THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

ANCIENT ANATOLIA

10,000–323 B.C.E.

Edited by

SHARON R. STEADMAN
AND GREGORY McMAHON

2011

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CHAPTER 31

INDO-EUROPEANS

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

For more than sixty years after the identification of Hittite as an Indo-European language by Bedřich Hrozný in 1917 (see Beckman, chapter 22 in this volume) it was taken for granted that Indo-European speakers were non-native to Anatolia. They were assumed to have migrated there from somewhere in eastern Europe (following the conventional definition of Europe as stretching to the Urals). Debate centered on three major issues. First, did the migration follow an eastern route through the Caucasus or a western one through the Balkans and across the Black Sea straits? Second, approximately when did this movement take place? Third, what was the nature of this event? The last question is multifaceted, including such issues as (1) was it in the nature of a hostile invasion and conquest or rather of relatively peaceful colonization? and (2) should we envision a mass movement of population or merely small bands of settlers?

The decade of the 1980s brought two radically new and different scenarios. Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1984) proposed that the dwelling place of the putative Proto-Indo-European (PIE) speech community lay in eastern Anatolia. While Gamkrelidze and Ivanov did retain the prevailing view that the prehistoric stage labeled PIE (alternatively Proto-Indo-Hittite) dated to the fifth or fourth millennium B.C.E., Colin Renfrew (1987) argued not only for a location of the PIE speech community in central Anatolia but also for a much earlier date of approximately 7000 B.C.E. Renfrew based his claim on a presumed association of the movement of the Indo-European languages and the spread of farming into Europe.

There clearly can be no pretense of a true consensus regarding Indo-Europeans in Anatolia. The following summary strives to distinguish what is purely personal opinion from what reflects a majority viewpoint. Important dissenting opinions are also cited, but no claim is made to exhaustiveness in this regard. The present treatment should also be read with the following caveats in mind. First, the

notion of "Indo-European(s)" is fundamentally linguistic—hence the references throughout to "Indo-European speakers" or "pre-Luvian speakers." Earlier close linkages of PIE speakers and their descendants with race or ethnicity are now emphatically rejected by all mainstream Indo-Europeanists. A shared language clearly may be an important factor in forging ethnic self-identity, but our knowledge of how inhabitants of second and first millennium B.C.E. Anatolia defined themselves is severely limited (for one recent thoughtful discussion of the problem see Gilan 2008).

A second difficulty is that our evidence for those we conventionally identify as Hittites, Luvians, or Lycians consists largely of written texts, and virtually all of those texts were written by and about limited classes of élites. We have little or no basis for drawing inferences about even the linguistic affinities of other classes of society. A third problem is that we know from modern examples that languages and various cultural practices may spread together, but they may also diffuse independently of each other. Therefore the mere co-occurrence of a certain kind of art or artifact and a Luvian text at the same site does not guarantee that the former may be safely defined as "Luvian." Likewise, archaeological evidence for prehistoric continuity or discontinuity of cultural practices does not per se assure corresponding linguistic maintenance or change.

Nevertheless, we must work with what we have, and in what follows evidence for a particular language being used in a given place at a given time will be taken as a sign of the presence of at least some associated speakers. Furthermore, demonstrable effects of one language on another and the apparent timing of such influence will be used to infer approximate locations of languages and their speakers. We may also with due caution draw some conclusions from the *lack* of evidence for language contact. Finally, few historical linguists believe that the rate of language change can be calculated in absolute terms according to the strong version of what is known as "glottochronology." However, most agree that one can make very rough estimates of the minimal time required to produce significant divergence among related languages.

Indo-Europeans in Anatolia: Autochthonous or Intrusive?

A majority of Indo-Europeanists have not been persuaded by the arguments of either Gamkrelidze and Ivanov or Renfrew for location of the PIE speech community in Anatolia. Among recent general studies of the Hittites MacQueen (1996:26) flatly rejects an Anatolian "homeland" for the Indo-Europeans without argumentation, while Bryce (2005:11–12) and Collins (2007:24) cite this possibility alongside that of in-migration, but remain firmly noncommittal. For a

critical assessment of Renfrew's model from an archaeological viewpoint see Anthony (2007:75–81) and Mallory (2009).

