

TOWARD A DIACHRONIC RECONSTRUCTION OF THE LINGUISTIC MAP OF ANCIENT ANATOLIA

Ruggero Stefanini, Berkeley

A reconstruction of the ethno-linguistic map of Anatolia from the depths of the third millennium to the Hellenistic age is a task and a challenge which the Hittitologist can hardly evade. In fact, this exercise in probability will test our methods and approaches, while establishing between general view and preserved details that dialectic discourse by which they can alone be mutually corrected and guaranteed. Throughout a period of almost three millennia, it is evident that this map must have changed, transforming with varying speed as in a cinematic sequence; but this development did not lack consistency or continuity, due, if nothing else, to the extraordinary capacity for assimilating and re-processing that Anatolia has always displayed. Something similar can be said of the geographic conformation of the country, where the mountain barriers and the different orientation of the rivers undeniably created marked regional differences, even with notably extroverted peripheral zones, but never compromised the basic unity and the extended viability of the peninsula. Speaking of ethno-linguistic reconstruction, we will obviously give *ethnos* an anthropological meaning (of cultural *facies*, that is), rather than a racial one; on the other hand, such a reconstruction cannot help but be "ideal", like those attempted by classical archaeologists on temples or mausoleums of which only a few ruins remain *in situ*, besides some numismatic images or literary references. This also means that, although aiming at a coherent and overall picture, ours will necessarily be a compendious reconstruction, with no abundance of specific information. In addition, we must keep it reasonably flexible and open enough, in order to be able to incorporate, with no need of extensive demolitions (that is to say, in the easiest and most economical manner), new elements that hopefully will come to enrich the general picture.

Before proceeding to our reading of the Anatolian data, we would like to touch upon the following considerations:

I. A literary (or, simply, a standard written language) should never be identified with the dialect type or the dialect area that yielded it; in fact, quite evident distinctions of both geographic and cultural nature prevent us from doing so.¹ A literary language is usually an artifact based on (not

¹ The fact that in Asia Minor the main literary language was based on the variety spoken at Kaneš/Neša and that its very name (*neš[um]n[il]*) was taken from this city by

identical to) a dialectal variety that, at a certain point, was favored by a set of political and cultural circumstances; but, once crystallized, it tends to perpetuate itself by growing on its own products (genre by genre) while gradually reducing the input from the linguistic reality (the spoken language) that underlies it. This means that the possible disappearance of the dialect(s) that rose up to become literary Hittite or the subsequent disappearance of Hittite itself as a written language does not imply at all that, by that time, any other dialect of the same type or group had also vanished from the linguistic map of Anatolia.² Hittite or Hittite-Palaic dialects, possibly endowed with features even more archaic than those which the literary language succeeded in maintaining or had ever mustered, may have lived and spread (not necessarily by significant displacements of people), in central and western Anatolia well after the fall of the Empire.

II. We should also learn to distinguish the ethno-linguistic level from the level of political organization, though keeping in mind the influence that, in the long run, the latter can exert upon the former (acculturation and/or colonization enforced from above) and the former upon the latter (ethno-linguistic absorption of the political superstructure from below). Indeed we know that strong political establishments have often been founded and organized by foreign-speaking minorities which may have imposed their language in the Palace and in the Chancellery (i.e., in the centers of power and administration) while ruling in fact over a population of a quite different kind. The indigenous layer (a) can now

no means implies that totally different languages were spoken in the neighboring districts, as Mellaart (1981: 141) and Steiner (1981: 167) seem to take for granted. One cannot reduce a rhetorical figure to a merely literal sense. Up to the beginning of the twentieth century, literary and standard Italian was still called *Florentine*, inasmuch as it was originally based on the dialect of that city. This does not mean, however, that the linguistic area comprising Florence did not extend to include other territories and urban centers. The term *lingua franca* to which Steiner (1981: 167) resorts, is quite unsuitable to describe a written and literary language such as Hittite, even if, exactly for being a written and literary language, Hittite was apt and geared to serve a cultural area far larger than the linguistic area which had produced it.

² Puhvel too (1966: 239) admitted a long while ago, though in a very cautious phrasing, that toward the end of the Imperial Period Hittite may have been on the road to becoming a kind of scribal petrifact, and that Luwian was spreading (or had spread) from the Central South (Tarhuntašša) up to Hattuša to become the first and most active vernacular of the Empire; see also Stefanini (1965: 78f.), Laroche (1978: 746) and Mallory (1989: 34). With this, one certainly does not mean that Hittite, as a literary language, did not have its own changes and history up until the end, even considering only the diverse competence and the diverse spatio-temporal extraction of the speakers that wrote it. In certain genres (administrative correspondence) and in certain *scriptoria* (particularly in the provinces) it is also probable that texts reflected more closely the use and phrasing of the spoken language.

end up adopting more or less extensively the language of the dominant class and its colonists; but we know very well that, under more advantageous conditions, (b) it may also succeed in regaining linguistic control, allowing the alien monarchy and aristocracy to retain the distinction of a prestigious onomastics together with a flattering corpus of legends likely to prolong their cohesion. On the other hand, a state rather homogeneous in its origins from the ethno-linguistic point of view can lose its compactness (c) following the annexation of neighboring territories or (d) due to the arrival of nomadic populations that, although remaining in a subordinate position, come to establish themselves within the state's borders. Also in these cases the political situation starts varying processes of acculturation whose waves move in general from the center to the outskirts (i.e., from the top to the base), not without reactions and repercussions that obviously proceed in an inverse direction. Furthermore, since the acculturation promoted by a large state passes beyond political boundaries to exert itself upon bordering regions ("spheres of influence"), buffer states are usually exposed to waves of acculturation (either alternating or synchronous) coming from the two centers of power which they lie between. Evidence of local resistance, but much more often of cultural conversion, has always been provided by the proper names of the ruling family or class.

III. We will never know for sure what geographical image Hittites had of Anatolia from their capital city; it is probable, however, that it was rather approximate and distorted. Long afterwards - it is true - Herodotus places in Aristagoras' hand a bronze cosmography on which the ethnic and regional subdivision of fifth-century Anatolia must have been accurate enough, at least judging from the character's oral exposition;³ but Herodotus also shows elsewhere (I.72) that, in spite of all his curiosity and explorations, he had a noticeably contracted contour of the peninsula (Asheri 1988: 82f., 314). The names of Anatolian kingdoms, regions and peoples recurrent in Hittite texts, even when they can be located on the map with a considerable margin of probability, do not usually provide in and of themselves precise ethno-linguistic references; with the exceptions of *Luwiya*, *Pala* and the un-Anatolian *Ahhiyawa*, they are rather to be taken as topographic containers. In addition, the possibility exists that these terms shift or expand or contract in accordance with the age or the source (Singer 1981: 119), as is also true for Classical Anatolia. Names such as *Hatti* or *Hayaša* (Arm.

³ See V.49 (Aristagoras of Miletus in the presence of Cleomenes, King of Sparta): "he brought with him a bronze tablet on which the map of all the earth was engraved and all the sea and all the rivers;" trans. by A.D. Godley, The Loeb Classic Library.

Hayastan) demonstrably had, moreover, different ethno-linguistic denotations depending upon the chronology.

