

THE HITTITES AND THE GREEKS

This title is likely to evoke in everybody's mind the notorious Ahhiyawa problem which has haunted Hittitology for nearly sixty years. True, the present contribution will deal with this problem but it will try to tackle the methodical approach rather than to offer yet another solution.

The fact is that the Ahhiyawa question was last dealt with extensively by Steiner (1964) and since his sober study there has been virtually no new evidence which would cast any new light on this old problem. In admitting this, the choice of such an overworked theme calls for some justification. The first reason is purely personal. When I was a first-semester student in 1960, it was Professor Grošelj who first acquainted me with this possible contact between the Hittites and the Greeks. Ever since, my main interest has been concentrated on Western Asia Minor as a bridge between the cultures of Europe and the Orient. Secondly, although there is hardly any new revealing material in recent years, the interest in Ahhiyawa has never waned and indeed in the last few years several new suggestions have been made (Muhly 1974; Bryce 1977a; Easton 1980) which call for some comment.

The works quoted so far contain all the previous material and arguments. Therefore there is no need to deal with the entire, often very involved, problem afresh. It suffices to sum up the three main positions defended.

1) Ahhiyawa was a maritime power, centred outside Asia Minor. This stream seeks Ahhiyawa either on mainland Greece or on some of the islands, notably Rhodes. This position cannot be convincingly argued for any more ever since Sommer (1937:286f.)

demonstrated that there is no evidence in Hittite sources which would allow a connection of Ahhiyawa with the Aegean world. The only known Ahhiyawan activity at sea is the joint raid on Cyprus together with Madduwatta and the "man of Piggaya" (cf. Steiner 1964:375 with n. 84 and 85). That it was situated in a coastal area, however, can be seen from references to ships in the "Annals of Mursili" (Götze 1933:66f.) and in the treaty of Tudhaliya IV with Sausgamuwa of Amurru (Kühne and Otten 1971: 16f.).

2) Ahhiyawa was situated in north-western Anatolia. Any location of Ahhiyawa in western Asia Minor, be it in the north, west or south, depends on the positioning of other countries in this area, favoured by each individual author. The variation of proposals is virtually unlimited. The Hittite texts offer a certain amount of information on the relationship between individual countries in this area as well as their relationship to Hatti. From this, a system of coordinates can be constructed which must match the given information: border crossings, raids, campaigns, refugees going from one country into another. There are two fundamental difficulties in this procedure which lie at the root of the great variety of suggestions: a) the relationships between the countries mentioned in the texts do not necessarily imply that these countries border on each other, b) in the entire western part of Anatolia there is not a single place located with certainty which could serve as a fixed point on to which the system of coordinates could be pegged. The present paper requires the location of Arzawa in classical Lydia and that of Lukka in classical Lycaonia (Kořak 1974 and 1980).

In spite of different schemes, the majority of scholars accepts the equation of Wilusiya (there is no reason to separate this from Wilusa) and Taruisa with the Homeric Ilios and Troy. Both countries belonged in the time of Tudhaliya II to the land of Assuwa. Although Assuwa is not mentioned again in later Hittite texts, the name must have remained in use since it later survived in the classical times as Asia. If now Ahhiyawa is located

in this area as well (Houwink ten Cate 1974a; Muhly 1974; Bryce 1977a), the place becomes too crowded for comfort. Also, it is difficult to see how an Ahhiyawa in the Troad could participate in a raid on Cyprus and be involved in regular trade with Assyria via Amurru, unless one assumes that it was a maritime power, for which there is no evidence. This last objection applies also to the proposals which set Ahhiyawa in the Troad but shift Wilus(iy)a away towards the east (Macqueen 1975:41), or those who shift Ahhiyawa even further north, to Thracia (Hellaart 1978:59, map; Easton 1980).

