

New archaeological discoveries in SE Europe and the origins of the Hittites

J. MAKKA Y (Budapest)

The ancient model of Hittite (and Luwian) origin has one paradigm, that of the possible diffusion of language and culture through conquest. At present, this theory goes against the dominant trend in archaeology that stresses indigenous developments, reflected, for example, in Hittite prehistory by the model of autochthonous origin¹. This short study will not focus on the competition between the conquest and the autochthonous model². P. Taracha's short article clearly shows that the archaeological evidence from the Early Bronze Age of Anatolia is inadequate for determining whether the Hittites and the Luwians were natives [from their cradles or from immemorial times] or intruders. In his view the Hattians were the natives of Anatolia who may originally have inhabited much larger territories in the south than is attested in the Hittite texts, which might also explain the non-Indo-European place name of Kanish. This Hattian civilization would be traceable in the archaeological record during the whole EBA. Later on, the northwestern and, primarily, the southwestern and southern parts of the Hattian "world" were infiltrated by Indo-European tribes - including the Hittites, the Palaeans and the Luwians. Among these, the Hittites were the first to adopt Hattian "civilization" and thus to become its heirs. The limitations of the evidence do not make it possible to infer the date of the Hittites' "arrival". In any case, their presence in the "Land of Hatti" proper as early as the second half of the 3rd millennium BC cannot be entirely excluded³. In the following our starting assumption shall be that the Indo-Europeans of Anatolia (i.e. the speakers of Common Anatolian) - or in any case, those groups that can be traced in the archaeological record at the turn of the 3rd and 2nd millennia BC and whose presence is also supported by the linguistic evidence - were not natives, but intruders.

A. Seebold has outlined the two conflicting and presently irreconcilable views on the degree of language relationship of Hittite to other IE dialects.

According to the first, the Hittite of the first half of the 2nd millennium reflects an archaic stage of development that would suggest a direct origin from a pre-Indo-European so-called Indo-Hittite proto-language. This assumption corresponds to the sister language theory; however, a date in the early 2nd millennium cannot be reconciled either with the current high or middle dating of prehistory or Indo-European linguistics, irrespective of whether an autochthonous or intrusive model is accepted. The alternative theory is that Hittite (or Common Anatolian) was a daughter language derived from the Indo-European parent language and that Hittite had lost certain linguistic categories such as the pre-separation archaic common innovations. Viewed in this light, a number of similarities between Hittite and German are indeed striking and these archaic characteristics can, in consequence, be linked to their early separation from the continuum of the parent language and/or to their peripheral position. German would thus be seen as an especially archaic Indo-European tongue (that either separated out at a very early date or came into a peripheral position) that would originally have been a dialect very close to Hittite⁴.

H. Wagner has invoked Ancient Near Eastern, Caucasian, Hatti, Hurrian and even Sumerian influences for explaining the differences between Hittite and the other Indo-European dialects, and has suggested its intrusion from the east on the basis of these influences and other, no less daring assumptions.⁵ The northern (Pontic) and western (Balkan) immigration route has been similarly rejected by some critics of Wagner.⁶

In his excellent study O. Szemerényi has commemorated Emil O. Forrer, who has unfortunately long since been forgotten, and who can be seen as the father of the Indo-Hittite theory. He convincingly points out that this assumption can be currently seen to gain increasing ground in the research on the origins of the Indo-European tongues of Anatolia. "The last fifteen

years have seen a widespread revival of Forrer's basic idea. It may have been just an isolated phenomenon that Yale's Warren Cowgill ... was prepared to embrace wholeheartedly Sturtevant's Indo-Hittite theory. But a fair number of scholars are now ready to view the early (pre)history of Indo-European in much the same light. In this the Hittite separated out from the common stock at an early date (perhaps before 5000 BC?) so that (what was to become) Indo-Iranian and Greek evolved subsequently into the type of IE traditionally accepted as such. Meid, Neu, Adrados, Georgiev all share this basic approach. And it is worth noting that this variant was presented by the Polish scholar Tadeusz Milewski some 50 years ago already."⁷ Obviously, a date around 5000 for the separation of Hittite offers considerably more opportunities for an archeological approach to this issue, but it does, at the same time, involve risks of dead ends and becoming hopelessly lost in the often bewildering maze of archaeological cultures. Criticizing Renfrew's well-known thesis, Szemerényi noted that "Renfrew is of course aware that other, non-Indo-European languages are also present in the area, in particular speakers of Hattic..., but, he [sc. Renfrew] says, 'there seems to be no way of telling which was *earlier* - Hittite or Hattic'. But this is again a quite impossible interpretation [by Renfrew] of the facts which clearly show that Hattic was a language present before the Hittites". Szemerényi goes on to quote Diakonoff's view that "it is not true that it is *unknown* which of the two languages is older, Hattic or Hittite, because there are a number of Hattic substratum words in Hittite, but no Hittite or other Indo-European substratum words in Hattic"⁸. Szemerényi also remarks that Harmatta had noted as early as 1964 that "since Hittite had no agreements with Greek, nor with Aryan, we must conclude that the Hittites had not migrated to Asia Minor, but had been there from the start". I should add, however, that in the latter part of his article, he [Harmatta] recognized some agreements with Pelasgic, and therefore assumed that the Hittite group was still in the Balkans in the 3rd millennium BC"⁹. In fact, it is not entirely clear from Harmatta's quoted article¹⁰ what the expression "*from the start*" actually denotes, even though his other studies¹¹ make it very clear that he was thinking of the Upper Palaeolithic.

