptions under the name WaDasatini.\(^40\) The ARSUZ inscriptions, already discussed above, once again confirmed the significance of the land. Given the spatial distribution of the inscriptions mentioning this land, it represented one of the most significant political formations of Early Iron Age Syria, comprising at least the whole Amuq plain and the territories up to Meharde-Sheizar in the south, up to ‘Azaz (Hazaz mentioned in Assyrian sources) in the north and, possibly, up to Aleppo in the east.\(^41\) The discovery in the Aleppo inscriptions of the form with initial <pa> and the improved reading of the second sign in the land name (<la/i> and <lá/i> instead of earlier <ta> and <ta> respectively)\(^42\) has made the phonetic similarity of Palastin(a/i) with the name of Philistines quite manifest and led to the ingenious assumption that this land, like Palestine itself, has taken its name from the ethnic name of another (“northern”) group of the migrants who came to the Levant and Egypt from the Aegean at the end of the Late Bronze Age.\(^43\) This assumption finds ample corroboration in the archaeological material. Recently renewed work in the Amuq plain and especially at Tell Tayinat, which conceals the remains of the kingdom’s capital (Kinalua), has brought abundant new evidence for the presence here in the Early Iron Age (Amuq Phase N, ca. 1200-1000 BC) of material culture with clear Aegean links, such as painted pottery of the LH CIII:1 and loom-weights of the Mycenaean type produced locally.\(^44\) The evidence has, however, not only a historical dimension. The form in which the land name is attested also allows for an important insight into the language of the Aegean new-comers to be made.

suffix frequently used in personal names. With the exception of “Greek” -ᾱνός, -ηνός (which has, however, nothing to do either with a “gentilic ending -na” or with the Luwic ethnic suffix -wana/i- seen in Tlãnna, s. below), none of these comparisons produce a convincing explanation of the morphology and meaning of Danuna.

\(^40\) Hawkins 2000: 365–367 (TELL TAYINAT 1) and 415–419 (MEHARDE and SHEIZAR). For the new inscriptions from the Aleppo temple see Hawkins 2011: 35–54.

\(^41\) Cf. Hawkins 2000: 362; 2009: 169–170; 2011: 51. The evidence of Taita’s inscriptions found in Aleppo in a temple context should be, however, taken cautiously, as the finds do not necessarily indicate that he controlled Aleppo politically. The stele ALEPPO 6 represents only a dedication to the Storm-God of Halpa and tells us strictly speaking nothing about the relationship of this city with the kingdom of Palastin(a/i). One cannot exclude that Aleppo was not under direct political control of Taita, and the king dedicated the stele only to demonstrate his respect to this paramount cult center of the Storm-God (and strengthen the political alliance with Aleppo), not unlike Croesus when he made dedications at Delphi.

\(^42\) A join of two new fragments found at Tell Tayinat by Weeden 2015 has produced the name spelled [w] a/i-la-s[á]-ti-ni-za-(REGIO), which makes clear that the second syllable was vocalized a.


\(^44\) For general overview of the recent research in the Amuq plain and Tell Tayinat see e.g. Harrison 2013 (with earlier literature). For the Aegeanizing material s. most recently Janeway 2017.
Neither of the texts attesting the name of the kingdom gives it in its root form. It appears only in the form of an adjectival derivative with suffix -izza- (the so called “ethnic adjective”): palastinizza- (or walastinizza-). Identification of the stem type of the underlying toponym is not quite obvious, but in any case it is clear that the name contains a nasal element which distinguishes it from the forms of the name known earlier: Egyptian p-w-r-s₃-t(-j), Hebrew plšt (“Philistia”) and plšty (“the Philistine”) and two Assyrian forms, KUR palast- (earlier) and KUR pilišt- (later). In CHLI Hawkins read the name of the kingdom with a vocalic auslaut (WaDasatini). However, in the edition of the new texts from Aleppo and Arsuz he rendered the name as Palastin; the reason for this is not quite clear, but most probably it results from a mechanical separation of the suffix -izza- from palastinizza-. Both Hawkins’s own explanation of the origin of the final nasal element and that of Singer are based on this reading of the toponym. Hawkins assumed that Palastin results from the adaption of a Semitic form with the plural ending -īm (plšt-īm). This explanation does not look especially convincing, both since there is no reason to assume a Semitic intermediary in the transmission of a Sea People’s ethnic name into Luwian, and since there are no examples supporting the idea of such a thoughtless adoption of a Semitic word into Anatolian. On the other hand, Singer proposed to connect the origin of the suffix with the region where the Philistines are supposed to have come from: the Aegean. Embracing the parallel pointed out (but rejected) by Hawkins himself, he proposed to see in the nasal element of Palastin the same suffix as seen in the Greek adjectival formation Παλαιστίνη used first by Herodotus as a designation for a part of Συρίη. Singer identified this suffix as a sort of counterpart of the Luwian -izza- which lead him to regard palastinizza- as a “double ethnicon”. Although the idea to see in the nasal element an “Aegean suffix” looks plausible, the interpretation of palastinizza- as a “double ethnicon” does not, as it again presupposes some sort of misinterpretation of the original name. However, there is no necessity in this assumption, as palastinizza- can be

---

45 The forms are spelled as pa-lá/i-sà-ti-ní-za- in ALEPPO 6, §1 and ALEPPO 7, §1 (restored), as wa/i-la/i-sà-ti-ní-za- in TELL TAYINAT 1 and MEHARDE §2; as [w]a/i-la/sà/i-zi-ní-za- in the new fragments from Tell Tayinat (cf. above fn. 42); as wa/i-lá/i-sà-ta-ní-za- in ARSUZ 1, §1 and as wa/i-lá/i-sí-ti-ní-za- in ARSUZ 2, §1. In SHEIZAR §1 the final part of the word is badly damaged and is restored by Hawkins as wa/i-la/i-sá-ti-ní-za- (REGIO) (Hawkins 2000: 417). However, the form expected from the context (“[mother] of Taita, the Palastnean Hero”) is actually walastinizzassi, i.e. root+izz(a)+assi. Although on the photo (Hawkins 2000: pl. 227) one can discern no traces of the signs in the gap, the fact that REGIO is set quite far away from <ti> suggests that there was a further sign after <ti> besides <ni>. Epigraphically this is certainly possible, as, when necessary, the scribe used quite tiny variants of <za>/<zi>, cf. especially <zi> in INFANS.NEPOS-ka-la-zi (INFANS)NEG.-wa/i-zi at the end of l. 3.

46 Hawkins 2000: 365–367 (TELL TAYINAT 1) and 415–419 (MEHARDE and SHEIZAR).


48 Hawkins 2011: 52.

49 Singer 2012: 463–464 with fn. 56 (with references to personal discussions with C. Melchert and N. Oettinger).

50 Both examples cited by Singer 2012: 464 with fn. 56) are incorrect: Romanian (Rumanian) is not a “double ethnicon”, but a normal toponymic adjective on -ian derived from a country name Romania (Rumania); the latter is a usual formation on -ia, which is indeed based on an old adjective functioning as an ethnicon roman < romanus. The same applies to Pal(a)estinensis: the adjective in -ensi- is based on the country name Pal(a)estina and not directly on the ethnic name of the Philistines. As will be shown below, exactly the same misconception underlies Singer’s interpretation of palastinizza- as a “double ethnicon”. 
interpreted much more naturally if we re-examine two points: the original root form of the toponym and the precise meaning of \( \text{Παλαιστίνη} \).

