

RELATIONS BETWEEN CYPRUS AND THE NEAR EAST IN THE MIDDLE AND LATE BRONZE AGE*

by Hara Georgiou

I. INTRODUCTION

The strategic location of the island of Cyprus between the Asian coast and the Aegean area has resulted in a succession of foreign influences, both European and Asian, which can be traced successively from the Bronze Age to modern times.

In this paper the role of Cyprus in the politics of the eastern Mediterranean during the Middle and Late Bronze Age will be reviewed. The problem will be approached primarily from the point of view of Cyprus itself, stressing references to the island of Alašiya in the correspondence of the Hittites, Ugarit, Egypt and other sources when available.

The identification of Cyprus with Alašiya will be accepted here.¹ Catling's objections to this equation were made previous to the new linguistic evidence on the basis of his estimation of the archaeological evidence from Cyprus prior to 1966.²

In the texts from the Near Eastern archives, Alašiya is described as a place which can observe the movements of ships before they reach Ugarit,³ it also can send ships,⁴ excels in building ships⁵ and conducts naval battles with other powers.⁶ It is also a place where political prisoners are exiled for security⁷ and it is ruled by an independent king.⁸ Alašiya is the place where Wenamon is shipwrecked upon his departure from Byblos.⁹ The island status of Alašiya has been proven.¹⁰ Furthermore, copper is the most frequently mentioned export of Alašiya. This harbour/island status combined with the export and production of copper and the position of Alašiya relative to the Syrian coast all point to Cyprus for the identification.

The bilingual inscription from Frangissa near Tamassos with the dedication to "Apollo Alasiotas" can be used to argue for or against the identification of Cyprus with Alašiya. Catling believes this Apollo to be a foreign god who retained his foreign name.¹¹ Other scholars argue for a

* I am much indebted to M. J. Mellink, W. W. Hallo, J. D. Muhly and J. Sasson for their suggestions and comments on this manuscript.

¹ Evidence proving the connection is to be found in the Arslan Tash tablets in which Alašiya is qualified as an island. For a discussion of this see O. Masson, "A propos de l'île d'Alasia", *Kadmos* 12 (1973) 98-9. See also the conclusive arguments by Y. Holmes "The location of Alashiya", *JAOS* 91 (1971) 426-9 and J. D. Muhly "The Land of Alashiya: References to Alashiya in the Texts of the second millennium B.C. and the History of Cyprus in the Late Bronze Age", *Proceedings of the First International Congress of Cypriot Studies* (1972) 201-19. Hereafter referred to as Muhly "The Land of Alashiya" (1972). For a somewhat different conclusion, see M. Artzy, F. Asaro and I. Perlman, "Alašiya of the Amarna Letter", Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory Preprint 2375 (1974).

² H. W. Catling, "Cyprus in the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Period", *CAH*², fascicle 43 (1966) 58-62. For a critique of his

position see M. J. Mellink in *JAOS* 88 (1968) 540, H. Otten, *Sprachliche Stellung und Datierung des Madduwatta-Textes* (1969) 33, and J. D. Muhly see above, n. 1.

³ RS 20.238 in J. Nougayrol, "Nouveaux textes accadiens de Ras-Shamra", *CRAI* 1960 (1961), 165-6; Ugaritica V, text 24, 87-9.

⁴ EA 40 in J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, Vol. I (1907).

⁵ *Ibid.*, EA 36.

⁶ KBo XII, 38 in H. G. Güterbock, "The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered", *JNES* 26 (1967) 80.

⁷ Discussed in full *infra* pp. 90, 93

⁸ The King of Alašiya addresses pharaoh as "brother" in EA 33-9. He is addressed as "brother" by Puduhepa, wife of Hattuşili III in KUB XXI 38. The King of Ugarit addresses him as "father" in RS 20.168 (letter 21) and RS 20.238 (letter 24). All examples discussed *infra*.

⁹ J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* IV (1906) p. 287 #591.

¹⁰ Masson, *Kadmos* 12 (1973), 98-9.

¹¹ Catling, *CAH*², 62.

local god bearing a local name for Cyprus (or at least a part of it).¹² The latter view places Apollo Alasiotas on Alašiya, native to Alašiya, thereby equating Alašiya with Cyprus since the inscription was found on Cyprus.

From the many references to Alašiya in the Near Eastern texts, the identification with Cyprus can be assumed to be valid until the end of Bronze Age. If Alašiya does not refer to the entire island of Cyprus it may represent the eastern portion but probably not a specific city, such as Enkomi.¹³ Aside from the Near Eastern texts and the Tamassos bilingual, Late Bronze Age evidence from Cyprus itself supports the identification with Alašiya.

II. ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE ON CYPRUS AND THE EARLIEST CONTACTS

The connections between Cyprus and the regions of the Aegean and the Near East are minimal during the Neolithic, Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age.¹⁴ The techniques of sea-faring had yet to develop to a stage where such contact could be regularized.¹⁵ The earliest C₁₄ date for Cyprus, 5685 ± 100, comes from the settlement of Khirokitia,¹⁶ Cyprus appears to harbour an early Neolithic culture, contemporary with European and Near Eastern counterparts¹⁷ but essentially local in character.¹⁸

The transition from Neolithic to Early Bronze Age is ill defined on Cyprus.¹⁹ The Early Cypriot period yields sparse evidence to date for foreign contacts and influences. The earliest Minoan imports in Cyprus are in Early Cypriot III and Middle Cypriot I levels and Cypriot artifacts in the Aegean are found in quantity only at the end of the Middle Bronze Age.²⁰

The geographical isolation of Cyprus may have continued to be a factor in its cultural development until the Middle Bronze Age when the island became an internationally important state in the eastern Mediterranean with the development of Near Eastern shipping and trade. The strategic geographical location of Cyprus made it an important stage in this trade network which supplied the Near East and, at a later period, the Aegean. The rich Cypriot deposits of copper which came to the attention of the neighbouring countries at the onset of the Middle Bronze Age provided a strong reason for their interest in Cyprus.²¹ Copper, the product for which Alašiya is best known in the Late Bronze Age was mined as early as EC I²² and perhaps traded as early as the transition from EC III to MC I.

¹² P. Jensen, "Απολλων Αλασιωτας" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 10 (1895) 380; R. Dussaud in C. R. A. Schaeffer, *Enkomi-Alašia* I (1952) 2-10; M. Dhorme, "Les peuples issus de Japhet" *Syria* 13 (1932) 44-5, republished *Recueil Edouard Dhorme* (1951) 184-5, relates Alašiya to the Elisha of the Old Testament; O. Weber in Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* Vol. III (1915) "Anmerkungen", 1077. O. Masson, *Kadmos* (1973) 99 points to the survival in Phoenician of the old name of Alasia in the 7th c. B.C.

¹³ W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (1962) 290; 298, n. 56; see n. 1 Muhly, "The Land of Alashiya" (1972) 201.

¹⁴ Catling, *CAH*², 3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹⁶ C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, "Concerning Gimbutas' 'The Indo-Europeans: Archaeological Problems'" *American Anthropologist*

66 (1964) 887-9. The date quoted here represents a mean of three C₁₄ recordings for Khirokitia. Catling in *CAH*², 7, gives the date "c. 5800" for Khirokitia. Remains predating the Neolithic period have not yet been located on Cyprus (Catling, *CAH*², 6); also N. Stanley Price, *Levant IX* (1977), pp. 66 ff., Fig. 2.

¹⁷ Lamberg-Karlovsky, *AA* 66 (1964) 887-9.

¹⁸ Catling, *CAH*², 8; 19.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 23; Catling believes that this related to an influx of Anatolian settlers responsible for the "Philia" stage in EC I (*Ibid.*, 26-7).

²⁰ R. S. Merrillees, "Trade and Transcendence in the Bronze Age Levant", *SIMA* 39 (1971) 3.

²¹ Catling, *CAH*², 32; 44.

²² *Ibid.*, 31.