In terms of the Nostratic (Eurasianic) hypothesis M. Rühlen has accurately noted that "with respect to Indo-European, the great divergence of the Anatolian branch from the rest of Indo-European points to a

homeland in Anatolia, as emphasized by Dolgopolsky, which matches the point of origin of the spread of agriculture into Europe through Greece and the Balkans"¹². According to Dolgopolsky "the habitat of Early pIE should be sought in Anatolia, while that of Late pIE (ancestral to all the IE languages except Hittite-Luwian) is most likely to have been located somewhere in the Balkan peninsula. It is up to archaeological scholars to determine whether pIE is to be associated with one of the Neolithic cultures of Anatolia and with the diffusion of Neolithic to the Balkan peninsula (the Starčevo-Karanovo-Criş-Körös-Sesklo complex, i.e. part of Gimbutas' "Old European" civilization)"¹³. Accordingly, on Renfrew's hypothetical map, a direct migration leads from the supposed Indo-European homeland in Anatolia to the earliest Neolithic cultures of Thrace and thence, through the Körös culture, to the Linear Pottery territory, and directly to Elsloo¹⁴. This can lead to a total confusion since this complex issue cannot be resolved on the basis of M. Gimbutas' amateurish ideas, especially if one is not entirely familiar with the intricacies of the general similarities and genetic differences between the types of the Körös-Starčevo complex and the Linear Pottery. The evaluation and understanding of this issue is all the more difficult since each and every branch of the Linear Pottery evolved under Körös influences, but, at the same time, research in the border region between these two complexes that lies in Hungary has shown that there are basic differences between these two cultural complexes¹⁵.

E. Masson has recently devoted two books to the strong links or similarities between Hittite and southern Slavic especially Serbian and, in part, Bulgarian religious tradition which in her view can be traced to like genetic origins (probably Indo-European)¹⁶. And although, curiously enough, she finds this Slavic connection to be stronger than in the case of other links between Hittite and other traditions of the Indo-European dialects, she nonetheless postulates the intrusion of the Indo-European dialects into Anatolia from the east¹⁷. Assuming an intrusion from the east, the scene of the adjacent habitation of a very early Proto-Slavic and Proto-Hittite lay somewhere to the east of the Volga and the Caspian Sea, a notion that runs counter to all the evidence on Proto-Slavic.

It is clear from this brief survey that the origins of the Indo-European dialects of Anatolia have not been resolved yet. Neither can the date, the direction or the

nature of their migration and arrival (diffusion or intrusion) if an external origin is assumed. An external intrusion could equally well have originated from the east, the northeast, the north or the northwest. It is not entirely clear whether the advocates of a particular theory have considered in depth to what extent their pet hypothesis calls for, or allows, widely differing conclusions regarding early contacts between Hittite and Luwian, and the other Indo-European dialects (such as Proto-Greek, Proto-Thracian, Proto-Slavic, Old Iranian, Indo-Aryan and Proto-Armenian) and the dialects of other parent tongues (such as Sumerian, Old Assyrian and Elamian). If a native origin is presumed, the archaeological and even the linguistic evidence is mute prior to the 2nd millennium BC or it can, at the most, be linked to one or more ethnic groups (primarily the Hattians) who, although important factors on the Hittite scene, can hardly be seen as speaking an Indo-European tongue or being of Indo-European stock.

In the following I shall take as my starting point the assumption that the Indo-European dialects were intruders in Anatolia (and this assumption is independent of where the Indo-European proto-homeland originally lay). An external expansion which in the case of Hittite ultimately led to military and political power (even though the Hurrian element remained dominant in the religious sphere and became increasingly dominant in the Imperial period) must by all means be linked to *weapons*. The economic and commercial aspects can for our purposes be neglected since the *karums* of Cappadocia and eastern Anatolia were controlled by the Assyrians in the early 2nd millennium and thus the Hittites or the Luwians could hardly have expanded *westwards* through trade. Neither can an expansion from the east through trade be assumed in the latter half of the 3rd millennium BC, not to speak of the fact that the currently known sources are silent as to the possible presence of Indo-Europeans, or proto-Hittites east of the Euphrates at any time during the 3rd millennium BC. Weapons suitable for a military conquest were already current in Central Anatolia by the turn of the 4th and 3rd millennia, as shown by the Malatya hoard, dated to around 3000 BC, and other find assemblages¹⁸. These weapons can hardly be associated with Indo-Europeans arriving from the east. The two shaft-hole axes, a shaft-hole crescentic axe, two long swords and eight daggers of the hoard from the region of Sakçagözü¹⁹ with the swords and daggers dating into the early part of the Middle Bronze Age are not of an

Anatolian type. Their close parallels are to be found in northern Syria and the Levant, and thus neither can these weapon types be linked to the arrival of the Indo-Europeans to Anatolia either in terms of their parallels or their date.

