

CHAPTER TWO

PREHISTORY

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

1. *General Considerations*

The problem of identification confronted in Chapter One becomes even more acute when we turn to prehistory. There can be little doubt that the societies of which Luwian speakers were a part were multi-ethnic, and this is almost certainly true of the Luwian-speaking population itself. Strictly speaking, then, a prehistory of the Luwians should include tracing the source of all those strands the union of which led to the ‘Luwian’ societies of the second and first millennia BCE. Such an undertaking lies far beyond our capacities, and we are once again constrained to focus on *linguistic* prehistory. The following discussion is limited to that group of speakers whose prehistoric Indo-European dialect led to the attested language we call Luwian. That this is a mere fragment of the total picture of Luwian prehistory should be self-evident, but we must work with what we have (cf. the remarks of Macqueen 1986 26 and 35).

Even this limited enterprise is fraught with serious problems. There is no neat correlation between the spread of language and population movements. Language spread *may* result from mass migrations, and the latter may include hostile takeovers of land that justify use of the terms ‘invasion’ or ‘conquest’. However, peaceful infiltration of relatively small numbers of speakers can also eventually lead to widespread adoption of their language in a new area. This range of possible scenarios makes it very difficult to correlate putative movements of prehistoric speakers with changes observed in the archaeological record of sites dating from the time before written records. Before attempting any such correlation, we must first derive as much as we can from the purely linguistic data.

2. Luwian as an Indo-European Anatolian Language

It is clear that Luwian does not stand in isolation. It is part of a group of closely related languages that includes Hittite, Palaic, Lycian, Lydian, and Carian¹ (the poorly attested languages Pisidian and Sidetic may themselves merely be late forms of Luwian, though this cannot be affirmed with finality). All of these languages of ancient Anatolia are derived from a prehistoric language we may term ‘Proto-Anatolian’. Proto-Anatolian in turn is derived from Proto-Indo-European, the ultimate source of most of the languages of modern Europe as well as those of Iran, Afghanistan, and much of India. Since the beginning of Indo-European studies there has been much interest in trying to locate in space and time the putative speech community associated with the reconstructed language stage we call Proto-Indo-European.² The discovery that the Anatolian languages as defined above belong to the Indo-European family has both renewed and complicated the debate over this issue. It seems prudent to treat this complex problem from the bottom up and to begin with what we can say about the immediate prehistory of Luwian itself and its closest relatives in Anatolia.

3. Indo-European Anatolian Languages in the Late Third Millennium

3.1. Palaic

Palaic, attested as a liturgical language in a few ritual texts from Hattusa (see Carruba 1970), was the language of the land of Palā, mentioned in §5 of the Hittite Laws alongside Hatti and Luwiya.

¹ The attested Carian language is assuredly Indo-European Anatolian, pace Stefanini (2002 796). See the various contributions in Blümel et al. (1998).

² Readers should be aware that there is considerable debate about the degree of reality that may be attributed to reconstructed proto-languages such as PIE. Many scholars seriously doubt or even deny the validity of attempts to identify and locate prehistoric speech communities. Such skepticism has not and certainly will not stop discussion of the topic, but these reservations should be borne in mind. For a sober and well-balanced summary of the problem of the PIE ‘homeland’ see Mallory (1989). As pointed out by a number of scholars, the traditional term ‘homeland’/ *Urheimat* is infelicitous and should be avoided. What is at issue is the approximate location of the PIE speech community at its last period of relative unity. There are many possible scenarios for how these speakers came to be at that location and for how the reconstructed language we call PIE came to be formed.

There is essentially unanimous agreement that Palā was located to the northwest of the lower course of the Halys River in classical Paphlagonia (see Map 1). The classical name Blaene is surely a reflection of Palā.³ It is important to note that in Old Hittite texts of the 16th century Palaic is already a fully distinct language from Hittite and Luwian.

3.2. *Luwian*

As already noted, there is considerable circumstantial evidence to suggest that Luwian was spoken over large areas of western, south central and southeastern Anatolia. This material includes the location of HLuwian inscriptions (see Map 4, p. 142), the designated homelands of authors of Luwian rituals in cuneiform found in Hattusa (both those containing passages in Luwian and those with isolated Luwianisms), and the personal names of various inhabitants of countries located in western and southern Anatolia. One must of course use the last-named evidence with due caution. Personal names may be chosen for a variety of reasons, and they do not always correlate with language use or ethnicity. Most of the persons cited in our texts also belong to the ruling class. However, in the absence of any indications to the contrary, we may reasonably infer a significant Luwian presence in these areas.

Most Anatolian place-names cannot be assigned to a given language with any reliability, but there are some important exceptions. The place-name †Dainis (= Ἐλαίω) for the port city at the mouth of the Caicos River argues that the Luwian speech area extended at least that far to the northwest.⁴ Whether Luwian was spoken in the far northwest (notably in the region of the Troad) remains an open question. The recent discovery of a hieroglyphic seal in Troy is suggestive, but far from conclusive (see the cautious stance of Neumann 2001 47f). The fact that the oldest form of the name for Wilusa (= Troy) known to

³ Starke (1997a 457 with n. 103 et aliter) assumes that *Pa-la-a* is already to be read as /Pla:/. This may well be true, but a later syncope in Blaene cannot be excluded.