During the Middle Cypriot I period (1850–1800) Minoan objects found on Cyprus attest to contact with Crete but not sufficient to enable one to postulate systematic trade relations.²³ This situation continues sporadically through the Middle and Late Bronze Age²⁴ but is secondary in importance to the contacts with Syria, Palestine and Egypt which are first observed in MC II (1800–1700).²⁵

Contemporary with the first of the new MC II contacts with the East is the mention of Alašiya in a text from Mari.²⁶ The tablet in question belongs to the archives of Shamshi-Adad I (c. 1813–1781). Imports of copper and bronze are listed. If Alašiya was already known as a source for these materials during the MC II period, it must have continued to play a role in Near Eastern trade throughout the Middle Bronze Age.²⁷ The earliest Babylonian reference to Cypriot copper dates to the fifth year of Samsuiluna (1743–4 B.C.).²⁸

People from Alašiya are also listed in two texts from the palace of Jarimlim in Alalakh dating to the eighteenth century (level VII).²⁹ One mentions Alašiya in a distribution of grain to individuals (ATT/39/112 #269, 33).³⁰ The other (ATT/47/3 #385, 2) mentions 15 shekels of silver received from Alašiya.³¹ In the latter tablet the name Alašiya might identify a person or place; the reference is unclear.

Two other tablets from Alalakh referring to Alašiya come from level IV, from the “Palace of Niqmepa” (fifteenth century B.C.).³² One of these (AT/8/218 #188, 5) is a list of householders.³³ The other, (#298, 3) is a list of 100 women who each receive a quantity of goods.³⁴ These references indicate contacts between Alašiya and Alalakh during the eighteenth and the fifteenth centuries B.C. but little additional information can be derived from them.³⁵

The archaeological situation indicates that contacts with the East increase in MC III (1700–1600/1550) and by LC I (1550–1400), the position of Alašiya within the Near Eastern trade route is firmly established.³⁶ References to Alašiya in Hittite, Ugaritic and Egyptian texts will be discussed in detail below. Contacts with the Aegean decrease at this time and the cities on the North coast of the island are predictably replaced in importance by new settlements on the East coast, especially Enkomi.³⁷

After the initial stage of Cypriot trade with the East in MC II–LC I, the Mycenaeans seem to show a new interest in the island during LC IB to LC II.³⁸ This is evidenced by the presence of Mycenaean IIB and IIIA pottery in great quantity on Cyprus³⁹ coinciding with increased Mycenaean influence on Crete and in the East Mediterranean in general.

²³ Ibid., 33.

²⁴ Ibid., 43.

²⁵ Ibid., 44.

²⁶ G. Dossin, “Les archives économiques du palais de Mari”, *Syria* 20 (1939) III; see n. 1 Muhly, “The Land of Alashiya” (1972), 204.

²⁷ M. C. Astour, “Ugarit and the Aegean: A Brief Summary of the Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence”, *Orient and Occident Festschrift C. H. Gordon* (1973) 17–27.

²⁸ A. R. Millard, “Cypriot Copper in Babylonia c. 1745 B.C., *J.C.S.* 25 (1973) 211–12.

²⁹ D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (1953) Index 154, 2; J. D. Muhly “Near Eastern Chronology and the Date of the Late Cypriot I Period” *The Archaeology of Cyprus: Recent Developments*, (Colloquium in Honour of Vassos Karageorghis) ed. N. Robertson, Noyes Press, (1975) 80–1.

³⁰ Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (1953), #269, 33, not fully translated.

³¹ Ibid., #385, 2; M. C. Astour, “Second Millenium BC Cypriot and Cretan Onomastica Reconsidered” *JAOS* 84 (1964) 242.

³² Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (1953) Index 154; 1.

³³ Ibid., #188, 5; “Alašiya” line not translated.

³⁴ Ibid., #298, 3; J. D. Muhly, “The Land of Alashiya” (1972) 205.

³⁵ G. Steiner, “Neue Alasiya-Texte”, *Kadmos* I (1962) 137.

³⁶ Catling, *CAH*², 44; 45.

³⁷ H. W. Catling, “Patterns of Settlement in Bronze Age Cyprus”, *OpAth* IV (1963) 141–6.

³⁸ Catling, *CAH*², 56; Y. L. Holmes, “Egypt and Cyprus: Late Bronze Age Trade and Diplomacy” *Orient and Occident*, Festschrift C. H. Gordon (1973) 98.

³⁹ Catling, *CAH*², 56.

Whereas the LC IB–LC II contacts were the results of trade, the appearance of Mycenaean in LC III is the result of settlement or colonization.⁴⁰ This continued until the end of LC III and the attack of the Sea Peoples during the reign of Ramses III.⁴¹ Thereafter habitation continues at Enkomi but the character of the settlement changes.⁴²

III. ALAŠIYA IN THE HITTITE TEXTS

The first mentions of Alašiya in the Hittite texts were previously dated to about 1200 B.C. The re-examination of the Madduwattaš text by Otten⁴³ and others⁴⁴ would now date relations between the Hittites and both Alašiya and Ahhiya closer to 1400 B.C.⁴⁵

The Madduwattaš text⁴⁶ illustrates the general upheaval in the Eastern Mediterranean and the prelude to the breakdown of Hittite power.⁴⁷ Although no Hittite ruler is mentioned by name in the text itself, the original dating was determined by examination of the historical contents of the text and comparison with aspects of contemporary Near Eastern history which were known at the time (1928).

The re-dating of this text and others is based primarily on philological evidence using comparative Hittite material which was not available when the Madduwattaš text was first published, although Goetze himself notes archaic usage in the text.⁴⁸

The new dating, if accepted, would alter our picture of Near Eastern history considerably. The text could no longer be used to illustrate events *c.* 1200 and would indicate that the disturbances at the end of the Hittite Empire period were not a sudden development but were present in some form at least a century earlier.⁴⁹ Following this new interpretation, the Hittites were experiencing problems on their western boundaries considerably earlier than implied by Goetze and other scholars who follow his dating.⁵⁰

The text under discussion involves one Madduwattaš whose land is attacked by Attarissiyas of Ahhiya and who comes with his retinue as a refugee to the Hittite king.⁵¹ Madduwattaš swears an oath of fealty to the king who sets him up in a vassal state, Zippašla in western Anatolia. Among other things, Madduwattaš is instructed not to address any foreign power as an independent agent and especially not to contact Attarissiyas. If the latter should seek to correspond, Madduwattaš is obliged to refer the letter to the Hittite king.

Madduwattaš does not comply with any of the terms of the treaty. Betrayals and intrigues abound. At one point in his career, Madduwattaš forms an alliance with Attarissiyas and “the man of Piggaiā” who had previously made attacks on Alašiya. Together they attack Alašiya and take prisoners. Madduwattaš is reprimanded by the Hittite king who claims Alašiya and demands return of the prisoners. Madduwattaš complies, professing his ignorance, which is not to be seen as proof

⁴⁰ Ibid., 64; and F. H. Stubbings, “The Recession of Mycenaean Civilization”, *CAH*², Fascicle 39 (1965) 17; E. Sjoquist, *Problems of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age, The Swedish Cyprus Expedition* (1940) 202; E. Gjerstad, “Summary of Swedish Excavations in Cyprus”, *Syria* 12 (1931) 61.

⁴¹ Catling, *CAH*², 67; 70.

⁴² R. D. Barnett, “The Sea Peoples”, *CAH*² fascicle 68 (1969) 14–5; Catling, *CAH*², 57–8.

⁴³ H. Otten, *Sprachliche Stellung und Datierung des Madduwattaš-Textes*, Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten, Heft 11 (1969).

⁴⁴ Ibid., 4–6 and notes.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 31–6, “Historisches Resümee”; see also J. D. Muhly,

“Hittites and Achaeans: Ahhijawa *redomitus*” *Historia* XXIII: (1974) 136, 137, 139–45 for a discussion of the re-dating.

⁴⁶ Published by A. Goetze in *MVAeG* 32 (1928) 1–178.

⁴⁷ Goetze, *MVAeG* 32 (1928), 157–9, “Datierung des Textes”; Otten, *Datierung des Madduwattaš-Textes*, 4 (review of Goetze’s dating).

⁴⁸ Goetze, *MVAeG* 32 (1928) 137 on the form of the pronoun *si-e-ta-ni*, Rs. 36.

⁴⁹ Otten, *Datierung*, 35–6.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 35, n. 2.

⁵¹ Synopsis from the translation by A. Goetze, *MVAeG* 32 (1928) 1–39.

of a tenuous Hittite control over Alašiya, but rather as an impertinence on the part of Madduwattaš.⁵²

The incidents listed among the “Verbrechen des Madduwattaš” can be interpreted as an attempt by an ambitious vassal to undermine Hittite control over western Anatolia and the strategically located island of Cyprus. One interesting aspect of the Madduwattaš story is that he was able to carry on such treacherous activities for an extended period of time without being severely checked by the Hittites. This would imply that they either were not able to control him or deliberately did not wish to. What seems like a lack of strong action on their part cannot be explained away by poor communications since the Hittites are able to exchange letters with Madduwattaš, and can send him defensive units when necessary.