In connection with weapons, the intrusion of the Indo-Europeans and Gimbutas' still fashionable proposal, known as the *Kurgan theory*, I would like to quote a longer passage from Childe's book, *The Aryans*, which seems to have escaped scholarly attention. Even though Gimbutas has never expressly quoted this passage it would appear that she drew the inspiration for her theory from here. "Troy no longer seems the Asiatic root of an European culture, but a branch of an European stem pushed across the Straits... The Trojan kings wielded as symbols of their power heavy battle-axes of noble stones, ... Such clumsy weapons ... in the rest of the Aegean area, in southern Asia Minor and in Mesopotamia ... are virtually unknown. But in Europe from the Volga to the Rhine they are scattered about in profusion and all the varied Trojan types are there represented. These European axes in Troy cannot (as I once thought) be explained by trade. ... Surely they are monuments of an intrusion from Europe of a people accustomed in a wilder environment to swing mighty hammers. And it is precisely this element which distinguishes the civilization of north-western Asia Minor from the general "Asiatic" cultural background to which it was so deeply indebted. ... And so the Troad and its hinterland becomes part of the great European battle-axe province extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea²⁰. Obviously, we have no way of knowing what language was spoken in Troy at the time that Priam's treasure was buried (Troy IIg), even though C. Watkins has noted that although "we do not know when the Anatolian Indo-European speakers entered Anatolia; nor do we know whether they entered from the east or the west. ... What we do know is that the Hittites were already in situ by the nineteenth century BC. ... This makes it very likely that the Indo-European Anatolians immigrated before 2000. Recall that according to Blegen, Troy VI ushers in the Middle Bronze Age 'shortly after 2000 B.C.', when in his words 'People of a new stock, who brought the horse, took over the Citadel'. [*The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd ed. 1970, pp.1097-1098.] That sounds like speakers of an Indo-European language, whether or not one of the Anatolian branch and whether or not

third millennium Troy was Indo-European speaking. ... My first working hypothesis is that their language in the second millennium was of the Indo-European family²¹". Even accepting this assumption does not automatically mean that groups, or perhaps an élite, speaking an Indo-European tongue inhabited Troy and adjacent areas in the early or mid-3rd millennium. Conversely, linking the appearance of an élite of this kind in the Troy II period or slightly before it, to the appearance of a single - symbolic - weapon type, battle axes fashioned from precious material would rightly raise scepticism. As I have already pointed out, the nordic or steppic Kurgan invasion theory, linked to the appearance of battle-axes, rests on very shaky foundations indeed²². K.Bittel and H.Otto noted as early as 1939 that there is no need to invoke sweeping population movements as an explanation for the appearance of battle-axes in Asia Minor²³.

The same holds true for the distribution of another early weapon type. I have shown elsewhere that influences from the northeastern Balkans, from the Lower Danube area and from the northwestern Pontic can be readily noted in Central Anatolia and in Cappadocia during the Eneolithic of South-East Europe (the Karanovo V-VI - Tripolye A-B - Precucuteni II-III phases). The evidence comes from certain pottery types, architectural features, distinctive ritual practices in connection with burials, in distinctive sanctuary types (with the sacred column), in figurine arts and from certain products of the earliest gold metallurgy²⁴. It is also possible that the infiltration of the intruders speaking a Proto-Hittite and Proto-Luwian [or still Common Anatolian] tongue was in part promoted by a very early weapon type, the *short thrusting dagger*²⁵, whose earliest appearance perhaps under southern influences can be dated slightly after the Karanovo VI - Tripolye BI period, for the earliest specimens have been found in Tripolye BII and Bodrogkeresztúr II contexts²⁶. This latter period coincides with the eve of the western and southwestern Yamna expansion, even though the dagger type itself cannot be exclusively associated with the Usatovo and Pit-grave population groups for the earliest specimens do not occur among their finds. The distribution of these copper daggers shows an even scatter from the western confines of the Carpathian Basin to the Dnieper river and Thrace. Nonetheless, these daggers cannot be directly linked to an Indo-European infiltration into Anatolia in part because they are at least younger by one phase than the

Precucuteni II-III traits that can be demonstrated in the ceramic inventory and in part because typologically they differ strongly from those Anatolian daggers which would be linked to such an assumed intrusion: from the daggers found in various layers of the İkiztepe site, from the Küçükhöyük daggers found near Bozüyük and from other, nearly contemporaneous Anatolian daggers²⁷. Consequently those warriors who fought with these South-East European Eneolithic daggers did not, at least according to the presently available evidence, cross over into Anatolia. The distribution territory in itself excludes that they could be responsible for the Proto-Hittite and Proto-Luwian expansion since the territory extending from the Vienna woods to the Dnieper is in itself far too vast for a hypothetical late homeland of the Anatolian Indo-European groups could, however, have lain somewhere in this roughly 1 million square kilometres large area.