⁴ See Starke (1997a 457) following Neumann apud Gusmani (1986 162), but the Luwian word for ‘oil’ is derived from a preform cognate with Hittite *šakan-* ‘oil, fat’ (see p. 184 in this volume). It is important to stress that the unusual characteristic sound change of initial **s-* > *d-* assures us that we are dealing here with Luwian in the strict narrow sense, not merely a language related to Luwian.

the Hittites is *Wilušiya-*, a Luwian formation, also does not strictly prove that the inhabitants themselves spoke Luwian (see Starke 1997a 458f).⁵ Contra Starke (2001 40) the adaptation of the Greek name Alexander as a *u*-stem in the name of the King of Wilusa Alaksandu is at least as compatible with Lydian as it is with Luwian. Likewise there is nothing definitively Luwian in the form of the names of the other two known kings of Wilusa, Kukkunni and Walmu (in contrast to those of other western Anatolian kingdoms—see the table in Starke 2001 37). Current evidence thus also allows for the possibility of a related, but distinct Indo-European language in Wilusa/Troy in the second millennium (see Neumann 2001 46 and cf. also the discussion by Stefanini 2002 798ff). We may hope that new evidence will soon be able to decide this issue.

It is also impossible to determine just how far the Luwian speech area extended to the southeast at various times. It seems certain that Luwian was present in Kizzuwatna by the Old Hittite period, and it was likely already there several centuries earlier. Just when and to what extent Luwian penetrated as a spoken language into regions of present-day Syria remains debatable. Significant Luwian presence seems highly probable for the five centuries or so following the fall of the Hittite Empire at the end of the 13th century. To what extent this reflects relatively recent movements and to what extent it continues traditions reaching well back into the Empire period is unknowable.

Also problematic is the status of Luwian in central Anatolia, in particular in the Hittite capital Hattusa. In addressing this question, we must avoid misconceptions and critically evaluate the different sorts of evidence cited. One occasionally reads the claim that Hittite was by the time of our records a purely written ‘chancellery’ language, while Luwian was the spoken language of Hattusa (e.g. Rosenkranz 1938 280ff). There is no sound basis for this assertion. First of all, we must be very clear on one point: we have no *direct* knowledge of the *spoken* form of any of the Indo-European Anatolian languages, including Luwian. With rare exceptions (the ASSUR letters and the KULULU lead strips), our HLuwian texts are fully as literary as anything we have in Hittite (see the proper appreciation by Cancik 2002b). Likewise, the Luwian ritual texts in cuneiform. On

⁵ Starke’s attempt to analyze the name Wilusa itself as Luwian is pure speculation. If the apparent alternation *Wiluš(š)a* is real, it suggests adaptation of a non-IE name. The alleged ‘lenition’ of Luwian /ss/ in Hittite does not exist!

the other hand, the changes in Hittite during the more than three centuries of its attestation are more than is consonant with a purely written language (likewise Steiner 1990 201 with refs). A few examples of Hittite colloquialisms also crop up in our essentially bureaucratic texts: see Melchert (1996 135) on *ḫulalittat* ‘it has been wrapped up’ for *taruptat* ‘it has been finished’ in IBoT 1.36 iii 54 and Hoffner (to appear) on *peššīyanun* ‘I bagged’, a hunter’s usage applied to enemy troops, in HKM 10, 39-41.⁶ A simplistic opposition between written Hittite and spoken Luwian is an entirely artificial construct (cf. also the useful remarks of Stefanini 2002 783f).

The fact that late Hittite kings wrote their monumental public inscriptions in HLUwian is also irrelevant for the question of Luwian as a spoken language in Hattusa. This usage may be culturally determined (cf. the remarks of Hawkins 2000 2f). To infer from such a practice that the population of Hattusa spoke Luwian would be comparable to inferring that citizens of Washington D.C. speak Latin because of the use of the latter in public monumental inscriptions in that city.

Of much more significance are the effects of Luwian on Hittite. As shown by Starke (1990 *passim*) and to be discussed in detail below, Luwian influence on Hittite begins in the prehistoric period. Luwian loanwords are already present in our oldest attested Hittite. Such loanwords, however, are fully adapted to Hittite patterns. Thus far there is no evidence for Luwian words with Luwian inflection in Hittite contexts before the Middle Hittite period, and such forms become common only with the reign of Mursili II towards the end of 14th century. Likewise confusion of *a*-stem and *i*-stem inflection due to the Luwian pattern of ‘*i*-mutation’ begins only in the Middle Hittite period (see Rieken 1994 42-50 and below p. 187f) and increases thereafter. Our almost total ignorance of the true sociolinguistic situation in Hattusa and in the Hittite Empire as a whole bids caution in drawing conclusions from these facts. Nevertheless, the prehistoric effects of Luwian on Hittite are consistent with close cultural contact, while the later features suggest (though they certainly do not prove) the presence of substantial numbers of Luwian speakers. A gradually increasing Luwian presence in Hattusa and in central Anatolia more generally during the period of the Hittite Empire

⁶ See also the cogent remarks of Laroche (1959 13) with his reference to a private Hittite document from Ras Shamra.

seems at least compatible with what we know of historical developments during that time.⁷

3.3 *Lycian and Carian*

Lycian clearly is more closely related to Luwian than to any other language of the Anatolian subfamily (see the discussion in Chapter Five below, p. 175ff). What we know of Carian points to a similar conclusion. The YALBURT HLuwian inscription now shows that there is considerable continuity in settlements in Lycia from the second to the first millennium (see Poetto 1993 77f). The absence thus far of archaeological evidence for Bronze Age settlements in Lycia may be explained in any number of ways. While we cannot exclude the possibility that the precursors of the speakers of Lycian and Carian moved south from northwestern Anatolia only at the end of the second millennium, absolutely nothing supports such an assumption. All that we now know argues rather that pre-Lycian and pre-Carian speech communities were located in the southwest already in the second millennium and probably by the end of the third.