A detailed presentation of the linguistic arguments against an Anatolian location for PIE is not possible here, but the main issues are easily summarized. Gamkrelidze and Ivanov present chiefly linguistic evidence as the basis for positing a homeland at the intersection of eastern Anatolia, southern Caucasus, and northern Mesopotamia (most accessible in English in Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995:757–79). Their arguments rest on: (1) the presence of significant numbers of Anatolian place-names and river names of Indo-European origin; (2) PIE lexemes for flora and fauna that point distinctly to a southern "homeland" (e.g., "monkey," "ape," "lion," "elephant"); (3) extensive loanwords from Sumerian and Semitic into PIE; (4) extensive loanwords from PIE into South Caucasian (Proto-Kartvelian). The putative etymologies of Anatolian place-names are dubious, and none of the exclusively southern-oriented items of vocabulary are likely to have existed in PIE. There is no compelling basis for a Sumerian or Semitic origin of most of the alleged loanwords. The few that are convincing (such as "ax") are entirely compatible with diffusion by trade that could have reached a PIE speech community even in Europe (see Korfmann 2001 for arguments for extensive long-distance trade already in the third millennium B.C.E.). Gamkrelidze and Ivanov themselves concede (1995:774) that the contact with Proto-Kartvelian may have been with only post-PIE dialect subgroups. Their assumption (1995:794–9 and map on 850–51) of pre-Greek migration into Greece from Anatolia (necessarily *through* the prehistoric forms of the Anatolian Indo-European languages) is also very difficult to reconcile with recognition of a dialect subgroup consisting of Greek, Armenian, and Indo-Iranian.

The chief problem with the thesis of Renfrew (1987) is that we may securely reconstruct for the PIE lexicon words for objects and activities that almost certainly did not exist in 7000 B.C.E. or any time close to that. See Barber (2001) and especially Darden (2001) for detailed arguments for the PIE words for "wool" (as a material suitable for spinning), "yoke," and "hitch-pole." If the Anatolian Indo-European languages have been in situ in Anatolia for five millennia when we first encounter them, as claimed by Renfrew, it is also scarcely credible that there is no evidence for loanwords into Proto-Anatolian from Sumerian, Semitic, or Hattic (or vice versa). Pace Simon (2006:317), the lack of evidence for such contacts cannot be explained due to geographical distance, which is minimal. Nor would the contacts in the fourth and third millennia B.C.E. have been only with proto-languages, since Sumerian dates from at least the fourth millennium B.C.E. and Akkadian from the third millennium B.C.E. The openness of Hittite to lexical loans (though not grammatical influence) once it did come into contact with other languages of the Ancient Near East suggests that there should have likewise been such influence in earlier periods, had opportunity for such contact existed. The weight of current evidence argues for the received view of Indo-European speakers as intrusive to Anatolia.

Time of Entry of Indo-Europeans into Anatolia

It seems prudent to confront this issue in terms of a reverse chronology, starting with the first direct evidence we have for the Anatolian Indo-European languages and working back from there. Our earliest evidence for Hittite and Luvian comes from texts of the Assyrian merchant colonies of the *kārum* period in central Anatolia (nineteenth–eighteenth centuries B.C.E.), chiefly from Kaneš (Kültepe), in the form of both loanwords and personal names. The loanword data have been most recently critically reviewed by Dercksen (2007), who concludes that there is evidence for a considerable number of loanwords from Hittite. These include some with uniquely Hittite formal features such as *išpuruzzinnum* < *išparuzzi-*, "ceiling beam" (or similar) with suffix *-uzzi-* < **-uti-* and *išḫiulum* < *išḫiul-*, "obligation." There are also some assured loanwords from Luvian, such as *kullitannum* < *kullit-* (a small vessel) with specifically Luvian suffix *-it-* and *upatinnum*, "(royal) land-grant" < *ubati-* (on which see Melchert 2004a and Yakubovich 2005). Evidence for Hurrian loanwords is scarce, and that for Hattic uncertain. Dercksen (2007:27) reasonably concludes that Hittite was at this time the dominant local language of Kaneš (thus also Singer 1981:126 and Steiner 1981:164). Both of the loanwords from Luvian just cited may have been transmitted through Hittite, but the presence of Luvian speakers in the area is also beyond doubt.