Concerning this issue A.I. Jones' estimates have led to some interesting conclusions. His estimates indicate that Hittite has been misplaced. The interlanguage similarities calculated from his model gives distances for Hittite based on relocating it at the geographical centre of the other [Indo-European] language groups. This would place it notionally above the Lower Danube, about 100 km northeast of Bucharest, but it is not suggested that Hittite had its origin in that area, as Bonfante had thought [?]. Rather, it would mean that Hittite was not an Indo-European language in the same sense as the others, but related to the Indo-European group as a whole (the Indo-Hittite hypothesis proposed by Forrer and later Sturtevant in 1933), with the provision that the Anatolian languages must represent an older divergence from an as yet undifferentiated Indo-European stock²⁸. In fact, there is no mention of a Lower Danubian homeland for the Anatolian Indo-European tongues in Bonfante's quoted article²⁹, but he does emphasize that Anatolian shows some very important connections with Slavic. At the same time, an area lying some 100 km to the northeast of Bucharest coincides exactly with the Cucuteni-Tripolye distribution territory, and the sherds found at Güzelyurt in fact recall the Precucuteni II-III pottery. The coincidence of these two independent lines of reasoning can hardly be mere chance.

Links with an ancient Proto-Slavic can also be demonstrated. Derivatives and reflexes that can be traced to a **per-* + *-k*³⁰ + *u* IE parent language root can be demonstrated in at least nine, but perhaps even

eleven Indo-European dialects. These include Hittite *pirua-*, *perua-* > *perunaš* or *pi-ru-na-aš*, the Hittite word for 'cliff' and 'rock', and Slavic *Perun*, "Thunder God". In their meaning, the other potential cognates range from 'pine' to 'oak', to 'oak forest', to 'forested mountains' and to 'deities of oak and thunder'³⁰. E.C. Polomé has succinctly summarized this complicated issue as follows: "The unifying theme, here, is obviously the thunderbolt striking oak trees, as well as rocks and boulders, a motif recurrent in Indo-European myth and folklore. ... An interesting feature of the Slavic *Perun* .. is that he was armed with a club. ... The folklore tradition about *Perun* makes it plausible to consider him as the Slavic representative of the Indo-European thunder-god, also associated with the warrior function"³¹. *Perun*'s attribute was in fact a double-edged axe, that in the time of the proto-historic Slavs (in the first centuries AD may equally well have been a hammer axe)³², in fact, ever since the Proto-Slavs appeared on the scene this axe was generally an axe form characterizing the given period that, moreover, lingered on in accordance with the nature of religious traditions, much in the same way as the axes held by the male figures depicted on reliefs of Hasanlu bronze vessels or on the Scythian period vessels from the řastij and Kelermeř Kurgans that had since long gone out of use and can in two cases perhaps be identified as stone axes³³. There is also evidence that during his excavations in the Majkop region N.J. Veselovsky found an iron sceptre surmounted by a stone axe in one of the Scythian period burials³⁴, which would explain why some of the lavish Varna burials, such as cenotaph grave 4, contained stone axe terminalled sceptres and why some of the Late Hittite reliefs depict sceptres topped with stone axes. Some of the gold mounted sceptres from the royal burials at Alaca Höyük too were surmounted by archaic copper axes³⁵. The axes of semiprecious stone from treasure "L" of Troy had probably adorned similar royal sceptres³⁶, not to speak of the Dorak axes. And while the ethnic background of the ceremonial weapons from Troy remains uncertain (even if the possibility that they had been in the possession of speakers of an Indo-European tongue), the sceptres from Alaca Höyük could equally have been symbols of power and royalty wielded by either Hattian or proto-Hittite kings (the latter being a possibility that now seems more plausible also for us)³⁷. What is certain is that the EB II burials from Alaca Höyük perhaps mark a centre that from the mid-2nd millennium BC

acted as the centre of the Hittite kingdom. The early Hittite conquerors may simply have occupied and seized control over this centre and the territory of an earlier, Hattian dynasty of the EBA II-III period. Crossland is undeniably right in asserting that "the rulers of ... Alaca Höyük certainly appear to have had cultural traits which are strongly reminiscent of those of later Indo-European-speaking aristocracies. ... But unless intelligible documents are found there we cannot be sure that they spoke an IE language"³⁸.