The “invasion” of Alašiya by Madduwattaš and the strong complaint of the Hittite king is an indication of the importance of Alašiya in a military as well as an economic sense. The reference to Hittites exacting or receiving tribute from Alašiya may reflect such an economic dependence.⁵³ The involvement of the man of Ahhiya suggest that Achaeans (Mycenaeans)—whether from the mainland or from another location—were challenging the Hittites during the period of time covered by the activities of Madduwattaš. If this is to be *c.* 1400 rather than *c.* 1200, it gives a far earlier date for Achaean activity in the East and provides yet another possibility for filling the historical gap which exists for the West.⁵⁴

The contents of the Madduwattaš text cannot be definitively related to events in Near Eastern history. A cadre for the text must be sought in Hittite history. Although much information is available, the reconstruction of a yearly history for each Hittite ruler remains problematical. Using philological methods exclusively, Otten fits the text into a period from Telepinuš to Šuppiluliuma I (1500–1375).⁵⁵ He then attempts to narrow this period by analyzing the text in the light of historical events known from other sources. By using general historical material, including the Amarna letters, other Hittite documents, and the text KUB XXIII 21 of Arnuwanda,⁵⁶ he concludes that the Madduwattaš text belongs to the period immediately preceding Šuppiluliuma I, i.e. anywhere between 1410 and 1375.⁵⁷ Proceeding with this argument, he places it in the reign of the Arnuwanda who precedes Šuppiluliuma I.⁵⁸ Otten concludes that the events described in the Madduwattaš text occurred at the turn of the fifteenth to the fourteenth century on the basis of philological analysis.

The Madduwattaš text suggests that the Hittites claim control over Alašiya but not actual sovereignty. Later texts, specifically the Plague Prayers of Muršiliš which describe events immediately preceding the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, indicate the sending of prisoners to Alašiya.⁵⁹ This and other texts confirm a close relationship between the two countries without actually proving it for the earlier date. Since Alašiya is not defined as a vassal of the Hittites in the Madduwattaš text where political relationships are specifically noted in other cases, it must therefore be an independent state. Alašiya seems to enjoy a similar relationship to Egypt in the Amarna period cor-

⁵² F. Sommer, *Die Ahhiyava-Urkunden. Abh. München*, N. F. 6 (1932) 339, comment on Rs 85 of the Madduwattaš text.

⁵³ F. Sommer, *Die Ahhiyava-Urkunden. Abh. München*, N. F. 6 (1932) 339, comment on tribute from Alašiya. Trade with Alašiya is evident in KBo IV, 1 in which copper and bronze are brought from Mount Taggata in Alašiya (A. Goetze in Pritchard, *ANET*, 356). Another text, KUB XV, 34 (*Ibid.*, 352) mentions Alašiya among a group of countries where one could go from Hatti. These texts probably date to the period immediately preceding the Hittite Empire.

⁵⁴ Otten, *Datierung*, 35, n. 2.; G. L. Huxley, *Achaeans and Hittites* (1960); Muhly, “Hittites and Achaeans,” *Historia* (1974) 129–39.

⁵⁵ Otten, *Datierung*, 30.

⁵⁶ Otten, *Datierung*, 30.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 2–3.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, and H. Otten, *Die hethitischen historischen Quellen und die Altorientalische Chronologie*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Litteratur, Mainz. Abh. d. Geistes und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1968, Nr. 3.

⁵⁹ For discussion of this text see *infra*, p. 90.

responding roughly with the reign of Šuppiluliuma I when the Hittites control northern Syria.⁶⁰ This immediately follows the period in which Otten places the Madduwattaš text. Therefore, since Alašiya is independent of both powers at this time and later, Alašiya might be independent at all times regardless of which power controls northern Syria or is engaging in an expansionistic policy. The apparent independence of Alašiya may be due to the status of the island as a trade centre which would afford it economic neutrality.⁶¹

Too little is actually known of the political allegiance of Alašiya from the Alašiyian point of view. Aside from indications in the Amarna letters (EA 33–40) and the Hittite and Ras Shamra texts, no decipherable documents have been found on Cyprus itself which would elucidate the matter. We can only say that a definite treaty binding Alašiya to the Hittites occurs in the reign of Šuppiluliuma II (KBo XII 39, c. 1200). Therefore, attempting to give an absolute date to the Madduwattaš text by pinpointing a period during which Alašiya functions as an independent state is problematical as this independence might have been the case throughout the history of the island until c. 1200.

Such independence for Alašiya does not refute Otten's dating, which is primarily supported by his other arguments.⁶² It would only limit the usefulness of attempting to establish a date for the Madduwattaš text on the basis of the relative position of Alašiya vis à vis the dominant Near Eastern powers.

The activities of the Hittites in Anatolia as described in the Madduwattaš text imply a renewed effort on their part to consolidate territory on all frontiers. In the new interpretation of the texts, campaigns in Syria, Kizzuwatna and in western Anatolia can be attributed to Tudhaliya (the father of the Arnuwanda mentioned above).⁶³ He is a logical candidate for the king in the Madduwattaš text who establishes Hittite connections with Alašiya. Lines 87 and following of the Madduwattaš text indicate that neither the father of the present ruler nor the ruler himself informed Madduwattaš of the political allegiance of Alašiya.⁶⁴ If two distinct rulers can be inferred from this passage, then they might be Tudhaliya I and Arnuwanda I. The activities of Madduwattaš are so numerous that they might easily span the reigns of two Hittite kings, beginning at the end of the reign of Tudhaliya I and continuing into the reign of Arnuwanda I. Otten places these two kings directly in line before Šuppiluliuma I, thus bringing their dates closer to 1375.⁶⁵

Whether we accept the broad dating or the narrower attribution of the text to Arnuwanda I, Otten's theory contrasts greatly with the prior opinions based on Goetze's evaluation dating the Madduwattaš text to Arnuwanda III, the predecessor of Šuppiluliuma II, c. 1200. The new dating establishes Hittite contacts with Alašiya c. 1400. It provides information on the earliest enemy raids on Alašiya as well as new evidence concerning Ahhiya.

The next mention of Alašiya occurs in the Plague Prayers of Muršiliš.⁶⁶ Although the prayers date to a period after the reign of Šuppiluliuma I, they refer back to events which occurred prior to his accession. A reason is being sought for the plague which is afflicting the Hittite land. In the course of the first prayer, Muršiliš expresses guilt concerning the fate of Tudhaliya the younger whom he calls the son of Tudhaliya (1.11). This Tudhaliya, the *tuhukantis* or pretender to the throne can be

⁶⁰ A. Goetze, "The Struggle for the domination of Syria", *CAH*², fascicle 37 (1965) 3–4.

⁶¹ Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962) 138.

⁶² Otten, *Datierung*, 34.

⁶³ H. Otten, *Die hethitischen historischen Quellen* (1968) 115; O. R. Gurney, "Anatolia c. 1600–1380 B.C." *CAH*², fascicle 44 (1966) 20.

⁶⁴ Goetze, *MVAeG* 32 (1928) 38–9; Rs 87, *A-BI* ^dUTU-šī trans-

lated as "Der Vater der Sonne"; and Rs 88, ^dUTU-šī translated "Die Sonne"; Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 10.

⁶⁵ Otten, *Die hethitischen historischen Quellen* (1968) 101–6.

⁶⁶ A. Goetze, "Die Pestgebete des Mursilis" *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* I (1930) 161–251. Translation of the First Plague Prayer with lines pertinent to this discussion: pp. 165–9, Vs. 1–39; *ANET*, 394 ff.

identified as the son of Tudhaliya I and the younger brother and successor to Arnuwanda I.⁶⁷ The events explained in the prayer would have occurred either late in the reign of Arnuwanda I or immediately afterwards. This would place them slightly later than the Madduwattaš indictment. The first Plague Prayer (1.13–20) explains that Tudhaliya the younger as pretender to the throne had obtained the allegiance of all the princes and military commanders of Hatti, including the father (or grandfather) of the writer. A conspiracy within the royal family developed supporting his ancestor, perhaps Suppiluliuma I, against the legal claimant. Tudhaliya the younger is eventually murdered along with some of his followers. Others are sent to the land of Alašiya in exile. The advantages of an island as a place of banishment are very clear.