Personal names from the Old Assyrian "Cappadocian" texts confirm the testimony of the loanwords. Names such as *Šuppiuman-* contain the characteristically Hittite ethnic suffix *-uman-*, whereas others such as *Zida-* and *Ḫutarla-* are based on Luvian appellatives ("man" and "servant," respectively); see among others on these names Carruba (1992) and Tischler (1995).

Direct textual evidence for Hittite, Luvian, and Palaic begins no later than the sixteenth century B.C.E. in the cuneiform archives of Ḫattuša (Boğazköy) and continues there for the first two languages to the end of the thirteenth century B.C.E.[1] Although Hittite is entrenched as our conventional name for the chief administrative language of the kingdom and empire centered on Ḫattuša, its speakers called it *ne/ašili* or *nešumnili*, "in the language of Neša" (i.e., Kaneš). This appellation confirms the evidence of the Assyrian texts already cited that this Indo-European language was originally associated with at least an élite stratum of speakers in Kaneš and that its appearance in Ḫattuša is likely to be relatively late and connected with the choice of Ḫattuša as a capital by the founders of the Hittite dynasty (thus also Singer 1981:129–30).

Later Hittite kings also produced Luvian inscriptions written in a hieroglyphic script invented in Anatolia, those of any length dating to the last two Hittite kings, Tuṯḫaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II (see Beal, chapter 26 in this volume). The use of the Anatolian hieroglyphs survived the fall of the Hittite Empire at the end of the thirteenth century B.C.E., and apart from a few inscriptions from the intermediate

period, most Luvian texts in hieroglyphs date from the tenth to eighth centuries B.C.E., comprising inscriptions on stone and a few on lead strips, the bulk of them attributable to local rulers from sites in southern Anatolia and northern Syria. There are limited but undeniable differences in the grammar of the language of the ritual texts in Luvian preserved in cuneiform in Ḫattuša and that of the first millennium B.C.E. hieroglyphic texts (see Melchert 2003a:171–72). However, Yakubovich (2010 and chapter 23 in this volume) has now presented extensive arguments that the conventional assumption of "Cuneiform Luvian" and "Hieroglyphic Luvian" dialects is false. In addition to identifying further dialectal features, he makes a compelling case that we should distinguish rather a "Kizzuwatnan Luvian" as the language of the cuneiform ritual texts and an "Empire Luvian," a *koiné* first promoted by the Hittite kings in Ḫattuša that is the source of Luvianisms in Hittite texts of the second millennium B.C.E. and was perpetuated as a prestige medium in the Luvian texts of the first millennium B.C.E.

Yakubovich also thoroughly treats the thorny issue of the status of Hittite and Luvian as spoken languages in Ḫattuša and elsewhere during the period of the Hittite kingdom, but a resolution of this issue is beyond the scope of the present chapter. Of much more relevance for our theme is his demonstration (2010:161–205) that contact with Luvian also caused a major transformation in the Hittite system of reflexive pronouns. It had already been established that Luvian furnished significant numbers of prehistoric loanwords in Hittite (see Starke 1990 and Melchert 2005), but such an influence on the Hittite grammatical system implies much more intensive prehistoric contact between speakers of Hittite and Luvian. This supports the claim of Yakubovich that the core area of Luvian speakers in the prehistoric period was in what the Hittites called "the Lower Land" (the area south of the Tuz Gölü) and that the primary movement of Luvian speakers in the late third millennium B.C.E. was westward, not eastward (contra Bryce 2003:28–35; MacQueen 1996:27–30; Steiner 1981:168). As correctly argued by Yakubovich (2010:140–57), the dearth of Luvian loanwords into Greek and the profile of the few genuine examples also argue against an early significant presence of Luvian speakers in western Anatolia. On the possible but unproven existence of yet another dialect of Luvian, represented in the Istanuvian Songs and localized in the area of the Sangarius (Sakarya) River basin, see Melchert (2003a:174–5) and Yakubovich (2010:22–3).