As noted above, it is not quite obvious to which stem type the toponym underlying the ethnic adjective \( \text{palastinizza} \) belongs. The underlying athematic stem form Palastin- preferred by Hawkins is in theory possible, but it is not the sole possibility. Equally likely would be a vocalic (thematic) stem. Moreover, a thematic stem is by default a much likelier possibility, as \( n \)-stems in Luwian are in general a rare class;\(^{51}\) there appear to be no \( n \)-stem toponyms in Luwian texts, the reason for which is apparently that all such names, whenever adopted from another toponymic tradition, were re-interpreted as thematic stems.\(^{52}\) The form \( \text{palastinizza} \) suggests \textit{prima facie} an \( i \)-stem (Palastini). However, a closer glance at the evidence shows that an \( a \)-stem (Palastina) is no less possible. In all likelihood the stem vowel of the toponym was absorbed by the suffix \(-izza-\). The first clear example for this is the city name \( \text{Taurišša} \) which is attested both in this root form and as a Luwian ethnic adjective, \( \text{Taurišizza} \).\(^{53}\) The second example is the name of Karkamis in Hieroglyphic-Luwian texts. The original form of this Syrian toponym had a consonant \( \text{al} \)auslaut (Karkamiš);\(^{54}\) however, the form of acc.sg. \( \text{kar-ka-mi-sà-na} \) attested in KARKAMIŠ A15b, §3 shows that the name was re-interpreted in Luwian as an \( a \)-stem (Karkamisa-), apparently for the reason that \( s \)-stems are in Luwian neutral nouns only.\(^{55}\) The form of the ethnic adjective ubiquitously found in the texts from Karkamis is \( \text{kar-ka-mi-si-za} \).

Some further evidence regarding stem type of Palastina/i can be gained from Assyrian texts. As was tentatively proposed already by Sh. Yamada, the Assyrian name of the country attested in the form \( \text{Pa-ti-na-a-a} \) (once \( \text{Pat-ti-nu} \)) should be somehow related to the Luwian name which was still read then as Wadasatini.\(^{56}\) The new attestations of the name in the Aleppo texts with initial \( p \)- confirmed this connection. In all probability, the Assyrian form reflects an allegro form of the name and is comparable with such cases as rendering of the name of Indian city Pataliputra by Greeks as \( \text{Παλίβοθρα} \) or the name of Πολυδεύκης as Pollux by the Romans.\(^{57}\) From the formal point of view, \( \text{Pa-ti-na-a-a} \) looks like a derivative

\(^{51}\) Cf. Starke 1990: 227, cf. Melchert 2003a: 197. The bulk of the \( n \)-stems constitute action nouns in \(-mman-\); besides these, hardly half a dozen other true \( n \)-stem nouns are known in Luwian. Note that attribution of \( \text{massana/i-} \) “god” to this class by Melchert is based only on the analogy with Lycian (cf. Melchert 1993: s.v. \( \text{māššan(i)} \)-).

\(^{52}\) Cf. the case of Harran, which, as far as one can see, is an \( a \)-stem in Luwian giving the ethnic adjective with suffix \(-wan\) as \( /\text{harranawi/i-}/ (\text{hara/i-}na-wa/i-\text{ni})\) and not \( */\text{harranwani-}/ (*\text{hara/i-wa/i-}\text{ni})\). There are reasons to think that other consonantal classes were also re-interpreted as \( a \)-stems (cf. below the case of Karkamis).

\(^{53}\) For attestations s. del Monte–Tischler 1978: s.v. \( \text{Tauriša} \). Note, however, that there are also several attestations of the athematic form Tauriš.

\(^{54}\) Cf. Starke 1990: 95. The spelling with \(<\text{sā}>\), which in the early texts from Karkamis tends to render \( \text{/s/} \) without a vocalic component, cannot be taken as evidence for the absence of final \(-a\) (which in the case of \( \text{kar-ka-mi-sà-na} \) is anyway not very sensible). The use of \( <\text{sā}>\) as \( /\text{harranawi/i-}/ (\text{hara/i-}na-wa/i-\text{ni})\) and not \( */\text{harranwani-}/ (*\text{hara/i-wa/i-}\text{ni})\). There are reasons to think that other consonantal classes were also re-interpreted as \( a \)-stems (cf. below the case of Karkamis).

\(^{55}\) For early attestations of the name see Hawkins 1980.

\(^{56}\) Yamada 2000: 96 with fn.71. Cf. Dinçol et al. 2015: 63 with further references.

\(^{57}\) As was shown by Rieken, Yakubovich 2010 in the later Luwian dialects the dental consonants \( d/r/l \) were articulated very similarly, and seem to merge in a “flap” \( /ɾ/ \). The real articulation of \( \text{Palastin(V)} \)- could
with formant -āyya(/u) (> -ā'ā), frequently attested in foreign (first of all, west Semitic) ethnic names.\(^{58}\) However, its usage by the Assyrians was inconsequent: in some texts Pa-ti-na-a-a does function as an ethnic adjective (“Patinean”); in some others, however, it appears where one expects a country name.\(^{59}\) It is difficult to be sure where the confusion comes from; the simplest assumption would be, however, that both the root form and the ethnic adjective sounded similarly, i.e. that the form of the toponym was Patina or even Patinā.\(^{60}\)

In any case, the Assyrian evidence gives no hints that the country name ended in -i.\(^{61}\) In sum, as toponyms of consonantal stem types were either non-existent or extremely rare in Luwian, there is every reason to think that the form palastinizza- was built on a noun of a thematic stem, Palastini or Palastina. From these two possibilities the latter appears to be somewhat likelier.

As a result, there are good reasons to think that the name of the kingdom founded by the “northern branch” of the Philistines in the Amuq valley contains precisely the same final element -na as the name of Danuna. Moreover, in both cases it appears to have precisely the same meaning. As a matter of fact, Palastina in the Luwian inscriptions is a country name – and not an ethnicon, as was assumed by Hawkins and Singer – as it serves as the basis of ethnic adjective on -izza-; in contrast, p-w-r-s3-t and other forms without -na refer first of all to the people representing thus, at least originally, ethnic names. Exactly the same can be assumed for Danuna: in KARATEPE and cuneiform sources, Danuna is a country name, while Δαναοί is an ethnicon.\(^{62}\) One may conclude that the function of the element -na is to build country names from ethnica. Moreover, now a comparison of Palastina with Παλαιστίνη becomes practically compelling. Again, the similarity between two names goes beyond merely phonetic one. Formally, Παλαιστίνη can be analyzed as an adjectival derivative with a nasal suffix -n-, found both in Greek and other Indo-European languages,\(^{63}\) plus feminine ending -ā (with the Attic-Ionic development ā > η). However, already Herodotus uses Παλαιστίνη not only as an adjective with Συρίη, but also elliptically as a country name (Hdt. VII 89,1 and 2; II 104,3), which later becomes a norm, adopted later also by the Romans (Palaestina). A clear parallel to the county name Παλαιστίνη consists of the country names ending in -ηνη (< -*(ā)nā), found especially in eastern Anatolia (cf., e.g., Κομμαγήνη < Hitt. Kummaḫa- or Μελιτήνη < Hitt. Malidiya-); these also look like old adjectives used elliptically (with ellipsis of γῆ or χώρα).\(^{64}\) Thus, the name of the kingdom of the northern

---

\(^{58}\) Cf., e.g. von Soden 1995: 85.

\(^{59}\) See attestations in Bagg 2007: s.v. ‘Pattinu’. As a country name: Grayson 1996: 102.3, 93 (KUR Patinā’a); the same context is 102.2, II 11, but spelling is different (‘Patinā’a); cf. further 102.2, II 5 (URU Patinā’a), but clearly referring to the land.

\(^{60}\) Note that Que is also appears in the spelling with the final ā (Qa-ū-a-a, Qu-a-a, Qu-u-a-a etc., see Bagg 2007: s.v. Que).

\(^{61}\) Note that the oscillation between a-, i- and u-stems was very usual in Assyrian renderings of toponyms from Syria and southern Anatolia (cf., e.g. Tabali/a/u, Melidi/i/u etc.).

\(^{62}\) However, in Egyptian texts both d3-jnjw-n3 and d3-jnjw seem to refer to a people. However, the context of the texts (military attacks) allows for both ethnic and country names, as is the case also in modern usage, cf. virtual identity of the statements ‘Germany attacked...’ / ‘The Germans attacked...’.

\(^{63}\) For nasal suffixes in Greek cf. Schwyzer 1953: 488–491, esp. §§6-8 for adjectival function.