The new dating of the Madduwattaš text suggests that the allegiance of Alašiya to the Hittites was already established under Tudhaliya II, making it possible for the Hittites to use Alašiya as a convenient place for the banishment of royal political exiles. This sort of arrangement emphasizes the fact that Alašiya lies within the Hittite sphere of influence or is at least friendly to the Hittites.⁶⁸

The Hittites continue to use Alašiya as a place for banishment until Šuppiluliuma II. Although the loyalty of Alašiya to the Hittites throughout this long period can be questioned, trade relations existed which were advantageous to both parties. It would certainly have been in the best interests of Alašiya to promote friendly relations since the Hittites were in control of all the territory along the north-eastern trade route.

Under Muršili II a political enemy, Uhha-LU of Arzawa escapes with his sons and followers “over the sea” to a place which may be Alašiya.⁶⁹ The first actual banishment occurs under Hattušili III who sends his enemies, the sons of Armadatta, to Alašiya.⁷⁰ His deposed nephew, Urhitešup (Muršili III) is sent “over the sea” which again may mean Alašiya or at least the same destination indicated for Uhha-LU.⁷¹ It seems that Urhitešup escaped from this place “over the sea” and it is known that he lives at the Egyptian court at the time of the signing of the treaty between Ramses II and Hattušili III in 1284.⁷²

Contemporary with the banishment of Urhitešup is a letter of Puduhepa, wife of Hattušili III, in which she addresses the King of Alašiya as “brother”.⁷³ The letter concerns the arrangement of a marriage between the King of Alašiya and a Near Eastern princess. Puduhepa is discussing selection of the princess and the bride price which the King of Alašiya, pleading poverty, is unwilling to pay. She chides him on this and accuses him of trying to take advantage of her. There is a possibility that Puduhepa is planning a trip to Alašiya as well.⁷⁴

The appellation “brother” supports the idea of an Alašiya neutral in the way described above but with strong ties to the Hittites.⁷⁵ Kings who are not vassals can be “brothers” to “Great Kings”. Alašiya was politically subordinate in terms of actual power to both Egypt and the Hittites, but the forms of address used between Alašiya and these greater powers also indicate that Alašiya is a vassal to neither but maintains friendly relations with both.

Following the reign of Hattušili III (c. 1275–1250), the Hittite references to Alašiya are more frequent and explicit. The texts which will be discussed next belong to a period of approximately

⁶⁷ Otten, *Hethitischen historischen Quellen* (1968) 107–9; H. Otten, “Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des Hethitischen Reiches” *MDOG* 94 (1963) 10; Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962) 136; Otten, *Datierung*, 33.

⁶⁸ E. Sjöquist in *Problems of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age* (1940) 201, would argue that these people escaped to Alašiya which was beyond Hittite control.

⁶⁹ Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962) 136; Sommer, *Ahhiyava-Urkunden*, (1932) 310–13. The son of Uhha-LU is later sent to Ahhiyava.

Alašiya is not mentioned in the text.

⁷⁰ Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962) 136–7; Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 10.

⁷¹ Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962) 136–7; Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 10.

⁷² Otten, *Fischer Weltgeschichte* III, 162.

⁷³ Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962) 133; Sommer, *Ahhiyava-Urkunden* (1932) 253–60, KUB XXI 38; Huxley, *Achaean and Hittites* #6.

⁷⁴ Sommer, *Ahhiyava-Urkunden*, 257.

⁷⁵ Sommer, *Ahhiyava-Urkunden*, 65 for discussion of terms of address.

fifty years, from the reign of Tudhaliya (II) until the end of the Hittite Empire under Šuppiluliuma II.⁷⁶ This is a time of increasing unrest and difficulties.

References to Alašiya in the Boghazköy archives include KBo XII 39, a treaty between the Hittite king and his vassal, the King of Alašiya.⁷⁷ He receives the blessing and good wishes of the Great King, which implies a favourable Hittite policy towards Alašiya. In return for this, Alašiya is bound to accept Hittite political prisoners or exiles and guard them. The sending of a prisoner is mentioned in the treaty. A man entitled Pidduri is mentioned in connection with the King of Alašiya. He is probably the vizier or "Grand-intendant". In this capacity he may be the Ešuwara mentioned in the Ras Shamra correspondence.⁷⁸ The title of Pidduri may be equivalent to the title of *rabišu* known from the Amarna letters.⁷⁹ In any event, the Pidduri is an important person and most likely to be the "right arm" of the king since he is mentioned in the treaty. KBo XII 39 probably dates to Arnuwanda (III) or Šuppiluliuma II.

The next tablet, KBo XII 38, is of a more complex nature and may actually be considered as two distinct references.⁸⁰ It concerns the last three Hittite Empire kings but was probably composed under Šuppiluliuma II.

The text is divided into four distinct portions. The first recounts a conquest of Alašiya and the tribute exacted by a Hittite king from the King of Alašiya and the Pidduri. The second portion begins with the dedication of a statute to Tudhaliya, continues with a full genealogy of Šuppiluliuma, and mentions the dedication of a sanctuary. These first two episodes are separated from the following by a double line usually indicating the beginning of a new text. After the double line, column II continues with another full genealogy of Šuppiluliuma II.

The third portion of KBo XII 38 is the description of another campaign in Alašiya. This second war is a sea engagement and therefore interesting because the Hittites relied upon Ugarit for naval power. They may have used ships from Ugarit for the campaign. It is also the first sea battle described in Near Eastern texts.

The adversary is mentioned as "the enemy from Alašiya".⁸¹ Earlier references to Alašiya indicate that the island was not a traditional enemy of the Hittites. All the previous exchanges between the Hittites and Alašiya indicate good trade relations and mutual regard. Therefore this enemy may be a hostile group and not the population of the areas with which the Hittites traditionally dealt. The episode can be placed in the period of transition between LC II and LC III on Cyprus (c. 1200, coinciding with the reigns of Arnuwanda (III) and Šuppiluliuma II).

Enkomi was destroyed at the end of LC II and rebuilt immediately thereafter in LC III. The later construction is characterized by an increase in Mycenaean wares and coincides with a greater Mycenaean presence on the island.⁸² The LC III evidence for Mycenaeans definitely indicates settlements and the beginnings of colonization as opposed to the earlier trade contacts which were more sporadic and not as dense.⁸³ These settlements are especially concentrated on the North and West coasts of Cyprus. They are also contemporary with increased Mycenaean presence at Ugarit and other trade emporia.⁸⁴

⁷⁶ KBo XII 38 and 39 published in *K.Bo Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Berlin (1921-63). Discussion in Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 1-21; Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 73-81.

⁷⁷ Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 73-81.

⁷⁸ Nougayrol, *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 166.

⁷⁹ Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 15; Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* I (1907) 297, EA 40.

⁸⁰ Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 74 ff.

⁸¹ Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 80, n. 10. The simple genitive "ŠA

KUR Alašiya" cannot be used to mean enemies hostile to Alašiya. Güterbock believes that the enemy is the one in RS 20.18 (*Ugaritica* V #22) to whom Ugaritic sailors hand over ships. See also Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 21.

⁸² Catling, *CAH*², 65.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 64, and p. 87 *Supra.*, n. 40; Astrom, P., *The Late Cypriot Bronze Age, Historical Conclusions, The Swedish Cyprus Expedition* IV, ID, Lund (1972).

⁸⁴ Sjöquist, *Problems* (1940), 205-9.

If these Mycenaean are the same people as the Ahhiya or the Ahhiyawa, certain inferences can be drawn.⁸⁵ The Ahhiyawa are hostile to the Hittites as can be seen in the interference of Attarissiyas, man of Ahhiya, in Hittite politics as early as the late fifteenth century. It cannot be assumed that such hostilities continued without periods of good relations. But as Mycenaean power expanded towards the eastern Mediterranean, a clash was inevitable at some point with the Hittites who sought to maintain control on their western frontiers. The Achaeans were a strong sea power by 1200 B.C. and could muster sufficient naval force to engage the Hittites in a sea battle in an effort to gain control over the strategic island of Cyprus.⁸⁶ The enemy mentioned in KBo XII 38 may be the Mycenaean.

Whereas the text KBo XII 38 refers to the enemy from Alašiya and the ships of Alašiya, the name of the king, or the enemy, is nowhere mentioned or specified. If, as indicated above, the Hittites are dealing with a power which is distinct from their traditional Alašiyian contact, the enemy must be sought in a different population. By comparison with Ugaritic documents it has been inferred that this enemy is the Sea Peoples or the enemy mentioned (again without name) in the correspondence between the King of Ugarit and the King of Alašiya.⁸⁷ This enemy may be the Mycenaean, pirates,⁸⁸ the Sea Peoples or a combination of any of these.