At the origins of Hittite civilization and Anatolian languages there is a long period of epichoric interaction between Indo-European and non-Indo-European speakers. This statement, which can seem an idle truism, leads instead, if coherently developed, to highly controversial corollaries. In fact, it stands in marked contrast to the grand maneuvers of those archaeologists and linguists who import into Anatolia eager contingents of Luwians, Hittites and Palaians already perfectly developed and just recently branched out from the Indo-European tree. And some (the Hittites) are summoned from the East and others (the Luwians) from the West; nor does one hesitate to interpose even a millennium and a half (3500-2000 ca.) between the first and the last invasion.⁴ Such reconstructions, based upon defective archaeological data which are so often arbitrarily or reversibly interpreted, sound quite absurd from a linguistic point of view.⁵ Nor is the matter noticeably helped by the attenuating factor of an imprecise terminology (for *Hittite* we should be perhaps kind enough to understand "proto-Hittites" or "would-be-Hittites", etc.): first of all, rarely (if ever) has this been the semantic intention of the authors; in the second place, this distributive predestination is still capable of distorting the nature and sequence of the

⁴ For more or less critical surveys of the different opinions, see lately Steiner (150-154), Liverani (1988: 307-314), Bryce (1998: 10-14) and Klengel (1999: 18-21). Some scholars tend to multiply and separate the "waves", in general giving precedence to the Hittites (Steiner, 169f.), while others tend to reduce and compress them (Crossland 1971: 842). Entry from the northwest has long seemed ideal for the Luwians, especially because Arzawa, in its widest geographic extension, was taken, not as a geo-political notion, but also as a linguistic one. However, this Balkan provenance has not seemed appropriate for the Hittites; it seemed to contradict, in fact, the cultural and geo-political orientation of their proto-history: hence compromises and crises. A typical compromise (Carruba 1969: 22-25, but cf. also Mellaart, 137) is to have the entire Indo-European contingent (i.e., the "Hittites" too) enter from the northwest, but then have the (would-be) Hittites cross the peninsula and execute a sharp turn, so to position them in the role and the direction in which they are attested by the time of the first historical data. Examples of crisis (a strong inclination to introduce the Hittites from the northeast, but a stronger aversion to separating them from the Luwians, whose entry from the northwest is in turn considered axiomatic) are to be found in Crossland (844f.), Winn (1974: 136f.) and Mallory (30). That all these Indo-European immigrants entered Anatolia (only) from the northeast is granted by Winn (1981), assumed by Adrados (1982: 1) and is by now the most diffuse opinion, at least among linguists.

⁵ Skepticism about the possibility of reconstructing a linguistic situation on the basis of archaeological data has been expressed by different authors: Crossland (828), Steiner (155), Mallory (28) and, above all, Liverani (312).

events;⁶ and, last but not least, without an adequate terminology one can hardly carry on a scholarly discussion. *Luwian*, *Hittite*, *Palaic* (in reference to the languages and their native speakers) are now to be considered genuine Anatolian products and notions that vanish as soon as they are extrapolated from their geographic and cultural environment.⁷ To ask oneself, then, whether the Luwians or the Hittites arrived first in Anatolia is much like posing the question of whether the Catalan or Portuguese arrived first on the Iberian peninsula.

Since, contrary to C. Renfrew (1987: 205f.), I do not place the *Urheimat* of the Indo-Europeans in central-eastern Anatolia,⁸ I will have to consider two questions that are closely related: (a) the problem of the Anatolian substratum and (b) the problem of the first Indo-European immigrants to the region. In other words, I will have to reconstruct or hypothesize in some way the two basic components of a linguistic situation that, from the outset of the second millennium, can be considered historic and attested. Beginning with the Indo-European component - the one which ended up prevailing - we can state that, once the Indo-European proto-homeland has been excluded from Anatolia, we will not go and look for it here or there.⁹ In this context, it is sufficient for us to decide: (b.1) from which side the Indo-Europeans (and not the Luwians or the Hittites) entered Asia Minor and (b.2) in which part of the peninsula they established and acculturated themselves, while the language introduced by them (and for us irretrievably lost) was developing into the Anatolian varyingly recorded in the extant documents. Supposing for linguistic reasons (fundamental homogeneity of the product) that the Indo-Europeans responsible for Anatolian belonged to the same tradition and came from the same concentration area, we can only admit that they entered Anatolia from just one

⁶ On this point (unity vs. trinity of Anatolian) Crossland's exposition (836) is not free from ambiguity. It is one thing to admit that the language of the immigrants (homogeneous, but certainly not homogenized) must have contained differences and variants (see below, p. 349), and quite another to imply that these differences already corresponded to the profile of the three historical dialects.

⁷ Here I fully agree with Gamkrelidze/Ivanov (1995 [1984]), when they state, for instance, that "there is reason to believe that the formation and development of the separate historical dialects from Common Anatolian (after the split of Common Anatolian from Proto-Indo-European) took place over a long period of time in Asia Minor, i.e. in the historical territory of the Anatolian speakers" (759) or that "Hittite and Luwian ... were already differentiated at the end of the third millennium" (761).

⁸ For enlightened and constructive critiques of Renfrew's thesis, see Liverani (312f.) and Mallory (166-168, 177-181).

⁹ To the traditional notion of a more or less mythical *Urheimat*, Mallory (144f.) rightly counterposes the more relevant and scientific concept of gathering centers and areas of acculturation.

direction, and not two or three.¹⁰ Asked to declare that direction, we would indicate, unhesitatingly, the eastern and northeastern tracks which connect Anatolia to Transcaucasia. We are also encouraged to opt for a (north)eastern provenance by the undeniable affinities, mostly but not exclusively lexical, which link Anatolian to Tocharian and can be explained only by hypothesizing a period of cohabitation or close contiguity between the bearers of the two traditions. The area of this "community" could be reasonably placed in eastern Ukraine and/or in the adjacent steppes to the north of the Caucasus. One would thus trace the following reconstruction. When (first half of the fourth millennium?), around the northwestern coasts of the Black Sea (northeastern Balkans and western Ukraine), the Indo-European coalition that would elaborate the lexicon and morphology of the "southeastern" languages (Greek-Aryan-Armenian) was formed, more archaic groups (destined therefore to preserve a pre-Brugmannian kind of Indo-European) found themselves displaced on the eastern front. They continued to move slowly eastward, but once they passed the Don, some maintained the same direction, heading toward the Volga and the plains that extend beyond it (Tocharians), others turned toward the south instead, heading for the Caucasus range.¹¹ In the Caucasian and Transcaucasian regions these Indo-Europeans were exposed to languages and enclosed in horizons mainly Hurrian (or, more generally, East-Caucasian) in character.¹² Then, after a period of cultural and linguistic intercourse, they entered eastern Anatolia (first centuries of the

¹⁰ It is the opinion shared by Carruba (1969: 11f.; see also 1976: 139), Crossland (832, 842, 845), Winn (1974: 128) and Mallory (30), who stress the homogeneity of this linguistic tradition (Anatolian), downplaying the internal differences at least from the typological and classificatory points of view.

¹¹ Ivanov (1988: 140f.), relying on some "common Anatolian-Tocharian words with possible North-Caucasian connections", even suggests that the association between the Indo-European ancestors of these peoples (Anatolians and Tocharians) was extended enough in time and space to expose proto-Tocharians as well to North-Caucasian influences.

¹² See Winn (1974: 26; 1981: 118), Ivanov (1988: 140f.) and Mallory (151). With regard to the "dialectal" specification of the Caucasian involved in this prehistoric association with Indo-European contingents, there are understandable waverings and approximations among the scholars (Northeast Caucasian or proto-Hurrian, a still undifferentiated North-Caucasian, and even South-Caucasian or Kartvelian). At any rate, correspondences of anthropological nature between Hittite texts and the modern folklore of the Caucasus - even granting the possible ubiquity of some motifs (though, in dealing with contiguous areas, this is a weak objection) - still remain impressive; cf. Grigolia (1939): the river ordeal (perhaps with the same procedure [154f.]), apotropaic effectiveness of woollen threads, especially if red-colored (109f.), abstinence from women before going to hunt (93), fierce pursuit of the ravisher of a bride and his party by her resentful kinsmen (67f.), etc.

third millennium?), where they spread out (northeastern quadrant) on a substratum of Hattic (or West-Caucasian) type,¹³ only to meet again, proceeding further south (southeastern quadrant), a substratum prevalently Hurrian (or East-Caucasian).¹⁴ The collective result of this geographic and chronological shifting is, at the end of the third millennium, the so-called Anatolian, subdivided in its two basic varieties (the northern [Hittite-Palaic] and the southern one [Luwian]). This dialectology must have been determined not only by the different reactions of the two substrata (West-Caucasian → northern Anatolian; East-Caucasian → Luwian), but also by the occasional prevalence of this or that Indo-European alternative, since the language of the immigrants was no monolith and certainly retained options and byforms (Puhvel 1966: 236f.). This new linguistic *facies* was still limited, in its geographic extension, to central-eastern Anatolia (up to the meridian of Gordion [32° E], to give a general idea) and probably left uncovered, to the north and to the south-east, zones of unassimilated substratum (Hattic and Hurrian, respectively). Anatolian, as a socio-linguistic reality, is less known to us than we generally realize or are ready to admit. We have recovered (a) a literary language (Hittite), based on the *sermo urbanus* of a city (Kaneš/Neša) and largely developed on foreign models (Hattic, Akkadian, Hurrian); (b) the casual "carrots" of Palaic and Cuneiform Luwian; (c) the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus, limited, except for a few and difficult exceptions (commercial correspondence), to the narrow and repetitive genre of the *Bauinschriften*. As for the mentioned substrata

¹³ On the relatedness of Hattic to the (north)western branch of Caucasian, see Ivanov (1985: 26-59; 1988: 133ff.). On the extent and duration of the Hattic substratum/adstratum, see Singer (1981: 119-126, 129-132) and below, n. 25. Some scholars (cf. Puhvel, 238) also reckon with a central (and third) kind of substratum, i.e., Kanešite - a "divergent and transitional idiom" which was allegedly spoken and then assimilated in the area around Kültepe.