\(^{64}\) The suffix in the country names on -ηνη is apparently connected with the ethnic suffix -νος associated with certain regions of Anatolia and, to a lesser degree, with Syria; for a usual overview of the toponyms with which it is attested see now Dale 2015 (its usefulness is, however, somewhat lessened
3. Cuneiform attestations of Danuna.

Now it is appropriate to take a closer glance at the cuneiform attestations of Danuna.65 Neither the context of the Amarna letter EA 151 nor that of KBo 28.25 provide unequivocal clues about the location of the country; the only basis for equation with dnnym(m) of KARATEPE and d3-jnjw-n3 was phonetic correspondence. For a long time association with Adana made scholars regard it as a reference to Cilicia (or part of it). However, as noted already by Forlanini and once again argued by Simon, this location is fairly impossible on historical grounds: at the time after the first Syrian War, as the letter is usually dated, there was no question of an independent kingdom in Kizzuwadna with its own royal house, as the context of EA 151 implies; the same applies, of course, also to the later attestation in KBo 28.25 (reign of Ḫattušili III).66 However, a location in northern Syria recently argued by Simon is equally impossible.67 The geography of the Late Bronze Age Syria is well known from very different sources and it is quite difficult to imagine how as large an entity as a land (KUR) Danuna, having its own king (LUGAL) – and not just a (petty) ruler (LÚ), as the Levantine and Syrian city rulers are usually termed – escaped the attention of any other text concerning Syria. No more credible is separation of this Syrian Danuna from dnnym(m) and d3-jnjw-n3, to which Simon is forced by accepting the Aegean origin of the latter.

The basis for Simon’s location of Danuna in Syria was his belief that the context of the letter excludes all other possibilities. However, this is not the case. The words of the Egyptian king “What you hear from Canaan, then write to me” (ll. 50–51: ša tašme ištu KUR Kinaḫna u šupur ana yâši)68 does not necessarily imply that he wants to hear only what is going on in

by the fact that the chronological factor is not taken its consideration). However, a connection of the suffix with Luwian -wanna/i- proposed by Dale seems to me rather unlikely. In fact, the picture of distribution of the suffix speaks just against its derivation from Luwian. The main area of the suffix spread is north-western and central Anatolia (the Troad, Mysia, Bithynia, Lydia and Phrygia), i.e. the regions more or less immediately affected by the migration from the Balkans at the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st millennium BC. In contrast, in southern parts of Anatolia (southern Caria, Lycia and Cilicia Trachaea and Pedias), which arguably represent the area in which Luwic linguistic element persisted longest, the suffix is practically not found. There is thus every reason to connect the origin of the suffix with the Balkan languages, more or less closely related to Phrygian and Greek. The same origin may be assumed also for the suffix in Palastina and Danuna (cf. below).

65 Spelled: Da-nu-na in EA 151,52 and Dá-nu-ú-na in KBo 28.25, 7”.
Canaan, as the answer of Abi-Milku itself speaks against such a perception: after the report about the king of Danuna, Abi-Milku proceeds to the news from Ugarit, whose inclusion into Canaan would look rather odd, even if not entirely impossible. Rather, the pharaoh asks for any news which could be heard “there in Canaan” or, possibly, more specifically in Tyre as an important trade hub visited by merchants from different regions both of the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean.\(^69\) Thus, now as before, the letter gives no positive evidence concerning the location of Danuna. However, both the Amarna archive and the multitude of other sources provide quite eloquent negative evidence: there is no place for the land Danuna either in Cilicia or Syria or Canaan.

Cyprus might seem to be a possible candidate for locating Danuna, the “land of Δαναοί”, especially taking into consideration the fact that the Early Iron Age name associated with the island, Yadnana, is quite probably linguistically connected with Danuna-Δαναοί.\(^70\) However, no other textual source suggests that the island, known in the Late Bronze Age under the name Alāsiya, was divided among several polities, and archaeological finds on Cyprus clearly show that there are no grounds to speak about Greek settlement on the island as early as the 14th century BC. The Danuna-Δαναοί appeared in all probability on the island roughly at the same time as in Cilicia, i.e., in the 12th century BC.\(^71\)

The only remaining possibility is to interpret cuneiform Danuna as referring to the original – the Aegean – homeland of the Δαναοί. This should represent most probably the same county, which the Hittites called Ahhiyawa. After so many years of misidentification and

\(^{69}\) Cf. the interpretation of ištu by Rainey 2015: fn. 68 as “there in” (cf. also his comments on p. 1503).

\(^{70}\) The interpretation of the name of Yadnana（KUR）\text{-a-\text{-ad-\text{-na-na} (with variants), for attestations s. Bagg 2007: s.v. Jadnana) as a composite of west-Semitic ‘y “island” (directly attested only in Hebrew) and the stem found in Danuna and Δαναοί goes back to Luckenbill 1914: fn. 24 and is commonly, but somewhat hesitantly accepted, cf., e.g. Albright 1950: 171–172; Mayer 1996: 475–476; Lipiński 2004: 46; Knapp 2008: 342–345; Jasink 2011: 8–10; for attestations of the respective word for “island” cf. Hoftijzer, Jongeling 2004, s.vv. ‘y, ‘y. It is noteworthy that the common interpretation of Yadnana as the island name is in all probability incorrect. In the inscriptions of Sargon II the name appears in the recurrent combination KUR-la-a’ nagē ša KUR-la-\text{-ad-na-na (cf. Bagg 2007: s.v. Jā’); nagē is generally interpreted as “region/district” and Yā, accordingly, is taken to be a name of one of Cyprus’ “districts” (cf., e.g. Fuchs 1994: 352: nagē as “Landstrich”). However, the interpretation of nagē “region/district” is senseless in the context, as the seven cities of Yā’ listed in the inscriptions are located all over the island, from Paphos (Pappa) in the south-west to Marion (Nūria) and Soloi (Sillu) in the north-west to Salamis (Silluwa) in the east (see discussion in Lipiński 2004: 62–76). It is also remains not clear what might stop Sargon from subjugating the whole island, which is not especially large. Surprisingly, the obvious alternative – to take nagē in its second attested meaning “island” – was never seriously taken into consideration (note, however, Albright 1950: 171, who translates “island” giving as an alternative “district”). However, given the noted discrepancy and the maritime context, there is every ground to prefer this interpretation. This means that it is Yā’ that is the Assyrian name of Cyprus; quite probably, it is indeed nothing other than an Assyrian rendering of west-Semitic ‘y “island”. From this it follows that Yadnana in the inscriptions of Sargon is an ethnicon. As the island was at this time heavily Hellenized, there is indeed every reason to analyze Yadnana as compound of Yā’ and Danuna (with a reduction in vowels in both parts of the compound), which should mean most probably “the Island Danuna/Δαναοί = “the Cypriot Greeks”. On the other hand, it is possible that the other current name under which the Assyrians knew the Greeks, Yamana, might in a way have influenced the formation of Yadnana; one cannot even exclude that Yadnana represents a sort of portmanteau of Yama and Danuna (cf. also the curious “alternation” between the “nicknames” of a troublemaker from Ashdod in the inscriptions of Sargon: Yamani “Greek” vs. Yadna, possibly, “Cypriot”; cf. Mayer 1996: 480–481).

\(^{71}\) See e.g., Knapp 2008: 249–258 with further literature.
misplacement, this new location of Danuna might seem surprising, but there is nothing improbable in it. There is no doubt that in the 14th century BC the Mycenaean ships visited Tyre, as well as the Tyrian ones the Aegean. As a matter of fact, Tyre is situated a great deal closer to the Aegean than Akhetaton (=Amarna) situated some 500 km upstream the Nile, if one counts with the route along the coast which should be usual for the merchant ships of the Late Bronze Age, so that one may expect that the news from the Aegean came to Tyre much faster than to the Egyptian capital.