The increased Mycenaean presence on Cyprus in LC III indicates that the Achaeans or Mycenaean are a more likely candidate for "the enemy from Alašiya" if we accept the hypothesis that the text is referring to a population distinct from the old vassal and ally of the Hittites. At the time of the battle described in KBo XII 38, which is dated c. 1200, the Mycenaean might be just landing on Cyprus and establishing their settlements, imposing their LC III culture on the previous Cypriot LC II.

There is no known incident up to this time which would imply a state of war or enmity existing between the Hittites and Alašiya. On the contrary, relations seem to be consistently agreeable and stable. Therefore, this text describes a major political shift in the attitudes of Alašiya towards the Hittites or *vice versa* which could be accounted for by an enemy occupation of the island. Chronologically and archaeologically the Mycenaean fit the description.

This text ends with the description of a sanctuary which Šuppiluliuma is dedicating to his father. The suggested interpretation of the entire text is that it describes two campaigns against Alašiya, both recorded by Šuppiluliuma II, the first war occurring under Tudhaliya IV and the second war being conducted by his son.⁸⁹

It is not certain which of the two texts (KBo XII 38, 39) is the earlier. The treaty (39) may actually follow the wars (38), clarifying relations between the Hittites and the new power on Alašiya which they have defeated.

IV. ALAŠIYA AND UGARIT

Texts dated to the thirteenth century referring to Alašiya were found at Ugarit, the city on the north Syrian coast which is closest in geographical proximity to the eastern part of Cyprus.

⁸⁵ Sommer in *Ahhiyawa-Urkunden*, 378, cautions against this identification which is supported by E. Forrer in "Vorhomerische Griechen in den Keilschrifttexten von Boghazköi" *MDOG* 63 (1924) 22, and "Für die Griechen in den Boghazköi-Inschriften", *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* I (1930) 252-72. The present knowledge of Mycenaean studies makes it possible to support the identification of Ahhiya and Ahhiyawa with Mycenaean Greeks but the equation is still not secure, see

Muhly, "Hittites and Achaeans" *Historia* (1974) 137-9.

⁸⁶ Sjöquist, *Problems* (1940), 202.

⁸⁷ Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962).

⁸⁸ Activities of pirates are known from the Ras Shamra texts (*infra.*) and in connection with Cyprus in EA 38-40 in the fourteenth century B.C.

⁸⁹ Güterbock, *JNES* 26 (1967) 74.

The earliest of these texts (RS 18.144 text IV E5) concerns the Hittites, Alašiya and Carchemish.⁹⁰ This fragment may represent a legal action and relates the transfer of escaped prisoners from Alašiya by Hattušili III to the King of Carchemish and by him to his son Tilišarrumu. The disposition of real estate belonging to the prisoners is also mentioned. Although it describes relations between the Hittites and Carchemish the letter does again indicate the use of Alašiya as a place of exile for prisoners.

A similar relationship between Alašiya, Ugarit and Carchemish occurs in the somewhat later series of texts from Ugarit. In RS 17.352 (text V B1) Initešub of Carchemish pronounces a verdict on two sons of a Queen of Ugarit, the Lady Ahatmilku.⁹¹ The sons are banished from the country and sent to Alašiya (1.10) in exile with their belongings. Once there, they are to appear before Ištār-šēri and swear that they will make no further claims on the King of Ugarit. The existence of a shrine to a Syrian goddess on Cyprus might imply that there were enough Syrian residents (rather than transients such as merchants or sailors) on Cyprus to support such a building.⁹²

The two sons were presumably intriguing against the king Ammištamru II who might have been their brother.⁹³ Ahatmilku is mentioned in RS 17.352 as the Queen Mother and again in RS 16.197.⁹⁴ She might have been the consort of Niqmepa whom she married towards the end of the reign of Muṣiliš II.⁹⁵ This same incident of the banishment is recorded in a verdict of Tudhaliya IV (RS 17.35 V B 2) and possibly RS 17.362 and 17.367.⁹⁶ These last three fragmentary texts mention the affair but not the place of banishment, Alašiya. The incident itself would certainly illustrate the close relations which must have existed at this time between the Syrian coast and Alašiya, relations which were firmly secured by mutual trade agreements.

Textual evidence for trade between Ugarit and Alašiya is indicated in a fragment attributed to Niqmadu II (RS 20.168, text 21).⁹⁷ The letter is addressed to the King of Alašiya and concerns a shipment of oil which was not paid for in full. The greetings are extremely formal and the King of Alašiya is called "my father". This unusual formula does not necessarily mean that the King of Alašiya is a suzerain of the King of Ugarit. Such greetings cannot be used to prove political alignment of this sort. They do, however, clearly show an intentional expression of respect.⁹⁸ Excluding the possibility of implied political dependence of Ugarit on Alašiya, the form of address which is a kinship term may imply actual kinship⁹⁹ or it may indicate a difference in the ages of the correspondents. The formula of address is used again for the King of Alašiya in RS 20.238.¹⁰⁰ The term "my son" from the King of Alašiya to the King of Ugarit occurs in RS 18.147.¹⁰¹

The name Alašiya also appears in an enumeration of distribution of wine jugs to persons or communities which are not specified (RS 15.39 Pl. XVI text 90, line 7-8).¹⁰² Elsewhere, a man from Alašiya also receives oil.¹⁰³

A somewhat more problematical reference is in RS 11.857, a list of approximately 30 families or households of the town of Alašiya.¹⁰⁴ The list includes numbers of wives, their children and possibly

⁹⁰ J. Nougayrol, *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit IV, Mission de Ras Shamra IX* (1956) 108.

⁹¹ Nougayrol, *PRU IV*, 121 f.

⁹² Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 13.

⁹³ Nougayrol, *PRU IV*, 120.

⁹⁴ *PRU IV*, 120; *PRU III*, 150.

⁹⁵ *PRU IV*, 120.

⁹⁶ *PRU IV*, 123.

⁹⁷ J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica V, Mission de Ras Shamra XVI* (1968) 80, n. 3; Nougayrol, *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 166.

⁹⁸ Nougayrol, *Ugaritica V*, 80, n. 3.

⁹⁹ M. C. Astour, "New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit", *AJA* 69 (1965) 255.

¹⁰⁰ Nougayrol, *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 165-6; *Ugaritica V*, text 24.

¹⁰¹ Astour, *AJA* 69 (1965) 255; *Ugaritica V*, text 61.

¹⁰² C. Viroilleaud, *PRU II* (1957) 114-15; Muhly, "The Land of Alashiya" (1972) 206.

¹⁰³ M. C. Astour, *JAOs* 84 (1964) 245 f. and Muhly, "The Land of Alashiya" (1972) 206.

¹⁰⁴ C. Viroilleaud, "Lettres et documents administratifs provenant des archives d'Ugarit", *Syria* 21 (1940) 267-70.

servants (*pqt* and *gwr*). Each listing includes the name of a male who owns the house in which they live. These male names are primarily Canaanite and Hurrian.¹⁰⁵ They provide no real clue to the nationality of the persons involved or to the location of Alašiya. Of the sixteen legible names only three are Semitic.¹⁰⁶ The translator believes this city to be located on the Syrian coast. He considers it to be colonized by Cypriots and therefore named Alašiya.¹⁰⁷ It might also be a list of captives or war prisoners.¹⁰⁸ Another possibility is that the text refers to people from Alašiya who are living in a section of Ugarit or in a city under its control. Either of the latter two possibilities would explain the interest in having a local record of such persons.

Another problematical text is RS 1929 no. 2 in which Alašiyans are mentioned among peoples who pillage and humiliate Ugarit.¹⁰⁹ This is considered to be contemporary with the reign of Šuppiluliuma II. These enemies of Ugarit are the Hty (Hittites) and Hry (Hurrians) and the Alsy (Alašiyans) mentioned above. It would seem from this tablet that the political situation has shifted considerably, and this text may actually be later than the others and may refer to a state of affairs which prevailed immediately following the end of Hittite power. Perhaps these traditional names are used to indicate new peoples who occupy the same general areas.

The next group of letters concerns enemy activities and naval matters.¹¹⁰ The date of these texts is somewhat problematical, and some may be as late as 1200.¹¹¹ The ethnic name or names of the enemy are unfortunately never mentioned in the texts. Since this is the case, it was probably a common enemy which was well known to both the Alašiyans and the King of Ugarit.