This statement emphatically is not meant to claim that these speakers necessarily already occupied the territories of later classical Caria and Lycia. While we should not place undue weight on the resemblance of the designation *Lukka* in the Hittite texts to the classical name Lycaonia as well as to Lycia, we should also be careful not to discount it entirely (see the careful review of the problem by Carruba 1996 29ff).⁸ We must also not forget the direct evidence for linguistic diversity within Lycia. As argued by Borchhardt (1998 158f), the dynasty of Harpagos is intrusive to Xanthos and western Lycia, and its members bring with them the Milyan (Lycian B) dialect. Borchhardt proposes central Lycia as their immediate seat of power, but tentatively follows Carruba in seeing the center of Milyan as farther to the north and east. Be that as it may, what is to be retained for our immediate purposes is the likelihood of significant local population movements within the area of the southwest.

⁷ There are also clear examples of Luwian place-names in central Anatolia: see the discussion in Poetto (1999) with references (reference thanks to N. Oettinger).

⁸ However, one must with Starke (1997a 475⁹⁷) reject the repetition by Carruba (1996 28 & 37) of the derivation of the name *Luwiya* from *Lukka*. Only voiced *g, not voiceless *k, is lost in Luwian. The two names, both undoubtedly non-Indo-European, have *nothing* to do with each other.

It would be surprising if there were not similar developments at an earlier stage, but the distance and direction of such movements cannot be determined.⁹ We can therefore be no more precise for the pre-stages of Lycian and Carian than ‘somewhere in the southwest’, and their positioning on Map 1 is meant only as a gross approximation.

3.4 Hittite (*Nesite*)

Hittite, the chief administrative language of the Hittite Empire, was designated by its own users as *neš(umn)ili/našili* ‘of (the city) Nesa’, i.e. Kanesh. However, use of the name Hittite for this language is by now too well established to be changed in favor of the more correct Nesite. There is no reason to doubt that Hittite was a spoken language for at least some of the ruling class, first in Nesa and later in Hattusa, to the end of the Hittite Empire (cf. section 3.2 above). The fact that the personal portions of letters found at the northeastern outpost of Maşat are also in Hittite confirms that officials stationed throughout the Empire used Hittite for everyday purposes, as we would have predicted. As in the case of Luwian, we can only guess at the extent to which Hittite was used among the general population, both in Hattusa and elsewhere (cf. the very interesting remarks of Steiner 1981 161ff).

The standard view is that the speakers of the Indo-European dialect that led to attested Hittite settled in north central Anatolia, in the area enclosed by the broad arc of the Halys River, and in areas to its immediate south and west (see e.g. the formulation of Neumann 2001 46). This scenario is based on the widespread premise that Hattic, the non-Indo-European language of that area, had significant ‘substrate’ effects on Hittite, while Hattic culture permeated all aspects of

⁹ There may be still other hints that at least some historical Lycians have external connections. The repeated attempts to derive the personal name *Xerēi* from the PIE word for ‘eagle’ (e.g. Starke 1990 76) face insuperable phonological and morphological obstacles. Lycian *x-* cannot continue PIE **h₃-* (see Kimball 1987). The name *Xerēi* can hardly be separated from *Xa/eriga*, but it is not credible that Lycian alone in all of Indo-European preserves a form of ‘eagle’ that is not based on an *n*-stem. One should take seriously the possibility that the element *Xa/er-* of these names is the same as that of the name for Caria. *Xerēi* and *Xa/eriga* would be etymologically merely ‘(the) Carian’. Such an identification does not, of course, require that we assume that the historical bearers of these names were themselves from Caria, nor even that they were conscious of the names’ original meaning. It would nevertheless point to some sort of Carian element in their background.

Hittite society. In reality, however, this supposed impact of Hattic on Hittite language and institutions has been consistently overestimated (most recently by Stefanini 2002 789ff), and the *prehistoric* influence of Luwian on Hittite seriously underestimated. It is time to redress this imbalance.

We may begin with language. There are *no* convincing examples of direct Hattic influence on Hittite morphology. The alleged derivation of the Hittite pronominal genitive ending *-ēl* from the Hattic derivational suffix *-il-* is phonologically impossible (the Hittite result of Hattic *-i-* is *-i-*, as shown by the genuine examples of the personal names *Ḫattušīli-* and *Muršīli-*).¹⁰ On the other hand, we already find in Old Hittite the derivational suffixes *-alla-* and *-alli-* borrowed from Luwian, as in *ḫurtiyalla-* ‘basin’ (or sim.) and *zuppariyalli-* ‘torch-bearer’ (see Melchert 2002c).¹¹ Likewise, as per Oettinger (1986a), the Hittite derivational suffix *-at(t)alla-* (as in OH *palwat-talla-* ‘clapper’) is created by reanalysis of the Luwian suffix *-alla/ī-*. The peculiar allomorph *-(i)yai-* in Hittite verbs in *-(i)ye/a-* (already attested in OH *urkiyaizzi!*) is also due to Luwian influence (Oettinger 1979b 382ff and Melchert 2002c).