¹⁴ A pre-Indo-European substratum for Luwian has been taken into account by Puhvel (238 - "a wide belt of pre-Luwian substratum covered large areas of the south") and by Mellaart (143). Schachermeyer (*Pauly-Wissowa*, XXII [2], 1954: 1498-1548) not only postulated it, but also labelled it as "Aegeo-Minoan," while Carruba (1969: 9-11), arguing against him, denied the very existence of such an indigenous layer. More convincingly, Ivanov (1988: 139f.) later came out in favor of an old and special association between Luwian and Hurrian. On the relatedness of Hurrian-Urartian to the (north)eastern branch of Caucasian, see Diakonoff/Starostin (1986).

I am far from believing, of course, that Hurrian or any kind of (East-)Caucasian was the first language ever spoken in the southeastern quadrant of the peninsula. "Substratum" is, after all, a relative notion; which also means that a substratum language may have had, in turn, its own substratum. Should the existence of Kanešite, for instance (see above, n. 13), be cogently proved, I would not have any problem in supposing it to be the relic area of a deeper substratum over which Hattic (in the north) and Hurrian (in the south) had successfully spread.

(West- and East-Caucasian) of central-eastern Anatolia, we must remember in the end that these two linguistic traditions continued to exert a strong influence on the Indo-European language (Anatolian) they had contributed to forming. In fact, during the second millennium, they will be seen again in the role of lively adstrata (historic Hattic and Hurrian) and maybe even in the role of superstrata, if we take into account, on the one hand, the periodic invasions of the Gašga people (whose linguistic affiliation with West-Caucasian is not improbable)¹⁵ and, on the other, the linguistic consequences (Hurrian) of Mitanni's ascent and consequent expansion into southeastern Anatolia.

The totally unexpected discovery of Indo-European peoples on the historic scene of the second millennium Near East (an Indo-European language and, more dramatically and less exactly, an Indo-European Empire) gave rise to romantic appraisals tinted with racism and prone to exalt the political and cultural achievements of the Hittites. These infatuations, justly ridiculed by Liverani in his *Storia*,¹⁶ have since provoked, as was foreseeable, no less romantic excesses in the opposite direction (that is, in favor of the substratum), with stances and statements that may remind one of Russian Scythism or South-Slavic and Albanian Illyrism.¹⁷ Therefore, for a reconstruction of the events that led to the formation of the Old Kingdom (from the Cappadocian Tablets to Hattusili I) and for a study of the composite ethnic and political map in which these events took place, it is better to rely on the cautious and judicious reasoning of Singer (1981) than on the paradoxical declarations of Mellaart (1981) or Steiner (1981). Beside Singer's article, we can take into account the interpretation given for the same period by Haas (1982: 40-44 - with an emphasis upon the ethno-political conflict between the Hattians and the Hittites) and the one offered by Liverani (1988: 443 - with annoyed dismissal, instead, of such a competition and a more homogeneous and Hittitized picture of the ethno-linguistic situation). Finally, having reconsidered the matter on the pages devoted by Bryce (1998: 7-20) and by Klengel (1999: 17-31) to the problems of this formative age, we could try to reach an agreement at least on the following points.

I. Kuššara was part of the Land of Kaneš (Crossland 1971: 833; Singer 1981: 129): it was, that is to say, culturally and linguistically Hittite

¹⁵ See Mellaart (141) and Singer (1981: 123).

¹⁶ Liverani (1988: 443f.); see also Crossland (826).

¹⁷ See especially Mellaart (1981) and Steiner (1981). Their peculiar reaction is partly motivated by a terminological misunderstanding, for which linguists rather than historians or archaeologists are to be held responsible: i.e., the misuse of *Hittites* as "a (genetically) Indo-European people or branch who came to settle in Asia Minor".

even before the rise of the strong local dynasty of Pithana and Anitta.¹⁸ That a process of conquest and unification (from Kuššara to Kaneš/Neša and beyond) may depart from a peripheral principality, rather than from the economic and cultural center of the land (Neša), is a historic universal that can be accepted without difficulty. No less paradigmatic is the historic (and certainly also historiographic) duplication represented by the second "man of Kuššara" (Hattusili I), who managed to gather and re-establish the endangered legacy of Anitta. A tie of kinship comparable to the one that connected Darius to the family of Cyrus probably existed between Hattusili and Anitta's line: the former could have belonged to a cadet branch that Pithana or his immediate successors had left in charge of the ancestral fief; but there is more (see here below).

II. The story of *l/tabarna* is not that of *Caesar*.¹⁹ We are not dealing here, that is, with a proper name which subsequently became a royal title nor with the intricacies of the adoptive and imperial onomastics of Rome. Just the opposite: *labarna* was from the very beginning a title (i.e., a common noun designating a high office and an extolled position) and only exceptionally did it later lend itself to purely onomastic applications. The lexical connection of this title (supposedly 'governor', 'ruler') with the CLuwian verb *tapar-/tapariya-* ('Gewalt ausüben', 'anordnen', 'bestimmen', 'gouverner', etc.; Starke 1990: 259), established by Götze as early as 1922 and later re-affirmed by Sturtevant and Kronasser (cf. *CHD* L-N: 43), also in our opinion should be considered etymological - and not simply para-etymological, as supposed by Carruba/Mora (1990: 145, n. 12).²⁰ This root of 'governing' (in the ancient and basic meaning of 'to dispense justice') is certainly pre-Indo-European: that is to say, it

¹⁸ Crossland (835) seems concerned with the possibility that *Pithana* and *Anitta* may have been pre- or non-Indo-European names; but the point is irrelevant. What is important is to acknowledge that Pithana and Anitta were Hittite and spoke Hittite. Whether their personal names (let alone their genes) were Indo-European or not is, in this composite cultural milieu, a matter of little consequence. Also *Teispes*, *Cyrus* and *Cambyse* (OP. *Cišpi-*, *Kuru-*, and *Kambujiya-*) are now suspected of being names of Elamite extraction (Stronach 1997: 38f.), but nobody would infer from that that the kings so called were not Iranian.

¹⁹ On *l/tabarna*, beside the entries ("Labarna") in *RLA* 6 (Starke) and *CHD* L-N: 41-43, see now the detailed discussions of the data provided by Bryce (65, n. 3, 68-70) and by Klengel (all over the first part of his "Kapitel II", esp. 35-38, 42f.).

T/labarna remains for me the most probable reading of the hieroglyphic logogram L277, in spite of Carruba/Mora's (1990) innovative proposal (*lahhiyala-* 'duce', 'condottiero').