It is very likely, then, that the oft-recurring 'golden axe' of the Hittite texts actually denoted a sceptre which since the EBA II was the royal symbol of Central Anatolian sovereigns and later also of Hittite kings, who inherited it from rulers buried at places like Alaca Höyük. It is more than conspicuous that the name of the male, the 'equestrian counterpart' of Ishtar was *Pirwa*, *Perwa*, and *Peruwa* and that this name can be related to Hittite *peruna-*, 'rock' which is probably of an Indo-European origin, and derived from a reconstructed root **per-*. According to one Hittite text Ishtar's male counterpart holds a golden axe in his hand³⁹. This again underlines the connection between Slavic *Perun* and Hittite *peruna-*, even if contacts between a very early Proto-Slavic and Proto-Hittite can only be postulated prior to 2000 BC, with a contact zone lying neither in Anatolia, nor in Central Asia or east of the Volga, but somewhere between the Dnieper and the Eastern Carpathians, to the north or northwest of the Pontic, adjacent to a probable Slavic homeland between the Dnieper, the Carpathians and the Vistula. This is further corroborated by the fact that the name and figure of *Perun* also has contacts with Iranian⁴⁰ since the steppe east of the Dnieper was inhabited by the Proto-Iranians by the Cucuteni-Tripolye period. One description of Hittite *Perunaš* also features the Luwian word *maldani*, that probably corresponds to Hittite *malatt-*, 'weapon'= Old Church Slavic *mlat*, 'axe, hammer-axe'⁴¹. *Perun* and *Perunaš* are thus strongly linked not only etymologically, but also by sceptres that were occasionally surmounted by archaic axe types, perhaps even by stone axes.

Conversely, one part of the archaeological evidence points to Proto-Iranian and Old Iranian. The *lahanzana*-birds of Hittite funerary sacrifices are reminiscent of the bird sacrifices found in the steppic Pit-grave Yamna burials, and in the burials of the Majkop complex⁴². Similarly, the wider circle of similarities between the Anatolian EBA II and the Majkop complex includes the

bird claws from the Majkop burial, as well as the bronze claws of the Anatolian EBA II. A recent study of the Alaca metal types has shown that a part of the claw-like hooks from Alaca had probably been used in ceremonies involving funerary meals, such as the hanging of the sacrificial birds on the wooden walls of the timber-built graves⁴³. This is again reminiscent of the hooks (and, probably, also claws) found in the Majkop burials that most likely served to hang birds (or fowls) onto the wall of the burial chamber⁴⁴. The survival of this custom on the enormously big Old Iranian territory is reflected by the claws of sheet gold that hung on the walls of the burial chamber of a priest excavated in the Middle Yenisei region, and dated to the Scythian Age⁴⁵. As for the Hittite archaeological finds, we know that the names of certain Hittite cult functionaries can be linked to animal names. These cult functionaries probably wore animal masks. For the time being, only male figures wearing eagle or griffin masks can be archaeologically attested⁴⁶, as well as a mythical hybrid beast that had an eagle's beak, a rabbit's nose, a human body and claws on its feet⁴⁷. Certain Hittite festival texts recount ceremonial processions in the course of which certain cult functionaries, the *hapiya*-men appear with animal attributes, such as the lion. Unfortunately, only one single part of the long list of attributes can be well understood: "*15 teeth of reed pigs*" - the rest appear to have been metal attachments, as well as studs and clasps of gold, silver, copper, iron and rock crystal⁴⁸. One interesting analogue that springs to mind is that in Schleswig-Holstein, on the Proto-German territory, bear claws were occasionally placed into burials from the Mesolithic to the Late Bronze Age⁴⁹.

Other Hittite customs and the archaeological finds that can be associated with these customs can also be linked to Germanic, another member of the Old [Northwestern IE] European dialect group. In one Hittite text (KUB XXIX 1 I 50 and II 1-8 = *CTH* 414), recording a dialogue between the throne and the eagle, two goddesses are mentioned, *Istustaya* and *Papaya*, sitting in a forest glade near the sea, one holding a spindle, the other a comb and a mirror⁵⁰. These two goddesses have been likened to the Old Nordic Norns, goddesses of fate, who sit on the banks of the river Urdborn, and spend their time spinning⁵¹. Spindles made of precious substances such as gold or ivory, as well as of bronze, have been found in EB II contexts at Alaca Höyük, Horoztepe, Merzifon and Karataş⁵². In

some Hittite texts the spindle - Hittite *tijari* - was the attribute of a female deity, and the act of spinning was part of a cult ceremony⁵³ that can thus be called as *ritual spinning*. The most important aspect of possible links between the various goddesses of fate, who turn the spindle, such as the Moirae, the Parcae, the Norns and Germanic Urth, as well as a conjecturable Hurrian/Hittite goddess whose attribute was a spindle, i.e. whether they can be traced to a common, Indo-European source or whether they have dialectal origins, is when the hypothetical late Indo-European dialectal continuum separated into dialect groups. If this *separation* occurred before the practice of weaving and spinning gained currency, a common Indo-European source for this custom can hardly be postulated; these religious customs can then be seen as being of dialectal origins, with their interconnections developing at a later date. The earliest evidence for spinning from the Balkans and from the Carpathian Basin comes from the Körös period of the Early Neolithic and thus a *separation* needs to have occurred before the Körös period. The fact that spindles, often made of silver, are frequently deposited in Scythian burials of the Pontic region, - and that a magic-ritual, rather than a day to day significance is attributed to this custom⁵⁴ - , might have some significance in terms of a dialectal diffusion. Herodotus (IV, 34) recounts that on Delos young girls used to place a lock of their hair, wound around a spindle, on the grave of Hyperborean virgins (probably Scythians) who had died.