Unfortunately, the evidence of the letter about Danuna is more than terse. Abi-Milku reports only that “the king of Danuna died, and his brother became king after him, and his land is quiet” (ll. 52-54: LUGAL KUR Danuna BA.UG u šarra ŠEŠ-šu ana EGIR-šu u pašḥat KUR-šu). Unsurprisingly, Abi-Milku does not know the names of the Mycenaean rulers, which contrasts with his more intimate acquaintance with his Syrian colleagues, who are mentioned by name (Etakama, Aziru, Biryawaza and Zimredda, ll. 59-66). Still, the evidence is of some historical value. First, the report sets a reasonably firm chronological benchmark for the death of a Mycenaean ruling dynast – the seat of whom was quite probably Mycenae itself (cf. below) – at ca. 1335 ±3 years (cf. above note 66). It is noteworthy that this date falls suspiciously close to the transition between Late Helladic IIIA2, linked with the reign of Akhenaten, and Late Helladic IIIB, which is usually set around 1330. On wonders if this change of the ruler on the Mycenaean throne could not eventually trigger, despite the initial “quietness in the land”, the major changes in society and culture which subsequently found reflection also in Mycenaean pottery style. On the other hand, the remark of Abi-Milku that the “land is quiet”, shows that both in the Levant and Egypt one cared about the political situation in Mycenaean Greece, which seems to imply a fair degree of integration of the region into the trade (and, quite probably, diplomatic) network already in the Amarna Age.

The second text concerning Danuna, the tiny fragment of a letter KBo 28.25, is not very informative either. The attribution of the fragment to the “Urḫi-Teššub dossier” proposed by E. Edel is highly speculative, as the text, as pointed out already by Singer, contains no actual clues for this and even its appurtenance to the corpus of Hittite-Egyptian correspondence is far from certain. The only, even if quite faint, clue to the context of the letter is a fragmentary city name appearing in l. 9: URU.KI-na-x[…] The name was tentatively restored by Edel as URU.KI-na-š[ə]-ra, suggested by an attestation of KUR URU Inaššara in KUB 21.6a rev. 9. The latter text contains a part of the Annals of Ḫattušili III describing attacks of an enemy from western Anatolia (very probably, Piyamaradu) on western and south-western parts of the Hittite Empire. The restoration seems to be the only available

---

72 See Rainey 2015.
75 The attribution of the fragment KBo 28.25 (=Bo. 499/d) to the Egyptian dossier is based on the fact that the fragment was found not far from the find spot of several fragments of KBo 28.24 (Büyükkale, Building A, room 6) and demonstrates a similar ductus and clay color (Edel 1994: Bd. II: 138), as well as on Edel’s reading in l. 5’ the rests of the sign GIŠ/IZ and RI which he restores as [KUR Mi-iš-ri[-i]]. However, what one can see on the tablet before RI is l. 5’ only one vertical wedge; there may be very tentatively identified some traces of horizontal wedges before it, but there seems to be three of them rather than two. In any case, the reading of the name of Egypt in the line is more than optimistic.
76 Edel 1994: Bd. II: 139.
77 See Gurney 1997; and for identity of the enemy: Gander 2016.
alternative⁷⁸ and, moreover, its appearance in one text with Danuna makes good sense indeed. The land Inaššara should be sought not in Taurus to the south of Karaman, as thought by Edel following Forrer, but somewhere in south-western Anatolia, not too far from the Lukka lands, as already pointed out by Forlanini.⁷⁹ Moreover, there is every reason to accept Forlanini’s identification of Inaššara with Annaššara, a city mentioned several times in the fragmentary letter KBo 18.86. A variation of i/e and a in the initial unaccented position does not represent anything unusual and is well attested later in Lycian (e.g., in Lycian PN ErKKazuma/ArKKazuma or arawazije/-erawazije-, reflecting apparently different renderings of the reduced vowel /a/). The letter KBo 18.86 mentions Annaššara in a context with Ḥuwaršanašši and T(a)lawa. The latter city can be most probably identified with Tlos in Lycia and Ḥuwaršanašši (= Ḫuršanašša), as I recently argued, is a settlement located somewhere on (or near) the Carian Chersonessos; the latter designation represents most probably the Greek re-interpretation of the native Carian toponym.⁸⁰ The evidence of the letter might suggest thus an even more specific location of Annaššara/Inaššara to the west of Lycia, most probably in the coastal zone. Be that as it may, Annaššara/Inaššara was located in the direction of the Aegean, or, in other words, that of Ahhiyawa/Danuna. It is noteworthy that the context of the combined mention of Danuna and south-western Anatolia proves to be strikingly reminiscent of the two letters from Ugarit mentioned earlier (see above, note 11) in which the presence of Hiyawans – i.e. Ahhiyawans or the Mycenaean Greeks – in Lycia is alluded to.

4. Egyptian evidence: d3-jnjw(-n3) and tj-n-3-y(-w).

Given the explicit identification of d3-jnjw-n3 as a “Sea People” and the indication that they come from the “islands” (cf. above), a connection of this group with the Aegean was always regarded as a likely possibility, so there is no need to linger on this question. There are, however, several points which deserve some discussion or, at least, a more pronounced formulation: 1) correct phonetic interpretation of the Egyptian syllabic writing d3-jnjw-n3; 2) attestations of the shorter form of the name (d3-jnjw); 3) the relationship between d3-jnjw-n3 and tj-n-3-y-w, another name attested in Egyptian texts which has been connected with Δαναοί.

4.1. The appellation “Denyen”, which is still frequently found in the literature for this group of the “Sea People”, represents a clear misnomer, as it neither reflects the intended

⁷⁸ Edel 1994 is right in pointing out that the gap between NA and ŠA is wider than one would normally expect. However, the interpretation of the sequence as URU.KI i-na š[a(?)-] would be highly unlikely for several reasons. On the one hand, the sequence … ša URU.KI ina š[…] “… of the city in …” is not very sensible syntactically: appearance of the word for “city” without any further specification does not make much sense, but, if ina š[…] were intended to describe a location of the city (i.e. “the city in the land …”), one would, first, expect KUR immediately after ina, and, second, there should be a further determinative pronoun ša before after URU.KI. On the other hand, to the best of my knowledge, URU.KI is used in the Akkadian texts from Ḥattišu only as a determinative before city names and never as an independent logogram for “city”, cf. the indexes in Edel 1994: fn. 74; Bd. II: 372–373, 378 which lists no URU.KI among logograms and gives only the following writings with URU.KI (actually attested and not restored). URU.KI Ana “Heliopolis”, URU.KI Kizzuwadna, URU.KI Q[inza(?)] “Kadesh”(?) and URU.KI Š[idiuna(?)] “Sidon”(?). Lastly it should be noted that a reading URU.KI i-ša […] in the present line is not completely excluded, but does not seem especially sensible.


⁸⁰ See Oreshko forthcoming (B), esp. fn. 23 for Annaššara/Inaššara.
pronunciation of the name, nor even is in any sense a correct transliteration of the Egyptian spelling. As for both *aleph*-containing “syllabic groups” (*d3* and *n3*), their primary *a*-vocalization hardly raises any doubts at all; the only stipulation to be made is that the vocalic value of any syllabic sign in the final unaccented position seems to be neutralized to *ә*.\(^{81}\)

Vocalization of the middle group *jn*jw as */nu/* or */no/* is confirmed by several good examples, as, e.g., by the spelling of Knossos in the “Aegean List” of Amenophis III as *k*3-*jn*jw-š3 (possibly */k(o)mossa/*), by the rendering of Nuḫašše as *jn*jw-ɡ3-s3 or spelling of the name of the musical instrument known as *κιννύρα* in Greek and *kinnōr* in Hebrew as *k-n-jn*jw-rw.\(^{82}\)

As a result, the Egyptian spelling can be phonetically interpreted as */danuna/ (or */danuna/) and there can be hardly any doubt that it renders indeed the same name as the cuneiform Danuna.