²⁰ The semantics of the verb base and the consequent meaning of the title ('governor', 'ruler') do not allow us to see in *tabarna*, as Liverani (445) would like, a personage originally belonging to the sacral sphere and the priestly class.

comes from a substrate, perhaps not even an immediate one, and in that case it could even be pre-Hattic.²¹ In this perspective, one cannot exclude the possibility that also the HLuwian term for both 'justice' and 'judge' (*tarwani-*) may be independently derived from this ancient lexical root.²²

An hereditary *labarnahood* maintained in Kuššara under Pithana and his successors, who reigned in Neša, could be viewed as a kind of stewardship or *Hausmeyerei* with viceregal connotations (also due to the geographic distance) and could provide the missing link between the Nešic and the Old Kingdoms. The position of the Kuššara *labarna* down to Hattusili's immediate predecessor would not have been too different, both pragmatically and institutionally, from the role played by the kings of Kargamiš during the last period of the Empire or by Azatiwata vis-à-vis the weak successors of King Awariku/Urikki of Adanawa/Que (i.e., the last scions of the House of Muksa). While the central power of the kings of Neša was vanishing, the princely dynasty of the *labarna*'s was apparently holding on well in Kuššara. Hattusili's grandfather might still have been a cautious maker of ephemeral *rois fainéants*, but Hattusili's father or Hattusili himself (they, too, called *labarna*, regardless of what their personal names might have been) must have thought it better to take for himself and his own descendants the crown of Anitta and to salvage for his house what remained of the glorious tradition of Neša. Thus, the *labarna* became the (Great) King.²³ The political and cultural prestige of the Neša kingdom, however, was still so high, that the title *labarna* was not cast off; in fact, it was kept and displayed as a claim of legitimacy and continuity - a link with a past whose vague recollection could only enhance its mythical lustre.

²¹ Indo-European etymologies have been offered for *l/tabarna* (and *tawananna*, too), as reported by Bryce (68, n. 16, and 96, n. 91) and reckoned with by Klengel (324f.); but it is necessary to defend, I believe, the autochthonous component in both Hittite culture and lexicon (absolutely preponderant in the former and still considerable in the latter) from the last Indo-European wave, no longer caused by a prehistoric invasion, but simply due, this time, to the zeal and bravura of modern linguists. The Anatolian (or at least Luwian) name of the rodent whose pictogram, normally with thorn (L115/LEPUS[+ra/r]-), is used to write the HLuwian cognate verb *TAPA+riva-* and some co-radical nouns could, however, be Indo-European; this because such writing puns operate on a mere homophonic base and not a derivational one.

²² In *tarwani* the (secondary) sense of 'judge' would then have developed through a mere rhetorical-semantic change, without need of morphological marking; cf. Engl. and OFr. *justice* (also 'judge'), It. *la potestà* ('power') / *il potestà* ('chief magistrate'), etc.

²³ With respect to their direct domain, the *labarna* might have already used the title of king: (vassal) kings of Kuššara acknowledging a *de iure* supremacy of the (Great) Kings of Neša.

III. No matter how one wants to interpret the excerpts of early chronicles and legends, it is clear that Zalpa(uw)a exerted *ab antiquo* a sovereignty *de iure* - and, with probable solutions of continuity, *de facto* as well - over other city-states or principalities of the Halys basin, with particular reference to Hattuša and Neša. Between Zalpa and the Hattuša of the Old Kingdom there was a kind of *translatio regni*, which anticipates on a smaller scale the *translatio imperii* from Mitanni to Hatti that took place in the age of Suppiluliuma I. The relationship between the two cities was complicated by the fact that Hattuša, which had traditionally been under Zalpa's rule, was chosen as the definite capital of the Hittite kingdom, at a time, furthermore, when Zalpa had already been privileged by Anitta and Hattusili themselves as a royal residence (at least temporarily) and as the ceremonial center of royalty (Singer 1981: 132, n. 8; Haas, 41f.). The notorious story of the queen of Neša and her two matching sets of children,²⁴ beside other possible allusions and motivations, bears a corrective message of a political nature: if lords from Zalpa had come to govern or preside in Neša (obviously an undeleted memory), the legend now claimed that they were in fact Nešian princes returning to their city; therefore, one could not infer from their unforgotten presence that Neša had ever been subjected to Zalpa (a propagandist lie that calls to mind the Persian legend of Alexander - he too being passed off as a returning Achaemenian). As for the ethno-linguistic aspect of this situation, we should first recognize that the primacy of Zalpa over Hattuša and Kaneš, with all the rivalries and sagas derived from it, probably dates back to not just a pre-Hittite, but actually a pre-Indo-European Anatolia (Liverani, 443). Coming down, however, to the age of Pithana and Anitta, when we must reckon with both Hattians and Hittites, one can agree that, before the conquest of Anitta, the Land of Hatti had not been largely Hittitized (Singer 1981: 131), though keeping in mind that the language and culture of the political establishment (i.e., of the acropolis) does not guarantee the same ethnos for the other strata of the population.²⁵ In the last phase, the competition between Neša or Hattuša, already Hittite or Hittitized, and Zalpa, still Hattic, resembles the situation which Latins and Etruscans would create in Latium: a struggle for political supremacy between city-

²⁴ Cf., in addition to Otten (1973), Singer (1981: 131), Yakar (1981: 108f.), Haas (42f.) and Liverani (430).

²⁵ I cannot agree with Ivanov (1988: 136) that "Hattic was practically a dead language in the beginning of the II Millennium." This date of extinction is too early. As Singer (1981: 126) correctly notes, this date is chiefly due to the fact that Garelli was too quick to extend the ethno-linguistic conditions of Kaneš to the overall Anatolian picture, with the consequent Hittitization of the entire milieu. It is better to think that Hattic died out, as a spoken language, toward the end of the Old Kingdom.

states that, although partakers of the same culture (in a broad sense), still differ and contrast in their ethno-linguistic otherness or at least in that of their ruling classes. Similar conditions are also to be found at the beginning of the first millennium (X-VIII cent.) around the Gulf of İskenderun, with Luwian acropolises in sight of Aramaic ones (alternating or intermixed centers).

At this point we can direct our attention to western Anatolia, whose original language(s) belonged, I believe, to a substratum of Aegean or Mediterranean pertinency and should be related, therefore, to the pre-Hellenic tongues of the islands (Crete included) and the Greek mainland.²⁶ Let us try to understand, then, what kind of progress the Indo-European tradition already established in the central and eastern regions managed to bring about in the territories of the Anatolian West in the course of the second millennium. The products of the first Indo-European colonization (Hittite and Luwian) become now - we could say - the agents of a second one, promoted in a parallel way by the kingdoms of Hatti and Arzawa, and then, after the collapse of Great Arzawa, by the still bilingual Empire of Hattuša. The kingdom of Arzawa, founded in the mid-South (in Luwiya) by a Luwian dynasty, had rapidly extended toward the west, incorporating territories that, linguistically, were not Luwian but were thus opened to Luwianization (south-western quadrant). When Mursili II undertook his victorious campaign against Arzawa, the kingdom of Uhhaziti already comprised within its sphere of political influence the states of the west, from Caria to the Troad (in Classical terms), threatening to exclude the kingdom of Hatti from the

²⁶ The thesis (or hypothesis) of such a substratum is no novelty; rather, it is soundly based on a tradition started by Greek authors and still comfortably dealt with by modern scholars - from Schachermeyer (see above, n. 14) to Mallory (64-68). Without hesitation, I give back to this substratum the toponymic suffixes in *-ss-* and *-nd-* (or in *-ssos* and *-nthos*), notwithstanding what Carruba (1969: 9f.) or Liverani (313) may have argued on this point. I cannot be persuaded, in fact, that (Proto-)Luwians ever inhabited the slopes of Παρθασ(σ)ός and even less that they founded or named Ταρτησ(σ)ός on the Baetis/Guadalquivir. Nor could I ever take, e.g., Κόρινθος for a typical Luwian derivation in *-(a)nt(i)-*. Believing in multiple causation and convergent processes, I am ready to grant, of course, that more recent formations of Luwian (i.e., substantivized genitives and adjectives of relationship in *-ssi/a-*) may have increased the list of Anatolian toponyms in sibilant, but I will never put Luwian into reverse and ask its morphology to explain data which are, in my opinion, clearly pre-Luwian and pre-Indo-European.

On the recollection of pre-Hellenic substrata and the patterns of their mythologization in the collective memory of the Greek people(s), cf. the masterly entry ("Pelagasi") written by A. Momigliano for the *Enciclopedia Italiana*, 26: 609.