Our first textual evidence for the western Anatolian languages Lycian, Carian, and Lydian dates only from the second half of the first millennium B.C.E.[2] The size and nature of the respective corpora also limit our understanding of the grammar and lexicon of these languages. These factors severely restrict knowledge of the linguistic situation in the west in the second millennium B.C.E., much less the third. Nevertheless, certain facts allow us to draw some reasonably reliable conclusions. There is widespread agreement that Luvian and Lycian form a well-defined dialect subgroup of Anatolian, based on an impressive number of common innovations (Melchert 2003b:267–69 with refs.), and it is likely that Carian shares many if not most of these features (Adiego 2007:345–47). However, Lycian at least also shows archaisms that preclude its being analyzed as a first millennium B.C.E. form of Luvian

(contra Bryce 2003:102 and Starke 1997:468 and 476, n. 108, among others): see Gusmani (1960) and Melchert (2003b:268). Because Luvian as attested in the early second millennium B.C.E. already shows key innovations separating it from Lycian, we may safely conclude that the divergence of Luvian and Lycian must date to at least the late third millennium B.C.E. Similar differences likewise assure that Lydian must have already been distinct from both Lycian and Luvian in the same period, notwithstanding that Lycian and Lydian as attested surely have evolved considerably from the form they had at the turn from the third to the second millennium B.C.E.

The fact that the Assyrian texts from Kaneš from the nineteenth to the eighteenth centuries B.C.E. attest to already distinct Hittite and Luvian, combined with the demonstration by Yakubovich of prehistoric Luvian influence on Hittite grammar, likewise necessarily *after* the two grammatical systems had already significantly diverged, falsifies any notion of a still undifferentiated Anatolian form of Indo-European at the end of the second millennium B.C.E. (contra MacQueen 1996:31). The differences cited between Luvian and the western Anatolian languages reinforce this conclusion. One may safely say that a consensus has therefore developed that divergences among the Anatolian Indo-European languages can have begun no later than ca. 2300 B.C.E. and likely began earlier, arguably as early as the beginning of the third millennium B.C.E. See, among others, Carruba (1995:31), Lehrman (2001:116), Oettinger (2002:52), and Yakubovich (2010:7). This convergence of opinion is all the more significant in that these scholars and others have widely divergent views regarding other aspects of Anatolian and Indo-European linguistic prehistory.

We take it as a given that the spread of Indo-European languages across Asia Minor involved at least some movements of speakers. Since geographic separation of an originally unified speech community typically leads to language differentiation between the respective new communities, the default assumption is that most (if not all) of the early attested divergence among the Anatolian languages is due to the break-up of what we call "Proto-Anatolian," as various groups of speakers scattered into areas of Anatolia. However, the methods of reconstruction that lead us to posit a prehistoric language system like Proto-Anatolian imply only that the attested languages in question underwent some period of common development that differentiates them from the rest of the Indo-European languages. Where this putative common development took place cannot be determined on linguistic grounds. We therefore cannot rule out an alternative scenario by which the isolation that led to Proto-Anatolian took place in, for example, the Balkans, and that the entry of its speakers into Anatolia took place in a series of successive waves (thus Steiner 1990:202–3; see also Darden 2001:220). Even the approximate date of entry of Indo-European speakers into Anatolia thus remains frustratingly indeterminate. However, we may draw one sobering lesson from the preceding discussion. The unavoidable need to assume considerable prehistoric movement *within* Anatolia by various groups speaking pre-Hittite, pre-Luvian, and so forth—and significant contact between them—effectively precludes the use of linguistic evidence to say anything illuminating about the route by which Indo-European speakers entered Asia Minor. Nothing further on this topic is presented here.

Role of the Indo-Europeans in Anatolia

If linguistic evidence gives us only an approximate terminus ante quem for when Indo-European speakers arrived in Anatolia and can tell us next to nothing about how they came, it also follows that it can offer only limited help in defining the nature and circumstances of their in-migration. Therefore, once again it seems useful to focus the following brief discussion on what linguistic facts may be able to contribute regarding the interactions of Indo-European-speaking groups with each other and with speakers of non-Indo-European languages in the prehistoric period immediately preceding our first texts.

