

The Luwians of Western Anatolia

Their neighbours and predecessors



Fred C. Woudhuizen

The Luwians of Western Anatolia

Their neighbours and predecessors

Fred C. Woudhuizen



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD
Summertown Pavilion
18-24 Middle Way
Summertown
Oxford OX2 7LG

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978 1 78491 827 9
ISBN 978 1 78491 828 6 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and Fred C. Woudhuizen 2018

Cover illustration: 'Tarkondemos' seal (Pope 1999: 139, Fig. 86)

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

Printed in England by Holywell Press, Oxford

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

Contents

Contents	i
Preface	1
1. The Homeland of the Luwians	5
2. Geography of Western Anatolia	19
3. Origin of the Luwian Hieroglyphic Script	36
3.1 Introduction	36
3.2 Catalogue of the Middle Bronze Age Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions.....	37
3.3 Middle Bronze Age Luwian Hieroglyphic Signary.....	39
3.4 In Search of the Cradle of the Luwian Hieroglyphic Script	41
3.5 Overview of Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from, or Attributable to, Assuwa/ Arzawa/Mira-Kuwaliya, Seḫa-Appawiya, and Ḫapalla.....	46
Addendum.....	51
4. Luwian Hieroglyphic Evidence on the Great Kingdom of Assuwa.....	55
4.1 Introduction	55
4.2 Two Assuwian Royal Seals.....	56
4.3 An Assuwian Royal Seal from Thebes.....	59
4.4 On the Reading of the Luwian Hieroglyphic Legends of the Schimmel Rhyton	66
5. Western Anatolia under Hittite Rule	74
5.1 Introduction	74
5.2 The Sealing of Prince Maṣḫuiluwas	79
5.3 The Stone Inscription of tuḫkanti Urḫitesup	80
5.4 The Seal and Rock Relief of Tarku(ndimu)was	80
5.5 The Stone Inscription of Prince Maṣḫuittas	83
5.6 The Luwian Hieroglyphic Stele from Afyon	83
6. Western Anatolia in the Final Stage of Bronze Age.....	88
6.1 Introduction	88
6.2 The Rediscovered Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from Western Anatolia in Transliteration and Translation.....	91
7. Amenhotep III: Historical Background to his Aegean Policy	107
7.1 Introduction	107
7.2 KUB 26.91 & the Tawagalawas-letter.....	108
7.3 The Phaistos Disc	111
7.4 The Madduwattas-text.....	114
7.5 Conclusion.....	115
8. The Arzwan Language	117
8.1 Cuneiform Luwian	117
8.2 Luwian Hieroglyphic	121
9. The Language of the Trojans.....	123
9.1 Introduction	123
9.2 The Relevant Late Bronze Age Data.....	124

9.3 The Relevant Homeric Data	128
10. Evidence for an Old Indo-European Substrate in Western Anatolia	132
10.1 Late Bronze Age Hydronyms and Toponyms of Indo-European nature in Western Anatolia	132
10.2 On the Identity of the Indo-European Substrate in Western Anatolia	139
Bibliography	144
Index	165