3) Ahhiyawa was situated in south-western Anatolia. There are again two main suggestions for this location. One advocates the western coast (e.g. Boysal 1978:1137), the other the southern one (e.g. Cornelius 1955:33 and n. 11). The second option seems to be the more likely one. We have only two concrete data concerning the situation of Ahhiyawa, namely the "boundary descriptions" KUB 31:29 and KUB 31:30 (CTH 214.12 and 214.16). In both, Ahhiyawa is listed after Mira. If Mira occupied roughly the territory of later Phrygia, which would best fit the evidence available, then Ahhiyawa could only be situated to the coast south of it, i.e. in Pamphylia. This ties in well with the "Annals of Hattusili III" (CTH 82) and the conclusion drawn by Cornelius (1955) that the unnamed enemy of the report must have come from Pamphylia and was in fact Ahhiyawa makes very good sense.

There is one problem which must be considered at this point. According to the "Tawagalawa letter" (CTH 181), Millawanda was in the sphere of influence of Ahhiyawa (cf. Bryce 1979:93). The town was traditionally identified as Miletus. The argument for this equation is either a linguistic one, connecting the Hittite name with an earlier form of the Greek Milatos/Miletos, or an archaeological one (cf. Bryce 1974:401ff.). Both arguments are a good example of how a preconceived idea turns into a vicious circle. Garstang and Gurney (1959:80f.) acknowledged in the first place the connection of Millawanda with Ahhiyawa according to the

"Tawagalawa letter", then accepted the identity of the latter with the Achaeans and from there proceeded to look for a site with archaeological evidence of Mycenaean imports. This line of reasoning had to lead them to Miletus.

Such a location triggers off a chain reaction in the search for further geographical links. The town Atriya lay in the district of Yalanda and was also in the possession of Millawanda. This means that Yalanda had to be near Millawanda. If this was Miletus, then Yalanda has to be placed in western Caria (Bryce 1974:403) and separated from the other group of Lukkan towns, the "Attarimma cluster". If, however, Millawanda is to be located without any preconception, then it could easily be sought somewhere along the Cilician coast (Bryce 1974:404) and a fairly compact area of Lukkan settlements stretching from Lycaonia towards the south would be preserved.

Similarly, as with the case of Millawanda, the aprioristic connection of Ahhiyawa with the Achaeans has always played an important role in the location of this country. Indeed, the location of Ahhiyawa in the region of Troad is mainly influenced by a sometimes subconscious desire to concentrate the "Homeric" names in the Hittite sources in this spot: Taruisa=Troy, Wilusa=Ilios, Alaksandu=Alexandros, Ahhiyawa=Akhaiwia, Attarissiya=Atreus, Tawagalawa=Etewoklewes, thus seemingly creating a "cumulative evidence". In fact, nothing whatsoever connects the set of the first three names with the other three.

The only known personal names from the land of Ahhiyawa are Attarissiya and Tawagalawa. The first one was interpreted as Atreus but it is more likely that it is derived from the town Atriya in Yalanda (Laroche 1966:48 no. 201). The second name was originally likened to Eteocles/Etewoklewes, but also with Theocles, a Mycenaean De-u-ke-ro=*Deukelos (cf. Harmatta 1968:183f.) and Deucalion. This last one was a son of Minos "the Younger" and brother of Sarpedon and Rhadamanthys who came from Crete and colonised Caria and Lycia. This saga was again connected

with the Ahhiyawa of the Hittite texts (Gurney 1980:65; cf. also the parallel tradition, Bryce 1977b:217) but it can have many other interpretations as well (e.g. Tritsch 1973).

An original offshoot of the linkage between Ahhiyawa and the Achaeans was the suggestion made by Merlingen (1962:36f.) claiming that the "Akhaiwians" were the master-race who caused the Greek migration into their historical lands.