For western Anatolia in the older period there is little to say due to the lack of sources. Speculations about "substrate" effects on Luvian and Lycian are no more than that. The notion of a common substrate shared by Greece and western Anatolia based solely on a supposed equation between Greek place-names in *-νθ-* and *-σσ-* and those from Anatolia in *-nd-* and *-ss-* (e.g., Stefanini 2002:794 with refs.) is a very fragile construct. Even if it is true, it tells us next to nothing. Not a single one of the numerous common innovations shared by Luvian and Lycian can be attributed to the influence of a substrate, since we know nothing about the hypothetical source language or languages. Since Carian is indubitably an Indo-European language (see now Adiego 2007:345–47), there is also no evidence for a non-Indo-European Carian substratum (contra Stefanini 2002:795–96).

The case of Hittite and Hattic, where we do know at least something about the latter (see now Soysal 2004), is highly instructive. There are no persuasive examples of Hattic influence on Hittite morphology (the Hittite pronominal genitive ending *-ēl* has developed from inherited material, as per Rieken 2008, and has nothing to do with the Hattic derivational suffix *-il-*). There are any number of possible reasons why Luvian and Lycian may have innovated more in some respects than Hittite, and there is no basis for attributing this fact to substrate influence (pace Puhvel 1990:191–92 and Stefanini 2002:789). The one demonstrable instance of a contact-induced innovation in Luvian is the creation—only in Kizzuwatnan Luvian!—of the form *-aššanza-* to mark plural number of the possessor in the possessive adjective in *-aššа/i-*, shown by Yakubovich (2010:45–53) to be due to Hurrian influence. Although this very phenomenon was quite hard to motivate as an internal change, all the shared innovations of Luvian and Lycian are easily accounted for without any recourse to external forces.

How far the Luvian speech area extended into western Anatolia in the early second millennium B.C.E. remains an open question. While arguing for early forms of Carian and Lydian as having been the spoken languages of that area, Yakubovich (2010:160) concedes that the few scraps of evidence we have do not permit definitive conclusions about narrower linguistic affinities. Nor can we be sure how far the linguistic Indo-Europeanization of western Anatolia had proceeded by that time. Barring a dramatic new discovery, the question of "the language of the Trojans" (more properly, the language of the inhabitants of Wiluša known to the Hittites) will

remain unanswerable. It may have been an unknown further western dialect of Indo-European Anatolian or a non-Indo-European language.

Indo-European Anatolian languages do appear to have become dominant in the west during the first millennium B.C.E. By the time of the first attested texts, the societies of Lycia, Caria, and Lydia are under heavy Greek influence. It is almost certain that the cultural exchange went in both directions (see various contributions in Collins, Bachvarova, and Rutherford 2008), but our inability to interpret most of the content of the few longer inscriptions in these languages robs us of the chance to discover more than the dimmest outlines of this activity.

We are in a rather better situation when it comes to central Anatolia in the late third to early second millennium B.C.E., though even here due caution is in order. We can assert that the sum of current linguistic evidence argues decisively against the old idea of a Hittite ruling class overrunning a Hattic population on the central Anatolian plateau. First of all, the supposed substrate influence of Hattic on Hittite has been widely overestimated (most recently, e.g., by Stefanini 2002:789–92). A sober look at the vocabulary of Old Hittite referring to political institutions (see Melchert 2003c:18–21) shows that it reflects a roughly equal mixture of Hattic and Luvian influences. The titles of the Hittite king and queen, *l/tabarna-* and *tawananna-*, are assuredly loanwords from Luvian with an impeccable Indo-European pedigree in terms of the lexical roots, word formation, and phonology (pace Klinger 1996:207–20; Stefanini 2002:791–92; and others); see Melchert (2003c:18–21 with refs. to Carruba and Puhvel). On the other hand, the designation of the crown prince *tuḫkanti-* and the name of the throne dais *ḫalmaššuitt-* are indubitably borrowed from Hattic. In similar fashion *telipuri-*, referring to an administrative district, is from Hattic, while *ubati-*, "(royal) land-grant," is taken from Luvian (Klinger 1996:200). Hittite notions of kingship and the ideal state show a comparable blending of Hattic and Luvian elements (along with some that are probably neither).