In RS 20.18 (letter 22), Ešuwara, vizier of Alašiya addresses the King of Ugarit.¹¹² This seems to be an answer to a previous enquiry of that king concerning the activities of some of his subjects. Ešuwara reports (in halting Accadian)¹¹³ that while stopping at Alašiya these people committed a transgression and delivered a flotilla of ships to an unspecified enemy. Ešuwara wishes not be blamed for the incident and warns the King of Ugarit that twenty boats have disappeared. These are presumably the boats which were handed over. The fragmentary nature of the text does not allow for a more detailed reconstruction of the event.

The next two letters can be seen as a sequence but it is not clear which is in answer to which. The first (RS L.1, letter 23) is from the King of Alašiya to Ammurapi concerning the enemies from the sea.¹¹⁴ He advises him to fortify his towns and await the enemy in security. This confident warning is related to a possible response (or is in response to a letter) from the King of Ugarit to Alašiya (RS 20.238, letter 24).¹¹⁵ The King of Alašiya is again addressed as “my father” and is informed that seven enemy boats have come and pillaged the territory of Ugarit. The King of Ugarit complains that he was caught unawares, his troops being in Hittite country and his boats in Lukka. He asks to be informed if any enemy boats are spotted so that he will be prepared.

These letters are certainly vivid testimony to the disturbances prevalent at the time they were written. They also confirm a close and friendly relationship between Alašiya and Ugarit, two important centres of trade. The enemy mentioned in the letters may represent pirates and raiders

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 272.

¹⁰⁶ Virolleaud, “Lettres et documents administratifs provenant des archives d’Ugarit”, *Syria* 21 (1940), 272.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 273.

¹⁰⁸ Helck, *Beziehungen* (1962) 298, n. 56; J. D. Muhly, review of *CAH* II, 1, Third Ed. in *JAOS* 97 (1977), 66.

¹⁰⁹ C. Virolleaud, “Les inscriptions cunéiformes de Ras Shamra”, *Syria* 10 (1929) Pl. 62; Virolleaud, *Syria* 21 (1940) 266; C. F. A. Schaeffer, *PRU* II p. xxviii; Steiner, *Kadmos* I (1962) 130, n. 4;

Sommer, *Ahhiyava-Urkunden*, 385.

¹¹⁰ J. Nougayrol, “Guerre et paix à Ugarit”, *Iraq* 25 (1963) 110–23 and refs. infra.

¹¹¹ Muhly, “The Land of Alashiya” (1972) 219.

¹¹² Nougayrol, *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 166; *Ugaritica* V, 83.

¹¹³ Nougayrol, *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 166.

¹¹⁴ Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 85–6.

¹¹⁵ Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 87–9; *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 165–6; Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 9.

who may be the Sea Peoples descending sporadically on Cyprus and the Syrian coast from the time of the reign of Merneptah until their defeat at the hands of Ramses III.¹¹⁶ They may also be connected with the movements of the Mycenaeans at this time (c. 1200 B.C.) in the eastern Mediterranean.¹¹⁷ Although piracy is known in the area since the fourteenth century, it becomes a widespread menace at this time.¹¹⁸ This indicates a severe disruption in the trade patterns and in the political system which had previously maintained a balance of power in the area.

The causes for such a break-down are certainly not simple and cannot be fully investigated in the present study. The Sea Peoples alone are not responsible for this situation, nor can we generalize about famines and droughts which might have been prevalent throughout the entire region encompassing Anatolia, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia and the western Mediterranean. There is insufficient evidence available at present to infer a general blight from one or two incidents and mentions of "plague" or famine. The Sea Peoples are one of the symptoms of increasing weakness of traditional political powers and they would probably not have ventured into the area had it been under strong control. The number of documents from Ugarit (and elsewhere) dealing with enemy attacks and ships rules out a destruction of Ugarit (and other sites) as a result of natural causes alone. The mention of shipments of grain being sent from Ugarit to other places would also indicate that Ugarit is not suffering from starvation and can therefore not be included in the area suffering from famine. Some enemy action is definitely involved in the fall of Ugarit as the letters themselves testify. In the case of RS 20.238 concerning the enemy activities on the coast of Ugarit proper, the actual invasion may have prevented the sending of the letter.¹¹⁹ On the other hand, it may also have been a copy which was being preserved for future reference.

The times seem to have been hard ones for many areas but for different reasons. A letter from *Pqn* in which Ammurapi is addressed as "my son" may be from the King of Alašiya (see Refs. in RS 20.212 and RS 20.168 for this relationship). *Pqn* thanks the King of Ugarit for sending food and asks for another shipment.¹²⁰

In a letter from the Hittite court (RS 20.212) the king of Ugarit is reminded of his obligations to Hatti in spite of the fact that Ugarit is technically liberated from Hittite vassalage.¹²¹ These special obligations of Ugarit may have been limited to situations and emergencies involving the use of sea power, which the Hittites lacked. The Hittite king asks for 2,000 measures of grain to be sent to the city of Ura (in Cilicia) from Mukish (in the lower Orontes valley). The king of Ugarit must furnish a boat and crew. He is further reminded that this is a question of life and death.

The amount of grain, which has been estimated at 6,000 hectolitres, would imply that either a large boat was needed or that several trips were required to transport the grain.¹²² The problem of boats is again raised in RS 20.141 B text 34¹²³ which may be an answer to RS 20.212. It would seem that thirty boats are needed instead of one.¹²⁴ But the context is not certain, and the two texts may not refer to the same incident. However, RS 26.158 text 171 is a fragment concerning the transport of grain by boat to the city of Ura.¹²⁵ This may again be the same incident or yet another shipment. These letters may be contemporary with a text of Merneptah in which he mentions sending ships with grain to the same spot.¹²⁶ This famine is certainly severe but it is localized at Ura in Cilicia with

¹¹⁶ Otten, *MDOG* 94 (1963) 9.

¹¹⁷ Catling, *CAH*², 65.

¹¹⁸ Steiner, *Kadmos* 1 (1962) 138, and n. 89 *Supra*.

¹¹⁹ Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 88, n. 1.

¹²⁰ Astour, *AJA* 69 (1965) 255, RS 18.147; *PRU* V text 61.

¹²¹ Nougayrol, *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 165; Astour, *AJA* 69 (1965) 255;

Ugaritica V, 105-7, text 33.

¹²² Nougayrol, *CRAI* 1960 (1961) 165; *Ugaritica* V, 323-4.

¹²³ Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, 107-8.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 107, n. 4.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, text 171.

¹²⁶ Breasted, *ARE* III, #518.

one possible reference to Alašiya.¹²⁷ Ugarit cannot be said to be suffering from famine since it may have sent food from its own resources (to Alašiya?) in RS 18.147. Nor is Egypt suffering from famine for the same reasons. The question is how bad the drought might have been (if the cause of the famine was a drought) and where it was localized.

The letters in which ships of Ugarit are mentioned as being mobilized under special obligation to the Hittites might help in clarifying KBo XII 38. Although only one ship is mentioned in RS 20.212, it might imply that the Hittites could call on ships or a ship from Ugarit to use as a fleet.

V. ALAŠIYA IN THE EGYPTIAN TEXTS

Alašiya is mentioned in the Egyptian sources under Tuthmosis III in connection with tribute lists of towns on the adjacent coast.¹²⁸ This would precede the earliest Hittite reference under Tudhaliya I, who may be the king who claims sovereignty over Alašiya in the Madduwattaš text. Tuthmosis III also claims tribute from Hatti in his thirty-third and forty-first years.¹²⁹ His control over Cyprus, North Syria and indirectly over Hatti reflects the weak state of the Hittite kingdom before the accession of Tudhaliya I.

Egyptian references to Alašiya increase in the Amarna period under Akhenaton. The relations between the two countries can be traced through seven letters from the king of Alašiya to the pharaoh (EA 33–39) and a further one from the *rabišu* of Alašiya to the *rabišu* of Egypt (EA 40).¹³⁰ In these letters, the king of Alašiya addresses pharaoh as “brother” indicating that Alašiya is independent of Egypt and not a vassal.¹³¹ The correspondence focuses on the copper trade. A close reading of these letters supports the idea of trade as opposed to a tribute situation, since payment for goods is demanded from Egypt.