To sum up, the entire problem sprang from the original linguistic equation of Ahhiyawa with the Akhaioi. Much ingenuity was employed to overcome the phonetic difficulties in this comparison. But it is well worth pointing out that the two oldest references to Ahhiyawa in the Hittite texts are spelt A-ah-hi-ya-a (KUB 14:1 obv 1,60) and Ah-hi-ya (KBo 16:97 obv 38) which would probably never have been connected with the name of the Achaeans had the longer form not turned up in other texts (Houwink ten Cate 1969:145). Thus we have here the variation -a/-wa which can be encountered frequently in native Anatolian toponymy (cf. Laroche 1958:267f.).

So far, we have seen that the Hittite textual evidence shows quite clearly that Ahhiyawa was situated in Anatolia, that it was active on the Anatolian mainland, that it was a coastal country - but not a great sea power - probably situated in Pamphylia, and that its name bears normal characteristics of Anatolian place names in the 2nd millennium B.C. There is not the slightest indication that this country can be in any way connected with the Achaeans. There is no text either, which would allow a link between the sources on Ahhiyawa and the texts mentioning Taruisa, Wilusa and Alaksandu. The grouping together of these texts gives a false impression of cumulative evidence (e.g. Houwink ten Cate 1974a:153). Consequently, they must be held strictly apart (see Steiner 1964:366 n. 2). The impasse which the "Ahhiyawa problem" has reached today is due precisely to the fact that Forrer's original proposals included all available evidence of "Greek" names and were retained as a single

package throughout the discussion. Sommer himself tried to reject the Greek equations of Alaksandu, Wilusa and Taruisa as fiercely as he rejected Ahhiyawa and thereby fell into the trap of de facto acceptance of the idea of the single package.

The idea of an Achaean colony in Late Bronze Age Asia Minor should be considered also from the point of view of Greek history. There certainly are many Mycenaean finds all along the Anatolian coast (Buchholz 1974) and we can, indeed must, expect that individual seamen, merchants or condottieri (cf. Eritsch 1974) stayed in Anatolia and even settled there permanently (Yakar 1976:125ff.). But the archaeological evidence of Mycenaean finds is so widespread in Anatolia that it actually disproves any connection between Ahhiyawa and the Mycenaean world: if there were a connection, we would expect the Mycenaean finds to be concentrated in a compact area. Also, a real Greek colonisation as early as the 15th century B.C. is highly unlikely (cf. Weiler 1976:76; Boardman 1980:35f.). Such a colonisation would have to have been a remarkable event in Asia Minor since the Hittites would have had to rename a country in the peninsula after the newcomers, a country which they already knew and had a name for. Most other names of Anatolian lands show an opposite direction: they were taken over by the Greeks (cf. Carruba 1964). On the other hand, a comparison of an Anatolian Ahhiyawa with the Hypachaioi and 'Aqaiwasa/Ekwesh of the Egyptian sources is still possible (Bengtson 1977:24 and 48f.).

In concluding this section, a brief outline of the history of Ahhiyawa according to the Hittite sources seems to be in place (cf. also Houwink ten Cate 1974a:148-152).

Arnuwanda I. Ahhiyawa was an active enemy of the Hittites (¹⁶KUR Ah-hi-ya KBo 16:97 obv 38 = CTH 571). According to the "Indictment of Madduwatta" (KUB 14:1 = CTH 147), Ahhiyawa took part in minor skirmishes on Anatolian soil as well as in a pirate raid on Cyprus. Although Attarissiya's force was very small (Steiner 1964:375 n. 82), it would still be quite an undertaking

were all the chariots and horses to be brought on boats by seafaring Mycenaeans (personal communication by Professor Tritsch).

Suppiluliuma I. A text mentions a "lord of Ahhiyawa" in a broken context; the text reaches back to the times of the great grandfather Tudhaliya who fought in Assuwa (KUB 26:91 = CTH 183; see Carruba 1973:45 and n. 16). KUB 14:2 deals with a Hittite queen who was perhaps Henti (Bin-Nun 1975:273 n. 192). The interpretations that she was banished to Ahhiyawa are dubious (Steiner 1964:375 n. 78).