The mixed influence of Hattic and Luvian on early Hittite suggests that we should take seriously the Hittites' own designation of their language as belonging to the area of Kaneš and cautiously infer that their "heartland" lay in the upper reaches of the Halys River, in a zone between the Hattians to the north on the central Anatolian plateau and the Luvians to the southwest in the Lower Land, south of the Tuz Gölü. Needless to say, this characterization is meant only to refer to centers of gravity. There is no need or justification to suppose that there were sharp boundaries between the respective speech areas, and the Assyrian texts of the *kārum* period argue in fact for trade, intermarriage, and all kinds of cultural exchange between these (and likely other unidentifiable groups) from whatever time the Indo-European speakers arrived in the area—whenever that may have been.

These results based on linguistic considerations square quite well with those reached by Singer (1981:120–25) on wholly independent grounds. They also support the claim by Yakubovich (2010:239–48) that the Lower Land was the heartland of Luvian speakers in the late third and early second millennium B.C.E. One should note in this connection the strong possibility of a few loanwords from

Hattic into prehistoric Hittite *through* the intermediary of Luvian: the words *Ḫarkiw(it)-*, "canopy, awning," and *ḫazziw(it)-*, "rite," show inflectional forms with the Luvian suffix *-it-* (on which see Starke 1990:151–226) but also peculiarities that point to an ultimately Hattic origin (see Weitenberg 1984:239 and 246–47). It is therefore likely that the tentative map offered in Melchert (2003c:9) should be revised by moving the label "Hittite" further to the northeast, while the lower of the two labels "Luwian" should be rotated clockwise about sixty degrees, so that it runs northwest–southeast from just west of the Tuz Gölü. The Hattians naturally may be supposed, as usual, to have been centered on the central Anatolian plateau.

Attempting to infer speaker attitudes from language contact effects is a parlous business. Hostility towards speakers of another language (for whatever reason) does not preclude adoption of loanwords from the latter. Widespread resentment or antipathy toward many aspects of current American culture has hardly slowed the massive worldwide spread of English loanwords, especially in the areas of technology and popular culture. The likely existence of substantial numbers of Hattic loanwords in Hittite for flora, fauna, and the paraphernalia and personnel of religious ritual—our very limited sources for Hattic leave most of these less than strictly proven—does not necessarily exclude the long popular idea of the imposition of an Indo-European ruling class on a native Hattian population referred to above (thus, e.g., still Gurney 1981 [1990]:13). Nevertheless, the nearly seamless blending of Hattian and Luvian elements into the creation of the Hittites' conception of kingship and the ideal state cited above lends support to the arguments of Klinger (1996:16–7 with n. 41, 93, 198 with n. 287; and others) rather for a relatively long and peaceful assimilation of the Indo-European-speaking newcomers with other inhabitants of central Anatolia.

The creation of the Hittite state undoubtedly drew together more strands of influence than just Hattian and Luvian, including imitation of Mesopotamian and Syrian models (thus also Liverani 1988:441). Political conflicts likely arose in terms of competing city states, not from a supposed clash of Indo-European and local Anatolian "values" (against the latter see Liverani 1988:443–44). Forlanini (2007) has argued on nonlinguistic grounds for a three-way power struggle in central Anatolia at the beginning of the second millennium B.C.E. between Purušḫanda, Kaneš, and Ḫattuša. He raises the question (2007:278) as to whether these polities reflected ethnolinguistic divisions between Luvians, Nešites (Hittite-speaking), and Hattians. The answer may be a qualified yes, but we should avoid concluding that the linguistic differences were the *basis* for the conflict. If the rise and fall of dynasties tied to certain cities led to expansion or diminution in the use of various languages (at least in the written record!), the latter was surely an effect of the former. At least, nothing in the available linguistic evidence supports the view that battle lines were drawn along language boundaries (see Steiner 1981:166–70 for an account supposing an actual disconnect between ethnicity and language). As elsewhere, the ascendancy and disappearance of particular languages in ancient Anatolia was due to a combination of nonlinguistic factors, including chance.