Oettinger (2002 54) has suggested that indirect Hattic influence appears in the structure of Hittite personal names of the Assyrian colony period, which make heavy use of terms of relationship (*Šuppia-ḫšu* ‘offspring of the pure one’, *Šuppia-niga* ‘sister of the pure one’) and of an ethnic suffix (*Šuppi-uman* ‘of the pure one’).¹² Hattic influence is quite possible, but similar structures are also found in Luwian and Lycian personal names (see Houwink ten Cate 1961 139ff & 180f), where Hattic influence is unlikely, and such naming patterns are typologically trivial (cf. Laroche 1966 300). Note also that the form of *-ḫšu-* ‘offspring’ is specifically Luwian (cf.

¹⁰ For the real Indo-European source of *-ēl* see Oettinger (1999 264 with refs.). Contra Kronasser (1966 216) the Hittite adverbial suffix *-ili* in expressions like *luwili* ‘in Luwian’ is also merely the nominative-accusative neuter plural of the adjectival suffix *-ili-* (as in *karuwili-* ‘ancient’), a suffix borrowed from Luwian: cf. *dammil(i)-* ‘virgin, uncultivated’. Hattic *-il-* occurs in Hittite only in personal names and a few lexical borrowings such as ^{LÚ}*šaḫtarili-*, a type of cult singer or musician.

¹¹ Contra Tischler (1998 678 with n. 8) Hattic is not the source of *-alla-*. Hittite ^{LÚ}*dudduḫiyalla-* is an *adaptation* of Hattic ^{LÚ}*dudduḫiyal-*, as shown by the geminate *-ll-*, which does not appear in true Hattic loanwords.

¹² Tischler (1998 678) suggests that a number of Hittite titles may be calques on Hattic. This is quite plausible, but our very limited knowledge of Hattic makes the proposal impossible to verify.

HLuwian (NEPOS)*ha-su-* ‘progeny, descendant’ and also Lycian *xahba-* ‘grand-son’). The Hittite word is *ḥašša-*, an *a*-stem.¹³

Turning to the lexicon, we may begin by dispelling the persistent myth that Hittite has replaced much of its inherited Indo-European vocabulary. Hittite core vocabulary remains Indo-European: see the detailed analysis of Tischler (1979) with references and the cogent remarks of Neumann (2001 49). There is no doubt that the Hittites took over the names for some flora and fauna of Anatolia from other languages—we have no assurance, however, that Hattic was the only such source. The dominant role of Hattic elements in Old Hittite religion and cult and ideology of kingship is undeniable, and we would expect to find reflexes of this in the associated terminology. Nevertheless, the current number of *assured* Hattic loanwords in Hittite is less than thirty.¹⁴ This figure is not significantly higher than that of Luwian loanwords in Old and Middle Hittite manuscripts of Old Hittite texts (see Melchert 2002c). The true number of Hattic borrowings into Hittite is surely far greater. The scarcity of solid examples is due to our sparse evidence for Hattic itself and limited understanding of what little we do have. The same remark applies, however, to Luwian, where we face the further problem of distinguishing borrowings from cognates and of dating the loans.

There has also been an unfortunate tendency to attribute Hittite lexical items to a Hattic source based on nothing more than their sole or frequent occurrence in texts relating to the Hattic cult. Such an argument is likely valid for a number of cases (e.g. ^É*ḥalent(i)u-* ‘palace’), but the risks of relying on it too heavily are shown by an example like *ērḥui(t)-* ‘basket’. The word does in fact occur in Old Hittite rituals with Hattic cult elements, and side by side with the Hattic loanword ^{GIŠ}*tuḥupzi-* (e.g. KBo 16.71+ i 22), but Starke (1990 198ff) has shown that the word is borrowed from Luwian (contra Friedrich-Kammenhuber 1988 92). Likewise, the arguments of Weitenberg (1984 237ff) for the Hattic origin of several words require reassessment. The inflection of ^{NINDA}*ḥarzazun-ḥarzazut-* ‘bread-soup,

¹³ It is of course possible that a genuine pre-Hittite **ḥaššu-* ‘offspring’ was preserved only in compound names, having been ousted by *ḥašša-* as the free form.

¹⁴ For one recent collection see Tischler (1998 679f), but not all of the examples he cites are genuine. On *tawananna-* see below. For Luwian(!) *paḥhit-* see Starke (1990 208). Luwian *wašḥay(a)-* ‘sacred’ (with Lycian cognate *wasaza-*) certainly is not Hattic!

ribollita' shows that it is also a Luwian loanword: cf. CLuwian *ḫīrūn-ḫīrūt-* 'oath'. The words ^(É)*arkiw(it)-* 'canopy' and *ḫazziw(it)-* 'rite' also show evidence of Luwian morphology: see Melchert (1993a 28) and Starke (1990 181ff). These two examples highlight a further aspect of the overall problem. It is implausible to suppose a Hattic origin for Luwian words shared with Lycian, but we can by no means exclude contact between Hattians and Luwians. We must therefore consider the possibility of parallel loans from Hattic into Hittite and Luwian or even from Hattic through Luwian into Hittite.