Mursili II. During his reign the relations between Ahhiyawa and Hatti seem to be friendly. The "Annals of Mursili" mention Ahhiyawa twice, unfortunately both times in a broken context. Yet it transpires that Uhhaziti of Arzawa and Millawanda changed over to the king of Ahhiyawa. When a son of Uhhaziti finally returned to the mainland from his refuge island, he sought asylum in Ahhiyawa but the king of Ahhiyawa extradited him to the Hittites. If the passage is interpreted correctly, this presupposes a treaty with Ahhiyawa since extradition is not an ethical but purely a legal obligation (Korošec 1931:64f.). Extradition in connection with Ahhiyawa occurs also in a letter KUB 23:95 = CTH 209 which is too fragmentary for dating.

After Mursili II, the continuity of references on Ahhiyawa becomes uncertain. This is due to the different suggestions for the dating of the "Tawagalawa letter" to the late years of Mursili II, to Muwattalli and to Hattusili III. The last option seems to me to be the most likely one because of the reference to Kurunta, the king of Tarhuntassa (see Houwink ten Cate 1974a:150f.).

Perhaps KUB 31:29 = CTH 214 listing Tarhuntassa, Mira and Ahhiyawa belongs to the same context, as well as the similar fragment KUB 31:30 = CTH 214. Ahhiyawa observed the diplomatic usage

of sending gifts (comitas gentium) for the coronation of the Hittite king (KBo 2:11 = CTH 209) and refused political asylum to Urhitešub and Sipaziti according to KBo 16:22 = CTH 214 (see Houwink ten Cate 1974b:138f.). The letter KUB 26:76 = CTH 214 probably refers to the same events. The oracle KUB 5:6 = CTH 570 which mentions the deities of Ahhiyawa and Lazpa is now also being dated to the time of Hattusili III (Rammenhuber 1976: 27f. n. 51). In the later years of his reign, however, relations with western Asia Minor were soured. It is possible that the troubles started with Mira backing Urhitesub in the civil war against Hattusili III. The hostilities then possibly spread further, with Ahhiyawa invading the Lukka lands, i.e. Lycaonia (Cornelius 1955:34) and further west to Arzawa (KUB 31:69 = CTH 590) which was crushed and virtually depopulated by Mursili II and did not enter the political scene until now.

Tudhaliya IV. The treaty with Sausgamuwa of Amurru (KUB 23:1 = CTH 195) contains two references to Ahhiyawa. The first one is the notorious scribal error in which Ahhiyawa is named among the superpowers of that period but immediately deleted. Whatever psychological explanation for the scribe's lapsus is given it cannot be taken as historical evidence. Much more interesting, however, is the second reference, namely the obligation of Amurru to prevent Ahhiyawan trading with Assyria.

Other texts referring to Ahhiyawa are either difficult to interpret or to date, or both (KUB 22:56 = CTH 570; KUB 18:58 = CTH 572; KBo 18:135 = CTH 581; KBo 19:83 = CTH 214). Worth mentioning are KUB 21:34 = CTH 214 which talks about Ahhiyawa, hostages and towns of the king of Mira and could therefore be dated to the same period as the "Tawagalawa letter", and KUB 23:13 which mentions a conflict (?) between the Seha River Land and Ahhiyawa.

This survey of Hittite sources, although brief and sketchy, reveals Ahhiyawa as an Anatolian country, slowly evolving as a political entity (its leaders are chronologically referred to

as "man of Ahhiyawa", "lord of Ahhiyawa" and "king of Ahhiyawa"), on a par with other lands of western Asia Minor such as Lukka, Mira or Tarhuntassa.