Aegean scene and to confine it to a Pontic-Cappadocian background.²⁷ There is no doubt that the defeat of Uhhaziti represents the loss of a great opportunity for the Anatolian civilization, chiefly due to the fact that, in the western regions and on the Aegean Sea, the Great Kings of Hattuša proved to be in the end much less enterprising than their Arzawian predecessors. The Hittite Empire (also because its time was by then becoming short) failed to carry out a complete linguistic colonization of western Anatolia. This colonization was certainly carried on for centuries as the consequence of a political and cultural impact, and indeed the two linguistic traditions of the Empire, the northern one (Palaic and Hittite) and the southern one (Luwian), kept moving toward the Aegean shore, overcoming with increasing difficulty a vital substratum, but it is very unlikely that they ever succeeded in making the sea their own boundary. Their most western and most progressive products whose existence we can assume, if not verify, were, respectively, a Proto-Lydia toward the north and a Proto-Lycian in the south. In the southwestern corner the Carian area appears to be the uncovered or minimally affected remainder of a larger ethno-linguistic zone - i.e., that West-Anatolian substratum, which we can indicate with an ethnic binomial drawn from the Greek tradition: Κάρες καὶ Λέλεγες.²⁸ The domain of these western indigenous populations

²⁷ On *Arzaw(iy)a* (primarily a geographic or geo-political term) and the entire question of the Anatolian (South)West, besides the monograph of Heinhold-Krahmer (1977), see, of course, all the manuals of Hittite history (from Gurney to Klengel) and, for the later period (after Uhhaziti), the revealing study authored by Hawkins (1998).

²⁸ As for the (Proto-)Carians and Lelegeans, the data provided by Greek or Classical tradition stretch from Homer to Stephanus of Byzantium (IV cent. C.E.), with relevant cores in Herodotus, Strabo and Pausanias; see, for a thorough presentation of the subject and a close discussion of the sources, "Karer", "Karia" and "Leleger" in *Pauly-Wissowa* (X [2], 1940-1947, and XII [2], 1890-1893); see also Asheri (363f.). The occasional mention of the Amazons in several of these references and their consequent connection with Carians and Lelegeans in West Anatolia lends support to the idea (Watkins 1986: 53f.) that the myth of the Amazons and their Pontic kingdom is to be interpreted as a fabled recollection of the Hittite Empire in the Greek lore. On the western substratum, I will limit myself to indicating here the following highlights: (a) the Carian substratum (not a Lycian one, which could mean 'Luwian') declared for Miletus, her surrounding region and Ionia in general (*Iliad*, II.867-869, Her. I.142, 146, V.88); (b) the memory of a common origin and of an ancient ethnic affinity connecting Carians to Lydians and Mysians, with implicit reference to the "Carian" substratum or background of the latter two (Her. I.171); (c) *Lelegeans* considered as an ancient name of the Carians (*ibidem*) or given as the name of a Carian branch (Paus. VII.ii.8); (d) the ethnic affinity established between Carian-Lelegeans, on the one side, and pre-Greek inhabitants of Crete and the Aegean islands on the other (Her. I.171f.); (e) Carians and Lelegeans stated to have been the original population of Ionia and Aeolis (Strabo VII.vii.2, XIV.i.3; Plinius V.112); (f) the existence of a Lelegean principedom, vassal of Priam, in the Troad (i.e., Πήδασος [*Iliad*, XXI.85-87]); (g) Androclos, founder of (the

(stretching from Caria to the Troad) had certainly been eroded and somehow altered along its eastern front - made, if you will, a peri-Luwian and a peri-Hittite/Palaic area²⁹ - but it had escaped a thorough linguistic assimilation on the part of the Hittite Empire, only to succumb, still with the exception of the southern corner (historical Caria), to the ensuing Greek colonization. In fact, I cannot consider Carian an Anatolian dialect (using *Anatolian* in its linguistic and, therefore, Indo-European denotation) - a twin sister to Lycian, in other words - though I can accept seeing there a zone of exposed substratum, already characterized, that is, by Lycoid or neo-Luwian streaks. Neither do I see in Carian - coming to Herodotus' typical alternatives (I.171) - the language of Minoan immigrants dislodged from the islands (an origin today generally accepted for the Philistines), though, following Asheri's advice,³⁰ I take care not to underestimate the importance of this tradition, obviously fostered by memories of intense commercial and cultural relationships existing *ab antiquo* between the southwestern coast of Anatolia in particular and the Minoan or Proto-Mycenean centers of the Aegean. Given the probable homogeneity of the Aegean and West-Anatolian substrata, one can also grant that settlements of islanders might have come to reinforce on Carian soil the ethno-linguistic resistance of the indigenous population.³¹

Greek) Ephesus and alleged son of King Codros of Athens, had to confront Lelegeans, Lydians and a group of Amazons (Strabo XIV.i.3; Paus. VII.ii.8). (This means that, for having been the residence of a Luwian court [Uhhaziti], Apaša did not give up her basic Lelegean character [see above, (e)], to which, in Androklos' time, signs of a political expansion of the former Šeha-River Country [the Lydian presence; see below, n. 33] and the aftermath of Hittite imperialism [the Amazons' garrison] seem to be added.)

²⁹ For the value assigned to the prefix (*peri-*) in linguistic terminology, see Devoto (1958). It should be noted, at any rate, that this dynamic and dialectic notion (*peri-Indo-European*) works and is useful only on the background of a previous *facies* where Indo-European and non-Indo-European are viewed as two separate and opposite domains. If the term is instead applied to a situation which is considered inextricably intermingled from the very beginning (Liverani, 313), the notion inevitably loses its epistemic relevance.

³⁰ Cf. Asheri (365: "La frequenza di tradizioni cretesi nell'area cario-licia è un fatto che non va trascurato").

³¹ Note that, in Herodotus' view (I.172), the Carian linguistic area included, besides Carian proper, Caunians as well: "The Caunians, to my mind, are aborigines of the soil; but they themselves say that they came from Crete. Their speech has grown like to the Carian, or the Carian to theirs (for that I cannot clearly determine), but in their customs they are widely severed from the Carians, as from all other men," transl. by A.D. Godley, The Loeb Classical Library. Whoever is right here, Herodotus or the Caunians (but both may be right, in the sense that we have just indicated), the important thing is that the text alludes to the existence of a Carian dialectology, i.e., to an ancient epichoric tradition of this linguistic type.

In the second half of the second millennium, the Anatolian West found itself exposed to a double attraction. The political and cultural influence there exerted by Hattuša through Hittite- or Luwian-speaking immigrants, representatives, conquerors, etc., was competitively checked by Ahhiyawa (i.e., Mycenean) visitors of any sort (merchants, metics, ambassadors, *condottieri*) who came from beyond the Sea or from Ahhiyawa encroachments on the Anatolian coast (esp. Milawa[n]ta/Miletos) to impress the provincial courts of minor kings and local dynasts not only with Aegean products and fashions but also with daring political advice.³²

To the north of the kingdom of (Arzawa-)Mira, whose center is to be placed in the valley of the Meander (Hawkins 1998: 1 and *passim*), two other kingdoms had acquired a certain level of power after the end of Great Arzawa: the Šeha-River Country and Wiluša (both belonging to the north-western quadrant). Also Güterbock (1986: 41), reconsidering the geographic problem, was inclined to recognize the Classical Hermus in the Šeha River, and Hawkins (23f.), confirming this identification, has recovered, one may say, the incunabulum of what in the Greek tradition would later emerge as the kingdom of Lydia. Onto the background of the historical Šeha-River kingdom could thus be projected, for a test of compatibility and with the prospect of some useful integration, the proto-historic and semi-legendary Lydia so suggestively evoked in Greek authors. The gaps and the otherness are in the information - as here, in the traumatic passage from alien (Hittite) to domestic (Classical) sources; as for history, no matter which standpoint we are left with, it continues its consequential and uninterrupted course.³³

³² While the equivalence *Milawata/Miletos*, no longer open to question (Hawkins, 26), suffices to establish the location of the city mentioned in the Hittite records, the parallel equivalence *Ahhiyawa/Achaean* (i.e., Myceneans), though, this too, by now hardly to be doubted, cannot solve by itself the geo-political unknown (i.e., the whereabouts of the Ahhiyawa homeland, kingdom and capital), so that, even with the most recommendable exclusion of the Anatolian West, a few possibilities still remain to be considered (Güterbock 1984, 1986; Bryce, 62f.; Hawkins, 30). As for the presence and the activities of Ahhiyawans in the East Aegean and on Anatolian shores, after some memorable pages written by Pugliese Carratelli on the subject, see now Mountjoy (1998), who boldly re-sets and re-faces the entire question (Ahhiyawa[ns]/Myceneans) on an updated archaeological base, cutting an East Aegean-West Anatolian Mycenean Interface (the Ahhiyawans of the Hittite documents) which must be kept apart from the Mycenean culture of the Greek mainland.