The as yet unappraised data mentioned in the above has not brought us much closer to the localization of the Proto-Hittite - Proto-Luwian late or transitional homeland. The evidence would point to an area which was adjacent to the south-eastern zone of the Old European dialect group [which latter ultimately evolved into Proto-Slavic] - , and, moreover, that lay relatively far from the supposed Proto-Greek homeland or was isolated from it (e.g. by the Carpathians)⁵⁵. There would have been some contact with the Proto-Iranians, even if these contacts, at least according to the linguistic evidence, were rather superficial. This homeland also needs to chronologically precede the Pit-grave expansion. The early periods of the Cucuteni-Tripolye complex fits the bill well, except for the weak contact with Proto-Iranian, for the Cucuteni-Tripolye complex had, for quite a long period of time, bordered on the Pre-Yamna distribution territory, and strong interrelations can be demonstrated between them. The

best solution would be to consider only the western Cucuteni-Tripolye distribution; however, this complex cannot be divided into an eastern and a western palaeoethnic and palaeolinguistic province on the currently available evidence. Conversely, the Hamangia culture, distributed in the northwestern Balkanic area in question, is another possible candidate with its archaic traits that differ from all other neighbouring archaeological cultures, for it would meet both the chronological and territorial requirements, for instance that of the early separation of the Proto-Anatolian group. Unfortunately, the distinctive finds and customs reviewed in the above are lacking from the Hamangia finds. Even so, the possibility outlined in this study for determining Hittite-Luwian origins can, as I do hope, by all means be considered as one possible alternative.

NOTES

1. The present author is an advocate of autochthonous development and only considers external influences if they can be convincingly documented. A *change* in itself is insufficient ground.

2. For a brief review of alternative models, see Piotr Taracha: Hittites in Alaca Höyük? An old question reconsidered. *ArchPol*, 29, 1991, 71-78, and J. Makkay: Pottery links between the Late Neolithic cultures of the NW Pontic and Anatolia, and the origins of the Hittites. *Anatolica* XIX, Special Issue, *Anatolia and the Balkans*, Istanbul 1993, 122-125.

3. *Ibid.*, 76-77.

4. E. Seebold: Die Konstituierung des Germanischen in sprachlicher Sicht. Germanenprobleme in heutiger Sicht. Edited by H. Beck. Berlin-New York 1986, 172-173.

5. Das Hethitische vom Standpunkt der typologischen Sprachgeographie. Pisa 1985, *Testi Linguistici* 7, *passim*.

6. Indogermanische Chronik 31b. *Die Sprache* 31, 1985, 312-314.

7. Hounded out of Academe ... : The sad fate of a genius. *Studi di Storia e di Filologia Anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, a cura di Fiorella Imparati. Firenze 1988, 263-265, with further literature, esp. his Recent developments in Indo-European linguistics. *JPhSoc* 83, 1985, 44-50, on the stratification of PIE.

8. See note 9, p. 161. I. M. Diakonoff in *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 9, 1988, 85.

9. O. Szemerényi: Concerning Professor Renfrew's views on the Indo-European homeland. *JPhSoc* 87, 1989, 161.

10. The prehistory of the Greek language. AUSBCL 3, 1975, 4-10 (paper originally delivered on October 18, 1965 (!) in Athens).

11. Hamatta's brief articles have only been published in Hungarian: Az indoeurópai őshaza problémája és az őskőkorkutatás [The problems of the Indo-European homeland and Palaeolithic research]. *AT*, 13, 1966, 246-248, and Az indoeurópai népek régi telep: élésterületei és vándorlása [The ancestral homelands of the

Indo-Europeans and their migrations] *MTAK* 27, 1971, 318-324, and his *Európa nyelvei és népcsoportjai a középső palaeolitikumban* [The languages and peoples of Europe in the Middle Palaeolithic]. *AT*, 32, 1985-1986, 244-248.

12. C. Renfrew: Before Babel: speculation on the origins of linguistic diversity. *Arch Journ*, 1, 1993, 12. A. Dolgopolsky: The Indo-European homeland and lexical contact of Proto-Indo-European with other languages. *Mediterranean Language Review* 3, 1988, 13, with reference to his earlier articles.

13. *Op. cit.*, 26.