Conclusion

The weight of current linguistic evidence supports the traditional view that Indo-European speakers are intrusive to Asia Minor, coming from somewhere in eastern Europe. There is a growing consensus that the differentiation among the Indo-European Anatolian languages begins at least by the mid-second millennium B.C.E. and possibly earlier. It is likely, but not strictly provable, that this differentiation correlates with the entry of the Indo-European speakers into Anatolia and their subsequent dispersal. Nothing definitive can be said about the route by which the Indo-European entry took place.

The very long gap between the approximate time of in-migration and our first textual evidence for western Anatolia precludes any conclusions about the nature of the interaction between the newcomers and any previous inhabitants. Claims of substrate effects on the western Anatolian languages are greatly exaggerated. In any case, our total ignorance of the structure of the putative substrate languages makes it impossible to draw any inferences about the relative social position of the respective sets of speakers. Recent research argues against the notion of Indo-European "invaders" imposing themselves on a Hattian population in central Anatolia and points rather to a gradual assimilation. Conflicts between various city-states may have correlated to some extent with ethnolinguistic differences, but the former, not the latter, were determining.

NOTES

1. For recent overviews of Hittite grammar, see Watkins (2004) and Rieken (2005); for both forms of Luvian, see Melchert (2003a) with modifications by Yakubovich (2010); and for Palaic, see Melchert (2004b).

2. Melchert (2004b) offers short overviews of the grammar of all of these languages. The description of Carian should be supplemented by that of Adiego(2007), while Gérard (2005) furnishes important correctives for Lydian.

REFERENCES

Adiego, Ignacio J. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden: Brill.

Anthony, David W. 2007. *The Horse, the Wheel, and Language: How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Barber, Elisabeth. 2001. The Clues in the Clothes: Some Independent Evidence for the Movements of Families. In *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family*, ed. Robert Drews, 1–14. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 38. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.

Bryce, Trevor. 2003. History. In *The Luwians*, ed. H. Craig Melchert, 27–127. Leiden: Brill.
———. 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Carruba, Onofrio. 1992. Luwier in Kappadokien. In *La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le Proche-Orient ancient, XXXVIIIe R.A.I.*, ed. Dominique Charpin and Francis Joannès, 251–57. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
———. 1995. L'arrivo dei greci, le migrazioni indoeuropee e il "ritorno" degli Eraclidi. *Athenaeum* 83: 5–44.
Collins, Billie Jean. 2007. *The Hittites and Their World*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
Collins, Billie Jean, Mary R. Bachvarova, and Ian C. Rutherford. 2008. *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbors. Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, 17–19 September 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA*. Oxford: Oxbow.
Darden, Bill J. 2001. On the Question of the Anatolian Origin of Indo-Hittite. In *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family*, ed. Robert Drews, 184–228. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 38. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
Dercksen, Jan G. 2007. On Anatolian Loanwords in Akkadian Texts from Kültepe. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 97: 26–46.
Forlanini, Massimo. 2007. The Offering List of KBo 4.13 (I 17'-48') to the Local Gods of the Kingdom, Known as "Sacrifice List," and the History of the Formation of the Early Hittite State and its Initial Growing beyond Central Anatolia. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 49: 259–80.
Gamkrelidze, Thomas V. and Vyačeslav V. Ivanov. 1984. *Indoevropejskij Jazyk i Indoevropejsky*. Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo Universiteta.
———. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. Trans. Johanna Nichols. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Gérard, Raphaël. 2005. *Phonétique et morphologie de la langue lydienne*. Louvain: Peeters.
Gilan, Amir. 2008. Hittite Ethnicity? Constructions of Identity in Hittite Literature. In *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors*, ed. Billie Jean Collins, Mary R. Bachvarova, and Ian R. Rutherford, 107–15. Oxford: Oxbow.
Gurney, Oliver R. 1981 [1990]. *The Hittites*, 2nd ed. Penguin.
Gusmani, Roberto. 1960. Concordanze e discordanze nella flessione nominale del licio e del luvio. *Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere. Classe di lettere e scienze morali e storiche* 94: 275–98.
Klinger, Jörg. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 37. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Korfmann, Manfred. 2001. Troia also Drehscheibe des Handels im 2. und 3. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend. In *Troia. Traum und Wirklichkeit*, 355–68. Stuttgart: Theiss.
Lehrman, Alexander. 2001. Reconstructing Proto-Indo-Hittite. In *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family*, ed. Robert Drews, 106–30. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 38. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
Liverani, Mario. 1988. *Antico Oriente: Storia, società, economia*. Rome: Laterza.
MacQueen, James G. 1996. *The Hittites and Their Contemporaries in Asia Minor*, rev. ed. London: Thames and Hudson.
Mallory, James P. 2009. The Anatolian Homeland Hypothesis and the Anatolian Neolithic. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles. 31 October–November 2, 2008*, ed. Stephanie Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine, 133–62. Bremen: Hempen.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2003a. Language. In *The Luwians*, ed. H. Craig Melchert, 170–210. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2003b. The Dialectal Position of Lycian and Lydian within Anatolian. In *Licia e Lidia prima dell'Ellenizzazione. Atti del Convegno internazionale Roma, 11–12 ottobre 1999*, ed. Mauro Giorgieri, Mirjo Salvini, Marie-Claude Trémouille, and Pietro Vannicelli, 265–72. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche.