List of Figures

Fig. 1. Distribution of Luwian place-names in -ss- and -nd-.....	12
Fig. 2. Seal of Tarku(n)timuwas from Malia	15
Fig. 3. Cylinder seal from Klavdia	17
Fig. 4. Cylinder seal impression from Kourion.....	17
Fig. 5. Map of western Anatolia	32
Fig. 6. Geography of the Hittite empire.....	33
Fig. 7. Distribution of Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic seals and sealings	42
Fig. 8. Sealing Tell-Atchana-Alalah no. 154.....	43
Fig. 9. Erlenmeyers' seal.....	43
Fig. 10. Seal Hogarth no. 154	44
Fig. 11. Seal of king Piyamakuruntas of Assuwiya	51
Fig. 12. Stamp seal from Beycesultan.....	51
Fig. 13. The Luwian hieroglyphic titular expression of the Indilima seal compared to its closest cognate on seal # 271 from Malia.	53
Fig. 14. Stamp side of stamp-cylinder seals Louvre AO 20.138 (a) and Aydin (b)	57
Fig. 15. Impression of the cylinder side of stamp-cylinder seal Louvre AO 20.138.....	59
Fig. 16. Cyprian cylinder seal from Thebes	61
Fig. 17. Luwian hieroglyphic cylinder seal from Thebes	62
Fig. 18. Drawing of the scene on the Schimmel rhyton	67
Fig. 19. Baltimore seal.....	69
Fig. 20. Luwian hieroglyphic legend no. 1 with comparison from the Baltimore seal.	70
Fig. 21. Thus far enigmatic sign from the Luwian hieroglyphic legends with suggested equivalent of later date, LH 430 sa.....	70
Fig. 22. Luwian hieroglyphic legend no. 2 with comparison from Südburg § 3	71
Fig. 23. Rock inscription of great prince <i>Kupaā</i>	78
Fig. 24. Sealing of prince Maṣḫuiluwas.....	79
Fig. 25. Stone inscription Beyköy 1	81
Fig. 26. Seal of 'Tarkondemos'.....	81
Fig. 27. Rock relief at Karabel.....	82
Fig. 28. Stele from Afyon	84
Fig. 29. Beyköy 2	102-103
Fig. 30. Edremit.....	104
Fig. 31. Yazılıtaş.....	105
Fig. 32. Beyköy 3-4 (A-B), Şahankaya (C), Dağardı 1 (D), Dağardı 2 (E-G).	106
Fig. 33. Throne-name of Amenhotep III.	107
Fig. 34. Cursive variant of the throne-name of Amenhotep III.....	107
Fig. 35. Scarab of queen Tiyi.....	108

List of Tables

Table I. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nd-</i> from Late Bronze Age Hittite cuneiform and Luwian hieroglyphic texts	6
Table II. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nth-</i> or names related to such place-names from the Late Bronze Age Linear B texts.....	8
Table III. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nd-</i> from Anatolia as recorded for sources from the Classical period	9-10
Table IV. Place-names in <i>-ss-</i> and <i>-nth-</i> from Greece as recorded for sources from the Classical period	12
Table V. Identification of place-names from cuneiform Hittite and Luwian hieroglyphic with a bearing on western Anatolia.	22-25
Table VI. Overview of the dating criteria for Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic seals or sealings.	41
Table VII. Analysis of the legends of the Erlenmeyers' seal and seal Hogarth no. 154 from Henri Frankfort's First Syrian Group.....	44
Table VIII. Overview of Proto-Indo-European roots in Middle Bronze Age Luwian hieroglyphic.....	54
Table IX. Synchronisms between the dynasties of Ḫattusa, Arzawa, and Seḫa	86-87
Table X. Grammatical sketch of the cuneiform Luwian evidence on the Arzawan language.....	121
Table XI. Grammatical sketch of the Luwian hieroglyphic evidence on the Arzawan language.....	122
Table XII. Overview of western Anatolian hydronyms and toponyms of Indo-European nature.....	133
Table XIII: Overview of literary evidence for Pelasgians in western Anatolia according to Lochner-Hüttenbach's <i>Die Pelasger</i> of 1960.	140
Table XIV. Names based on a Proto-Indo-European root associated in the Greek sources with Pelasgians	141

Preface

Just recently, in spring of 2016, Eberhard Zangger wrote a stimulating book on the Luwian civilization. He aptly calls this the missing link in the history of the Aegean Bronze Age. As it happens, namely, there are 340 major archaeological sites in western Anatolia, ‘very few of which have been excavated on a large scale—and virtually none of these were published in a western language.’ (Zangger 2016: 14).

It will take at least a century to excavate at least some of the tells in western Anatolia, if not longer. So the prospects for this ‘missing link’ to become as profoundly prospected archaeologically as the Aegean in the west and central Anatolia and the Levant in the east are rather grim on the short term.