14. Renfrew, *op. cit.*, 13, Fig. 5.

15. For details, see J. Makkay: A Neolithic model of Indo-European prehistory. *JIES* 20, 1992, 200-212, and The Linear Pottery and the Early Indo-Europeans. *Proto-Indo-European: the archaeology of a linguistic problem*. Studies in honor of Marija Gimbutas. Washington 1987, 165-184. Recent research has shown that a stone industry differing markedly from that of the Körös culture can be demonstrated from the Late Mesolithic in the Middle Tisza valley directly to the north of the Körös distribution, which again underlines a point made in our earlier articles, namely that the Körös culture and the Linear Pottery were two distinct, even if adjacent, cultural complexes and that subsequent language developments in both territories can be ultimately traced to these Neolithic bases. For archaeological details see R. Kertész: Data to the Mesolithic of the Great Hungarian Plain. *Tisicum*, 1993, 81-104, and Late Mesolithic chipped stone industry from the site Jásztelek I. *Von der Steinzeit bis zum Mittelalter*. Studien zum 60. Geburtstag von O. Trogmayer. Szeged 1994, 23-45.

16. *Les douze dieux de l'immortalité. Croyances indo-européennes à Yazılıkaya*. Paris, 1989, and *Le combat pour l'immortalité. Héritage indo-européen dans la mythologie anatolienne*. Paris, 1991.

17. *Op. cit.*, 1989, Fig. on p. 4, and 136-137.

18. A. Palmieri: Excavations at Arslantepe (Malatya). *Anat.St.* 31, 1981, 101-109, and Figs. 3-4. M. Frangipane: Early developments of metallurgy in the Near East. *Studi di Paleontologia in onore di S.M. Puglisi*. Roma, 1985, 216-218, Fig. 5, 16-20. C. Caneva - M. Frangipane - A.M. Palmieri: I metalli di Arslantepe nel quadro dei più antichi sviluppi della metallurgia vicino-orientale. *qRS*, 112, Roma 1985, 115-137, Fig. 1.

19. G.D. Summen: Metalwork in Gaziantep Museum. *Anat.St.* 41, 1991, 173-195.

20. V.G. Childe: *The Aryans*. London, 1926, 132-135.

21. Calvert Watkins: The language of the Trojans. In *Troy and the Trojan war*. Ed. by Machteld J. Mellink. Bryn Mawr, 1986, 50.

22. J. Makkay, *Acta Arch.Hung.* 42, 1990, 357-358, and *Acta Arch.Hung.* 46, 1995, in press.

23. *Demircihöyük*. Berlin, 1939, 34.

24. J. Makkay *op. cit.* in *Anatolica*, XIX, 1993, 122-125. - J. Makkay: Funerary sacrifices of the Yamna - complex and their Anatolian (Hittite) and Aegean (Mycenaean and Homeric) parallels. *Acta Arch.Hung.* 44, 1992, 213-237. - J. Makkay: Comparisons of some Chalcolithic and EBA types from Anatolia, the Aegean and the SE Balkans. In *Ancient Macedonia, Fifth International Symposium*,

vol.2, Thessaloniki, 1993, 821-830. - J.Makkay: The most ancient gold and silver in Central and South - East Europe. In *Découverte du métal*, ed. by J.P.Mohen and Chr. Éluère. Paris, 1991, 119-129, with further literature. - J.Makkay: Opferposten in Gebäuden und Opfergaben in oder neben Pfostenlöchern. *Acta Arch.Hung.* 40, 1988, 3-16.

25. J.Makkay op.cit. in *Anatolica*, XIX, 1993, 124.

26. I.Vajsov: Die frühesten Metalledolche Südost - und Mitteleuropas. *PZ* 68, 1993, 103-145, and Fig.1.

27. Önder Bilgi: Metal objects from İkiztepe-Turkey. *BAVA* 6, 1984, Figs.7-13, and also by him: Metal objects from İkiztepe-Turkey. *BAVA* 9-10, 1990, Figs.3-12 and 14-15. G.Gürkan - J.Seeker: Die frühbronzezeitliche Nekropole von Küçükhöyük bei Bozüyük. *Ist.Mitt.* 41, 1991, 92., Abb.23, 2,3,5. - Ç.Anlagen - Ö.Bilgi: *Weapons of the protohistoric age*. Istanbul, 1989., 25-37: daggers. The typological differences between the relevant types are clear, therefore there is no need here for a detailed description.

28. Language and archaeology: evaluating competing explanations of the origins of Indo-European languages. *JIES* 20, 1992, 41 and 43.

29. The relative position of Indo-European languages. *JIES* 15, 1987, 77-80.

30. Cf. J.Makkay: Äxte und Beile als Machtsymbole und Götterwaffen. *Acta Arch.Hung.* 40, 1988, 16-17, with further literature. Also by him: Archaeological examples of gold-masked statue and mace. *Orientalia* 56, 1987, 70-71. To the question of Hittite *peruna* see recently V.Haas: Das Pferd in der hethitischen Überlieferung. *Die Indogermanen und das Pferd*. Festschrift Berrfried Schlerath. Budapest, 1994, 79.

31. E.C. Polomé: The Slavic gods and the Indo-European heritage. *Festschrift für Nikola R.Pribič*. Neuried, 1985, 546-547.