4.2. There are five attestations of the “Sea people” Danuna in the texts dated to the reign of Ramses III: four in the inscriptions of Medinet Habu and one in Papyrus Harris I.\(^{83}\) Only one of them, reporting an attack of the Sea Peoples in the 8th year of Ramses III (KRI V 40:3-4), gives the name as *d3-jn*jw, which raised some doubts concerning the reality of the form.\(^{84}\) However, there can be pointed out some later evidence which may confirm that the shorter form of the name, Danu, corresponding thus immediately to the *ethnicon* Δαναοί, was known both in Egypt and the Levant. First, the name of the same people seems to be attested in the Onomasticon of Amenope (Nr. 244) in the form *d-n-jn*jw.\(^{85}\) Both the spelling and the context of the attestation are ambiguous. The name *d-n-jn*jw appears between ḫškš “Kaškeans” (a north Anatolian people) and ḫ-t-t3 “Hatti”, in a sequence which appears to be a list of Hittite allies in the Battle of Kadesh. The context made E. Edel assume a corruption in the text and propose the emendation *d3-r-d-n-y* “Dardanians” (who are indeed attested as Hittite allies).\(^{86}\) However, it is difficult to assume so many drastic changes in the spelling of one name,\(^{87}\) while all other names in the list are written in a quite usual way and are easily recognizable. A more likely assumption would be that the name was simply misplaced from another part of the Onomasticon (e.g., the list of the “Sea Peoples”), but the spelling *d-n-jn*jw itself is correct.\(^{88}\) As for the phonetic side of the spelling, its interpretation as */Danu/ is not immediately obvious. However, this or a similar reading is the likeliest possibility. As

---

\(^{81}\) See already Albright 1934: 45–46 (for *n3*), and 65–66 (for *d3*); Helck 1971: 551 (for *n3*), and 564 (for *d3*); Edel 1966: 74–75 (for *n3*); cf. also Zeidler 1993: 579–590.


\(^{83}\) For the list of attestations see Adams, Cohen 2013: 658-659.

\(^{84}\) Cf., e.g. Albright 1950: 170 with fn. 32.

\(^{85}\) Gardiner 1947: 126.


\(^{87}\) An especially strong argument against the corruption of the name from *d3-r-d-n-y* is the presence of the determinative “old man” (A 19), which makes sense only if the word has a phonetic shape close to *tnj/*tnw “old”. Moreover, the latter word is attested in a very similar writing elsewhere in the Onomasticon (Nr. 54), see Gardiner 1947: 126.

\(^{88}\) The Sea Peoples appear as Nrs. 268-270 (*š3-r-d3-n3, 13-k3-rw, p-w-r-s3-tj*) in the Onomasticon, followed by two damaged entries (see Gardiner 1947: 194–205). It is noteworthy that fragmentary nr. 272, which seems to begin with *rw/- might conceal a second entry for Lukka, this time mentioned as one of the Sea Peoples. Note also the appearance of ḫ3(j)w-nhw(š) as nr. 276, which refers to the northern (= Mediterranean) lands in general. One should also note that the appearance of Danuna in the list of Hittite allies would be, of course, rather strange, but basically not completely improbable. Danuna could represent a small mercenary contingent, just like the *rw-k3* (Lycians, nr. 247), who, as far as one
observed by Gardiner, the determinative of the “old man” (A 19) present in the spelling associates the name with Egyptian root for “old” (tnj), so the name contained in all probability only one -n- and the spelling reflects the practice of redundant notation of consonants. However, the association with the root for “old” also shows that the final vowel was to all appearances not pronounced as /u/ at the time of composition of the Onomasticon (the late 20th to 22nd dynasties), and the usage of jnjw probably reflects only a traditional spelling; the absence of aleph after the initial d also suggests that the value of the first vowel was reduced. Thus, the spelling most probably renders something like /Dәnә/; there are, however, good reasons to trace this form back to /Danu/.

The next piece of evidence is the name of the ancient Israelite tribe of Dan (which is the Masoretic vocalization of dn). The connection of this name with the “Sea People” Danuna is a notoriously moot point, and the possibility of a chance similarity is high. However, at least two indications speak for a possibility of some connection with the Aegean newcomers: their initial settlement in the coastal area just to the north of Philistia and the reference to the people in the Song of Deborah as “living on ships”, which strongly recalls the words applied to Šikalāyū (= Šikila), another group of the “Sea Peoples” whose origin is probably connected with Sicilia, in a letter from Ugarit (RS 34.129). Furthermore, recent archaeological finds at Tel Dan – a settlement situated outside the territory ascribed to the tribe of Dan, but whose name is linguistically quite probably connected with the tribe name – seem to corroborate the Aegean links of Dan.

The third piece of evidence is preserved by the Phoenician inscription found in Hassan-Beyli (Hasanbeyli), located to the east of Amanus some 10 km to the south-east of the Bahçe Pass (Amanian Gate). The inscription is fragmentary, but the preserved part makes it clear that the text concerns not only some local matters and the relationships with Assyria (cf. a mention of mlk šr ‘king of Assyria’), but also neighboring Cilicia. In particular, line 5 of the inscription mentions Awariku (wrk) who is known from KARATEPE as a “king of Danunaens” (mlk dnnym). Furthermore, Lemaire assumed that the combination mlk dn which can be tentatively read at the beginning of line 3 refers to Awariku; accordingly he interpreted the combination as “king of Adana”. The suggestion to see in mlk dn a reference to Awariku looks plausible, and one can propose no obvious alternative to it. However, dn cannot be Adana. As already discussed above, the city name was known in Phoenician in its usual form ’dn and there is no evidence that it ever lost initial aleph in any of the languages of the region. Moreover, the evidence of the inscription itself speaks clearly against the assumption of aphaeresis: both the name Awariku and that of Assyria are given with the initial aleph. Thus, if mlk dn indeed refers to Awariku, the only reasonable possibility is to

can judge, were not “allies” of the Hittites strictu sensu, but rather mercenaries serving in the Hittite army.

89 Gardiner 1947: 126.
90 See, e.g., Machinist 2000: 67 with further references.
92 The finds have not yet been published, to my knowledge, but some information on the evidence can be found in popular articles (cf., e.g. http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/archaeology/1.756385; accessed on 19.03.2017).
93 For edition see Lemaire 1983.
interpret it as a synonym of the usual appellation of Cilician kings as mlk dnnym\textsuperscript{94} using the original form of the ethnonym, Danu \textless Δαναοί.

In sum, although every piece of evidence is ambiguous in its own way, the evidence taken together supports the possibility that Danu is a linguistically real form reflecting directly the ethnic name of the Δαναοί. A further indirect support is provided by the parallel situation with the name of the (land of the) Philistines known both with and without nasal element (cf. above).

4.3. The relationship between $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ and $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$(-w)

The toponym $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$-$w$, rendered usually as Tanaja, appears most prominently near $k$-$f$-$tj$-$w$ in the caption of the “Aegean list” (list E\textsubscript{S}) on one of the statue bases from the mortuary temple of Amenophis III at Kom el-Hettân.\textsuperscript{95} Besides that, the name is attested (in a slightly different spelling $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$) in an inscription of Tutmosis III also in a close association with $k$-$f$-$tjw$ (Urk. IV 733, 5) and in a further geographical list from the time of Amenophis III.\textsuperscript{96} Both appearance of the name in combination with $K$-$f$-$tj$-$w$ “Crete” and the composition of the “Aegean list” containing many toponyms which may be plausibly identified with places in the Peloponnese (such as mw-$k$-$j$-$nw$ “Mycenae”, mj-$d3$-$n3$-$j$ “Messenia”, nw-$p$-$j$-$r$-$j$-$w$ “Nauplia” and k$3$-$tv$-$j$-$r$ “Kythera”, an island to the south of the Peloponnese) leave no doubt that $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$-$w$ refers to (a part of) Mycenaean Greece.\textsuperscript{97} The question whether $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$-$w$ was a designation for the entire Mycenaean Greece or specifically for the Peloponnese remains open, the choice depending first of all on the interpretation of the toponym $d$-$i$-$q3$-$j$-$3$-$s$ (the two main candidates being Boeotian Thebes (Θῆβαι < Myc. /Tēgṷa/) and Arcadian Tegea).\textsuperscript{98} In any case, the general location of $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$-$w$ in the Aegean naturally suggests a connection with Δαναοί. Plausible in itself, this connection might seem problematic when confronted with the fact that $d3$-$jn$jw(-$n3$) is also derived from the same ethnic name. However, the discrepancies between $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$-$w$ and $d3$-$jn$jw(-$n3$) are not crucial and can be attributed to the different time of attestation in Egyptian texts and to a slightly different morphological structure.