———. 2003c. Prehistory. In *The Luwians*, ed. H. Craig Melchert, 8–26. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2004a. A Luwian Dedication. In *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, ed. John W. Penney, 370–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2004b. Palaic. Lycian. Lydian. Carian. In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. Roger D. Woodard, 585–613. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2005. The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite: When and How Much? In *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17–23 September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, ed. Gerhard Meiser and Olaf Hackstein, 445–60. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Oettinger, Norbert. 2002. Indogermanische Sprachträger lebten schon im 3. Jahrtausend v. Chr. in Kleinasien. In *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich. Das Volk der 1000 Götter*, 50–55. Stuttgart: Theiss.

Puhvel, Jaan. 1990. Anatolian: Autochthon or Interloper? *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22: 251–63.

Renfrew, Colin. 1987. *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*. London: Cape.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 2005. Hethitisch. In *Sprachen des Alten Orients*, ed. Michael P. Streck, 80–127. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 2008. The Origin of the *-l* Genitive and the History of the Stems in *-īl-* and *-ūl-* in Hittite. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles. 3–4 November 2007*, ed. Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin Huld, Angela Della Volpe, and Miriam Robins Dexter, 239–57. Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 54. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.

Simon, Zsolt. 2006. Review of H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians* (Leiden/Boston, 2003). *Acta Antiqua* 46: 313–28.

Singer, Itamar. 1981. Hittites and Hattians in Anatolia at the Beginning of the Second Millennium B.C. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9: 119–34.

Soysal, Oğuz. 2004. *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*. Leiden: Brill.

Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

———. 1997. Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend. *Studia Troica* 7: 448–87.

Stefanini, Ruggiero. 2002. Toward a Diachronic Reconstruction of the Linguistic Map of Ancient Anatolia. In *Anatolica Antiqua. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, ed. Stefano de Martino and Franca Pecchioli Daddi, 783–806. Eothen 11. Firenze: LoGisma.

Steiner, Gerd. 1981. The Role of the Hittites in Ancient Anatolia. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9: 150–73.

———. 1990. The Immigration of the First Indo-Europeans into Anatolia Reconsidered. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 18: 185–214.

Tischler, Johann. 1995. Die kappadokischen Texte als älteste Quelle indogermanischen Sprachgutes. In *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, ed. Onofrio

Carruba, Mauro Giorgieri, and Clelia Mora, 359–68. Studia Mediterranea 9. Pavia: Iuculano.

Watkins, Calvert. 2004. Hittite. In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. Roger Woodard, 551–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weitenberg, Joseph J. S. 1984. *Die hethitischen U-Stämme*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2005. Carian Monument. In *Hṛdāmánasā. Sbornik statej k 70-letiju so dna rozhdenija professora Leonarda Georgijevicha Gerzenberga*, ed. Nikolai N. Kazanskij, 240–51. St. Petersburg: Nauk.

———. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.