In the first letter (EA 33), the king of Alašiya congratulates the new pharaoh, Amenhotep IV, on his accession and sends 200 talents of copper asking for a yearly exchange of messengers. A shipment of 100 talents of copper is mentioned in the second letter (EA 34) in payment for miscellaneous luxury items. The king of Alašiya is concerned with the problems of trade and may be referring to the death of one of his tradesmen. A consistent theme throughout this correspondence is the difficulty of the administration of the trade and the length of time expended between voyages. It is remarkable that such a complex system could have been maintained at all considering the problems of distance and communication.

In the third letter (EA 35) the king of Alašiya sends 500 talents of copper and ironically asks to be forgiven for the small amount. This shipment of copper is the largest recorded in any of the tablets. Pharaoh might have asked for a larger quantity which the king of Alašiya was unable to deliver. The reasons he gives is that “Nergal” has killed many of his subjects and that there is not one left for mining the copper. Nergal is the Assyrian god of death and the underworld.¹³² The reference is taken to mean that people were dying of an unspecified sickness, a plague or some other disease. The infant son of the king of Alašiya is also a victim of this sickness. In return for the copper the king asks for silver, oil and an ox, as well as payment for a previous shipment of wood. If famine were the cause of the disease we might expect him to ask for grain.

¹²⁷ RS 18.147; Astour, *AJA* 69 (1965) 255.

¹²⁸ G. A. Wainwright, “Alashia–Alasa; and Asy” *Klio* 14 (1915) 33; Helck, *Beziehungen* (1962) 165; Muhly, “The Land of Alashiya” (1972) 208.

¹²⁹ Helck, *Beziehungen* (1962) 164; K. Bittel, *Hattusha* (1970) 120 ff.

¹³⁰ Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* I (1907) 279–97 with commentary by O. Weber in Vol. III (1915) 1076–86, *The Tell El-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum* (1892).

¹³¹ Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln* III, 1076.

¹³² Helck, *Beziehungen* (1962), “Ägypten und Vorderasien während der Amarnazeit”, 187. Helck connects this sickness on Alašiya with a more widespread “Plague” which he believes began in Egypt at the end of Akhnaton’s rule and reached the Hittites during their war against Egypt over the murder of Zannanza who was sent to marry the widow of Tutankhamon. Although Helck acknowledges the difficulties in pinpointing the type of plague or the direction it took, he believes that it may have spread along the main trade routes and lasted at least twenty years.

A consular matter is also included in this communication. A citizen of Alašiya (possibly a merchant) died in Egypt. His goods are to be returned with the messenger for delivery to his family. At the end of this letter the pharaoh is asked not to make treaties with Hatti or Šanhar (the Hittites and Babylon).¹³³ This may be a warning not to be too trusting of either power. It certainly indicates that Alašiya is not bound by any oath to the Hittite king but is acting as an independent state manipulating the allegiances of the great powers to its advantage.

The fourth letter (EA 36) mentions the sending of 80 talents of copper with approximately 70 others which are owed to Egypt and a number of ships which are to be built. This fragmentary letter seems to continue with references to hard times. Grain is to be sent to the area of Kinahi which may be in Alašiya or in Canaan. The messenger of Alašiya has been detained in Egypt for two years.

In the fifth letter (EA 37), the king of Alašiya acknowledges receipt of five talents of silver and five spans of horses. He asks for prompt return of his messenger along with a number of other people whose names are not Egyptian.¹³⁴ These people may be merchants or crews of the boats which traffic between the two countries.

In the sixth letter (EA 38), the king of Alašiya disclaims any knowledge of an alliance between his citizens and Lukki raiders who have violated Egyptian territory. If pharaoh can prove such a conspiracy, the king of Alašiya will deal with the people personally. He himself has problems with the people of Lukki who annually attack one of his small cities. These may be the Lukka mentioned in RS 20.338. Although the Amarna correspondence is earlier than the Ras Shamra documents, the reference could be to the same ethnic group. Similarly, in RS 20.18 when citizens of Ugarit hand over boats to an enemy on Alašiya, one can postulate that this enemy operates out of Alašiya but is also inimical to the king of that country. Sea pirates might already have been operating out of a base on Alašiya in the earlier context. This would explain the confusion in the mind of pharaoh as to the participation of Alašiyans in such raids. If the raiders for both periods are to be identified as the Lukka, this theory becomes even more tenable. It is possible that in their yearly forays, these Lukka, passing through Alašiya could have had financial dealings with other peoples who also stopped on Alašiya for trade, such as the later citizens of Ugarit in RS 20.18. The Lukka might have acquired goods which they needed (new ships) and reimbursed their suppliers at a black market rate since they were known as general enemies and would not be dealing on the open market. The sixth letter also includes a quote (1.8–9) in which it would seem that the pharaoh also addresses the king of Alašiya as “brother” thereby establishing that neither is subordinate to the other.

In the seventh letter (EA 39), the king of Alašiya asks for the return of his messengers or tradesmen and his ship. There seems to be a suit pending against them in Egypt. This suit is brought up again in EA 40, an exchange between the *rabišu* of Alašiya and the *rabišu* of Egypt. A shipment of copper, elephant tusks and wood has been sent and not been paid for by the Egyptians. The *rabišu* of Alašiya asks for ivory (presumably worked) in return. This shipment of elephant tusks from Alašiya is used by Catling to support his belief that Alašiya cannot be Cyprus because elephants are not native to that island.¹³⁵ However, the ivory could originate in Syria and be delivered to Egypt and other places through Alašiya. Any number of trade possibilities can be used to explain this shipment of tusks. They do not have to be a product of Alašiya. More important for the Cyprus/Alašiya identification is the fact that the majority of the Amarna letters from Alašiya mention the export of copper which is said to be mined locally in EA 35. Alašiya/Cyprus is the only country in the Amarna letters from which copper is traded and the quantities are considerable. Furthermore, the frequent mention of ships is another point in favour of the identification. Naturally, such large

¹³³ For the identification of Šanhar see O. Weber, “Anmerkungen”, 1080–2 in Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, III.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1083.

¹³⁵ Catling, *CAH*², 61.

quantities of copper would be sent from any port most expediently by sea,¹³⁶ but Alašiya excels in the building of ships which are also exported to Egypt (EA 36, 1.13). All these factors outweigh the matter of the elephant tusks in further arguing the case for an identification of Cyprus with Alašiya.

Other brief mentions of Alašiya occur in the reigns of Sethos I¹³⁷ and Ramses II.¹³⁸ Copper and Alašiya are mentioned together in another text of Dynasty XIX.¹³⁹

Under Merneptah, Alašiya is not mentioned but its enemy, the Lukka, appear in a list of the northern Mediterranean people who make a coalition with the Libyans and invade Egypt.¹⁴⁰ This event is important as a precedent for the northern invasion under Ramses III, successor of Merneptah. Merneptah is the last pharaoh to record relations between his country and Hatti, and his name may appear in a document of Šuppiluliuma II.¹⁴¹

The situation in the eastern Mediterranean does not seem to have been stable or entirely peaceful at any point from the Madduwattaš incident through the Egyptian and Hittite wars in Syria to the plague at the end of the Amarna period¹⁴² and the first incursions of Sea Peoples c. 1200. The texts from Ugarit, Egypt and Boghazköy testify eloquently to these unstable times. The last upheaval, the second invasion by the Sea Peoples in the eighth year of Ramses III is recorded at Medinet Habu on the entire front of the North tower of the Second Pylon and in the Harris Papyrus.¹⁴³

The countries of Hatti, Qode, Carchemish, Arzawa and Alašiya are all overcome and destroyed. The Egyptians with the help of Sherden mercenaries defeat the Sea Peoples at the Delta in a sea battle. After their defeat, the Sea Peoples whose origins are problematical, dispersed and settled in areas which take on their respective names (i.e. Peleset in Palestine, Lukka in Lycia, etc.).¹⁴⁴

From the evidence of the records of Ramses II, Alašiya and the other countries mentioned are completely destroyed during the raids of the Sea Peoples. From this point on, mentions of Alašiya virtually cease. The last use of the name Alašiya in a Near Eastern text occurs in the Egyptian story of Wenamon dating to the reign of Ramses XII.¹⁴⁵ On his departure from Byblos, Wenamon is driven off course to Alašiya. The local population receives him with suspicion. He addresses the local queen, Heteb, through an interpreter since she cannot understand Egyptian nor presumably could the average Alašiyian of that time.

Although this is the last actual use of the name Alašiya in a Bronze Age document, the name may have survived in the god Apollo Alasiotas mentioned above.¹⁴⁶ The Assyrian name for Cyprus in the

¹³⁶ G. Bass, "The Cape Gelidonya Wreck", *AJA* 65 (1961) 267 ff.