The first discrepancy is the difference in spelling of the initial syllable, both in its consonantal and vocalic part. This discrepancy is due most probably to the fact that spellings $tj$-$n$-$3$-$y$-$w$ and $d3$-$jn$jw(-$n3$) reflect two different writing traditions and/or two different chronological stages of the Egyptian language. The former spelling appears in the texts of the 18th dynasty written in the Middle Egyptian orthography, while the “syllabic writing” in which $d3$-$jn$jw-$n3$ is spelled is based on the orthography of Late Egyptian, which became the

\textsuperscript{94} Besides KARATEPE and ÇİNEKÖY, mlk dnnym is attested in the Phoenician part of the Incirli trilingual (front: 1. 2; left, ll. 3, 17, 25; see S. Kaufman 2007: 7–26, 107–115 [Pl. III-XI]) and in the Kilamuwa inscription (l. 7; s., e.g., Hallo, Younger 2000: 147–148 with further references). An alternative appellation is “king of (the land of) Que” (mlk qw), attested in Incirli l. 9.

\textsuperscript{95} For a detailed discussion of all the toponymic lists of the monument see Edel, Görg 2005: esp. 161-213 and for the new important finds of further fragments of the Aegean list, see, e.g., Stadelmann 2008, and the most recent discussion in Gander 2015.

\textsuperscript{96} Cf. Edel, Görg 2005: 167 with further literature.

\textsuperscript{97} Besides Edel, Görg 2005: 167, see Haider 2000: 149–158; Cline, Stannish 2011 (with further literature). Note that Edel strongly opposed a connection of the name with Δαναοί and the Peloponnese (cf. discussion in Edel, Görg 2005: 196–199), suggesting instead a location either in Cilicia (=Adana) or on Rhodes, the locations still sporadically referred to in some works.

\textsuperscript{98} Cf. Cline, Stannish 2011: 9.
The differences between Middle and Late Egyptian are very significant and concerned, besides grammar, also the phonetic system in general and realization of dentals in particular, which has found its reflection, at least to an extent, in the hieroglyphic writing system, conservative as it was.\(^\text{100}\) Besides these general considerations, one can adduce a particular case, which may serve as a perfect illustration of the changes. As mentioned above, the spelling of the name Danu (\(d-n-jnjw\)) in the Onomasticon of Amenope includes also the determinative for “old man” (\(A 19\)), which links it with the lexeme which is spelled in the Middle Egyptian orthography as \(tnj\) (“old”). This traditional spelling was replaced by \(t-n-nw\) in the period of the 19th-20th dynasties and, slightly later, by \(d-n-jnjw\) which one has in the Onomasticon.\(^\text{101}\) It is clear that around 1100-1000 BC the ethnic name of Δαναοί (or at least its root) sounded in Late Egyptian just like the word for “old”. It is quite probable, however, that this was the case already some time earlier, and it is not excluded that already in the period of the 18th dynasty the articulation of the dental in \(tj\) was not so much different from the voiced dental in Greek. Furthermore, the usage of the signs for “voiceless dental” for rendering the Aegean voiced counterpart is confirmed by the example of \(k3-tw-n3-y\) “Kydonia” in the “Aegean list” (Κυδωνία, Linear B \(ku-do-ni-ja\)). As for the vocalic part of \(tj\), its usage for rendering \(a\)-vocalized syllables is confirmed by other examples from texts of the 18th dynasty.\(^\text{102}\)

As for the second part of \(tj-n-3-y-w\), its straightforward phonetic interpretation would be /-najV/ (or /-naja/). The form is traditionally perceived as reflecting *Danaya, a \(j\)-suffix derivative (feminine noun) from the ethnic name of Δαναοί, designating the land of Δαναοί.\(^\text{103}\) The interpretation looks plausible, as the context of the “Aegean List” indeed clearly presupposes a land name rather than an ethnonym; the derivation type corresponds to well-known Greek pattern and, even if *Danaya is not actually attested in Greek, its existence and the possibility of borrowing into Egyptian does not raise serious doubts. As for the final \(waw\), which might seem strange for rendering \(a\)-vocalization, there are strong doubts that it corresponds to any phonetic reality at all. As already mentioned above, the Egyptian vowels had a reduced value (probably close to /ǝ/) in the word-final position and the rendering of this sound fluctuated almost freely between different “vowels” of the Egyptian script;\(^\text{104}\) note also that in Urk. IV 733, 5 the final -\(w\) is simply absent in the name. Two other examples of the “Aegean list” clearly demonstrate how little final \(waw\) has to do with the phonetic reality of the respective syllable of the underlying toponyms: \(mw-k-j-nw\) renders the name of Mycenae (Μυκῆναι or Μυκήνη) and \(k-f-tj-w\) renders phonetically something like /kap\(h\)ta/ ≪ /kap\(h\)tar\.\(^\text{105}\) Lastly, one may ask why the final -\(ṷ\) of the root underlying the name of Δαναοί (*danaṷ-) is not reflected in the Egyptian as -\(u\), as it is the case in \(d3-jnjw(-n3)\). The answer is that the cluster -\(ṷ\) of the putative pre-form *Danay-ja would develop to -\(jj\) in Greek


\(^{100}\) For the phonetic system of Egyptian see Peust 1999: esp. 27-28, 79-95 for a discussion of Egyptian stops; cf. also Peust 2008: 105–134.

\(^{101}\) See Erman, Grapow 1971: s.v. \(tnj\).


\(^{103}\) See Edel, Görg 2005: 96-99. Despite my efforts, I was unable to identify the ultimate source of the proposal.


\(^{105}\) See discussion Edel, Görg 2005: 177-180 (\(mw-k-j-nw\)) and 166-67 (\(k-f-tj-w\)).
Part III. The origin of the distinction Danu(na) and Ahhiyawa and the ethnic picture of the Late Bronze Age Greece.

As a result of the proposed revision, one may state that the references to the “Mycenaean Greeks” (or their descendants), Δανα(ϝ)οί and Ἀχαι(ϝ)ί, and their land are somewhat more appreciable in the Near Eastern sources of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age than previously thought. It seems appropriate now to consolidate the evidence and give a concise overview of all the textual sources referring to the Mycenaean Greece.

1. Appellations going back to *Δανα(ϝ)οί

1) Cuneiform Hittite Aḫḫiyawā (Aḫ-ḫi-ya-wa-a, A-aḫ-ḫi-ya-a; the determinative varies between KUR, KUR.URU and URU). There are 26 texts coming from Hattuša and written in Hittite which mention the land Aḫḫiyawa (although less than a half in a sensible geographical or historical context); the texts are dated from the reign of Tudḫaliya I/II/Arnuwanda I to that of Tudḫaliya IV (ca. 1400-1210 BC). To this one should now add a fragmentary middle-Hittite letter from Ortaköy published recently which mentions a “man of Aḫḫiyawā” (LŪ URU Aḫḫiya[-wa]) in a west-Anatolian context. The earlier form of the name is Aḫḫiyā (Āḫḫiyā), found in the middle-Hittite texts dating to the late 15th-early 14th century BC. The name clearly refers to a land in the Aegean, i.e. Mycenaean Greece or part of it, but the precise geographical scope of the term remains unclear (cf. below).

2) Cuneiform Akkadian Ḫiyawa/ī (Ḫi-ya-a-ú, Ḫi-a-ú-wi-i, Ḫi-ya-ú-wi-i, determinative LŪ( MEŠ)). The form is attested in two companion letters from Ugarit written in Akkadian, which are addressed from a Hittite king (most probably Šuppiluliuma II, beginning of the reign ca. 1207 BC) and a Hittite high official respectively to Ammurapi, king of Ugarit; the probable dating of the letters is the early 12th century BC. The term very likely refers to the Mycenaean Greeks, who, as the letters seem to suggest, reside in south-western Anatolia (Lukka).