This state of affairs, however, should not discourage us from studying the culture of the Luwians of western Anatolia during the Bronze Age and collecting the relevant data presently at hand. In fact, this is precisely what Zangger aimed to do in his book and aims to put on a more solid basis with his foundation *Luwian Studies* (see esp. its website).

The interest in the Luwians as an object of study next to and apart from the Hittites is already growing for some time. A pioneer in this respect is Jacques Freu with his monograph entitled *Luwija* of 1980. However, Luwian studies becomes of age, so to say, with *The Luwians*, edited by Craig Melchert, of 2003 and the publication of the papers to the conference in Reading on *Luwian Identities*, edited by Alice Mouton, Ian Rutherford, and Ilya Yakubovich, in 2013.

The habitat of the Luwians is not confined to western Anatolia, but included the later Hittite provinces of Tarḫuntassa (Konya basin), Kizzuwatna (Cilician plain), and the island of Cyprus in the east. In the west, it extended to the Aegean islands, up to and including Crete, and regions in southern Greece. In the present book, however, after an introductory chapter on the extent of the homeland, I will focus on the Luwians of western Anatolia because the reconstruction of their Bronze Age history up to this moment is a *desideratum*.

In my opinion, especially with the help of data from epigraphy and linguistics, the history of western Anatolia during the Bronze Age can be reconstructed in its bare outlines. Of fundamental importance to such an endeavor is the reconstruction of its geography. We cannot reach the stage of historical reconstruction before we know where the various places and countries named in cuneiform Hittite and Luwian hieroglyphic texts are situated. Therefore I first address the question of the geography of western Anatolia before I set out to discuss the relevant Luwian hieroglyphic and cuneiform Hittite texts.

Since I finalised the first draft of this book in July 2016, our knowledge of the geography of especially northwestern Anatolia has improved dramatically. It so happens, namely, that in the meantime Eberhard Zangger acquired the files on the so-called ‘Beşköy

Text' from the inheritance of James Mellaart (Zangger 2017: 309). In these files there were, next to the translation of the cuneiform Beyköy Text, drawings of Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered at Beyköy and some other sites in northwestern Anatolia between 1854 and 1878. One of these Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, Beyköy 2, actually is, with its 50 phrases, the longest Late Bronze Age text known to date and as such highly informative on the Arzawan language (Zangger & Woudhuizen 2018). Among the remaining Luwian hieroglyphic texts, the one from Edremit, which only entails 4 phrases, records numerous toponyms from the Troad, whereas those from Yazılıtaş and Dağardı consist almost exclusively of place-names from the realm of Seha. Owing to this discovery, then, the formerly almost blank region of northwestern Anatolia can be filled in with toponyms primarily known from Greek sources.

The joy about this sensational find is somewhat hampered, however, since the foremost specialist in Luwian hieroglyphic, David Hawkins, considers it forged. Hawkins' successor Mark Weeden informed me on September 29, 2017 in personal communication, that Beyköy 2 as well as the smaller fragments are merely the product of the lively imagination of James Mellaart, who falsified them apparently out of resentment of his critics and in order to give a surge to his otherwise ruined career. Weeden presented me with the copies of these inscriptions as they were in David Hawkins' possession since 1989. The proposed scenario, however, is highly unlikely if we realise that Mellaart was not a specialist in Luwian hieroglyphic and, in view of the attempts at interpretation of the inscriptions also present in his files, had only limited understanding of their contents. I believe that no one, not even Hawkins himself, could falsify a Luwian hieroglyphic text of the length of Beyköy 2.