The most egregious case of overly precipitous misattribution of Hittite words to Hattic is that of the royal titles for the king and queen, *t/labarna-* and *tawananna-*. No advocate of their Hattic origin has ever been able to provide any remotely satisfactory account of their meaning or morphology in Hattic terms (see the just remarks of Tischler 1990 39 and 1993 285).¹⁵ The only evidence for a Hattic source is their occurrence in Hattic texts, and allegedly the word-initial alternation *t/l-*. As correctly stressed by Puhvel (1989 359), the mere appearance of *Hittite* royal titles in Hattic contexts proves absolutely nothing about the words' origin. Once they became royal titles, they would necessarily have occurred in any text referring to the royal couple, regardless of the language.¹⁶

As to the initial alternation *t/l-*, this feature actually argues decisively against Hattic origin, as seen by Carruba (1986 203f). We have a dozen true loanwords from Hattic with an initial dental stop, and *none* shows any such alternation. Nor do any of the names of the Hattic deities with initial *T/D-* appearing in Hittite context, while the name of Lelwani shows only *L-*. The likely reason for this is that Hattic had only voiceless/fortis stops (see Kammenhuber 1969 448).

¹⁵ This applies also to the new proposal of Schuster cited by Tischler (1990 39). Even if one concedes the quite speculative morphological analysis (but cf. already Carruba 1986 205), there is no Hattic source for the base of *tawananna-*, and a connection of *tabarna-* with a Hattic *b/var* is excluded by the spelling of the former, which never shows an alternation *wa/pa* or spelling with the sign *wa_a*.

¹⁶ The 'argument' of Klinger (1996 209) that *tabarna-* must be Hattic because there it shows no alternation simply makes no sense. The word also appears in Palaic only in the form *tabarna-*, but he does not assume for that reason that it is native there. In any case, his *assumption* of an original Hattic form *tabarna-* leaves him with no explanation for the appearance of *labarna-* except the totally ad hoc appeal to a personal name of unknown origin with no original connection to *tabarna-*.

On the other hand, we have evidence to suggest that word-initial voiced stops were devoiced in the individual prehistories of the Indo-European Anatolian languages (Melchert 1994 18ff with refs.). We may thus assume that a Luwian **dabarna-* was borrowed as Hittite *labarna-* at a prehistoric stage when Hittite no longer had initial voiced *d-* (for at least one other example see p. 181 below). The Hittite word was later (but still prehistorically) altered to *tabarna-* by association with the Luwian verb *tapar(iya)-* ‘to rule’ after *d-* had also been devoiced to *t-* in Luwian.¹⁷

The Luwian base **tapar-* ‘powerful’ (or sim.) reflects an adjective **dh_eb-ro-* for which one may compare MHG *tapfer* ‘massive, firm’ also ‘brave’.¹⁸ For the development to **tapar-* see Melchert (1993b). From this adjective was formed the denominative verb *tapariya-* *‘to be powerful’ > ‘to rule’ (cf. Eichner 1975 81⁵ and Starke 1990 259). The verbal stem *tapar-* is a back-formation (for the process see Melchert 1997a 87f). As per Oettinger (1986b 21), a substantivized **dapar-* ‘power’ (cf. CLuwian *waššar-* ‘favor’) is the base of *tabarna-* in turn again ‘(the) powerful (one)’.¹⁹ As seen by Starke (1983 406), The derivation of *tabarna-* from **tapar-* is entirely parallel to that of **immarna-* ‘(deity) of the open country’ < **immār-* ‘open country’ (attested in the substantivized adjective ^d*Immarniya-* ‘deity of the open country’). On the suffix *-na-* see immediately below.

Puhvel (1989 360) plausibly compares the suffix *-nna-* of *tawanna-* with the PIE ‘ruler’ suffix seen in Latin *Matrōna* and

¹⁷ The frequent spelling of the word with the sign *ba*, sometimes cited as an indicator of ‘substrate’ origin, in no way excludes a Luwian source. Starke (1983 406) correctly compares *u-ba-ti-* ‘land-grant’, a certain Luwian loanword in Hittite. As noted by Carruba (1986 203), the use of *ba* argues against Hattic origin.

¹⁸ Previous formulations of this etymology (see the references in Tischler 1991 118) cite Latin *faber* ‘craftsman’ as well as MHG *tapfer* and sometimes give the preform as **dhabhro-*. However, *tapfer* demands PIE **b*, and the earliest attestations point to a physical quality. This is surely the source of the Luwian: cf. Hittite *daššu-* ‘mighty’ < **dēnsu-* ‘massive, thick’ and for the development of the verb from **b* ‘strong’ to ‘to rule’ cf. OHG *waltan*, OCS *vlasti* etc. ‘to rule’ beside Latin *ualeō* ‘be strong’. Strength, not craftsmanship, was the defining quality of the Hittite king. Latin *faber* and Armenian *darbin* ‘smith’ (the latter can only reflect **bh*) should be kept separate.

¹⁹ We may leave open the much-debated question regarding the priority of the use as personal name or title, both of which are trivial from an appellative meaning ‘(the) powerful (one)’.