3) Hieroglyphic-Luwian Ahhiyawa and Hiyawa (á-hi(ya)-wa/i-, hi-ya-wa-, PLUVIUM/HIYAWA; determinative varies between URBS and REGIO). The forms are found in three texts: two coming from Cilicia (the KARATEPE bilingual and ÇİNEKÖY) and dated to the second half of the 8th century BC and one found in the northern part of the Levantine coast (ARSUZ 1 and 2, two copies of the same text), dated to the late 10th century BC. The name refers to the land in Plain Cilicia (= Assyrian Que) and represents thus the “New Ahhiyawa”, a foundation by migrants from the Aegean (most probably around the mid-12th century BC).

4) Egyptian syllabic ‘a-k-3-(y-)w3-š3 (commonly rendered as “Akaivasha” or “Ekwesh”, determinative varies between A1 (“man”/“people”) and N77 “foreign land”). The name

107 Cf. also a personal name da-na-jo attested in Knossos (KN Db 1324, V 1631), which might represent a name based either on the ethnicon Δαναοί or the land name *Danai̯a (i.e. „Mr. Peloponnesian“); cf. Aura Jorro 1985–1993: s.v.
108 See Beckman, Bryce, Cline 2009: 1-26 (AhT) with further literature.
110 See Beckman, Bryce, Cline 2009: AhT 27A and 27B with further references.
111 For references see above, notes 2, 16, cf. also Beckman, Bryce, Cline 2009: AhT 28 = ÇİNEKÖY.
is found in two texts from the reign of Merneptah (ca. 2013-1203 BC), the Great Karnak Inscription and the Atribis stele, both times in the context of the Libyan wars; along with several other groups of the “Sea Peoples” – Tursha (t-w-rw-š3), Lukku (rw-k-w), Sherden (š(3)-r3-d-n(-3)), Shekelesh (š(3)-k-rw-š3) – the Akaiwasha appear as allies of the Libyans (Libu). It is noteworthy that the Akaiwasha is the only group explicitly defined in the texts as “Sea People”. Identification of the Akaiwasha with Ἀχαιοί and Ahhiyawa is commonly accepted; however, due probably to the somewhat strange context of their appearance and the fact that they, according to the text, were circumcised – a custom allegedly alien to the Aegean – the evidence is cited mostly briefly and somewhat hesitantly or frequently skipped entirely. However, the circumcision of the Akaiwasha may be due simply to misunderstanding on the part of Egyptian scribes. On the other hand, the idea that circumcision was practiced also in the Aegean would not seem so odd, if one takes into account the evidence of Aristophanes who seems to refer to this custom among the Thracian tribe of the Odomantians. As for the phonetic side of the equation ‘a-k-ȝ-w3-š3 with *Ἀχαιϝοί, it is amazingly exact, with the Egyptian form reflecting, unlike the Anatolian one, even the diphthong -aj-, the presence of the final element -š3 (also seen in t-w-rw-š3 and š(3)-k-rw-š3) does not in any way prevent the equation, as it represents in all probability a sort of suffixal extension, whatever its exact function. Identification of Ahhiyaw/Hiyawa in the Hieroglyphic-Luwian inscriptions of the Early Iron Age brings now additional support for the equation, as it unequivocally demonstrates that a part of the Aegean population known under the name *Ἀχαιϝοί did take part in the “Oriental enterprise” at the end of the Late Bronze Age. Lastly, one should note that appearance of Akaiwasha in company with Lukku (Lukka ~ Lycians) is reminiscent of the dealings of the Hiyawa people in Lycia mentioned in the letters from Ugarit and the appearance of Danuna in the context with Annaššara in or close to Lycia (cf. above).

112 The attestations include KRI IV 2:13; 4:1; 8:9 and 12; 22:8; cf. Adams, Cohen 2013: 652 with further references.
113 KRI IV 22:8: ’a-k-ȝ-w3-y-s3 (sic) n3 h3s.t n p3 ym.
114 Cf. the doubts in Niemeier 1998: 46 (pointing out their circumcision) or the agnostic stance in Bryce 2016: 73; the evidence is absent from Beckman, Bryce, Cline 2009
116 Arist. Ach. 158: τίς τῶν Ὀδομάντων τὸ πέος ἀποτεθρίακεν “who has stripped the fig-leaves of the dicks of the Odomantians?”. The context gives no reason to think that Aristophanes invented this (contra Olson 2002: 121; cf. also Henderson 1975: 118 for a discussion of the passage and p. 111 with fn. 17 for the Greek attitude to circumcision). One may also note that Herodotus (II 104) also knew the custom among the Colchians and some peoples in the north-eastern parts of Anatolia (“Syrians” in the Thermodon valley and Makrones).
117 As suggested in Oreshko 2013: 27 the metathesis -af- -> -iyaw- in Ahhiyawa might be a result of folk-etymological approaching of the ethnic name with the Anatolian word for “rain” (Hittite ḫēu-/ḫēyaw-).
118 For the element cf., e.g. Kretschmer 1933: 230. The problem of the linguistic attribution of this element will be addressed elsewhere.
2. Appellations going back to *Δαναϝοί

1) Cuneiform Akkadian Danuna (Da-nu-na, Dá-nu-ú-na, determinative KUR). The name is attested in two texts dated to ca. 1335 BC and the first half of the 13th century BC respectively. Both refer, as far as one can judge, to the land of Δαναοί, i.e. Mycenaean Greece or its part.

2) Egyptian syllabic tj-n-3-y(-w) (Danaya). The name appears in the texts of the 18th dynasty dated to the reign of Tutmosis III (ca. 1479–1425 BC) and Amenophis III (ca. 1388–1351 BC). The name refers either to Mycenaean Greece in general or specifically to the Peloponnese (cf. below).

3) Egyptian syllabic d3-jnjw-n3 and d3-jnjw (determinative “foreign people / land”). The name appears in the texts dated to the reign of Ramses III (ca. 1186–1155 BC) in the context of attacks of the “Sea Peoples” on Egypt and in the Onomasticon of Amenope (ca. 1100-1000 BC). There is a possibility that the name of the Israelite tribe Dan attested in Tanakh reflects ultimately the same Aegean ethnicon.

4) Phoenician and Hebrew alphabetic dnny(m) and dn. The nisbe dnny is attested in the Phoenician part of the KARATEPE bilingual dated to the second half of the 8th century BC. The country name dnn (= Danuna) refers to the land in Plain Cilicia (= Assyrian Que) and represents thus the “New Danuna”. The form dn is attested in the Phoenician inscription Hassan-Beyli, dated to the same period as KARATEPE, and, represents, as far as one can judge, an ethnicon referring to the people of the Cilician Danuna, the descendants of the Mycenaean Δαναοί. There is a possibility that the name of the Israelite tribe Dan attested in Tanakh reflects ultimately the same Aegean ethnicon.

5) Assyrian cuneiform Yadnana (Ia-ad-na-na(-a-a), Ia-ad-na-na, Ad-na-na; determinative KUR). The name, contra the common view, represents probably not the name of Cyprus itself (which is Yā'), but the name of the people inhabiting it (see above, note 70). Despite deviating vocalism, it is quite probably connected with Danuna, referring specifically to “the island Danuneans”.

The distribution pattern of the two names is quite obvious: with the exception of the Egyptian texts concerning the fights with the “Sea Peoples” – a very particular historical event – the appellation going back to *Ἀχαιϝοί is restricted basically to Anatolia, while the names based on *Δαναϝοί served as the standard reference to the Mycenaean Greeks and their land in the Levant and in Egypt. It is also noteworthy that even in Egyptian texts the terms d3-jnjw(-n3) and ’a-k-3-(y-)w3-š3 does not appear together. Thus, the names have a complementary distribution in the texts. This pattern, combined with the fact that both in the Homeric poems and in the KARATEPE bilingual Ἀχαιοί-Ahhiyawa and Δαναοί-dnnym are used as synonyms, strongly implies that Danaja/Danuna and Ahhiyawa in the Late Bronze Age texts are two different names for the same entity: the Mycenaean Greeks and their country.