It could be so, and in any case the discussion will benefit from all this (Rhodes, as an Ahhiyawa center, will prove more readily acceptable than the *pendant* assigned to it [Troy]). What puzzles me is, rather, the historical advisability or even possibility of drawing a curtain in the middle of the most viable of seas (Aegean).

³³ If it is fairly probable that the southern kingdom of Mira was to pick up the inheritance (prestige, influences and ambitions) of the Great Arzawa of Uhhaziti

What kind of language was spoken - we may wonder - in the Šeha-River kingdom during the closing years of the Hittite Empire, or, from a Greek perspective, what kind of language was spoken in what must have been the Lydia and the age of the last Atyadae and the first Heraclidae kings? A sort of Proto-Lylian, we may infer. Unfortunately, as far as this long linguistic tradition is concerned, we have at our disposal only the relics of a very late phase: i.e., the Lylian of the extant inscriptions (IV cent.). It is true, however, that the components of this tradition can be postulated, if not with exactness, at least with a certain degree of verisimilitude: (1) there was a western substratum (which we have labelled "Carian-Lelegean"); (2) there was the advance of the North-Anatolian layer or, more precisely (taking both longitude and latitude into account), of a peripheral variety of Hittite; (3) nor should we disregard a Neo-Indo-European input of Phrygian brand that in the last centuries of the second millennium was already spreading from the Northwest (Balkan peninsula).³⁴ What we will never succeed in recovering is the diachronic dynamics of this field of forces, with all the linguistic phases that were the temporary products, constantly recycled, of this complex interplay (prevalence and recession of this or that component, commingling, reciprocal conditioning, etc.).³⁵

More toward the North, in the kingdom of Wiluša, the cultural and linguistic situation could not have been much different. The forces at

(Hawkins, 21), I would not exclude the possibility that in the last decades of the 13th century, hegemony, with the connected territorial gains, would have passed to the central kingdom (the Šeha-River Country), especially if we maintain (Singer 1983: 216), that the flattered western addressee of KBo XVIII 18, *Parhuitta* (better than *Mašhuitta*) by name, could have been a king of that realm (the onomastic ending or suffix -V+*tta* being, again, reminiscent of some historical Lylian kings [Sadyattes, Alyattes]), and not another king of Mira-Arzawa (as in Hawkins, 20f.). Both **Parhuyatta* and **Parhuwatta* can be considered pre- or byforms of that name.

³⁴ As Strabo (XII.viii.3) relates, Xanthus of Sardes and Menecrates of Elaea agreed that the language of the Mysians was "μιξολύδιον ... καὶ μιξοφρύγιον"; cf. also *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, C. and Th. Müller ed., Paris: A. F. Didot, 1874, p. 37, nr. 8. If Xanthus could testify that, in his own times (V cent.), the Mysians spoke a Lylian dialect mixed with Phrygian elements, it is wise to admit that also the language of the Sardian inscriptions may have experienced the influence of a dense and lasting Phrygian adstratum. Accordingly, Lylian words or meanings with no comparison in Anatolia but well paralleled in other Indo-European languages, rather than being explained as Anatolian archaisms (which is not to be excluded *a priori*; see above, p. 343), would be better qualified as post- or extra-Anatolian additions to the Indo-European tradition of Asia Minor.

³⁵ Likewise, it is unthinkable that the Lukka people (Crossland, 836) spoke in the 14th and 13th centuries the Lycian of our records, although we won't be able to specify which stage the Luwian linguistic colonization had reached in the region at that time or what grade of resistance was still mustered up by the indigenous substratum of Carian extraction.

work were basically the same, albeit with some differences of quantitative and qualitative order. The conflicting exposure of Wiluša to the Mycenaean sphere of influence (vs. the Hittite one) is shown in an exemplary manner by the palatine onomastics. *Kukkunniš* retained and re-interpreted in the Greek epic tradition as Κῦκνος ('swan'), represents the Lelegean substratum, on which *Alakšanduš*, possibly given to the son of a Mycenaean princess, was superimposed from the West.³⁶ Finally, it is probable that also Luwian names of (Great-)Arzawian tradition, comparable with those recorded for the kingdom of the Šeha-River Country (*Manapa-* and *Ura-Tarhuntaš*), had also arrived, from the South-East, to complete the picture.³⁷ Homer's memory - we would like to add - is not, as some scholars strangely seem to suppose, a historic one, but a poetic one, which, just according to its nature, freely displaces and re-elaborates data. One cannot therefore insist, for instance, that the Alexander of the *Iliad*, in order to qualify for our comparisons and reconstructions, should be at least contemporary with King Alakšanduš of Wiluša and possibly share with him who knows how many other features.³⁸ The identity involved here concerns more the names than the persons; but this is already something. This mere name (Ἀλέξανδρος/*Alexander*), repeated in Tallqvist's list (1914: 20) for having belonged first to one king of Wiluša (*Alakšanduš*) and much later to the conqueror of Asia (*Aleksandar*), can in fact invite us to reconsider, possibly in the wake of Pugliese Carratelli (1968: 1231-1237), even the semantic reach of a technical term like *Hellenism*. Also for the toponyms, it could be stated that, once the identity and continuity of the name have been ascertained (*Wiluša* → [F]iλi[σ]o-ς; *Truiša* → Τροι[σ]α), the more specific question, whether *Wiluša* and *Truiša* were only names

³⁶ For Cycnus (Κῦκνος), a Trojan ally slain by Achilles, cf. Pindar (Loeb edition), *Olymp.* II.81-83, X.15f.; *Isthm.* V.39-41. On the controversial evaluation of these onomastic data, cf. Güterbock (1986: 34f.) and Watkins (49f.). I basically agree with the latter (Κῦκνος considered a Greek rendering of *Kukkunniš* and *Alakšanduš* interpreted as the Anatolian adaptation of Ἀλέξανδρος), rather than with a noncommittal and overcautious Güterbock. In my opinion, however, *Alakšanduš* is the only and original name of that Wilušan king, and not his additional "international name" (Watkins, 49) as if we were dealing with the onomastic pattern of Alexander Jannaeus and Alexandra Salome. If Homer's Ἀλέξανδρος actually had two names (Ἀ. and Πάρις) - which could even be explained as the merging of two distinct bardic traditions - , it does not follow that Alakšanduš, king of Wiluša, should have also had a double name.

³⁷ Luwian originals have, in fact, been proposed for Παρίαμος (*Pariya-muvas*) and Πάρις (*Pariya-*): Durnford 1975: 51-53; Watkins, 57.

³⁸ See, for instance, the chronological concern expressed by Güterbock (1986: 33), who seems somehow reassured only at the end of his paper (44), when considering the transformations undergone in the *Nibelungenlied* by historical characters such as Theodoric and Attila. (The pertinent parallel had been already adduced by Kretschmer [1924: 213]).

of cities or wider designations of regional states (Güterbock 1986: 40), is a matter of minor importance.³⁹

The kingdom of Wiluša, more coastal than the Šeha-River Country and therefore leaning more toward the Aegean, entered in conflict with the Mycenaean Empire or Commonwealth and was put to an end by the Ahhiyawans, who hastened there with a great deployment of forces. If, as a point of reference, we take the Trojan War (to be placed, as still seems advisable, in the course of the 12th century - i.e., at the time of the Hittite catastrophe or shortly afterwards)⁴⁰ and we ask ourselves what may have been the linguistic situation in the kingdom of Priam, more generally, in north-western Anatolia, we will have again to play with the components already cited for the Proto-Lyidian kingdom of the Šeha River: (1) a Carian-Lelegean substratum, perhaps still amply uncovered (see the much longer resistance that the same substratum will show in the deep South [historic Caria]); (2) a North-Anatolian input, here more rarefied, maybe, than in the Hermus valley and of a more Palaic than Hittite coloring;⁴¹ (3) a recent but probably already strong Phrygian

³⁹ It is unrealistic, however, to expect that the adaptations undergone by onomastic borrowings, from one language to another, should represent irreproachable phonetic correspondences or changes. I even harbor the suspicion that the strange name (Τεύθρας) of the legendary king of Mysia connected with the myth of Telephus may have perpetuated among the Greeks the phonetic memory of the name of the last and greatest Tuthaliya. A bisyllabic pronunciation *Túth(a)lja* (via *Túθrjja-* or *Túθra*, with eventual "monophthongization" of /t/ and /h/ into /θ/ and change of liquid [from /l/ to /r/]) would not be so far from the supposed outcome. The thematization in -ant- (gen. Τεύθραντος) could easily have been analogical.