¹³⁷ Helck, *Beziehungen* (1962) 297, n. 51; *Ibid.*, 290 for a general discussion of Alašiya in the Egyptian records.

¹³⁸ G. Daressy, "Litanies d'Amon du temple de Louxor", *Rec Trav* 32 (1910) 69, lines 22-3; Helck, *Beziehungen*, 289 ff. and p. 297, n. 51.

¹³⁹ R. A. Caminos, "Late Egyptian Miscellanies", *Brown Egyptological Studies* I (1954) 201.

¹⁴⁰ Breasted, *ARE* III (1906) 238-9 #s 569-617; Barnett, "The Sea Peoples", *CAH*², 10 ff.; B. Hrouda, "Die Einwanderung der Philister in Palästina, Eine Studie zur Seevölkerbewegung des 12. Jahrhunderts", *Vorderasiatische Archäologie, Moortgat Festschrift* (1964) 126-35.

¹⁴¹ Helck, *Beziehungen*, 233. Merneptah sends grain to Hatti during a famine there in his fourth year. *Ibid.*, 234 for references to Merneptah in Hittite texts of Suppiluliuma II.

¹⁴² Barnett, *CAH*², 7, n. 4. agrees with R. Carpenter (*Discontinuity in Greek Civilization*, 1966) that these disturbances may be ascribed to climatic change and resultant famine and upheaval. This writer would like to support such a theory of climatic change as contributing to the instability of the Eastern Mediterranean c. 1200 B.C., but the evidence for such an interpretation is at best

meagre. On the other hand, as noted *supra*, evidence for human activity is provided by the various texts and archaeological data. Naturally, something must be used to explain the origin of the disturbances: why do the Sea Peoples appear when they do, etc.? But the climatic theory cannot be used to the exclusion of any other. One would need a good many samples of pollen analysis in order to test the distribution of such a drought and its duration. Until tests are made it would seem that the climatic change theory should be used with extreme caution and precise documentation which is lacking at present. Whatever the original causes for the disturbances (economic, political, technological, etc.) the results and the final destructions are related to human activity. For Helck's interpretation of the "Plague" see *Beziehungen*, 187 and n. 132 *supra*.

¹⁴³ *Medinet Habu, vol. I, Earlier Records of Ramses III*, ed. J. H. Breasted, Chicago (1920) Pl. 46; Breasted, *ARE* IV (1906) 37-8, #64; Barnett, *CAH*², 21; A. Goetze, *Kleinasiens, Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients* III (1957) 185; Helck, *Beziehungen*, 289 and notes.

¹⁴⁴ Hrouda, *Moortgat Festschrift* (1964) 126-35.

¹⁴⁵ Pritchard, *ANET*, 262; Barnett, *CAH*², 20.

¹⁴⁶ See n. 12 *supra*.

eighth century is Yadnana possibly implying a settlement of the Denyen on the island.¹⁴⁷ In the text of Ramses III, the Denyen are mentioned as arriving from the islands and they may have passed through Cyprus. The Tjekker are another group which has been connected with settlement on Cyprus¹⁴⁸ and etymologically equated with the Teucrians and Teucer of Salamis.¹⁴⁹ The Sherden are also connected with Cyprus,¹⁵⁰ the Peleset primarily with Palestine but also with Cyprus.¹⁵¹ Whatever these connections may actually mean, it would seem that the Sea Peoples came through the Aegean, possibly from the western Mediterranean and passed through Cyprus on their way to Egypt leaving some traces of their cultures on the way which survived in later nomenclature as well as in the archaeological record.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In reviewing the mentions of Alašiya in the inscriptions and correspondence of the Near Eastern powers in the Bronze Age it becomes clear that there are contacts between the island and the Levant from the eighteenth century up to the eleventh century with some interruptions. This is substantially corroborated by archaeological finds both on Cyprus and in the areas which traded with Cyprus. The contacts are sporadic at first and increase in the fifteenth century, continuing consistently from then on. The greatest number of contacts occurs in the Cypriot period LC II and LC III when trade in the eastern Mediterranean reaches a peak. The earlier part of this period coincides with Hittite expansion, the latter part with the destruction of the Hittite empire and the devastation of the cities along the Syrian and Cilician coasts.

During the period of active trade, Cyprus seems to have retained some measure of independence from the great powers of Egypt and Hatti. The island was important as a place of exchange and as a link within the trade network which spanned East and West. The strategic location of Cyprus and the importance of its copper resources ensured it economic immunity. Its status remains constant despite fluctuations in the policies of the surrounding countries. It can be argued in return that these qualities would have made Cyprus the target of any expansionistic power. The practical reason why it retained this independence during the Bronze Age up to approximately 1200 B.C. may be due to the difficulties of communication, the fact that it is an island, weak Hittite naval power and Egyptian political isolationism and withdrawal.

Cyprus does not seem to have shared completely in the fate of its neighbours following the raids of the Sea Peoples under Ramses III. The final LC III destruction which is associated with the activities of the Sea Peoples is followed by a rebuilding and an increase in direct influence from the East.¹⁵² This may be due to the arrival of refugees from the Syrian coast and people from the Aegean area¹⁵³ creating a fusion with the local population. This then is the state of the island on the arrival of Wenamon.

The name Alašiya seems to exit together with the Bronze Age. The traditional trade connections are broken, Hatti no longer exists as a strong state and Egypt withdraws from the international scene. The seas are no longer safe because the political balance which previously had ensured safe commerce is destroyed. Conditions in the Iron Age are entirely different and trade in the Mediterranean does not fully recover until considerably later in the Greek Archaic period at the end of the "Dark Age" when contacts with the East are re-established.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁷ D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (1926-7). For Sargon II: #'s 54, 70, 80, 92; 96-9, 102, 186, 188. For Esarhaddon: #'s 690, 709-10; Barnett, *CAH*², 20; R. D. Barnett, "Mopsos" *JHS* 73 (1953) 140 ff.

¹⁴⁸ A. S. Murray, A. H. Smith, H. B. Walters, *Excavations in Cyprus* (1900) Pl. 1, British Museum gaming box from Enkomi showing a Syrian noble followed by a Tjekker; Barnett, *CAH*², 19.

¹⁴⁹ Barnett, *CAH*², 19.

¹⁵⁰ Barnett, *CAH*², 12.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 19, 21; see n. 141 *supra*.

¹⁵² Barnett, *CAH*², 14-15.

¹⁵³ Catling, *CAH*², 67-70; E. Vermeule, *Greece in the Bronze Age* (1964) 270.

¹⁵⁴ Goetze, *Kleinasien*, 184-209.

VII. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Cyprus	Egypt	Hatti	Ugarit	Alalakh	Mari
MC I c. 1850-1800		Hattušili I c. 1650			*Shamshi-Adad I c. 1815-1781.
MC II c. 1800-1700		Mursili I c. 1600		*Level VII	
MC III c. 1700-1600/1550	*Tuthmosis III c. 1504-1450	Telepinus c. 1500		Idrimi	
LC I c. 1550-1400	Amenhotep II c. 1450-1425	*Tudhaliya I c. 1450-1430		Niqmepa, Level IV	
	Tuthmosis IV c. 1425-1417	(+Nikalmatu)		Liliiuma	
	Amenhotep III c. 1417-1379	*Arnuwanda I c. 1400			
		(+Ashmunikal)	Ammišamru I		
		(Tudhaliya "the younger")			
LC II c. 1400-1200	*Amenhotep IV c. 1379-1362	Šuppiluliuma I c. 1380-1336		Ituradda	
	Smenkhare c. 1362-1359				
	Ay c. 1352-1348		Niqmadu		
	Horemhab c. 1348-1320		(Abatmilku)		
	Ramses I c. 1320-1318	*Mursili II c. 1335-1310			
	Sethos I c. 1318-1304				
	Ramses II c. 1304-1237	Muwattallis c. 1310-1294			
		(Urhitsep)			
		*Hattušili III c. 1207-1265			
		(+Puduhepa)			
		Tudhaliya II c. 1265-1235			
	Merneptah c. 1236-1223	Arnuwanda c. 1220			
		*Šuppiluliuma II c. 1200			
LC III c. 1200-1050	*Ramses III c. 1195-1164				
			Ibiraru		
			Niqmadu		
			Ammurapi		

* Indicates texts mentioning Alašiya.