What then about the contacts between the Hittites and the Greeks, if the Hittite sources are almost completely silent on this subject? The archaeology proves beyond doubt that at least trading links existed. Hittite figurines in Greece and Mycenaean pottery as deeply in Anatolia as in Maşat (Yakar 1976: 126) provide solid evidence of this. In this light, individual Greek settlers should not surprise us and their names must be expected to appear in some Hittite sources. I think that Alaksandu is such a case, displaying the u-stem typical of the north-western, later Lydian region (Carruba 1968:36). A Greek etymology for Tawagalawa cannot be excluded either. Conversely, an Anatolian name is probably present in the Minoan Qeti-radu (Meriggi 1979:418).

Further evidence may be obtained from the later Greek tradition. Admittedly, the upheavals of the migration during the 12th century B.C. has unsettled whole population groups. The Phrygian invasion caused a southwards shift of Anatolian peoples (Sandars 1978:143f.). For example, the classical Maeonia and Caria reflect the earlier names Masa and Karkiya but the former are situated further south than the latter; the same applies to the personal names such as Mirasetas and Koualis which are found much further south than the lands of Mira and Kuwaliya of the 2nd millennium B.C. Yet some traditions have survived the tumultuous period and were eventually handed down to the Greeks.

Among the most conspicuous of these traditions are the parallels between the Hittite myth of Kumarbi and Hesiod's "Theogony" (Steiner 1958), the striking similarity between the incantation for the netherworld deities in the "Odyssey" (10.508-540 and 11.20-50) and in Hurro-Hittite rituals (Steiner 1971), the legends of the Amazons (Ivanov 1977:18f.), the references to the Kēteioi/Khēteioi (Gladstone 1876:169-183; Huxley 1959:281f.; Gindin 1977:110f.), the origins of Apollo (Schretter 1974), and many more.

Once the red herring of the "Ahhiyawa problem" is discarded, the research - a rich and multidisciplinary one - can concentrate on these traditions and try to establish which are contemporary, obtained through direct contacts during the 2nd millennium B.C., and which were received later and how they were received. There are several possibilities for the Greeks to have learnt these traditions during the 1st millennium B.C. The most obvious is Asia Minor, colonised during this period. A second one are the Syrian ports, such as Al Mina (Murray 1980:93) since much Hittite thought must have survived in the so-called "Late Hittite Kingdoms". Finally, some of these traditions may well have survived though the mediation of the Etruscans on their way to Italy (Ogilvie 1980:11ff.; Stare 1975). Such an approach will no doubt discover many contemporary contacts between the Greeks and the Hittites and prove more fruitful than the futile quest for a Greek Ahhiyawa.

R E F E R E N C E S:

- Bengtson, H. 1977. Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit. (5. Aufl.). München.
- Bin-Nun, Sh.R. 1975. The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom. (THeth 5). Heidelberg.
- Boardman, J. 1980. The Greeks overseas: their early colonies and trade. (New and enlarged ed.). London.
- Boysal, Y. 1978. Die Ergebnisse der neuen Forschungen in Karien. Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Classical Archaeology. Ankara. 1135-1137.
- Bryce, T.R. 1974. The Lukka problem - and a possible solution. JNES 33, 395-404.
- . 1977a. Ahhiyawa and Troy - a case of mistaken identity. Historia 26, 24-32.
- . 1977b. Pandaros, a Lycian at Troy. AJPh 98, 213-218.
- . 1979. Some reflections on the Tawagalawas letter (KUB XIV 3). Orientalia 48, 91-96.