The desire to declare Beyköy 2 a forgery may rest in the fact that the inscription does not fit in the framework of Hawkins' readings. These were introduced in 1973 and are currently generally applied in the field of Luwian hieroglyphics. Since 1931 and until Hawkins' introduction of the new reading, the sign LH 376 was interpreted as expressing the value *i*, – one of only three vowels in Luwian. Hawkins then proposed that it should be read as the expression of the value *zi* – and every scholar in the small field of Luwian studies followed him. I, for one, challenged this interpretation, arguing that sign LH 376 is indeed polyphonic and thus can be used as expressing both the values *i* and *zi* (Woudhuizen 2004c: 11). There are indeed 24 cases certified by bilingual evidence for the *zi*-reading, but also 18 cases, also with bilingual evidence, for the *i*-reading (latest count, cf. Woudhuizen 2011: 92-97). Thus, a 'readjusted old reading' of sign LH 376 would be called for.

As it happens, in Beyköy 2, sign LH 376 is used twice for the expression of the value *i*, in the name of a great king of Mira, *ma-sa-hù+i-ti* (§§ 1, 5), corresponding to Hittite cuneiform *Mashuittas*, and the place-name *i-ku-wa-na* (§ 50), corresponding to Hittite cuneiform *Ikkuwaniya* 'Konya'. Only once is sign LH 376 in Beyköy 2 used for the expression of the value *zi*, in the country name *mi-zi+r(i)* (§ 28), corresponding to Hittite cuneiform *Mizri* 'Egypt'.

It is inconceivable that Mellaart based his forgery in the 1980s on a theory about the reading of Luwian hieroglyphic that would appear over twenty years later! Far more likely, Beyköy 2 and the other texts are indeed genuine. In that case, they provide us with further evidence that the new reading and current paradigm in the study of Luwian hieroglyphics is flawed and needs to be adjusted.

What is more, Hawkins proposal to read sign LH 376 exclusively as the expression of the value *zi* reduced the number of available vowels from three to only two. He therefore suggested that sign LH 209 should now be read as the expression of the value *i*. The Beyköy 2 inscription, however, contains the Luwian word for 'sea', of which we know from Hittite cuneiform texts, that is *aruna*. It is spelled correctly in the document, but when transcribed using Hawkins' system, it would read *ʔiruna* – which is evidently incorrect.

The study of cuneiform Luwian is also of relevance, as the so-called songs from Istanuwa presumably bear direct testimony of the language of Ḫapalla, one of the Arzawa lands. The town of Istanuwa, namely, is directly associated with Saḫiriya or the Sangarios river, and therefore likely to be situated within the bend of this river. Now, within this bend the Arzawa land Ḫapalla happens to be situated. Accordingly, it may reasonably be inferred that the songs of Istanuwa are conducted in the Arzawan language.

For our understanding of the history of the Luwians of western Anatolia, even in its bare outlines as aimed at here, it is also helpful to distinguish their neighbours. An unknown fraction of the inhabitants of the Troad in northwest Anatolia was presumably of a stock different from the Luwians. They spoke another language, closely related to Thracian and Phrygian. Furthermore, the Luwians of western Anatolia were in contact with the Hittites of the central Anatolian plateau in the east and with the Mycenaean Greeks in the west.

Finally, it should be realised that the Luwians, like most other Indo-European peoples, were not indigenous in their Anatolian habitat but entered this at some point in the Bronze Age. Accordingly, they were preceded by earlier inhabitants of the region, called a substrate population. From the relevant hydronymic and toponymic evidence, then, it can positively be deduced, at least in my opinion, that among the substrate populations of western Anatolia there were speakers of an Old Indo-European tongue well-known in the Classical sources by the ethnonym Pelasgians.

It is to be hoped that this book will serve as a worthy tool in the development of Luwian studies into a discipline in its own right and in the ongoing process to turn the civilization of the Luwians of western Anatolia from a 'missing link' into a 'link' between cultures of the Hittites in the east and the Mycenaean Greeks in the west.