⁴⁰ When old Priam recalls the battle between the Phrygians and the Amazons (*Iliad* III.184-189) which took place on the Sangarius bank in the time of his youth and in which he says he participated as an ally of the Phrygians, one has the impression that the Homeric epic preserves and conveys here the faded memory of one of the last and definitive defeats inflicted by these Balkan invaders on the army of the last Hittite Great King. For the interpretation of the Amazons as Hittites, see above, n. 28.

⁴¹ I am reluctant to block the Palaic area far in the Northeast by suggesting that, since *Pala* survives in the name of Paphlagonia (Παφλαγονία ← **pa-ph[alla]*), Palaic could not have advanced beyond the western boundaries of this Classical region (Watkins, 45: "Pala, in classical Paphlagonia"). The toponym and ethnonym *Pala* - one could object - survives, more certainly or, at least, more directly than in *Paphlagonia*, in Βλαχνη (Strabo XII.iii.40; Tomaschek 1891: 77) and this identification (*Pala*: Βλαχνη) posits a Palaic core or hotbed in the Paphlagonic Far West (near the Bythinian border), according to the best probability for Βλαχνη's geographic location (see, in fact, the more western position assigned to Pala in some recent maps; e.g., Liverani, 429, 505). Furthermore, considering that a North-Anatolian layer is an integral part of the linguistic tectonics of historical Lydia and Mysia, it is not wise to exclude the possibility that the same component had spread to the neighboring Troad during the last centuries of the second millennium, as already stated above. At any rate, I do not see how the hypothesis of a North-Anatolian dialectal continuum can be discarded for the

influence; and finally (4) a considerable penetration of Mycenaean elements especially into the maritime and commercial lexicon of the indigenous language.⁴² Again, what exactly the linguistic alloy or the *Ineinanderarbeitung* was into which these components had fused and fixed together at the height of the 12th century, or how much the Wilušan differed from the Proto-Lyidian of the Šeha-River Country, are facts which we will never succeed in verifying. In the same way, it would be impossible for us to get a clear idea of the French language if all we knew about it were that Latin, Celtic and Germanic all contributed to its formation. It is my contention - one sees - that Luwian was never spoken as a native language by the pre-Greek population of northwestern Anatolia: in other words, Lydian, Mysian and, all the more, the tongue of the Homeric Troad cannot have been produced by Luwian, a language which, to the North, never overcame the barrier represented by the Lydian (i.e., North-Anatolian) tradition. Had not Mursili II put a stop to the expansion and hegemonic endeavors of Great Arzawa, the linguistic history of western Anatolia could have taken a different course, with the ultimate result that around the middle of the first millennium the Lycian area probably would have also included the valleys of the Hermus and the Caicus and even reached the Troad; but this was not the case. Arzawa Minor did not even manage to complete the linguistic colonization of the Southwest (Caria), let alone promote Luwianization of the Northwest. I cannot believe, therefore, in an Anatolia that in the first centuries of the second millennium was already 75% Luwian, with only the exception of a Palaic quadrant to the northeast, as Watkins (1986: 58) likes to represent it by giving Arzawa, taken in its wider geopolitical denotation (the federation or coalition), an ethno-linguistic meaning with a Luwian sense. Furthermore, as Watkins himself (62) has, though reluctantly, to admit, the existence of a Luwian epic song naming or involving Wiluša is no evidence that Luwian was ever spoken in that kingdom.⁴³

conjecture of a Luwian area surprisingly entrenched here (Troad) between un-Luwian Palaic in the East and un-Luwian proto-Lyidian in the South.

⁴² On the inevitable linguistic consequences of Mycenaean influence and presence on the western shores of Anatolia, see also Watkins (47).

⁴³ The tantalizing *incipit* preserved in KBo IV 11 45f. (*ahha-ta-ta alati awenta Wilušati* "When they came from the steep Wiluša" [cf. Hom. Ἰλῖος αἰπείνῃ]) could hardly be, as suggested by Watkins (58f.), the beginning of a "Wilušiad" (an epic poem, that is, already devoted to Wiluša/Ἰλῖος). As a matter of fact, those men *come* from Wiluša; they do not *go* there (to besiege the city and start a war), as, were this a "Wilušiad", one could reasonably expect. They left Wiluša to go, apparently, somewhere else - to another city, perhaps, which probably was the true protagonist of this epos or epyllion. Taking into account the ritual introduction (an officiant "drinks a

Bibliography

Adrados, Francisco R.

- 1982 "The archaic structure of Hittite: The crux of the problem". *JIES* 10 (1-2): 1-35.

Asheri, David (ed.).

- 1988 Herodotus, *Le Storie*, libro I. Milano: Mondadori.

Bryce, Trevor

- 1998 *The kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Carruba, Onofrio

- 1969 "Origini e preistoria degli Indoeuropei d'Anatolia". «*Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica*» 97 (1): 5-30.
1976 "Anatolico e Indoeuropeo". In: *Scritti in onore di Giuliano Bonfante*, vol. 1. Brescia: Paideia. 121-145.

Carruba, Onofrio and Clelia Mora

- 1990 "Il segno L277 del geroglifico anatolico". «*Orientalia*» 59 (2): 143-149.

Crossland, Ronald Arthur

- 1971 "Immigrants from the north". *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., vol. 1 (2), ch. XXVII. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 824-876.

god" [Šuwašuna], after which they start singing), we could also surmise that the song, certainly epic in tone, extolled a *κτίστης* or, more generally, the "heroic" origins of a city, a clan, or a local dynasty. It could even be the first nucleus or the archetype of what would later be known as the legend of Aeneas: a group of valiant warriors leave Wiluša - probably under duress, to add to the pathos - and go and found elsewhere another city or principedom with a glorious future. Mentioning Aeneas in this context may sound idle if not incongruous. And yet, if we assume that a West Anatolian clan or aristocratic household, whose origins were proudly traced back to an exiled wilusian hero, migrated to Italy at the dramatic close of the II Millennium (cf., *cum grano salis*, Bryce, 369 bottom), the reference may not seem so wild. Once in Italy, those Anatolian immigrants inevitably developed a feeling of belonging there, without renouncing their supposed wilusian roots; the result of this situation being that the founding hero and his companions were now imagined as having come themselves directly to Italy in order to meet an old people and create out of it a new one. Furthermore, the circumstance of the emergency leaving of the hero and his party (a tragic matter) could now be epically shifted to the final fall of Ilios. Let us finally note that, expectedly, descending from *pater Aeneas* was in all probability an Etruscan claim before a Roman one.

Devoto, Giacomo

- 1958 "Indeuropeo e peri-indeuropeo". *Scritti minori*, vol. 1. Firenze: F. Le Monnier. (For occurrences of the same term in other articles, see indices of vol. 1 [459] and vol. 2 [1967, 448].)

Diakonoff, I. M. and S. A. Starostin

- 1986 "Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian language". *MSS Beiheft* 12.

Durnford, S. P. B.

- 1975 "Luwian linguistics". *RHA* 33: 43-53.

Gamkrelidze, Thomas V., and Vjačeslav V. Ivanov

- 1995 [1984] *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A reconstruction and historical analysis of a proto-language and a proto-culture*. 2 vols. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. [English translation by Johanna Nichols of the Russian original, Tbilisi State University Press, 1984.]