The question is where this distinction comes from. The default explanation, suggested by numerous parallels from different periods and regions, is that the respective ethnic (tribal) terms – originally specific in their application and only later generalized – were found in the regions situated most close to the country of the receiving people/language or were for

119 See above section II 3.
120 See above section II 4.3.
121 See above section II 4.1-4.2.
122 See above section II 4.2 and for dating cf. Lemaire 1983: 16–18.
some other reason encountered earlier than other names. The Greek evidence, scarce as it is, seems to corroborate this model. In the Homeric poems Ἀχαιοί and Δαναοί are used, as already noted, practically indiscriminately as synonyms. It is likely that in the Iliad Δαναοί originally represented either the Peloponnesean contingents in general or, more specifically, the Mycenaean, Spartan and Argive contingents coming with Agamemnon, Menelaus and Diomedes respectively; the development of the more transparent Ἀργεῖοι went apparently along the same lines (Argives > Peloponneseans > „Greeks“). As for Ἀχαιοί, a general clue for their location is offered by the Homeric formula Ἄργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον καὶ Ἀχαιΐς καλλιγύναικα („to the horse-pasturing Argos and to Achaea, the land of beautiful women“, Il. 3.75 = 3.258 = 3.283) used to refer to the homeland of the Greek host in general. As Ἄργος refers, as pars pro toto, apparently to the Peloponnesian (cf. Strab. 8.6.5), Ἀχαιΐς should refer to more northern parts of Greece. A further and more specific indication is provided by the passage of the Catalogue of Ships describing the contingent of Achilles (Il. 2.681-685); here Ἀχαιοί appear as one of three tribes (the other two being Μυρμιδόνες and Ἐλλήνες) inhabiting the territories under the sway of Achilles which were located approximately in the southernmost part of Thessaly and immediately to the south of it. These Ἀχαιοί later gave name to Ἀχαια Φθιῶτις, a region centered on the mountain range of Othrys and including the northern coast of the Thermaic Gulf. However, it is dubious that Achaea Phthiotis represents the core land of the Late Bronze and/or Homeric Ἀχαιοί: the rough and rather out-of-the-way region looks rather like a retreat area. As in the 13th-10th centuries BC one can count first of all with population pressure from the north-west (moving of Boeotian tribes from Thessaliotis and North-West Greek tribes (“Dorians”) from Hestiaiotis and Epirus) one may safely assume that the original “Achaea” included at least some further parts of southern Thessaly. The question whether some more southern regions of Central Greece could be also included into this “core Achaea” remains open.

The location of the heartland of the Δαναοί on the Argive plain and that of the Ἀχαιοί in Central Greece – or more specifically in southern Thessaly – squares well with the distribution pattern of the names for the Mycenaean Greeks in the Near Eastern sources. Indeed, the Peloponnese is the first region of the mainland Greece which one reaches sailing from Egypt and the Levant sailing along the south-Anatolian coast and making a stop at Crete, which appears to be the most usual trade route connecting the two regions. Lakonia and Argolis are the closest regions of the peninsula and the Aegean List of Amenophis III, which mentions
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123 Cf., e.g., Finkelberg 2011: s.v. Achaeans (R.L. Fowler), with further references.
124 For different sorts of evidence connecting the Δαναοί with the Peloponnese cf., e.g., the literature cited in Kopanias 2008: 73, fn. 225.
125 Cf. Steiner in LfgrE, s.v. Ἀχαιΐς B I 1 and Αχαιός B I 1 or Finkelberg 2011: s.v. Achaeans.
126 For the definition of territory of Achaea Phthiotis see DNP, s.v. Phthiotis (H. Kramolisch).
127 The same is true also for the Peloponnesian Achaea, the mountainous region in the northern part of the peninsula. In this case it is, however, much more difficult to define from which direction the migrants have come.
128 Cf. references in Finkelberg 2005: 130.
129 For the sea routes and navigation in the Late Bronze Age eastern Mediterranean see, e.g., Wachsmann 1998: 295–301.
Mycenae and Nauplia located in Argolis (cf. above), confirms that the Egyptians well knew the route to Mycenae. The adoption of the name based on the ethnicon Δαναοί as a name for the Mycenaean Greece in general in Egypt and the Levant looks thus perfectly logical. On the other hand, the most likely region of the first encounter of the Mycenaean Greeks with Anatolians was in all probability the western coast of Anatolia, possibly more specifically its central part, the region between Miletus and Ephesos. The distances between this region and almost any Aegean port of the Greek mainland do not differ significantly, and from a purely geographical point of view it is not quite evident which ethnic group of the Greek-speaking population might appear in the central part of western Anatolia first. However, if we consider the later distribution of Greek dialects in western Anatolia, we find out that it is not random, but correlates quite precisely with the dialectal situation in corresponding parts of mainland Greece. The sphere of influence of Doric dialects, spread, *inter alia*, in the Peloponnese (excluding its central part) and in Megaris, was confined in the western Anatolian region to its southernmost part (Rhodes, Kos, the Knidos and the Halikarnassos peninsulas). The central part of the west-Anatolia coast, including both Ephesos and Miletus, was the domain of the East Ionic dialect, connected in mainland Greece with Attica and Euboea (West Ionic), while the northern part was Aeolic-speaking (Lesbian dialect), corresponding to Thessalian and Boeotian on the Greek mainland. The border between Aeolic and Ionian lay in western Anatolia somewhere in the region of Smyrna, as the latter city was claimed to be originally an Aeolian foundation later taken over by the Ionic-speaking Colophonians (cf. Hdt. I 150). It is quite possible that this pattern corresponded, at least approximately, to the pattern of interaction of Greek ethnic groups with western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age, which would mean that the central part of the region lay within the “sphere of interests” of, first of all, the ethnic groups connected with Central Greece. Whether we can narrow it down specifically to southern Thessaly remains an open question.

It seems thus possible to conclude that the Near Eastern sources as a whole preserve a genuine trace of the ethnic composition of Mycenaean Greece. However terse and ambiguous the evidence is, it is a useful reminder that the region was more diverse in ethnic and linguistic terms than is suggested by the Linear B texts with their uniform language and style. The uniformity of language of the Mycenaean texts can be explained, however, also as a result of the (relative) political integrity of the region in the late 13th-12th centuries BC (LH IIIB), a condition implied by several other indications, such as the uniform pottery style based on the standard of the region of Mycenae and perception of Mycenaean Greece by the Hittites as a kingdom under the rule of a single “Great King”. Whatever was the actual degree of the political integrity of the Mycenaean Greece, there is hardly any reason to think that it could have any profound effect on the ethnolinguistic situation in it; the example of
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130 Cf., e.g. the map in Finkelberg 2005: 110.
131 For a discussion of Mycenaean pottery of LH IIIB and the archaeological argument for political uniformity of Mycenaean Greece see Eder 2009. For an evaluation of Hittite evidence concerning the Great King of Ahhiyawa see Kelder 2012. For further discussion see Eder, Jung 2015: 113-140. As for the centre of the “Mycenaean Kingdom”, Mycenae itself remains the most likely candidate (cf. ibid.). Thebes, which is the other alternative advanced in recent years (see Kopanias 2008: 72 with further references) was no doubt a highly significant centre. However, there is no good evidence confirming its supra-regional significance in the Mycenaean Greece, and even in the Greek legendary tradition one does not find such a claim. A possibility of coexistence of two Mycenaean kingdoms with seats in Mycenae and Thebes does not seem likely either (cf. considerations of Kopanias 2008: 71–74).
the “unitary” Hittite Kingdom with its highly complex ethno- and socio-linguistic situation aptly demonstrates how different the political and ethnolinguistic realities could be. The highly diverse picture of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships – even if it reflects, in all probability, the situation several centuries after the disintegration of the Mycenaean palatial system (ca. 1000–900 BC) – as well as, to a degree, the evidence of the Greek dialects of the 1st millennium BC, once again corroborates that the ethnolinguistic situation in the Mycenaean Greece was very far from uniform and the distinction between the terms Ahhiyawa and Danu(_na) is probably only the tip of the iceberg.
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