1. The Homeland of the Luwians

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Emmanuel Laroche studied the place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* as recorded in the Hittite Late Bronze Age sources. In these studies he came to the conclusion that the given elements are of an Indo-European nature (Laroche 1961: 91; Laroche 1957: 7). What the distinguished French scholar actually meant with this verdict is that the toponymic elements *-ss-* and *-nd-* are a typical feature of the Indo-European languages of Anatolia (= IE Anatolian), viz. Hittite and Luwian. However, if we put examples of the place-names in question which can be localised on the map, it so happens that the Hittite core land within the bend of the Marassantiya or Halys river—apart from the case of Zippalanda—forms no integral part of the distribution zone.¹ By means of deduction, then, it may safely be concluded that the place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* are typically Luwian.

In Table I below an overview is presented of place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* from Hittite cuneiform and Luwian hieroglyphic sources which can be localised. From this overview it can be deduced that these types of place-names are attested for the regions of Arzawa and Lukka in western Anatolia, of the Lower Land, Tarḫuntassa, and Kizzuwatna in the adjacent part of southern Anatolia, up to that of Karkamis along the upper Euphrates in the east. In this manner, then, we get a fairly accurate idea of the confines of the homeland of the Luwians (see Table I).

The inclusion of the region of Karkamis in the distribution zone of place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* is based on the localization of *Urussa* and *Terussa* along the Euphrates to the north of Karkamis by Jacques Freu (1980: 178 [map]). Now, it is well known that Karkamis is included into the Hittite empire by Suppiluliumas I (1350-1322 BC) and from this time onwards produced inscriptions, more in specific seal legends, in the Luwian hieroglyphic script. However, already during the Middle Bronze Age the region of Karkamis was under the sway of a king with an IE Anatolian name, *Aplahandas*, who in turn was in contact with functionaries using the Luwian hieroglyphic script at the time (Özguç 1980: 82; Fig. III-17). As it seems, therefore, the region of Karkamis may well have been an integral part of the Luwian homeland from the very beginning, even though, if so, it evidently forms its eastern limit.

Outside the distribution zone of place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* are the regions of Troy in the northwest corner of Anatolia and Ḫapalla within the bend of the Saḫiriya or Sangarios river. Both these regions were counted by Muwatallis II (1295-1271 BC) among the four Arzawa lands, Mira-Kuwaliya, Seḫa-Appawiya, Ḫapalla, and Wilusa (Alaksandus-treaty § 17, see Latacz 2010: 165).

¹ Note that in Kaskan territory along the southern Pontic littoral there are some place-names in *-ss-*, but the only ones in *-nd-*, *Wistawanda* and *Ḫinariwanda* (von Schuler 1965: 102-103), are in *-wanda*, presumably, as we will see below, a separate category featuring a reflex of Luwian *wanta-* ‘mountain’ and attributable to Luwian population groups resettled by the Hittites in former Kaskan territory devastated by their incessant wars against the latter.

region	-ss-	-nd-
Lesbos	<i>Wanata₆sa</i>	
Arzawa	<i>Huwalus(iy)a</i>	<i>Puranda</i> <i>Arinnanda</i>
	<i>Mutamutassa</i>	<i>Millawanda</i>
	<i>Hursanassa</i>	<i>Iyalanda</i> <i>Waliwanda</i>
Lukka	<i>Kuwalapassa</i>	<i>Luwaⁿta</i> <i>Wiyawawanda</i>
Lower Land	<i>Tiwatassa (Mt.)</i> <i>Parnassa</i> <i>Nenassa</i>	<i>Lalanda</i>
Tarḫuntassa	<i>Pitassa</i>	<i>Naḫḫanta</i>
	<i>Ḫantassa</i>	<i>Ḫuwatnawanda (Mt.)</i>
	<i>Ḫadduassa</i>	<i>KuWarsuwanta</i>
	<i>Walistassa</i>	<i>Arlanda (Mt.)</i>
	<i>Paraiyassa</i>	<i>Sinuwanda</i>
	<i>Gurtanassa</i>	<i>Ḫassuwanta</i>
	<i>Watassa</i>	<i>Ḫarḫasuwanta</i> <i>Sarnanta</i> <i>Ḫassuwanta</i> <i>Mattarwanta</i> <i>Talwisuwanta</i> <i>Iyasanta</i>
Kizzuwatna		<i>Paduwanda</i> <i>Wiyawawanda</i>
Karkamis	<i>Urussa</i> <i>Terussa/Tarwaza</i>	