Neptūnus.²⁰ Also correct is his adduction of the Hittite adverb *tāwana*, but the assigned meaning ‘well’ and comparison with Latin *bonus* cannot be upheld. The adverb means rather ‘truly, honestly’, a moral sense derived from ‘upright, straight’, as shown by the derived noun *tāwani-* ‘stalk, stem’ (Melchert 1999 367). The queen is thus ‘(the) righteous (one)’, a fitting pendant for the king’s epithet ‘(the) powerful (one)’.²¹ The phonology of *tāwana-* with loss of **h₂* before *w* shows that the word is Luwian in origin: for the phonology see p. 180 below and for derivation from a **(s)téh₂wen(o)-* see Southern (2000 104).

The titles of both the Hittite king and queen are thus Luwian, while that of the crown-prince ^{LÚ}*ta/uḫ(u)kanti-* and the word for ‘throne’ *ḫalmaššuit-* are Hattic (see Klinger 1996 220ff and 162ff). We should not be surprised by this mix. Likewise *telipuri-* ‘(administrative) district’ is from Hattic, while *ubati-* ‘land-grant, demesne’ is from Luwian (Klinger 1996 200). Such a fusion of Hattic and Luwian elements appears more generally in Hittite notions of kingship. The concept that the king receives his authority from the Storm-god, Sun-goddess, and Throne (*ḫalmaššuit-*) is certainly taken from Hattic (Klinger 1996 134-141). Likewise the special role of the mountains in protecting the Hittite kingdom (Lombardi 1996). On the other hand, the list of desiderata given by Telipinu to the Hittite king (KUB 17.10 iv 29ff with parallel 33.12 iv 2ff) includes two pairs of Luwian loanwords: *šalḫittiš mannittiš* and *nūš tummantiyaš*. The sense of the first pair still eludes us, but the second means ‘assent (and) obedience’.²² The ideal of a well-ordered kingdom is thus expressed in Luwian already in an Old Hittite composition whose overall milieu is clearly Hattic.

²⁰ The parallel with *tawananna-* and the name of the Storm-god *Tarḫunna-*, both with geminate *-nn-* after vowel, suggests that the suffix in both *tabarna-* and **immarna-* is also ultimately **-h₃no-* (thus implicitly Puhvel; cf. Bader 1988 186 et aliter). On the further history of this suffix see most recently Pinault (2000).

²¹ For arguments against Puhvel’s claim that *tawananna-* originally referred to the king’s daughter and for *tawananna-* as at all times a title of the queen see Klinger (1996 213-219).

²² The sense ‘assent, compliance’ for *nū-* is shown by the passage KBo 11.14 iv 7-8 and its parallel KUB 57.79 iv 31-33 (see Güterbock and Hoffner 1980-89 477). Luwian *tummantiya-* matches Hittite *ištamaššuwar* ‘obedience’ (Puhvel 1984 459 with refs).

A full discussion of Hattic and Luwian elements in Hittite religion is impossible here. That Luwian as well as Hattic influence appears already in the Old Hittite cult is indisputable: see the discussion of the goddess Kamrusepa by Klinger (1996 156ff).²³ However, the fact that Luwian and Hittite share a common tradition precludes any simplistic confrontation of Luwian versus Hattic in this sphere. The Storm-god who gives the Hittite king his royal authority is Hattic, but his name *Tarḫunna-* is not, and the existence of Luwian *Tarḫunt-~Tarḫunza-* and Lycian *Trqqñt-* shows that the figure of the Storm-god belongs already to Indo-European Proto-Anatolian. The formation of the ‘Hittite’ state cult (on the problem of its definition see Klinger 1996 15) remains an object of investigation. As in the case of the relationship of the Hittite language to Proto-Indo-European, the issue must be treated in the overall context of ‘Indo-Europeans’ in Anatolia, not merely ‘Hittite’ versus Hattic.

Klinger (1996 16f with n. 41, 93, 140, 198 with n. 287) argues eloquently against claims that early Hittite texts attest ‘confrontation’ between Indo-European newcomers and Hattians and more generally against the popular model of imposition of an Indo-European upper or ruling class on a native Hattic population (for independent arguments against such a conception see Steiner 1981 166f and cf. also Bryce 1998 15). What evidence we have points rather to a long-term assimilation (Oettinger 2002 51). The linguistic facts cited above argue not for Hattic as an exclusive ‘substrate’ of Hittite, but rather for ‘adstrate’ effects on Hittite from both Hattic and Luwian. We are thus led to a scenario by which the speakers of the prehistoric dialect that became Hittite were located not in north central Anatolia, but in an area *between* the Hattians to the north and the pre-Luwian population to the south and west. This means roughly in a band of territory stretching from the southwest to the northeast along the upper course of the Halys, centering on Nesa/Kanesh, the *only* site for which we

²³ Contra Klinger (1996 157¹¹⁹) and Taracha (2000 179⁶²) linguistic archaisms assure that the rituals of KUB 7.1+ date to Old Hittite. The provocative claim of Taracha that the Sun-goddess of Earth is of southern Anatolian origin and that the Old Hittite Sun-god of Heaven is to be equated with Luwian *Tiwad-* may be left for discussion.

have direct evidence for a strong early presence of Hittite speakers (see Map 1).²⁴

This largely linguistic result matches well those reached by Singer (1981 124ff) and Steiner (1981 169ff and 1990 200) on wholly independent grounds. Unfortunately, one must concede that no consensus has yet been reached regarding the localization of Kussara and Sana-(h)witta, two cities crucial in the history of the rise of the Hittite kingdom. Some scholars do place both in the territory defined above (e.g. Klengel 1999 32), but others put one or both farther north in Hatti (cf. Bryce 1998 xvi, Starke 2002 302). It does seem fair to say that the location suggested here for the Hittites at the turn from the third to the second millennium is a viable hypothesis.