32. V.P. Darkevič: Topor kak symbol Pruna v drev'neruskom jazičestve. *SovArch* 1961:4, 91-102.

33. G.N. Kuročkin: Bogin'as' zerkalom i geroi s sekiroi. *Skifia i Bospor*. Novočerkassk, 1993, 76, Fig.2, 1-3.

34. J. Janko, *AE* 34, 1900, 134.

35. J. Makkay op.cit. *Orientalia* 56, 1987, 71-72, and also by him op.cit. *Acta Arch.Hung.* 40, 1988, 18-20: reliefs from Zircirtli, Yazilikaya and Malatya. - In addition to battle axes made of semiprecious stones copper axe - adzes were also found in earlier levels of Troy during excavations of Schliemann which find their exact parallels in axe - adzes of the Bodrogkeresztúr culture: H.Schliemann: *Atlas trojanischer Altertümer*. Leipzig, 1874, Taf. 69, 1535 and Taf. 99, 2195, and p.25.

36. H. Schmidt: *Heinrich Schliemann's Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer*. Berlin, 1902, 242-243, Nos. 6055-6058. Cf. J. Makkay op.cit. *Acta Arch.Hung.* 40, 1988, 20, esp. note 29 with reference to a Hittite source mentioning a part of a gold weapon made of *lapis lazuli* which clearly refers to an axe made of noble stone like the lapis lazuli axe from Troy.

37. J. Makkay: Hittite sources and archaeological finds: a short review. *X. Türk Tarih Kongresi, 1986, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, I. Ankara, 1990, 531-532, note 2.

38. Recent re-appraisal of evidence for the chronology of the differentiation of Indo-European. In *The first arrival of Indo-European elements in Greece*. Athens, 1972, 55.

39. L. Rost: "Zu den hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen, I. *MIO* 8:2, 1961, 175.

40. H.-D. Pohl: Historische slawische Sprachwissenschaft seit 1945. *Krytalos* 22, 1977, 8.

41. Ibid. 29.

42. J. Makkay: Funerary sacrifices of the Yamna-complex, op.cit. *Acta Arch.Hung.* 44, 1992, 216, 226 and 234.

43. A. Nejat Bilgen: The importance of Alacahöyük's early Bronze Age metal artefacts to the Anatolian archaeology. In *Essays on archaeology in honour of Hiroshi Shiomi*. Tokyo, 1992, 1008.

44. For further details see J. Makkay: *The Tiszazsölös treasure*. Budapest, 1989, 65, notes 359-360, and 73, note 412.

45. G.N. Kurochkin: The discovery of a rich priest's tomb of the Siberian Scythians. *Arch.Vest.* 1, Sankt Petersburg, 1992, 101.

46. H.Th. Bossert: *Janus und der Mann mit der Adler - oder Greifenmaske*. Istanbul, 1959, passim.

47. Sedat Alp: *Zylinder - und Stempelsiegel aus Karahöyük bei Konya*. Ankara, 1978, 171, no.41, Abb.57 and Taf. 62, 156. - Also by him: *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. Ankara, 1991, 326.

48. I. Singer: *The Hittite Kl. LAM Festival*. SBT 27, Wiesbaden, 1983, vol.I, 150 and 165.

49. I. Kühl: Eine Leichenbestattung mit Bärenkralle aus der mittleren Bronzezeit. *Die Heimat* 88:8, 1981, 215-227. She refers to the paper of E.Schmid: Die Bärenkralle in vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit. *Sachsens Vorzeit* 1941, 37-50 [non vid]. For a comprehensive survey of German burials with bear-claws see M. Schönfelder: Bear-claws in Germanic graves. *OJA* 13, 1994, pp.217-227. Such prestige items are also found in Celtic areas, and they may be thought to reflect Germanic ethnicity.

50. E. Mason op. cit. 1989, 68.

51. Pl.H. Bossert: Die Schicksalsgöttinnen der Hethiter. *WO* 2, 1954-1959, 349-354.

52. For a (not complete) list of the occurrences see E.J.W.Barber: *Prehistoric textiles*. Princeton, N.J. 1990, 61-62. For a corrected list see J.Makkay in *Acta Arch.Hung.* 46, 1995, in press.

53. M. Popko: *Kultobjekte in der hethitischen. Religion nach keilschriftlichen Quellen*. Warsaw, 1978, 108. - S.Alp: *Beiträge zur Erforschung des hethitischen Tempels. Kultanlagen im Lichte der Keilschrifttexte*. Ankara, 1983, 239.

54. E.V. Jakovenko: Skythische Spindeln. In *Gold der Steppe*. Archäologie der Ukraine. Schleswig, 1991, pp.111-113, and also N.A.Gavriljuk: Das Spinnen bei den Steppenskythen. In *Skify Severnogo Przemomora*. Kiev, 1987, 116-130.

55. For details see J. Makkay: Mycenaean burial sacrifices and the origins of the Protogreeks. *Atti del II. Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma-Napoli 1991*, in press.