Table I. Place-names in -ss- and -nd- from Late Bronze Age Hittite cuneiform and Luwian hieroglyphic texts (in the main based on del Monte & Tischler 1978, Otten 1988, and del Monte 1992).¹

¹ I include *Huwalus(iy)a* in this overview because it corresponds to Classical *Kolossai*. *Luwaⁿta* (= Classical *Loanda*) and *Tarwaza* are only attested for Luwian hieroglyphic texts, Yalbut (§ 9) and the Ankara silver bowl (§ 2), see Woudhuizen 2015a: 15 and 17; on the silver bowl, see now Woudhuizen 2017b.

But, as I will argue in later on (see chapter 9), the language of the population of the region of Troy to all probability in the main falls outside the scope of the Luwian language group. As opposed to this, the region of Ḫapalla (< Luwian *ḫapa-* ‘river’) in the river land of the Sakarya and Porsuk most likely of origin formed an integral part of the Luwian homeland. In any case, in this region the town of Istanuwa is situated and the songs of Istanuwa as preserved in cuneiform Luwian texts of early date bear the testimony of a Luwian dialect distinct from Kizzuwatna Luwian (Yakubovich 2010: 22) which in my opinion (see chapter 8) is most adequately to be defined as the language of Arzawa—i.e. the language of the Arzawa lands with the exception of Wilusa. It seems likely, therefore, that the place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* are obliterated here by the incursion of Thracian and Phrygian population groups which started as early as 15th century BC. Note in this connection that according to Homeros (*Iliad* 3, 184-187) Phrygian troops headed by Otreus and Mygdon were already mustered along the banks of the Sangarios when Priamos was still able to fight himself, which means about a generation before the Trojan War of c. 1280 BC (Woudhuizen 2012a: 267).

However this may be, the Luwian nature of place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* can be further substantiated by linguistic evidence. First of all, the morpheme *-ss-* is no doubt related to adjectival *-s(s)-* which is a distinctive feature of all the extant Luwian dialects. To this comes that the roots of the place-names sometimes are patently Luwian, like in case of *Wiyawanda* (< Luwian *wiyana-* ‘wine’), *Tiwatassa* (< Luwian *Tiwata-* ‘sun-god’), *Tarḫuntassa* (< Luwian *Tarḫunt-* ‘storm-god’), *Pitassa* (< Luwian *pata-* ‘plain’), *Parnassa* (< Luwian *parna-* ‘house’), *Nenassa* (< Luwian *nana-* ‘brother’), and *Terussa* (< Luwian *taru-* ‘wood’). Finally, the toponyms characterised by the final element *wanda-* may well be distinct from the ones in *-nd-*, in any case this particular element is a reflex of Luwian *wanta-* ‘mountain’.

The distribution of place-names in *-ss-* and *-nd-* is not confined to western and southern Anatolia, but also includes Greece. As rightly pointed out by Laroche in his aforesaid studies, the Greek toponymic morphemes *-ss-* and *-nth-* (= Greek reflex of Anatolian *-nd-* or *-nt-*) are of Indo-European nature, but not Greek. In effect, this means that the place-names in question are to be attributed to a population group which inhabited Greece before the formation of the Greek ethnos took place. What is even more, this particular pre-Greek population group can positively be identified as Luwian. It follows from this line of reasoning that the Aegean with the islands (including Crete) and the Greek mainland of origin formed an integral part of the homeland of the Luwians.