3.5 *Lydian*

The whereabouts of pre-Lyidian speakers at the end of the third millennium remains a matter of conjecture. Circumstantial evidence suggests that classical Lydia was Luwian-speaking in the second millennium (see 3.2 above and cf. Starke 1997a 457), though evidence for possible Luwian ‘substrate’ influence on Lydian remains sparse (see the cautious summary by Carruba 1961 403ff). While Lydian shares some common innovations with other western Anatolian dialects (see the summary in Melchert 2002b),²⁵ its mostly divergent development points to relative isolation. These combined factors lead to a tentative location in northwest Anatolia in classical Maionia or Bithynia (similarly Starke 1997a 457 and 1997b 384 with note 10 and Oettinger 2002 52; for a contrary view see Stefanini 2002 798). Confirmation of this conclusion drawn largely by a process of elimination must await further research.

²⁴ Norbert Oettinger (pers. comm.) points out that the near certain adoption by the Hittites of the Old Babylonian script via a northern Syrian intermediary also suggests that the Hittites’ position at the start of the second millennium was relatively closer to Syria than that of the Hattians (cf. the similar comments by Neu 1968 134). On the origin of the Hittite script see among others Gamkrelidze (1961).

²⁵ However, one feature cited there should be deleted. Schürr (1997) has presented persuasive arguments that Lydian does not share in the generalization of the animate nominative plural in **-Vnsi*.

4. *Indo-European Speakers in Anatolia: when and from where?*

Linguistic arguments provide an approximate *terminus ante* and *post quem* for the appearance of Indo-European speakers in Anatolia. On the one hand, the Assyrian colony texts attest both appellatives and names reflecting already distinctively evolved Luwian and Hittite: *upatinnum* < Luwian *upati-* ‘land-grant’ and *Zida-* and *Ḫutarla-* < Luwian *zida/i-* ‘man’ and *ḫutarlā-* ‘servant’ vs. *išpattalu-* ‘night-quarters’ < Hittite *išpant-* ‘night’ and *Šuppiuman-* < Hittite *šuppi-* ‘pure’ and ethnic suffix *-uman-*. See Tischler (1995), Carruba (1995a 30f), Starke (1997a 457), Oettinger (2002 52) and others contra MacQueen (1996 31). We do not control the rate of language change with precision, but one can only agree with Carruba and Oettinger that the stage of Proto-Anatolian must precede our earliest attested evidence by at least half a millennium, and in all likelihood by considerably more than that.²⁶

On the other hand, we may emphatically reject the claim of Renfrew (1987 et aliter) for Indo-European speakers in Anatolia since 7000 BCE. For recent arguments against Renfrew’s model see Darden (2001). The virtually complete absence of evidence for linguistic contact between Proto-Indo-European or Proto-Anatolian and the known ancient languages of the area (Hattic, Akkadian, and Sumerian) also precludes an Indo-European linguistic continuity in Anatolia of five thousand years (pace Renfrew 2001 54). The same objection applies to the proposal of Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995 791) that the center of the PIE speech community was in eastern Anatolia.²⁷ There is no basis for abandoning the standard view that Indo-European speakers are intrusive to Anatolia. Darden (2001 204) presents arguments for the end of the fifth millennium or the fourth

²⁶ It is important to bear in mind that we must allow not only for a time of relative isolation of the pre-Luwian and pre-Hittite speakers that led to their divergence as distinct languages, but also for a subsequent period of contact during which Luwian influenced Hittite. The degree of difference between the earliest attested Luwian and Hittite precludes the scenario of MacQueen (1996 30) by which the Hittites separated from the Luwians by moving north and east only shortly before the colony period.

²⁷ Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995 769ff) do indeed claim a significant number of Semitic and Sumerian loanwords in PIE, but most of these do not withstand close scrutiny. Given what we now know about long-distance trade at least as early as the third millennium (see e.g. Korfmann 2001), the few genuine examples are compatible with location of the PIE speech community north or west of the Black Sea.

millennium as a *terminus post quem* for a PIE speech community that includes Anatolian. Lehrman (2001 116) arrives at a similar date of 4000 BCE.