- Buchholz, H.-G. 1974. Ägäische Funde und Kultureinflüsse in den Randgebieten des Mittelmeers. Forschungsbericht über Ausgrabungen und Neufunde, 1960-1970. AA 1974, 235-462.
- Carruba, O. 1964. Ahhijawa e altri nomi di popoli e paesi dell' Anatolia occidentale. Athenaeum 42, 269-298.
- . 1968. Anatolico Runda. SMEA 5, 31-41.
- . 1973. Die Annalen Tuthalijas und Arnuwandas. Festschrift H. Otten. Wiesbaden. 37-48.
- Cornelius, F. 1955. Eine Episode der hethitischen Geschichte, geographisch beleuchtet. MSS 6, 30-34.
- Easton, D.F. 1980. Ahhiyawa. (Paper read at the 5th International Colloquium of Aegean Prehistory, Sheffield).
- Garstang, J. and Gurney, O.R. 1959. The geography of the Hittite Empire. London.
- Gindin, L.A. 1977. Mif o poedinke i mifologii Apollona (na materiale I-III gomerovskix gimnov). Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie. Moskva. 96-117.
- Gladstone, W.E. 1876. Homeric synchronism: an enquiry into the time and place of Homer. New York.
- Götze, A. 1933. Die Annalen des Muršiliš. Leipzig.
- Gurney, O.R. 1980. Die Hethiter. (2., veränderte Aufl.). Dresden.
- Harmatta, J. 1968. Görog nevek a hettita forrásokban. Antik tanulmányok 15, 181-189.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph.H.J. 1974a. Anatolian evidence for relations with the West in the Late Bronze Age. Bronze Age migrations in the Aegean. (ed. R.A. Crossland and A. Birchall). London. 141-161.
- . 1974b. The early and late phases of Urhi-Tešub's career. Anatolian studies presented to H.G. Güterbock. Istanbul. 123-150.
- Huxley, G.L. 1959. Hittites in Homer. PP 14, 280-281.
- Ivanov, V.V. 1977. K istorii drevnix nazvanij metallov v južnobalkanskom, maloazijskom i sredizemnomorskom arealax. Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie. Moskva. 3-27.
- Kammenhuber, A. 1976. Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern. (THeth 7). Heidelberg.
- Korošec, V. 1931. Hethitische Staatsverträge: ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Wertung. Leipzig.

- Košak, S. 1974. Geografski in politični položaj arzavskih dežel. Ljubljana. (Diss.).
- . 1980. The western neighbours of the Hittites. Eretz-Israel 15 (in print).
- Kühne, C. and Otten, H. 1971. Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag. (StBoT 16). Wiesbaden.
- Laroche, E. 1958. Études sur les hiéroglyphes hittites II. Syria 35, 252-283.
- . 1966. Les noms des Hittites. Paris.
- Macqueen, J.G. 1975. The Hittites and their contemporaries in Asia Minor. London.
- Mellaart, J. 1978. The archaeology of ancient Turkey. London.
- Meriggi, P. 1979. Nouveaux documents et résultats dans le domaine des langues égéennes (des hiéroglyphes crétois jusqu'à l'éétéochyprïote). Colloquium Mycenaeum: actes du 6e Colloque International sur les textes myceniens et égéens, Chaumont-sur-Neuchâtel 1975. Neuchâtel et Genève. 411-418.
- Merlingen, W. 1962. Zum "Vorgriechischen". LinguBalk 4, 25-55.
- Muhly, J.D. 1974. Hittites and Achaeans: Ahhijawa redomitus. Historia 23, 129-145.
- Murray, O. 1980. Early Greece. Glasgow.
- Ogilvie, R.M. 1980. Early Rome and the Etruscans. Glasgow.
- Sandars, N.K. 1978. The Sea Peoples: warriors of the ancient Mediterranean 1250-1150 B.C. London.
- Schretter, M.K. 1974. Alter Orient und Hellas: Fragen der Beeinflussung griechischen Gedankengutes am altorientalischen Quellen, dargestellt an den Göttern Nergal, Rescheph, Apollon. Innsbruck.
- Sommer, F. 1932. Die Ahhijawa-Urkunden. München.
- . 1937. Ahhijawa und kein Ende? IF 55, 169-297.
- Starè, F. 1975. Etruščani in jugovzhodni predalpski prostor. Ljubljana.
- Steiner, G. 1958. Der Sukzessionsmythos in Hesiods "Theogonie" und ihren orientalischen Parallelen. Hamburg. (Diss.).
- . 1964. Die Ahhijawa-Frage heute. Saeculum 15, 365-392.