The latter conclusion can be substantiated already by the Late Bronze Age sources. It so happens, namely, that place-names in *-ss-* and *-nth-*, or names or indications related to such place-names, feature in the Linear B texts from Knossos, Thebes, and Pylos dated between c. 1350 BC and c. 1200 BC as *termini ante quo*. An overview of the Linear B evidence is presented in Table II.

Now, this Linear B evidence has a bearing on southern and central Greece, including the islands of Euboia to the east and Zakynthos to the west. Of particular interest, however, is the fact that it also includes the island of Crete.

region	-ss-	-nth-
Hellespont		<i>pe-ri-te-u</i> ‘Perinthian’
Troas	<i>ru-na-so</i> ‘Lyrnessos’	<i>si-mi-te-u</i> ‘Sminthian’
Euboa		<i>a-ma-ru-to</i> ‘Amarynthos’
Argolis		<i>ti-ri-to</i> ‘*Tirynthos’
Ionian islands		<i>za-ku-si-ja</i> ‘Zakynthian’
Messenia	<i>ku-pa-ri-so</i> ‘Kyparissia’	<i>o-ru-ma-to</i> ‘Erymanthos’
Crete	<i>a-mi-ni-so</i> ‘Amnisos’	<i>da-pu₂-ri-to-jo</i> ‘of the Labyrinth’
	<i>ko-no-so</i> ‘Knossos’	<i>ku-ta-to</i> ‘*Gurtanthos’
	<i>tu-ri-so</i> ‘Tylissos’	<i>ra-su-to</i> ‘*Lasynthos’

Table II. Place-names in -ss- and -nth- or names related to such place-names from the Late Bronze Age Linear B texts (based on Ventris & Chadwick 1973: glossary, s.v.).

Here, namely, the Luwian nature of the place-names in -ss- and -nth- receives additional confirmation from the fact that the root sometimes is of a Luwian or IE Anatolian nature as well, as in case of *Tylissos* (< Hittite *tuliyā*- ‘assembly’) and *Labyrinthos* (< Lydian *labrus* ‘double-axe’). Finally, it deserves our attention in this connection that the relevant Linear B evidence also indicates Mycenaean Greek contacts with the region of the Hellespont (*Perinthos*) and the Troad (*Sminthē*, *Lyrnēssos*). In the latter instance, it should be noted that the place-names in question according to Homeros (*Iliad* 20, 92-96; 21, 86) are situated in the land of the *Leleges*, a Luwian population group (see further below) inhabiting the southern Troad also addressed by the poet as *Kilikēs* or *Cilicians* (*Iliad* 6, 397; 415; cf. Strabo, *Geography* 13, 1, 7). That Luwian influence indeed radiated to the north-Aegean as early as in the Late Bronze Age is further emphasised by Linear B *i-mi-ri-jo* ‘Imbrian’ (KN Db 1186)—the name of the island *Imbros* being related to cuneiform Luwian *immara/i*- ‘open country, wilderness’ and likewise showing a reflex of Proto-Indo-European (= PIE) *ǵ^him- ‘winter, snow’ characterised by the typical Luwian loss of the initial voiced velar *ǵ[ǵ].

After the Bronze Age, the typical Luwian place-names in -ss- and -nd- remained a productive factor in the toponymy of Anatolia as illustrated in our list of these place-names from the Classical period of Table III below. For the sake of emphasis, in this table the examples with a Late Bronze Age forerunner are rendered in bold type and those with a parallel in Greece in italic. In this manner on the one hand continuity from the Bronze to the Iron Age is visualised, whereas on the other hand the Aegean nature of this class of toponyms receives proper attention. The list is not a comprehensive one but only serves illustrative purposes and focuses on those examples of which the location is secured so that they can be put on the map (= our Fig. 1). Note that in the Classical period the eastern extremity of the distribution zone, the region of Karkamis, is no longer represented.