At this point the limitations of linguistic evidence come into full force. Lehrman proposes a tentative date of 3000 BCE for the last stage of unified Proto-Anatolian, a choice that plausibly allows about a millennium for both the development from PIE to PA and from PA to the first attested Anatolian languages. Carruba (1995a 31) arrives at a similar date of 3000-2800 for PA. However, nothing precludes that the evolution from PIE to PA took longer than that from PA to the attested languages—or vice versa. A further element of uncertainty is introduced by the fact that we cannot be sure of the manner in which the differentiation of Proto-Anatolian from PIE or that of the individual attested languages from Proto-Anatolian took place. One reasonable scenario is that a group of PIE speakers isolated themselves by moving into Anatolia. After a period of relative unity during which the language developed the characteristic set of features by which we define Proto-Anatolian, speakers dispersed across Anatolia with the resulting divergence into the attested languages of the early second millennium (thus e.g. Oettinger 2002 52). However, we cannot entirely exclude the alternative model of Steiner (1990 202f): the isolation that led to the development of Proto-Anatolian took place outside Anatolia (in the Balkans, e.g.), and entry into Anatolia took place in several successive waves (the objections to this scenario by Stefanini 2002 786 are overstated). According to this view some of the differences between the attested languages are correlated with the movement into Anatolia, while others develop as part of the dispersal within Anatolia.²⁸

Plausible locations for the PIE speech community range from Eastern Europe and the Balkans to the region of the southern Volga. We cannot determine on linguistic grounds alone whether entry into Anatolia was from the northwest or the northeast. Steiner (1981 169) argues that the attested location of the Anatolian IE languages, the presence of non-Indo-European languages in northern and eastern Anatolia, and the evidence for movement of the Luwians from west

²⁸ Oettinger and likewise Bryce (1998 14) argue that the earliest forms of Hittite, Luwian and Palaic are close enough to disprove successive waves of migration, but it is far from clear that such movements only a few centuries apart would have led to a radically different result in the attested languages.

to east point to entry from the (north)west. But if one assumes that the movement into Anatolia was a full millennium before our first records (as does Steiner), it seems hard to exclude the possibility that all traces of an early migration from east to west have simply been obliterated (or not yet discovered). That the Luwians *subsequently* moved from a western base south and east does not logically require that prior movements followed the same trajectory. An entry from the northwest does seem most plausible, but one would like to have corroboration, e.g. in the form of common innovations shared by Anatolian with western Indo-European dialects. The proposals of Puhvel (1994 et aliter) in this regard are at present merely suggestive, not yet compelling.²⁹

Trying to correlate the linguistic developments and supposed population movements just described with changes in prehistoric cultures reflected in the archaeological record is a parlous enterprise. There does seem to be broad agreement that there is a high degree of cultural continuity in Anatolia from the Early through the Middle Bronze Age with relatively little evidence of ‘destruction layers’: see among others Yakar (1981) and Mellaart (1981).

To this extent the archaeological findings agree with the conclusions reached above on linguistic grounds in pointing to a relatively long and slow infiltration and acculturation rather than ‘invasion’ or ‘conquest’ and the imposition of a ruling class of Indo-Europeans on pre-existing populations (such as the Hattians). Mellaart (1981 137ff) suggests a date as early as 3500 BCE for entry of Indo-European speakers into Anatolia (cf. also Yakar 1981 96). Steiner (1981 169), for whom the differentiation of Luwian and Hittite begins outside Anatolia (see above) allows for a somewhat later date, but still

²⁹ On the other hand, the arguments of Stefanini (2002 788) for an entry from the northeast are invalid. The affinities linking Anatolian and Tocharian (some of which are also shared with western IE dialects) can all thus far be interpreted as archaisms and thus retentions by peripheral dialects. They offer no evidence for an alleged common eastward movement of pre-Tocharian and pre-Anatolian speakers. There is also no credible evidence for substrate influence of Caucasian languages on Proto-Anatolian, which is the only issue here. Possible later influence of Hattic and Hurrian specifically on Hittite is irrelevant to the question of the entry of IE speakers into Anatolia. Certainly false is Stefanini’s claim (2002 786 n. 4) that a majority of linguists believe in a northeastern entry.

assumes that the Hittites have been ‘in Anatolia for at least one millennium’ (1990 204).³⁰

Note that such dates for initial entry of Indo-Europeans into Anatolia permit later signs of apparent west-to-east movement (see Mellaart 1981 145, Steiner 1981 169, and MacQueen 1996 27) to be interpreted as further movement *within* Anatolia by the pre-Luwians. One should probably be careful in pressing too far the contrast of small groups of ‘peaceable’ pre-Hittites with larger numbers of more aggressive and ‘restless’ pre-Luwians (cf. Steiner 1990 202f). Nevertheless, the circumstantial evidence for the eventually much wider attestation of Luwian vis-à-vis Hittite and Palaic does lend some credence to this notion.

It is tempting to see the Demircihüyük culture described by Korfmann (2001 361ff) as associated with the arrival of Indo-Europeans in Anatolia (cf. the remarks of Yakar 1981 96 and Darden 2001 220). The dating to the second half of the fourth and first half of the third millennium would correlate reasonably with those proposed on linguistic criteria above. In this case one would accept Steiner’s and others’ proposal of entry from the Balkans across the Bosphorus, arguably in the late fourth millennium. After a period of relative unity in the northwest pre-Hittite and pre-Palaic speakers would have moved off towards their later attested positions, while the pre-Luwians stayed behind, later to move south and west. The ultimate viability of such a scenario remains to be determined. For the present we must be satisfied with a more vague characterization: the pre-Luwians entered Anatolia along with or only slightly later than other Indo-European speakers, surely no later than in the first half of the third millennium. They then spread across extensive areas of western and southern Anatolia already in the second half of the third millennium. Just how far this expansion had proceeded we can only guess.

³⁰ In which case the movement of the pre-Luwians *into* Anatolia cannot be much later (cf. note 28).