Grigolia, Alexander

- 1939 *Custom and justice in the Caucasus: The Georgian highlanders*. Ph.D. diss. in Anthropology. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Güterbock, Hans G.

- 1984 "Hittites and Akhaeans: A new look". «*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*» 128 (2): 114-122. Reprinted in: *Perspectives on Hittite civilization*. 205-210.
1986 "Troy in Hittite texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, and Hittite history". In: Mellink, Machteld J. (ed.). *Troy and the Trojan War: A symposium held at Bryn Mawr College (October 1984)*. Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College. 33-44. Reprinted in: *Perspectives on Hittite civilization*. 223-228.

Haas, Volkert

- 1982 *Hethitische Berggötter und hurritische Steindämonen: Riten, Kulte und Mythen*. Mainz: Ph. von Zabern.

Hawkins, J. D.

- 1998 "Tarkasnawa, King of Mira: 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy sealings and Karabel". «*Anatolian studies*» 48: 1-31.

Heinhold-Krahmer, Susanne

- 1977 *Arzawa. (Texte der Hethiter, 8.)* Heidelberg: Winter.

- Ivanov, Vjač. Vs.
 1985 "Ob otnošenii khattskogo jazyka k severozapadnokavkazskim". *Drevnjaja Anatolija*. Moskva: Nauka. 26-59. (English summary, 250.)
 1988 "Relations between the ancient languages of Asia Minor". In: Vavroušek, P., and V. Souček (eds.). *Sulmu: Papers on the Ancient Near East presented at the International Conference of Socialist Countries (Prague, Sept. 30-Oct. 3, 1986)*. Prague. 133-144.
- Klengel, Horst
 1999 *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill.
- Kretschmer, Paul
 1924 "Alakšanduš, König von Wiluša". «Glotta» 13: 205-213.
- Laroche, Emmanuel
 1978 "Problèmes de l'écriture cunéiforme hittite". In: *Atti del Seminario sulle scritture dell'Anatolia antica*. «Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa (Classe di Lettere e Filosofia)», Serie III, vol. 8 (3): 739-753.
- Liverani, Mario
 1988 *Antico Oriente: Storia, società, economia*. Bari: Laterza.
- Mallory, James P.
 1989 *In search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, archaeology and myth*. London and New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Mellaart, James
 1981 "Anatolia and the Indo-Europeans". JIES 9 (1-2): 135-149.
- Mountjoy, P. A.
 1998 "The East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaeans and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa". «Anatolian Studies» 48: 33-67.
- Otten, Heinrich
 1973 *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, 17.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Perspectives on Hittite civilization: Selected writings of Hans Gustav Güterbock*. Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (ed.). (The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Assyriological studies, no. 26.) Chicago. 1997.

- Pugliese Caratelli, Giovanni
 1968 "I Micenei nel mondo mediterraneo". «Incunabula Graeca» 25 (3): 1231-1237.
- Puhvel, Jaan
 1966 "Dialectal aspects of the Anatolian branch of Indo-European". In: Puhvel, Jaan, and Henrik Birnbaum (eds.). *Proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics held at the University of California, Los Angeles (April 25-27, 1963)*. Berkeley: UC Press. 235-247.
- Renfrew, Colin
 1987 *Archaeology and language: The puzzle of Indo-European origins*. London: J. Cape.
- Singer, Itamar
 1981 "Hittites and Hattians in Anatolia at the beginning of the second millennium B.C." JIES 9 (1-2): 119-132.
 1983 "Western Anatolia in the thirteenth century B.C. according to the Hittite sources". «Anatolian Studies» 33: 205-217.
- Starke, Frank
 1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, 31.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Stefanini, Ruggero
 1965 "KBo IV 14 = VAT 13049". «Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche». Serie VIII, 20 (1-2): 39-79.
- Steiner, Gerd
 1981 "The role of the Hittites in ancient Anatolia". JIES 9 (1-2): 150-173.
- Stronach, David
 1997 "Anshan and Parsa: Early Achaemenid history, art and architecture on the Iranian Plateau". In: Curtis, John (ed.). *Mesopotamia and Iran in the Persian Period: Conquest and imperialism, 539-331 B.C. Proceedings of a seminar in memory of Vladimir G. Lukonin*. London: British Museum Press. 35-53.
- Tallqvist, Knut L.
 1914 "Assyrian personal names". «Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae» 43 (1). Helsingfors [Helsinki].

Tomaschek, Wilhelm

- 1891 "Zur historischen Topographie von Kleinasien im Mittelalter".
«Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der
Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften», Wien, 124. VIII. Abh.
1-106.

Watkins, Calvert

- 1986 "The language of the Trojans". In: Mellink, Machteld J. (ed.). *Troy
and the Trojan War: A symposium held at Bryn Mawr College
(October 1984)*. Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College. 45-62.

Winn, M. M.

- 1974 "Thoughts on the questions of Indo-European movements into
Anatolia and Iran". JIES 2 (2): 117-142.
1981 "Burial evidence and the Kurgan Culture in eastern Anatolia". JIES 9
(1-2): 113-118.

Yakar, Jak

- 1981 "The Indo-Europeans and their impact on Anatolian cultural
development". JIES 9 (1-2): 94-112.

EIN MISSVERSTANDENER ALTHETHITISCHER TEXT: DIE SOG. PUḪANU-CHRONIK (CHT16)*

Gerd Steiner, Marburg

1. Deutung und Analyse

1.1 Der Text CTH 16 ist sehr unterschiedlich gedeutet worden, wobei allerdings berücksichtigt werden muß, daß er, obwohl mehrere Exemplare bekannt sind, zu einem großen Teil immer noch sehr fragmentarisch erhalten ist. Für E.O. Forrer scheint er "eine Heldensage zu sein, die an historische Personen anknüpft".¹ H.G. Güterbock sieht darin "eine Verbindung von Mythologischem und Historischem"² und ähnlich urteilt R.S. Hardy: "The opening paragraphs are mythological or ritualistic, but the last paragraph apparently contains historical information".³ Für die Anfangsparagraphen nimmt F. Sommer eine Gottheit oder ein "übernatürliches Wesen" als Sprecher an⁴ und A. Kammenhuber spricht von einer "mythisch-epischen Erzählung".⁵ Dagegen faßt H.J. Otten den Anfang des Textes als "aitiologische Erzählung" auf, wobei "irdische und göttliche Welt zusammenfließen".⁶ E. Laroche charakterisiert den Text als "Récits légendaires", nennt ihn aber später "chronique de Puḫanu".⁷ Auch O. Soysal bezeichnet den Text als "Puḫanu-Chronik", versteht ihn aber als rein historischen Bericht, der keine mythologischen Elemente enthält.⁸

* Für den Text vgl. generell O. Soysal, «Hethitica» 7 (1987), 173-178 (Fragmente 1-4). Ergänzungen nach Duplikaten und beschädigte, aber eindeutige Zeichen sind nicht besonders gekennzeichnet, neue Vorschläge zur Ergänzung und Übersetzung nur vereinzelt; von einem Kommentar mußte abgesehen werden. Zitiert wird nur die wichtigste Literatur; vgl. aber dazu O. Soysal, l. c. 173-253; sowie ders., «Hethitica» 14 (1999) 110-137.

¹ Vgl. E. O. Forrer, 2 BoTU II (1926), 7*f.

² Vgl. H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44 NF 10 (1938), 113.

³ Vgl. R. S. Hardy, AJS 58 (1941), 214.

⁴ Vgl. F. Sommer, OLZ 44 (1941), 59f.

⁵ Vgl. A. Kammenhuber, «Saeculum» 9 (1958), 140 Anm. 25, vgl. 138.

⁶ Vgl. H. J. Otten, ZA 55 NF 21 (1962), 156-168, bes. 156, 166; bzw. «Saeculum» 15 (1964) 117f.; sowie Fischer-Weltgeschichte 3 (1966), 114.

⁷ Vgl. E. Laroche, Cat² (1971) 16f. Nr. 16; bzw. ACFr 84 (1983-84), 614.

⁸ Vgl. O. Soysal, «Hethitica» 7 (1987), 173-253, bes. 187, 194f.; sowie «Hethitica» 14 (1999), 110-137.