region	-ss-	-nd-
Troas	Assos Lyrnēssos (ru-na-so)	Sminthē (si-mi-te-u)
Mysia	Larissa	Kalandos
Lydia	Attanassos Korēssos Mykalēssos Myessos	Mormonda Salinda Puranda Diginda Ariandos Silandos Blaundos Isindos
W. Phrygia	Prymnessos Kidyessos Huwalusiya/Kolossai	Trokonda Lalanda/Lalandos
Caria	Iassos Mylasa Kasossos Alossos Halikarnassos Bybassos Hygassos	Iyalanda/Alinda Millawanda/Milete Labraunda Waliwanda/Alabanda Karyanda Kyllandos
Lycia	Telmēssos Karmylēssos Termēssos Habēssos Tyberissos Tragalassos Idebessos Akalissos	Kalynda Luwa"ta/Loanda Aloanda Kadyanda Wiyanawanda/Oinoanda Isinda Arykanda
Pisidia	Termēssos Ariassos Alassos Tymbrianassos Mylasa	Isinda Sibidunda Perminunda
Pamphylia	Kolybrassos	Aspendos

region	-ss-	-nd-
Lycaonia		Sinethandos Laranda
Cilicia	Marassa Adrassos Koropissos Kindyassos	Selindos Mysanda Kyinda Myriandos
Cappadocia	<i>Parnassa/Parnassos</i> <i>Nenassa/Nanassos</i> Aliassos	Rodandos Dasmenda Tzamandos <i>Paduwanda/Paduanodos</i> <i>Wiyanawanda/Oiniandos</i>

Table III. Place-names in -ss- and -nd- from Anatolia as recorded for sources from the Classical period (italic: paralleled for Greece; italic and bold: already attested in the Late Bronze Age sources; in the main based on Zgusta 1984).

A list of place-names in -ss- and -nth- from Greece as recorded for the Classical sources is presented in Table IV below. It deserves our attention that in this list the island of Cyprus is included. Further, it is remarkable that the island of Rhodes consistently shows -nd- and therefore in this sense actually belongs to the Anatolian sphere of influence. Conversely, the north-Aegean region, including *Sminthē* in the Troad from the previous list, consistently shows -nth- and therefore in its entirety should be grouped with the Greek side of the evidence.

region	-ss-	-nth-
Cyprus	Tamassos Lemessos Amamassos Tegessos	Melanthos Arabanda
Rhodes	Ialysos	Keskindos Kamyndos Erindos Lindos
Crete	<i>Karnēssopolis</i> <i>Knossos (ko-no-so)</i> <i>Amnisos (a-mi-ni-so)</i>	<i>Labyrinthos (da-pu₂-ri-to-jo)</i> Berekynthos <i>Pyranthos</i>

region	-ss-	-nth-
	Tylissos (tu-ri-so)	*Gurtanthos (ku-ta-to)
	Poikilassos	*Lasynthos (ra-su-to)
	Pyrgiotissa	Syrinthos
	Rhytiassos	Priansos (< *Prianthos)
Cyclades	Marpēssa	Lebinthos
	Korēssos	Prepesinthos
	Bolissos	
	Kaukasa	
		Greece
Laconia	Kardamylessos	
Argolis	Larissa	*Tirynthos (ti-ri-to)
		Saminthos
		Korinthos
Arcadia		Erymanthos
Ionian islands		Zakynthos (za-ku-si-ja)
Messenia	Kyparissia (ku-pa-ri-so)	
Attica	Kephissos	Probalinthos
	Ilissos	Trikorynthos
Euboia		Koskynthos
		Amarynthos (a-ma-ru-to)
		Kērinthos
Boiotia	<i>Mykalēssos</i>	
	Teumēssos	
	<i>Termēssos</i>	
	Kerēssos	
	Permēssos	
Phokis	Assos	
	Ambrossos	
	<i>Parnassos</i>	
	Kyparissos	
Locris	Amphissa	
Aetolia	Taphiassos	Arakynthos
Thessaly	Larissa	
Macedonia	Turissa	
Chalcidicè	Thyssos	Olynthos