- Steiner, G. 1971. Die Unterweltsbeschwörung des Odysseus im Lichte hethitischer Texte. UF 3, 265-283.
- Tritsch, F.J. 1973. The judgment of Minos. Peprägmena tou 3 diethnous krētologikou synedriou, I. Athenai. 354-360.
- . 1974. The 'Sackers of Cities' and the 'movement of populations'. Bronze Age migrations in the Aegean. (ed. R.A. Crossland and A. Birchall). London. 233-239.
- Weiler, I. 1976. Griechische Geschichte: Einführung, Quellenkunde, Bibliographie. Darmstadt.
- Yakar, J. 1976. Hittite involvement in western Anatolia. AnSt 26, 117-128.

Povzetek

HETITI IN GRKI

Ko je E. Forrer leta 1924 predložil, naj bi ime dežele Ahhijava v hetitskih tekstih povezali s homerskimi Ahajci, je sprožil razpravo, ki se vleče v hetitologiji do danes. V diskusiji nastopajo nadaljnje primerjave med hetitskimi in grškimi osebnimi in krajevnimi imeni, med njimi zlasti Taruisa=Troja, Vilus(ij)a=Ilios, Alaksandu=Aleksander(Paris), Millawata=Milet, Tavagalava=Etewoklewes/Eteokles, Attar(is)sija=Atrej, Lahurzi=Laertes, Parijamuva=Priamos itd. Ta sklop daje vtis navidezne kumulativne evidence, ki naj bi dokazala obstoj mikenskih Grkov v hetitskih virih. Pri tem je značilno, da tako pristaši kot nasprotniki "ahajske Ahhijave" to evidenco vseskozi obravnavajo kot enoten sveženj.

V resnici je treba vse te primerjave strogo ločiti. 1) Ahhija(va) je po pričevanju hetitskih tekstov dežela na jugozahodu Male Azije, ki se v ničemer ne razlikuje od drugih dežel na tem področju v 2. tisočletju pr.n.št. (Mira, Tarhuntassa, Lukka). Tudi obliki Ahhija oz. Ahhijava kažeta alternacijo -a/-va, ki je povsem običajna v maloazijski toponomastiki. 2) Grki so prevzeli večino hetitskih imen dežel, ko so se naselili v Mali Aziji v

1. tisočletju pr.n.št. (n.pr. Karkija=Karia, Masa=Maionia, Assuva=Asia itd.). To seveda ne more služiti kot dokaz za sočasne stike med Hetiti in Grki v 2. tisočletju pr.n.št. 3) Med Taruiso in sklopom ostalih "homerskih" imen na eni strani ter Ahhijavo na drugi strani ni po hetitskih virih nobene povezave. Že zavoljo tega ne more biti govora o kumulativni evidenci.

Po drugi strani pa arheologija nedvoumno izpričuje, da so med mikenskimi Grki in Hetiti obstajali vsaj trgovski stiki, medtem ko mikenske delavnice in pokopi ob obalah Male Azije pričajo tudi o tem, da so se posamezniki naseljevali v Mali Aziji. Ta evidenca po eni strani izključuje domnevo o strnjeni ahajski kolonizaciji Male Azije v hetitski dobi, po drugi pa dopušča možnost, da na obrobju hetitske kulturne sfere naletimo tudi na posameznike z grškimi imeni.

Zato je treba namesto jalove diskusije, ki temelji na površni glasovni podobnosti Ahhija(va)/Akhaioi, neposredne stike med Hetiti in Grki, ki so nedvomno obstajali, iskati v grških literarnih, mitoloških in zgodovinskih izročilih in ob tem sproti ugotavljati, ali je določen podatek lahko preživel padeč hetitske države in bil sprejet šele v 1. tisočletju pr.n.št., ali pa se je lahko ohranil le v neposrednem stiku med obema kulturama.